Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2004-01 - 2004-02

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2004-01-01 through 2004-02-29

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 3,338

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 00:12:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqs2kz7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84777

On Wed, 31 Dec 2003 18:23:19 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>I believe the downward spin began with Dick Bash.

He may have been the "external" cause but there were folks inside
the agency who did not understand or appreciate ham radio and could
not understand why any resources had to be expended in enforcement.
Then along came the bad years of CB running wild and things went
downhill fast.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 00:13:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ysOcnSonbrjn-26iUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84778
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312311131.41d83b79@posting.google.com...
> Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<VfBIb.19838$P%1.18531178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> > > Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> > > belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
> > > magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> > > every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> > > clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> > > a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.
> >
> > Well then you can't expect the magazine to be sold at outlets when you
only
> > buy it once in a while. They've got to recoup the costs of printing and
> > distributing and the "once in a while" buyer just doesn't provide that.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Gee ...

I've declined the AARP (for now at least - they started sending me
membership
solicitations on my 50th birthday - maybe some day I'll see a benefit)

The NRA would be of interest if I was still a hunter, but alas, the XYL is a
biologist and state-licensed wildlife rehabilitator, so for the sake of
marital
harmony, I've given up that hobby. (I have so many other things going on,
I don't know when I'd have the time for it anyway ...)

The AAA has never appealed to me ... I get good towing coverage for much
less through my car insurance and my new Ford Explorer also comes with
roadside assistance.

Skinheads ... well 'nuff said, I guess.

However, WRT the ARRL - as much as I've had some policy differences
with them over the years, they DO do a LOT of good things for ham radio,
and their member services and publications are also valuable.

All together, I made the value judgment to support the ARRL by maintaining membership for the past 25+ years (I should have become a life member years ago - I'd have really saved money over the years - but I resisted because of my
policy differences with the ARRL leadership in a couple of areas.)

However, with BPL, CC&Rs (don't affect me, but affect a lot of hams), and the good work that the ARRL/IARU did at the WRC on 40m expansion, I finally decided to become a life member and to work my policy differences from the inside as well as from the outside. If I live an average life span from
now, I'll just about break even on the $975.00 life membership. I also sent them $100.00 earmarked to support Ed Hare's work against the BPL threat.

I think that ARRL membership (with QST included) is a good value at the current
dues rates and find it hard to understand how anyone who's REALLY interested in ham radio and its future could justify NOT joining and supporting the good things
that the ARRL does - you don't have to agree with EVERYTHING they do or every position they take (I don't ...), but on balance they do much more right than
wrong, so I support them for that and joust with them on the things I disagree with.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Life Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

I can't understand how

3. Happy New Year!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 00:22:15 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <XKJIb.6900$Do6.3726691@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84779

```
Dear fellow R.R.A.Pers:

Wishing all who read these words a healthy, happy, and prosperous new year.
May all you DXers snare those rare ones and may all the ragchewer's
receivers be filled with nice long QSO's. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
```

4. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 00:39:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqs3s78.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84780

On 31 Dec 2003 23:56:47 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Just one example: The government used tax dollars to rescue Chrysler
>about 20 years ago. It turned out to be a good gamble because Chrysler
>paid back all of the money with interest, and in the end it cost the
>taxpayers nothing.

WHAT? Must be a different "government" and "Chrysler" than the one
that I remember, where all the government did was to be the "final"
guarantor of loans that Chrysler was seeking from the private sector
banks, enabling Chrysler to get a much lower interest rate than they
could get without such "bailout". No government money was expended,
nor would any have been expended unless Chrysler defaulted on said
loans, which of course they did not do.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5. Re: Happy New Year!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 02:59:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <G2MIb.1483$uF6.302828@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84782

Bert Craig wrote:

> Dear fellow R.R.A.Pers:
>
> Wishing all who read these words a healthy, happy, and prosperous new year.
> May all you DXers snare those rare ones and may all the ragchewer's
> receivers be filled with nice long QSO's. :-)

And the same to you Bert!

- Mike KB3EIA -

6. If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 03:18:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84784

Here is a hypothetical situation:

Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their access to the airwaves after WW1.

Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn, with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.

What should the testing regimen be?

- Mike KB3EIA -

7. Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 03:41:08 UTC
From: Alan Jatowski <a@letdjatow.org>
Message-ID: <bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84781
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat a judge of male character.

Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff. The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated. Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.

Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue. The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have, how many people work for them and how many college degrees they have.

"If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos," said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for hours after they're gone.

"Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.

8. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 04:17:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <2bNIb.247539$_M.1132714@attbi_s54>
Source record: 84783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.
>
> Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>
> Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> they have.
>
> "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> hours after they're gone.
>
> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.

Yawnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn........

73 from KI3R (I use Old Spice Sport)

ps if you want to smell something bad catch me the day after a good fish
dinner and I when I come back from an 8 mile run .... boy the system really
blows off those protein by-products .....I know that was just as interesting
as the story above .....Happy New Year KI3R

9. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 05:28:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <UdOIb.1567$uF6.329266@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84785
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:

> Look at your local HAM clubs, talk to the members(if you can wake them
> up). Most show up and act disgusted with the club, Ham radio, life in
> general. New folks are never there.

From reading your posts, I think you would fit right in with a club
like that, JEP.

- Mike KB3EIA -

10. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 05:37:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VmOIb.1569$uF6.330587@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:

> Check the figures yourself then check how many are really active. Yes
> you can but NRA and AARP rags on the stand. AAA no. I quoted no data,
> I made an observation. Get you head out the sand and look around. See
> all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
> nothing?

Nope.

> is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's?

Better. I just posted some pix on our website, from FD in 1968. My guess is we have about three times the number as we did then.

> Are new folks welcomed?

Yup. During the day, I do no operating at all, just control op the GOTA station and talk to new people when any show up. And we have new people show up.

>Is help provided?

Of course
> If so then consider yourself lucky.

Yeah, lucky enough. If you want, you can bitch about the ARS. Or you could do something about it.

Or are you one of those hams you bitch about in a previous message?

- Mike KB3EIA -

11. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 05:40:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ipOIb.1571$uF6.331001@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Dave Heil wrote:

> I don't know about lucky. Fortunate, maybe, that my experience over
> forty years in amateur radio hasn't been the unpleasant one you've
> obviously been forced to endure.

Do you think this guy would by any chance be Vipul, Dave? Has that same sort of pro-ham attitude, eh?

- Mike KB3EIA -

12. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 05:44:03 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <b7Kdne1GtpaxJW6iRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84789
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan Jatowski wrote:
> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.
>
> Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>
> Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> they have.
>
> "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> hours after they're gone.
>
> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.

And then it gets even worse, the cbers from the keydown come in.

13. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 05:52:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kAOIb.1574$uF6.332916@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84788
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0312311131.41d83b79@posting.google.com...
>
>>Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.
>>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>
> news:<VfBIb.19838$P%1.18531178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>>>"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>>Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
>>>>belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
>>>>magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
>>>>every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
>>>>clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
>>>>a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.
>>>
>>>Well then you can't expect the magazine to be sold at outlets when you
>
> only
>
>>>buy it once in a while. They've got to recoup the costs of printing and
>>>distributing and the "once in a while" buyer just doesn't provide that.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Gee ...
>
> I've declined the AARP (for now at least - they started sending me
> membership
> solicitations on my 50th birthday - maybe some day I'll see a benefit)
>
> The NRA would be of interest if I was still a hunter, but alas, the XYL is a
> biologist and state-licensed wildlife rehabilitator, so for the sake of
> marital
> harmony, I've given up that hobby. (I have so many other things going on,
> I don't know when I'd have the time for it anyway ...)
>

> The AAA has never appealed to me ... I get good towing coverage for much
> less through my car insurance and my new Ford Explorer also comes with
> roadside assistance.
>
> Skinheads ... well 'nuff said, I guess.
>
> However, WRT the ARRL - as much as I've had some policy differences
> with them over the years, they DO do a LOT of good things for ham radio,
> and their member services and publications are also valuable.
>
> All together, I made the value judgment to support the ARRL by maintaining
> membership for the past 25+ years (I should have become a life member years
> ago - I'd have really saved money over the years - but I resisted because of
> my
> policy differences with the ARRL leadership in a couple of areas.)
>
> However, with BPL, CC&Rs (don't affect me, but affect a lot of hams), and
> the good work that the ARRL/IARU did at the WRC on 40m expansion, I
> finally decided to become a life member and to work my policy differences
> from the inside as well as from the outside. If I live an average life span
> from
> now, I'll just about break even on the $975.00 life membership. I also sent
> them $100.00 earmarked to support Ed Hare's work against the BPL threat.
>
> I think that ARRL membership (with QST included) is a good value at the
> current
> dues rates and find it hard to understand how anyone who's REALLY interested
> in ham radio and its future could justify NOT joining and supporting the
> good things
> that the ARRL does - you don't have to agree with EVERYTHING they do or
> every position they take (I don't ...), but on balance they do much more
> right than
> wrong, so I support them for that and joust with them on the things I
> disagree with.
>

Just like you should! I'm amazed by the number of hams that seem to
thing that the ARRL has to agree with all their personal opinions. I
wonder how many of those type are married! 8^)

I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.

- Mike KB3EIA -

14. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 08:56:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101035639.22081.00002951@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84790

In article <AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their >access to the airwaves after WW1.

Could have very well happened, if not for the ARRL. Or, amateur radio could have been legislated out of existence at one of the radio conferences in the early 1920s. But fortunately it didn't happen.
>
> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn, >with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.

Whoa there! How could that happen?

And if it somehow did, what spectrum, power and modes would be allowed? What services would give up spectrum?

> What should the testing regimen be?

Depends entire on what the "new" service in this alternate-history line is like, don;t you think?

73 de Jim, N2EY

15. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 13:01:12 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84791
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

>
> I've declined the AARP (for now at least - they started sending me
> membership
> solicitations on my 50th birthday - maybe some day I'll see a benefit)
>
> The NRA would be of interest if I was still a hunter, but alas, the XYL is a
> biologist and state-licensed wildlife rehabilitator, so for the sake of
> marital
> harmony, I've given up that hobby. (I have so many other things going on,
> I don't know when I'd have the time for it anyway ...)
>
> The AAA has never appealed to me ... I get good towing coverage for much
> less through my car insurance and my new Ford Explorer also comes with
> roadside assistance.
>
> Skinheads ... well 'nuff said, I guess.
>
> However, WRT the ARRL - as much as I've had some policy differences
> with them over the years, they DO do a LOT of good things for ham radio,
> and their member services and publications are also valuable.
>
> All together, I made the value judgment to support the ARRL by maintaining
> membership for the past 25+ years (I should have become a life member years
> ago - I'd have really saved money over the years - but I resisted because of
> my
> policy differences with the ARRL leadership in a couple of areas.)
>
> However, with BPL, CC&Rs (don't affect me, but affect a lot of hams), and
> the good work that the ARRL/IARU did at the WRC on 40m expansion, I
> finally decided to become a life member and to work my policy differences
> from the inside as well as from the outside. If I live an average life span
> from
> now, I'll just about break even on the $975.00 life membership. I also sent
> them $100.00 earmarked to support Ed Hare's work against the BPL threat.
>
> I think that ARRL membership (with QST included) is a good value at the
> current
> dues rates and find it hard to understand how anyone who's REALLY interested
> in ham radio and its future could justify NOT joining and supporting the
> good things
> that the ARRL does - you don't have to agree with EVERYTHING they do or
> every position they take (I don't ...), but on balance they do much more
> right than

> wrong, so I support them for that and joust with them on the things I
> disagree with.
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> Grid Square FN20fm
> http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c
> ----------
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, IEEE Standards Association
> Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
> Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
> Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
> Member, QCWA (31424)
> Life Member, ARRL
> Member, TAPR
> ----------
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>
> I can't understand how

Your SIG says it all. An EXTRA in NO CODE INTERNATIONAL? I see you are a joiner. The more you belong to the better it is.

Help insure the survival and prosperity of ham radio? I think not. Insure the life of the ARRL and manufacturers? YES! No code is killing ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.

16. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 13:39:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <FRycnYljLeMevmmiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84792
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
> >

"JEP" snipped the headers - I said the stuff below that's prefaced with "> >
"

> > I've declined the AARP (for now at least - they started sending me
> > membership
> > solicitations on my 50th birthday - maybe some day I'll see a benefit)
> >
> > The NRA would be of interest if I was still a hunter, but alas, the XYL
is a
> > biologist and state-licensed wildlife rehabilitator, so for the sake of
> > marital
> > harmony, I've given up that hobby. (I have so many other things going
on,
> > I don't know when I'd have the time for it anyway ...)
> >
> > The AAA has never appealed to me ... I get good towing coverage for much
> > less through my car insurance and my new Ford Explorer also comes with
> > roadside assistance.
> >
> > Skinheads ... well 'nuff said, I guess.
> >
> > However, WRT the ARRL - as much as I've had some policy differences
> > with them over the years, they DO do a LOT of good things for ham radio,
> > and their member services and publications are also valuable.
> >
> > All together, I made the value judgment to support the ARRL by
maintaining
> > membership for the past 25+ years (I should have become a life member
years
> > ago - I'd have really saved money over the years - but I resisted
because of
> > my
> > policy differences with the ARRL leadership in a couple of areas.)
> >
> > However, with BPL, CC&Rs (don't affect me, but affect a lot of hams),
and
> > the good work that the ARRL/IARU did at the WRC on 40m expansion, I
> > finally decided to become a life member and to work my policy
differences
> > from the inside as well as from the outside. If I live an average life
```

span
> > from
> > now, I'll just about break even on the $975.00 life membership. I also
sent
> > them $100.00 earmarked to support Ed Hare's work against the BPL threat.
> >
> > I think that ARRL membership (with QST included) is a good value at the
> > current
> > dues rates and find it hard to understand how anyone who's REALLY
interested
> > in ham radio and its future could justify NOT joining and supporting the
> > good things
> > that the ARRL does - you don't have to agree with EVERYTHING they do or
> > every position they take (I don't ...), but on balance they do much more
> > right than
> > wrong, so I support them for that and joust with them on the things I
> > disagree with.
> >
> > --
> > Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> > Grid Square FN20fm
> > http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c
> > --
> > NCI-1052
> > Executive Director, No Code International
> > Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> > Senior Member, IEEE
> > Member, IEEE Standards Association
> > Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
> > Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
> > Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
> > Member, QCWA (31424)
> > Life Member, ARRL
> > Member, TAPR
> > --
> > Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> > Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> > <http://www.nocode.org>
> >
>
> Your SIG says it all. An EXTRA in NO CODE INTERNATIONAL?

Most of the NCI Directors are extras, of their national equivalent thereof.
One has DXCC CW only. What's your point?

> I see you are a joiner. The more you belong to the better it is.

I am ACTIVE in the things I've listed, except for TAPR. I am into
digital communications but have not been active in TAPR projects
for a number of reasons. However, I am VERY active in all of the
others. (I didn't list my local club/RACES/ARES ...) So, it's not a

"the more you belong to the better it is" thing. What's your point?

> Help insure the survival and prosperity of ham radio? I think not.
> Insure the life of the ARRL and manufacturers? YES! No code is killing
> ham radio.

Were it not for the no-code tech license since 1990, I'd bet we'd have
about 1/2 the number of licensed hams in the US that we have now.
(and commercial interests would be better positioned to take some of
our prime spectrum for lack of use)
So, how is no code "killing ham radio" ???

> See you on channel 22 good buddy.

Sorry, you'll have to find someone else to talk to on your favorite
frequency.
I don't have any equipment that will transmit there. (But I do have 3 rigs
that cover all of the amateur bands (except the 5 channels at 5 MHz) from
160m-70cm, all modes, and can be run without AC mains power - main station
rig, mobile (I'm in the process of installing that rig in a new vehicle),
and a QRP
station I use for backpack/travel use.)

How many (ham band) rigs do you have? Can you run for extended periods
(weeks or more, if need be) without commercial power? How active and
well-prepared are you?

Oh, you're just trolling? That's become abundantly clear ... why not try
another stream? I think the bites are about to dry up here.

Carl - wk3c

17. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 13:45:05 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3FF42460.476A26C1@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 84793
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

I need to find a can of 'Thread Be Gone'...

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
> > >
>
> "JEP" snipped the headers - I said the stuff below that's prefaced with "> >
> "
>
> > > I've declined the AARP (for now at least - they started sending me
> > > membership
> > > solicitations on my 50th birthday - maybe some day I'll see a benefit)
> > >
> > > The NRA would be of interest if I was still a hunter, but alas, the XYL
> is a
> > > biologist and state-licensed wildlife rehabilitator, so for the sake of
> > > marital
> > > harmony, I've given up that hobby. (I have so many other things going
> on,
> > > I don't know when I'd have the time for it anyway ...)
> > >
> > > The AAA has never appealed to me ... I get good towing coverage for much
> > > less through my car insurance and my new Ford Explorer also comes with
> > > roadside assistance.
> > >
> > > Skinheads ... well 'nuff said, I guess.
> > >
> > > However, WRT the ARRL - as much as I've had some policy differences
> > > with them over the years, they DO do a LOT of good things for ham radio,
> > > and their member services and publications are also valuable.
> > >
> > > All together, I made the value judgment to support the ARRL by
> maintaining
> > > membership for the past 25+ years (I should have become a life member
> years
> > > ago - I'd have really saved money over the years - but I resisted
> because of
> > > my
> > > policy differences with the ARRL leadership in a couple of areas.)
> > >
> > > However, with BPL, CC&Rs (don't affect me, but affect a lot of hams),
> and

> > > the good work that the ARRL/IARU did at the WRC on 40m expansion, I
> > > finally decided to become a life member and to work my policy
> differences
> > > from the inside as well as from the outside. If I live an average life
> span
> > > from
> > > now, I'll just about break even on the $975.00 life membership. I also
> sent
> > > them $100.00 earmarked to support Ed Hare's work against the BPL threat.
> > >
> > > I think that ARRL membership (with QST included) is a good value at the
> > > current
> > > dues rates and find it hard to understand how anyone who's REALLY
> interested
> > > in ham radio and its future could justify NOT joining and supporting the
> > > good things
> > > that the ARRL does - you don't have to agree with EVERYTHING they do or
> > > every position they take (I don't ...), but on balance they do much more
> > > right than
> > > wrong, so I support them for that and joust with them on the things I
> > > disagree with.
> > >
> > > --
> > > Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> > > Grid Square FN20fm
> > > http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c
> > > --
> > > NCI-1052
> > > Executive Director, No Code International
> > > Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> > > Senior Member, IEEE
> > > Member, IEEE Standards Association
> > > Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
> > > Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
> > > Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
> > > Member, QCWA (31424)
> > > Life Member, ARRL
> > > Member, TAPR
> > > --
> > > Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> > > Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> > > <http://www.nocode.org>
> > >
> >
> > Your SIG says it all. An EXTRA in NO CODE INTERNATIONAL?
>
> Most of the NCI Directors are extras, of their national equivalent thereof.
> One has DXCC CW only. What's your point?
>
> > I see you are a joiner. The more you belong to the better it is.

>
> I am ACTIVE in the things I've listed, except for TAPR. I am into
> digital communications but have not been active in TAPR projects
> for a number of reasons. However, I am VERY active in all of the
> others. (I didn't list my local club/RACES/ARES ...) So, it's not a
> "the more you belong to the better it is" thing. What's your point?
>
> > Help insure the survival and prosperity of ham radio? I think not.
> > Insure the life of the ARRL and manufacturers? YES! No code is killing
> > ham radio.
>
> Were it not for the no-code tech license since 1990, I'd bet we'd have
> about 1/2 the number of licensed hams in the US that we have now.
> (and commercial interests would be better positioned to take some of
> our prime spectrum for lack of use)
> So, how is no code "killing ham radio" ???
>
> > See you on channel 22 good buddy.
>
> Sorry, you'll have to find someone else to talk to on your favorite
> frequency.
> I don't have any equipment that will transmit there. (But I do have 3 rigs
> that cover all of the amateur bands (except the 5 channels at 5 MHz) from
> 160m-70cm, all modes, and can be run without AC mains power - main station
> rig, mobile (I'm in the process of installing that rig in a new vehicle),
> and a QRP
> station I use for backpack/travel use.)
>
> How many (ham band) rigs do you have? Can you run for extended periods
> (weeks or more, if need be) without commercial power? How active and
> well-prepared are you?
>
> Oh, you're just trolling? That's become abundantly clear ... why not try
> another stream? I think the bites are about to dry up here.
>
> Carl - wk3c

18. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 13:56:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101085622.22081.00002956@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84794

In article <kAOIb.1574$uF6.332916@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
>granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.
>
None of them, I'd say.

Yes, ham radio was shut down during WW1 and there was a strong contingent that did not want to allow hams back on the air after the Armistice. But there were several other severe threats. Here's just a few:

- in the 1920s there were at least three radio international conferences where the very existence of amateur radio hung in the balance. At that time there was a strong opinion outside of the USA and a few other countries that the airwaves whould be reserved for government and commercial use *only*. Some countries with significant amateur populations (like Great Britain) proposed restrictions that would have essentially killed amateur radio (ten watts and dummy antennas only, for example).

The very concept of allowing "regular people" to simply set up their own stations and communicate was alien to the mindset of many government officials. ARRL folks like Maxim, Warner and Stewart had the unenviable job of changing their minds. (Mrs. Maxim played a very important role as translator at the Paris conferences, btw). Indeed, amateur radio did not gain international treaty recognition as a separate radio service until 1927.

- The WW2 shutdown and reactivation went much more smoothly than the WW1 experience, in part because of ARRL leadership in dealing with FCC.

- Interference to radio broadcasting was a serious problem before WW2, due in part to lack of BC receiver selectivity. It reached the point where hams in many areas had to observe "quiet hours" and were not allowed to transmit during much of the evening and weekend. This situation reoccurred with TV in the 1950s to the point that a "traveling TVI roadshow" was put on by ARRL Hq. W1ICP and others traversed the country with cars full of equipment to demonstrate that TV and amateur radio could coexist without interference.

And now we have BPL.

73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

.

19. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:21:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF42CC2.245B7B65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84795

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FF32D36.DA7F397D@earthlink.net...
> > JEP wrote:
> > >
> > > Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.
> > >
> > That'll show 'em...

> I bet it will Dave....maybe they should cut off their noses also, eh?

Dan, it seems obvious that this fellow believes that his tirade will
have some effect on the ARRL. It won't, but let's not spoil his dream.

Dave K8MN

20. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:29:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <x9WIb.19968$P%1.18767913@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84796
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:ysOcnSonbrjn-26iUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0312311131.41d83b79@posting.google.com...
> > Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.
> [snip] However, WRT the ARRL - as much as I've had some policy differences
> with them over the years, they DO do a LOT of good things for ham radio,
> and their member services and publications are also valuable.
>
> All together, I made the value judgment to support the ARRL by maintaining
> membership for the past 25+ years (I should have become a life member
years
> ago - I'd have really saved money over the years - but I resisted because
of
> my
> policy differences with the ARRL leadership in a couple of areas.)
>
> However, with BPL, CC&Rs (don't affect me, but affect a lot of hams), and
> the good work that the ARRL/IARU did at the WRC on 40m expansion, I
> finally decided to become a life member and to work my policy differences
> from the inside as well as from the outside. If I live an average life
span
> from
> now, I'll just about break even on the $975.00 life membership. I also
sent
> them $100.00 earmarked to support Ed Hare's work against the BPL threat.
>
> I think that ARRL membership (with QST included) is a good value at the
> current
> dues rates and find it hard to understand how anyone who's REALLY
interested
> in ham radio and its future could justify NOT joining and supporting the
> good things
> that the ARRL does - you don't have to agree with EVERYTHING they do or
> every position they take (I don't ...), but on balance they do much more
> right than
> wrong, so I support them for that and joust with them on the things I
> disagree with.
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> Grid Square FN20fm

> http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

Exactly. Working from within is generally the most effective way to bring about real, long-term change. However too many other people just want to be back seat drivers or focus on a single policy they don't like and "throw out the baby with the bathwater" so to speak.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

21. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:34:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF42FEE.A172BBC1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84797

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > I don't know about lucky. Fortunate, maybe, that my experience over
> > forty years in amateur radio hasn't been the unpleasant one you've
> > obviously been forced to endure.
>
> Do you think this guy would by any chance be Vipul, Dave? Has that same
> sort of pro-ham attitude, eh?

Naw, not a chance, Mike. JEP's use of language doesn't quite have that flowery lilt to it. To emulate Vipul, he'd have to insert some terms like "only-morse" and a few whopping tales of radio amateurs' love affair with food or about how some group traveled to some spot on a DXpedition and then spent all of their time operating radios.

Dave K8MN

22. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:35:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3fWIb.19969$P%1.18768738@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84798
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:VmOIb.1569$uF6.330587@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> JEP wrote:
>
> > Check the figures yourself then check how many are really active. Yes
> > you can but NRA and AARP rags on the stand. AAA no. I quoted no data,
> > I made an observation. Get you head out the sand and look around. See
> > all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
> > nothing?
>
> Nope.
>

Our club members are also quite active. They actively participate in the
business meetings and presentations.

> > is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's?
>
> Better. I just posted some pix on our website, from FD in 1968. My
> guess is we have about three times the number as we did then.

Ours is infinitely better attended than it was in the 1960s. Our club did
not even exist back then.

>
> > Are new folks welcomed?
>
> Yup. During the day, I do no operating at all, just control op the GOTA
> station and talk to new people when any show up. And we have new people
> show up.
>
> >Is help provided?
>
> Of course

Absolutely. Break time usually finds the newcomers making a beeline to the
oldtimers and lively discussions about items they need help with. Several
of us are on an "Elmer's phone list", all of us regular talk to new people
over the air and give help, and several of us regularly teach classes with
many others putting in a little help at one or more sessions of a class.

> > If so then consider yourself lucky.
>
> Yeah, lucky enough. If you want, you can bitch about the ARS. Or you
> could do something about it.

>
> Or are you one of those hams you bitch about in a previous message?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yup, change starts with each individual. Don't complain, do something. Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

23. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:38:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nhWIb.19970$P%1.18769244@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:kAOIb.1574$uF6.332916@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
> granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

None as the ARS would have remained closed down after World War I. There
was no intent on the government part to ever re-establish those privileges.
While this is in the distant past, we don't have to look too far back to see
loss of spectrum and proposals from the government for loss of spectrum.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

24. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:51:32 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040101095132.586$bx@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84800
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
Should a ham be like N8WWM!?

http://tinyurl.com/q3xp

25. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 14:56:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101095622.07961.00000916@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84701

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hqs3s78.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 31 Dec 2003 23:56:47 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Just one example: The government used tax dollars to rescue Chrysler
>>about 20 years ago. It turned out to be a good gamble because Chrysler
>>paid back all of the money with interest, and in the end it cost the
>>taxpayers nothing.
>
> WHAT? Must be a different "government" and "Chrysler" than the one
> that I remember, where all the government did was to be the "final"
> guarantor of loans that Chrysler was seeking from the private sector
> banks, enabling Chrysler to get a much lower interest rate than they
> could get without such "bailout". No government money was expended,
> nor would any have been expended unless Chrysler defaulted on said
> loans, which of course they did not do.
>
Of course you are correct, sir! My explanation was incomplete and misleading on the use of taxpayer dollars to bail out Chrysler.

However, the point is still valid. The Feds got involved in saving a major US corporation. Taxpayer dollars and government resources certainly *were* spent in studying the problem and setting up the loan guarantees, even if Chrysler never got a nickel of govt. money directly.

And the question remains - was that bailout a "conservative" or a "liberal" action?

73 de Jim, N2EY

26. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:18:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401010818.568594cd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84702
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message news:<bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.
>
> Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>
> Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> they have.
>
> "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> hours after they're gone.
>
> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.

Name and Places Search

This form can be used to search for names, cities and towns, states
and Zip Codes. The format is free form meaning you can input whatever
you like into the box. Note: callsigns are excluded from the search.

Enter name or keyword(s) to search

Use Simple Search help

To search for the name or address of a club or person, enter the first
and/or the last names (in any order), or a part of the address (like
number and street) and/or the Zip Code. Go get Similar Zip codes, use
the star (*) such as '85*' which returns mostly Arizona zip codes.
Comma's and other punctuation are ignored. Both upper and lower case
letters are treated the same.
Click here for more advanced search options...

There are 0 records matching 'jatowski'.

27. Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:23:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xQXIb.29370$Pg1.5281@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84703
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://www.cdc.gov/elcosh/docs/d0500/d000568/d000568.html

28. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:27:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401010827.62494c94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84704

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040101035639.22081.00002951@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their
> >access to the airwaves after WW1.
>
> Could have very well happened, if not for the ARRL. Or, amateur radio could
> have been legislated out of existence at one of the radio conferences in the
> early 1920s. But fortunately it didn't happen.
> >
> > Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
> >with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>
> Whoa there! How could that happen?
>
> And if it somehow did, what spectrum, power and modes would be allowed? What
> services would give up spectrum?
>
> > What should the testing regimen be?
>
> Depends entire on what the "new" service in this alternate-history line is
> like, don;t you think?

No, it's bad grammar. Good grammar would be "How many minutes does it
take to send a FAX image?"

29. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:39:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <d3YIb.18828$IM3.15026@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84705

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0312311446.3ebe5f10@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
>
> > As for "free upgrades", the FCC already unleased THAT genie with
thier
> > last round of "restructuring" with no help at all from the ARRL.
>
> And what "free upgrade" did you see in the last round or
> restructuring?
>
> The only thing that remotely resembles "free", was giving Pre-87
> Technicians credit for the General written exam which they took.
> Since the exam was EXACTLY the same as Generals took, I don't see any
> freebie there.
>
> But just wait till ARRL BoD meets next month..... I expect to see
> them recommend a three-tier license regime, with a new low-powered 50W
> beginners "C" license, a new mid-range "B" license with 3-400W power
> limit, and a new top of the line "A" class license with 1.5KW power
> limit and a CW test in the 15-25WPM range. Frequency ghettos for "C"
> and "B" similar to now. Current Novice/Tech get free upgrade to "B"
> privs, current General/Advanced get free upgrade to "A".
> Yawwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!
>
> I'm sure I'll miss some of the details in their proposal, but the
> above is pretty much the way I read the tea-leaves.
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

The important aspect of getting to any truly "new" licensing scheme
absolutly requires either some free upgrades, loss of some privileges
or a combination of both. Hans's view of the future takes into
account a "least" loss approach plus free upgrades. I could easily
support Hans's vision above. The one differing aspect I think
would be that the "C" license would more likly have a 100W
limit since 50w would exclude a great many rigs.

Personally, I have no problem with free upgrades if it makes
sense and is done to (1) simplify overall and (2) avoids taking
significant privileges away from anyone already licensed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

30. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:42:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <36YIb.18835$IM3.12005@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84706

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Yes they can be. I've known several.
> They too often fall in the "know it all"
> category.

That hasn't been my experience. First, I haven't seen that many rule violations across the board. Most operators tend to stick to the rules, or at least make a darn good effort to do so. But, second, I certainly haven't seen that among those who tend to be technically oriented. If anything, they tend to go overboard on the rules.

> I think 50 to 100 questions ought to
> do it. Only the pool would need to
> be several hundred questions, just as
> today's pools are far larger than the
> number of questions actually
> occurring on any one exam.

I assume you want an equal number of questions for each exam. If so, you still haven't answered the key point of my last message. The current exam concept is basic exams for entry into each license class. Since you're advocating much more extensive exams, are you saying the current concept should be thrown away? If not, how do such large exams fit into the current concept? None of the other FCC licenses, except those professionally oriented, have such an extensive exam system. Are you advocating that we turn the exams for the Amateur Radio service into something similar to the exams for the professionally oriented licenses? If so, are you also advocating that we change the concept behind our licenses, and, by extension, the radio service, at the same time - in other words, the elimination of "amateur" from the Amateur Radio service?

> How many questions has she had to
> pass to get her law degree and to
> pass her bar exam?

It is patently absurd to compare the Amateur Radio license exams to the final exams for a law degree or any other college degree. I was more than generous when I compared them to the tests for a single college class. And, as I said, my wife only had 50 questions on the tests to pass her international law class.

> On the Tech exam there are only 5 rules
> questions. That means missing all 5
> gives you a score of 30, which is passing.
> This gives you room to miss several other

> questions on the exam. (snip)

Again, do you have anything to suggest this (a person missing every question on the rules, yet still passing the overall exam) has ever happened, much less commonly so? If not, you're doing as some others have done - offering a solution without evidence of a problem (in other words, an answer seeking a question).

> The current question pool however no
> longer includes the data rates for digital.
> This is quite important for legal operation
> that does not exceed the bandwidths for
> these modes. (snip)

Again, is there a widespread problem with this? I certainly haven't heard any complaints in this regard.

> Difference of opinion is fine but don't
> assume that the FCC knows what they
> are doing. Just because they've said it
> doesn't make it true. They have a long
> history of mistakes.

Speaking in general (not specifically to you, Dee - your comment just offered an opportunity to spread this to a wider issue to more directly address the subject line of this thread), the anti-FCC sentiment now spreading in the Amateur Radio community bothers me greatly. This same mentality started spreading in the CB community many years ago, with disastrous long term results. The FCC isn't our enemy. Any ruling we disagree with isn't necessarily a mistake and any mistakes they've made are far outweighed by the good things they've done for us (like the continued support for this radio service). In many ways, some in this service act like a bunch of spoiled brats. We have more frequencies, and more privileges on those frequencies, than just about any other non-government radio service. But these spoiled brats will never be satisfied - endlessly demanding more attention from the FCC over often trivial issues and then whining about how horrible the FCC is when things don't go their way. This behavior is extremely destructive, both for our relationship with the FCC and for the spirit of this radio service. And that, in my opinion, is the main problem with Ham radio today.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

31. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:44:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <u7YIb.18841$IM3.13944@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84707

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031231185647.22081.00002876@mb-m17.aol.com...
> In article <nwBIb.16932$IM3.5849@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Personally I think good true conservative idea is to allow people on
> >> the air with no licencing requirements whatsoever, then cull out the
> >> ones that violate the rules.
> >
> >Wrong. A true conservative desires the least practical government
> >intervention in life.
>
> A true liberal desires the least practical government intervention in life
as
> well.

ROTFLMAO...
Guess I have truly never met such a "true liberal." Every liberal I
hear from is always looking to use more of my money to create
larger and more involved government programs to do ever more
for the "poor, unwashed public".

> The devil is in the details of what "least practical government
intervention"
> really means.
>
> Just one example: The government used tax dollars to rescue Chrysler about
20
> years ago. It turned out to be a good gamble because Chrysler paid back
all of
> the money with interest, and in the end it cost the taxpayers nothing.
>
> Now - was the bailout a "liberal" move to save workers' jobs and try to
manage
> the economy? Some "conservatives" would say that companies that get in
trouble
> should be allowed to fail in a 'free market' and not propped up with tax
> dollars.
>
> OTOH, was the bailout a "conservative" move to save investors' money? Or
to
> give some help to an industry bedeviled with safety, pollution and economy
> regulations *and* the double whammy of foreign competiton and two oil
crises?

>
> Some "liberals" would say that Big Business should not be propped up with
tax
> dollars. (Ma's Diner wouldn't get such a bailout)
>
> >Clearly a "free-for-all" no license approach
> >to ham radio wouldn't cut it and, as such, I and other conservative
> >minded individuals do support ham licensing.
>
> Most "conservatives", anyway. The exact same is said by most "liberals".
>
> >Where we depart from
> >the current approach is in the recognition that the "incentives" of
> >today's licensing do NOT dovetail with the knowledge needed
> >to pass the higher level license exams.
>
> Not perfectly, anyway.

Not even very imperfectly.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

32. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:48:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <obYIb.29399$Pg1.2395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84708

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> The important aspect of getting to any truly "new" licensing scheme
> absolutly requires either some free upgrades, loss of some privileges
> or a combination of both. Hans's view of the future takes into
> account a "least" loss approach plus free upgrades. I could easily
> support Hans's vision above.

That's not my view of the future, and it FOR DAMNED SURE isn't my "vision".

For a view of my vision, visit http://tinyurl.com/wce9. No losses, and no freebie upgrades, and elimination of "newcomer ghettos". So much for your "absolutly (sic) requires".

73, de Hans, K0HB

33. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:51:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84709
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
SNIP
> YES! No code is killing
> ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.

And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"

Odds are you haven't a single rational example.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

34. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:56:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101115637.15462.00005314@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84710

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of December 31, 2003:

Novice - 32,755 (decrease of 16,574)
Technician - 259,431 (increase of 54,037)
Technician Plus - 63,070 (decrease of 66,015)
General - 141,447 (increase of 28,770)
Advanced - 82,022 (decrease of 17,760)
Extra - 104,867 (increase of 26,117)
Total - 683,592 (increase of 8,800)

73 de Jim, N2EY

35. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 16:59:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <NlYIb.18874$IM3.12919@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312311137.11929708@posting.google.com...
> Check the figures yourself then check how many are really active.

And just "how" do you propose anyone can "check how many
are really active?"

> Yes
> you can but NRA and AARP rags on the stand. AAA no. I quoted no data,
> I made an observation.

Your observation
was absent any clarification that it was only YOUR observation,
unsubstantiated by any true facts.

> Get you head out the sand and look around. See
> all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
> nothing? is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's? Are new
> folks welcomed? Is help provided?
> If so then consider yourself lucky.

One aspect of almost all hobbies" is the cost to play
which often results in an older cross-section of participants.
The same is true for antique cars, model railroading, etc.
Add to that the available "free time" which most older
folks, especially retirees, have.

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ODBIb.16943$IM3.1446@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> > > Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> > > belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc.
> >
> > Can you "just buy" the magazines of AARP, NRA, AAA, etc.
> > without joining? I am always amazed at people that want the "benefits"
> > of an organization's efforts, in this case the publication, but don't
want
> > to support the organization by joining. I see the same thing at times
> > in the antique car hobby. People that bitch about the club rules
> > at a car show, or otherwise want technical help from club officials
> > but won't part with the few bucks it takes to join.
> >
> > > I just want to read their
> > > magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it

> > > every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> > > clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> > > a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.
> >
> > Is it lessening? News to me.
> >
> > > If they took a
> > > real survey as to how many real active ham there are they would find
> > > the number far less than they think. I'm not talking about members,
> > > I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
> > > Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
> > > week? Most don't.
> >
> > Please provide your survey data.
> >
> > > Look at your local HAM clubs, talk to the members(if you can wake them
> > > up). Most show up and act disgusted with the club, Ham radio, life in
> > > general. New folks are never there. Ya I know about your Skywarn in
> > > Flint, MI. Great service! Could be run on CB, NEXTEL, GMRS.
> >
> > Could be but isn't...there in lies the difference.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

36. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:01:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gnYIb.18882$IM3.12914@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84712

"Phil Kane" wrote:
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > How many questions has she had to pass
> > to get her law degree and to pass her
> > bar exam?
>
> Pending Dwight's reply, I can add from my
> own experience. (snip)

Since a person still in college obviously hasn't yet got a law degree or passed the later bar exam, I thought Dee's question was rhetorical. Therefore, I didn't answer in that vein. However, before anyone takes it seriously in regards to my wife, let me add that my wife isn't seeking a degree in law. The international law class was just one class leading to a degree in another subject.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

37. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:10:21 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <7sYIb.8085$yA6.432@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 84713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.

NaNa NaNa Boo Boo. I smell a troll.

(This same tripe appears on some of the chicken band groups. Anybody can
stereotype anyone. Don't get me
started on them thar fellers that live in them drafty ole
house trailers and drive them thar pukey green Pontiacs
with the twin "whup-whips" 4 feet apart--you know; the
ones that go down the road going "fooomp-foomp-fooomp' on 4-5 cylinders and
smokin' out all the 'skeeters'. Five miles to the quart [oil].)

Try THAT on for size Mr. Jatowski.
>
>
>

38. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:14:52 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <azYIb.2266$ml6.2075@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 84714
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:b7Kdne1GtpaxJW6iRVn-vg@gbronline.com...
>
> And then it gets even worse, the cbers from the keydown come in.

.............driving rusted out Suburbans with them thar
huge "coily" antenners thar.

They are just jealous of the Greyhound bus-sized motor
homes that frequent the hamfest. You know, doctors, lawyers, surgeons,
bankers and the like. LMAO!

J

>

39. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:15:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8BYIb.18918$IM3.1191@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84715

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:obYIb.29399$Pg1.2395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>
> > The important aspect of getting to any truly "new" licensing scheme
> > absolutly requires either some free upgrades, loss of some privileges
> > or a combination of both. Hans's view of the future takes into
> > account a "least" loss approach plus free upgrades. I could easily
> > support Hans's vision above.
>
> That's not my view of the future, and it FOR DAMNED SURE isn't my
"vision".
>
> For a view of my vision, visit http://tinyurl.com/wce9. No losses, and no
> freebie upgrades, and elimination of "newcomer ghettos". So much for your
> "absolutly (sic) requires".
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

Apologies for misunderstanding your position. As to my
view that either freebies or losses are needed to get to a
new license plan, I truly think that will be the case. I doubt
the FCC wants to have a hybred licensing scheme in the
long run. That's my perspective. Assuming "free upgrades"
as was noted in your post, what's the overall harm?

Cheers and Happy New Year.
Bill K2UNK

40. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:24:46 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <sIYIb.2276$ml6.8@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 84716
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>
>
> There are 0 records matching 'jatowski'.

Elementary, my good man. Chicken Banders don't HAVE a data base! LOL!

J

41. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:41:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <XYYIb.29440$Pg1.8932@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84717

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> Assuming "free upgrades"
> as was noted in your post, what's the overall harm?

You're a bright guy, Bill, so surely you can see the "overall harm", but maybe you're having some trouble shaking off the effects of your New Years Eve celebration, so I'll spell it out for you.

Today, passing the Amateur Extra exam is the qualification required for full amateur privileges. An existing General or Advanced licensee has passed a less comprehensive set of examinations, and has not (by FCC definition) demonstrated qualification for full amateur privileges.

If FCC suddenly upgrades all General and Advanced licenses to Amateur Extra, then ipso facto and ipso jure the qualification required for full amateur privileges has been lowered by two full steps.

Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can reasonably plead that any examination more comprehensive than the current General discriminates against new applicants.

In some circles I've heard that called "the Great Dumbing Down" of amateur radio.

73, de Hans, K0HB

42. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 17:52:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <l7ZIb.3867$6B.1529@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84718

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:XYYIb.29440$Pg1.8932@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > Assuming "free upgrades"
> > as was noted in your post, what's the overall harm?
>
> You're a bright guy, Bill, so surely you can see the "overall harm", but
> maybe you're having some trouble shaking off the effects of your New Years
> Eve celebration, so I'll spell it out for you.
>
> Today, passing the Amateur Extra exam is the qualification required for
full
> amateur privileges. An existing General or Advanced licensee has passed a
> less comprehensive set of examinations, and has not (by FCC definition)
> demonstrated qualification for full amateur privileges.
>
> If FCC suddenly upgrades all General and Advanced licenses to Amateur
Extra,
> then ipso facto and ipso jure the qualification required for full amateur
> privileges has been lowered by two full steps.

Only on a one-time basis. The question still is, what is the harm of
such a one-time "fix."

> Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can
reasonably
> plead that any examination more comprehensive than the current General
> discriminates against new applicants.

They can plead all they want...doesn't make it so. The FCC could
certainly counter argue the upgrades were a one-time need to
simplify the overall license structure. YMMV

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

43. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 18:22:15 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84719
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
> SNIP
> > YES! No code is killing
> > ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
>
> And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
> that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
>
> Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

May I, Bill?

While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe it is fostering a bad mindset.

If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA. However, there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.

IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:

1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."

2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements we *want* to meet.)

I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions and their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe to say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.

What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can be reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for Technician "+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than squeaked.

73 es HNY de Bert
WA2SI

44. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 18:25:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DCZIb.29483$Pg1.3348@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84720

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Only on a one-time basis.
>

If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if the "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees would increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra Class" would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or tomorrows rules.

> > Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can
> >reasonably > plead that any examination more comprehensive
> > than the current General discriminates against new applicants.
>
> They can plead all they want...doesn't make it so. The FCC could
> certainly counter argue the upgrades were a one-time need to
> simplify the overall license structure.

Their counter argument would utterly fail, because they'd first need to prove that the "one-time need" over-rides the harm of a massive influx of underqualified (by their own rules) individuals into the top class of amateur operators. Judges rule on logic, not administrative convenience.

>
> The question still is, what is the harm of such a one-time "fix."
>

Trivializing this as a one-time "fix" shows how little you've examined the issue. Instead of a one-time "fix", it would be a one-time "hammer blow". The answer still is exactly as stated in my previous message.

Cheerios and bran flakes to you to,

K0HB

45. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 18:32:51 UTC
From: "Gary S." <Idontwantspam@net>
Message-ID: <9jp8vvomeisl6panapp6t9ofd7bpamarih@4ax.com>
Source record: 84721
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 16:23:57 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
wrote:

> http://www.cdc.gov/elcosh/docs/d0500/d000568/d000568.html
>
Big wall rock climbers and vertical cavers need to deal with the same,
and some of their gear and techniques may be helpful.

For example, when suspended on a rope, in harness, you could use a
loop of cord with a Prusik hitch, attach it to the main rope, and give
yourself a loop to stand on and get some more leg circulation.

There are other techniques used by belayers, as they may be in place
for extended times, and not able to let go of the rope their partner
is on.

As always, this is dangerous stuff, and should only be done with
proper instruction and equipment. Gravity is not always your friend.

Happy trails,
Gary (net.yogi.bear)
---
at the 51st percentile of ursine intelligence

Gary D. Schwartz, Needham, MA, USA
Please reply to: garyDOTschwartzATpoboxDOTcom

46. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 18:48:31 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401011048.10f3141@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84722
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

SNIP again.

> Sorry, you'll have to find someone else to talk to on your favorite
> frequency.
> I don't have any equipment that will transmit there. (But I do have 3 rigs
> that cover all of the amateur bands (except the 5 channels at 5 MHz) from
> 160m-70cm, all modes, and can be run without AC mains power - main station
> rig, mobile (I'm in the process of installing that rig in a new vehicle),
> and a QRP
> station I use for backpack/travel use.)
>
> How many (ham band) rigs do you have? Can you run for extended periods
> (weeks or more, if need be) without commercial power? How active and
> well-prepared are you?
>
> Oh, you're just trolling? That's become abundantly clear ... why not try
> another stream? I think the bites are about to dry up here.
>
> Carl - wk3c

The bites don't seem to drying up at all. I found a few nibbles yet.
The Extras on the no code board have to 5wpm Extras. Couldn't be real
Extras that had at least one exam in front of a FCC examiner. Passed
at least one test at a real FCC examination site. Actually learned
radio theory.
The radios I own are not your concern. I will say I own enough to
operate all bands and modes. Can stay active as long as some kind of
power is still available.Also have had a Ham ticket long enough to
know exactly what the ARRL has really done with the incentive crap
from the 60's. Remember, it was Maxim not the ARRL thst got the
frequencies back after WW 1. Maxim was a mover and shaker, unlike the
deadheads in there now---The Good Ole Boy Club! You guys keep nibbling
because you are afraid to admit you are wrong.

47. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 18:53:04 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3FF46C90.478C0E25@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 84723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

I misplaced my can of 'Thread Be Gone', does someone know where I can get a replacement?

JEP wrote:

> SNIP again.
>
> > Sorry, you'll have to find someone else to talk to on your favorite
> > frequency.
> > I don't have any equipment that will transmit there. (But I do have 3 rigs
> > that cover all of the amateur bands (except the 5 channels at 5 MHz) from
> > 160m-70cm, all modes, and can be run without AC mains power - main station
> > rig, mobile (I'm in the process of installing that rig in a new vehicle),
> > and a QRP
> > station I use for backpack/travel use.)
> >
> > How many (ham band) rigs do you have? Can you run for extended periods
> > (weeks or more, if need be) without commercial power? How active and
> > well-prepared are you?
> >
> > Oh, you're just trolling? That's become abundantly clear ... why not try
> > another stream? I think the bites are about to dry up here.
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> The bites don't seem to drying up at all. I found a few nibbles yet.
> The Extras on the no code board have to 5wpm Extras. Couldn't be real
> Extras that had at least one exam in front of a FCC examiner. Passed
> at least one test at a real FCC examination site. Actually learned
> radio theory.
> The radios I own are not your concern. I will say I own enough to
> operate all bands and modes. Can stay active as long as some kind of
> power is still available.Also have had a Ham ticket long enough to
> know exactly what the ARRL has really done with the incentive crap
> from the 60's. Remember, it was Maxim not the ARRL thst got the
> frequencies back after WW 1. Maxim was a mover and shaker, unlike the
> deadheads in there now---The Good Ole Boy Club! You guys keep nibbling
> because you are afraid to admit you are wrong.

48. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 19:50:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5S_lb.1746$uF6.508230@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84724

N2EY wrote:
> In article <AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their
>>access to the airwaves after WW1.
>
>
> Could have very well happened, if not for the ARRL. Or, amateur radio could
> have been legislated out of existence at one of the radio conferences in the
> early 1920s. But fortunately it didn't happen.
>
>> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
>>with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>
>
> Whoa there! How could that happen?
>
> And if it somehow did, what spectrum, power and modes would be allowed? What
> services would give up spectrum?

Aww, don't make me define too much Jim! Okay, lets say that in the rebirth, fueled by concerns for homeland security, that a a loosely organized group of non-professional communication savvy people that might be able to respond to disasters or the is made.

Assume that it is decided that this group should have some technical abilities, so that if need be, they might stand a chance of getting a station operational under adverse conditions.

The philosophy is that these people would pursue the service as a hobby, working for enjoyment while honing operational skills.

Let's say that amateurs are allocated some frequencies. I'll assume that the bands I not will be similar in width to what we have now:

2 meters
10 meters
20 meters
40 meters - or nearby, away from broadcasting frequencies
80 meters

The various frequencies are chosen to take advantage of propagation characteristics.

No UHF or above, no 160 meters.

>> What should the testing regimen be?
>
>
> Depends entire on what the "new" service in this alternate-history line is
> like, don;t you think?

Work with me a little bit, Jim! This can be a fun exercise. See what
you can come up with based on what I gave you so far.

- Mike KB3EIA -

49. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 20:02:21 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <mynews@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <eas8vv0mtrfk2vvr8frk40d3rt6d2tgodd@4ax.com>
Source record: 84727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 16:23:57 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>
> http://www.cdc.gov/elcosh/docs/d0500/d000568/d000568.html
>
>
Experience tells me there is something missing from their
explanations. For those who do much climbing the hazards, or at least
some of them associated with staying in the same position are known.

At my age I still do a fair amount of tower climbing. A typical tower
climb is 3 to 4 hours with no few running up to 6 or 7. The longest
have been on the order of 8 to 9 hours. The longest in the last two
years was between 6 and 7 hours.

I always use a "tag line". which they refer to as an arresting
harness. Actually it's a double line with two clips and they are only
a bit over 3 feet long. So, if I slip I won't fall far, but it's gonna
hurt! It does not get in the way of work. It can be clipped to the
side, or in front but attaches to the D rings on the belt. A simple
"tag line" makes climbing safer and easier. Even a simple one
properly attached does not have to get in the way.

I do not believe in the harnesses I see advertized and I do not
believe in using Nylon harness or safety belts. Although we used them
where I used to work, we considered them disposable with a very short
life.
"As I recall" we replaced them every 8 months. Remember, Nylon does
not stand up well in direct sunlight.

I avoid the harnesses as I particularly do not want my legs hanging
or something that will encourage a situation where I can work with
them hanging. Sure they are comfortable, but I stand! If the work is
too strenuous to stand it should be done in some other manner. If the
climber can not keep his or her weight on their feet for the duration
of the climb they should not be climbing in those situations.

I wear a Kline, free floating leather belt which is 5 inches wide. The
belt itself is of double neoprene impregnated nylon monofilament. I
have it inspected regularly. The pole strap is of the same material
and easily extends to go around a tower 2 foot on a side, yet works
just fine on a small TV tower. I knew I'd be using the belt a lot so
I purchased the same type as used by the line and tower crews. I do
see that they are migrating tot he harnesses probably due as much to

OSHA as any other reason. Who knows, ,maybe after this study they will be moving away from them, but they are active and rarely remain in one position for long, so I don't see this as a hazard they would be exposed to very often.

On one job a few years ago, they came up short on some parts. So I slid into the tower, got comfortable and waited about an hour and a half. The temperature was well over 90F. I was in a vertical position, it was hot, and I did very little moving. I wore a wide brimmed hat, long sleeve shirt, and work pants. (and leather gloves) There was no problem nor was there any indication of one. OTOH I sure was getting bored. However it was a position that required I move my legs at regular intervals to stay comfortable.

"I think", although I disagree with their wording, they are referring to a "motionless" upright position. I also believe that although the bent knees at "parade rest" *might* help, it's the movement of the leg muscles that forces the blood out, not just using the muscles to support the weight. Those legs have to *move* to keep the blood from pooling.

One thing I did not see them mention, or I missed it, is the greater likely hood of developing blood clots in the legs when they are motionless or just hanging for long periods. Hanging is far worse than standing on rigid, straight legs.

I would reiterate that any one who feels they need to use a harness of the type in which you can sit to make life easier on a tower should not be climbing at least for nothing more than a very short job, but not the ones that take over half an hour. OTOH there is nothing wrong with wearing one for convenience if handled properly. Tower climbing requires the climber to be in good physical shape, not just for the climbing, but for safety and health reasons.

If the climber is over weight, out of shape, not feeling good, or feels they need additional support to be able to do the job, they should stay on the ground. It is not something that should be taken lightly.

One of the greatest hazards has been the unknowing staying "up there" too long and then being too tired to climb down. On rare occasion some one will climb up a ways and suddenly discover that "This is not for me!" Going up a tower and then helping someone climb down one hand or foot at a time is a rather unique and tiring experience. (and it takes a very long time) At least he didn't go up to 200 feet before looking down. <:-))

Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
(N833R, S# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
www.rogerhalstead.com

50. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 20:09:44 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <c8%Ib.29601$Pg1.1910@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84725

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Here is a hypothetical situation:

97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass
a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple
equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah,
blah, blah). You will be issued a license and callsign when you
pass the test. Transmit your call sign once every 10 minutes when
on the air.

97.2 Your power limit is 1.5KW to the antenna.

97.3 Here are your bands. Stay inside of them.

97.4 Your are encouraged to tinker and experiment and communicate
and do public service and talk to strangers in far away lands and
launch communications satellites into space and any other cool
technical "radio stuff" you may think up. The government doesn't
care what mode you use for any of this, except that 10 years from
today, all non-digitized modes will be retired.

97.5 Play nice. We'll try to keep the CBers out of your hair.
Deliberate interference, unresolved dirty signals, or other asinine
behavior on your part will cause Riley Hollingsworth to come and
permanently kick your ass off the playground. Have fun.

Love always,
/signed/ FCC

Just as the amateur service thrived on the challenge of being "banished" to
the
shortwaves back 80 years ago or so, I think another "challenge" is needed to
revitalize the spirit of experimentation and invention. We need to be
kicked
out of our comfort zone.

Give us the authority to freely tinker, explore, innovate, and generally be
"hams" again. That's how we "colonized" the electromagnetic spectrum,
"proved
it in", and "made it safe for commerce". As long as we don't spill out of
our assigned segments, let us play without technical micro-management.
Who knows what we might develop!

73, de Hans, K0HB

51. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 20:11:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0a%Ib.1755$uF6.512839@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

N8KDV wrote:

> I need to find a can of 'Thread Be Gone'...

What reader are you using? You can make this disappear in an instant!

- Mike KB3EIA -

52. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 20:29:54 UTC
From: Jerry Bransford <jerrypb@mecox.net>
Message-ID: <7r%Ib.36541$gN.20656@fed1read05>
Source record: 84728
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Roger, (hello, haven't talked with you in a while) I did a bit of not-so-tall tower climbing as part of my job while I was in the USAF communications biz and I quickly discovered "This is not for me!" Heck, I even got scared once or twice on the so-called parachute ride at Knott's Berry Farm hehheh.

Jerry
--
Jerry Bransford
To email, remove 'me' from my email address
KC6TAY, PP-ASEL
See the Geezer Jeep at
http://members.cox.net/jerrypb/

"Roger Halstead" <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> wrote in message news:eas8vv0mtrfk2vvr8frk40d3rt6d2tgodd@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 16:23:57 GMT, "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >
> > > http://www.cdc.gov/elcosh/docs/d0500/d000568/d000568.html
> >
> >
> Experience tells me there is something missing from their
> explanations. For those who do much climbing the hazards, or at least
> some of them associated with staying in the same position are known.
>
> At my age I still do a fair amount of tower climbing. A typical tower
> climb is 3 to 4 hours with no few running up to 6 or 7. The longest
> have been on the order of 8 to 9 hours. The longest in the last two
> years was between 6 and 7 hours.
>
> I always use a "tag line". which they refer to as an arresting
> harness. Actually it's a double line with two clips and they are only
> a bit over 3 feet long. So, if I slip I won't fall far, but it's gonna
> hurt! It does not get in the way of work. It can be clipped to the
> side, or in front but attaches to the D rings on the belt. A simple
> "tag line" makes climbing safer and easier. Even a simple one
> properly attached does not have to get in the way.
>
> I do not believe in the harnesses I see advertized and I do not
> believe in using Nylon harness or safety belts. Although we used them
> where I used to work, we considered them disposable with a very short

> life.
> "As I recall" we replaced them every 8 months. Remember, Nylon does
> not stand up well in direct sunlight.
>
> I avoid the harnesses as I particularly do not want my legs hanging
> or something that will encourage a situation where I can work with
> them hanging. Sure they are comfortable, but I stand! If the work is
> too strenuous to stand it should be done in some other manner. If the
> climber can not keep his or her weight on their feet for the duration
> of the climb they should not be climbing in those situations.
>
> I wear a Kline, free floating leather belt which is 5 inches wide. The
> belt itself is of double neoprene impregnated nylon monofilament. I
> have it inspected regularly. The pole strap is of the same material
> and easily extends to go around a tower 2 foot on a side, yet works
> just fine on a small TV tower. I knew I'd be using the belt a lot so
> I purchased the same type as used by the line and tower crews. I do
> see that they are migrating tot he harnesses probably due as much to
> OSHA as any other reason. Who knows, ,maybe after this study they
> will be moving away from them, but they are active and rarely remain
> in one position for long, so I don't see this as a hazard they would
> be exposed to very often.
>
> On one job a few years ago, they came up short on some parts. So I
> slid into the tower, got comfortable and waited about an hour and a
> half. The temperature was well over 90F. I was in a vertical
> position, it was hot, and I did very little moving. I wore a wide
> brimmed hat, long sleeve shirt, and work pants. (and leather gloves)
> There was no problem nor was there any indication of one. OTOH I sure
> was getting bored. However it was a position that required I move my
> legs at regular intervals to stay comfortable.
>
> "I think", although I disagree with their wording, they are referring
> to a "motionless" upright position. I also believe that although the
> bent knees at "parade rest" *might* help, it's the movement of the leg
> muscles that forces the blood out, not just using the muscles to
> support the weight. Those legs have to *move* to keep the blood from
> pooling.
>
> One thing I did not see them mention, or I missed it, is the greater
> likely hood of developing blood clots in the legs when they are
> motionless or just hanging for long periods. Hanging is far worse than
> standing on rigid, straight legs.
>
> I would reiterate that any one who feels they need to use a harness
> of the type in which you can sit to make life easier on a tower should
> not be climbing at least for nothing more than a very short job, but
> not the ones that take over half an hour. OTOH there is nothing wrong
> with wearing one for convenience if handled properly. Tower climbing

> requires the climber to be in good physical shape, not just for the
> climbing, but for safety and health reasons.
>
> If the climber is over weight, out of shape, not feeling good, or
> feels they need additional support to be able to do the job, they
> should stay on the ground. It is not something that should be taken
> lightly.
>
> One of the greatest hazards has been the unknowing staying "up there"
> too long and then being too tired to climb down. On rare occasion some
> one will climb up a ways and suddenly discover that "This is not for
> me!" Going up a tower and then helping someone climb down one hand
> or foot at a time is a rather unique and tiring experience. (and it
> takes a very long time) At least he didn't go up to 200 feet before
> looking down. <:-))
>
> Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
> (N833R, S# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
> www.rogerhalstead.com

53. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 21:01:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <4V%Ib.19277$IM3.16720@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84729

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:DCZIb.29483$Pg1.3348@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > Only on a one-time basis.
>
> If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if the
> "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees would
> increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra
Class"
> would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or tomorrows
rules.

Doesn't bother me. It may just be something we live through to
get to a new, more rational licensing scheme.

> > > Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can
> > >reasonably > plead that any examination more comprehensive
> > > than the current General discriminates against new applicants.
> >
> > They can plead all they want...doesn't make it so. The FCC could
> > certainly counter argue the upgrades were a one-time need to
> > simplify the overall license structure.
>
> Their counter argument would utterly fail, because they'd first need to
> prove that the "one-time need" over-rides the harm of a massive influx of
> underqualified (by their own rules) individuals into the top class of
> amateur operators. Judges rule on logic, not administrative convenience.

The FCC doesn't have to prove anything. The burden of proof would
be on those that oppose what was done. Government regulations have a
presumption of legality to start with.

> > The question still is, what is the harm of such a one-time "fix."
>
> Trivializing this as a one-time "fix" shows how little you've examined the
> issue. Instead of a one-time "fix", it would be a one-time "hammer blow".
> The answer still is exactly as stated in my previous message.
>
> Cheerios and bran flakes to you to,

Happy new year too.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

54. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 21:01:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
> > SNIP
> > > YES! No code is killing
> > > ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
> >
> > And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
> > that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
> >
> > Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> May I, Bill?
>
> While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe
it
> is fostering a bad mindset.
>
> If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
> Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
> aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA.
However,
> there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some
> pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
>
> IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>
> 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
> higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."

Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as

an international treaty element.

> 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if
> it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements
> we *want* to meet.)

I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added priviliges
have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.

> I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles
> on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions
and
> their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim
> an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe
to
> say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.
>
> What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can
be
> reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for
Technician
> "+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than
squeaked.

Fair enough.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

55. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 21:34:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Pn0Jb.29749$Pg1.12522@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84731

I wrote:

> > If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if
the
> > "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees would
> > increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra
> > Class" would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or
> > tomorrows rules.

Bill Sohl blew it off with ......

>
> Doesn't bother me.
>

Bill, when are the next NCI elections for Director? I look forward to
voting for whoever runs in opposition to you. You are irresponsible and
dangerous.

K0HB

56. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 22:23:41 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401011423.59897410@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> > And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
> > that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
> >
> > Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> May I, Bill?
>
> While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe it
> is fostering a bad mindset.
>
> If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
> Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
> aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA. However,
> there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some
> pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
>
> IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>
> 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
> higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>
> 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if
> it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements
> we *want* to meet.)
>
> I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles
> on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions and
> their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim
> an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe to
> say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.
>
> What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can be
> reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for Technician
> "+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than squeaked.
>
> 73 es HNY de Bert
> WA2SI

Yep, the dumbing down of America. The masses can't pass the test so we will make the test easier. Notice how they skirt the issue of having passed any test in front of a FCC examiner. The VEC program is another farce. Why not put the little piece of paper in a corn flakes box. At least you would have breakfast.

57. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 22:24:55 UTC
From: blackm00@cam.org
Message-ID: <6447bcd3.0401011424.3dc279dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84733

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Here is a hypothetical situation:
>
> Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their
> access to the airwaves after WW1.
>
> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
> with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>
> What should the testing regimen be?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

It wouldn't be amateur radio.

Amateur radio derives from that time and place where radio began.
It was there before there were rules, or most of the technology that
came later. It also came before there was much clue about what
the new technology could be used for, and before there were well defined
radio services.

Anateur radio exists because hams staked out the territory before
most people knew about radio. Amateur radio did not see others
making use of the technology and then claim they needed space;
they put the technology to use, and helped push the technology
and the applications that came later.

For something to start now, one has to wonder what the purpose
would be? It's certainly not about getting in on emerging technology.
Without the history of radio behind it, then there is no way it
would be the same sort of service. Even things like contesting
derive from those early days, when being able to reach further
and further was a reflection of the effort put into the equipment
and antennas, and the contests were a means of testing it, or
testing radio itself. Witness the TransAtlantic Tests in December
of 1921; a form of contest yet the whole point was to see if
those useless shortwave frequencies where hams had been relegated
once rules were set in place could actually be used to span the
Atlantic.

People are forever saying that amateur radio can't compete with
today's technology, when everyone can get a cellphone or an FRS
transceiver, and use the internet. Put in those terms,
there is no point to amateur radio. And anything created
today would take that into consideration.

A very important part of amateur radio is it's history, because it's an important history, not just to the hobby but to radio itself. Take that away, and it could not be anything close to what it is now.

Michael VE2BVW

58. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 23:09:48 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9463B8BF5EF4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84734

<snip>
>>
>> PS: I am a 'know-it-all' EE, but I don't think anyone in my position
>> would take the tests without at least reading Part 97.
>>
>
> Alun, not everyone is as conscientious as you are about having checked
> out the rules. Of those hams that I personally know, only a small
> percentage have a copy of the Part 97 rules and an even smaller
> percentage bother to keep up with making sure it is current.
>
> Also you didn't have to quote the ENTIRE discussion to make a reply. I
> was beginning to wonder if you had written anything as I scrolled down.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

My newsreader (XNews) has a 'skip quoted text' button. As a result I tend not to snip much!

Alun

59. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 23:20:04 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9463BA7C94237elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84735

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqry2k6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

<snip>
>
> Another radical idea: The (commercial) radiotelephone operator's
> exam has two elements that all classes must pass: Element 1 dealing
> with Rules and Regulations, and Element 2 dealing with operating
> practices and procedures.
>
> As this is a requirement even for a charter boat skipper operating
> in tidal waters who isn't even allowed to do anything with the
> transmitter except to operate the external channel and volume knobs,
> I can see having a counterpart of perhaps another 50 questions in
> the Amateur exam dealing with operating practices in all modes.
>
> Like the Rules exam, pass it once, never have to pass it again
> unless the license lapses beyond the grace period for renewal or the
> licensee's conduct is found to be so egregious that a re-exam under
> FCC supervision is necessary - "all or nothing".
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

I don't think the FCC will ever again go for anything that increases the
total number of elements. However, if the licence structure were ever
rationalised to a two-tier system, then your idea might fit in. One rules
and regs test, and two theory tests, with the higher theory test giving
access to, say, 20m and the WARC bands, plus more power (1500W versus
200W).

60. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-01 23:43:00 UTC
From: Cecil Moore <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.ONEDOT.org>
Message-ID: <3ff4b10b$1_2@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 84736
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Roger Halstead wrote:
> I always use a "tag line". which they refer to as an arresting
> harness. Actually it's a double line with two clips and they are only
> a bit over 3 feet long. So, if I slip I won't fall far, but it's gonna
> hurt!

I have my Purple Martin birdhouse mounted on my tower at a height
of about 20 ft. Last year, I wished I had not been wearing my safety
harness when I was surprised by a six foot long rat snake during a
nest check. The harness forced me to face the snake when I would have
much rather jumped. :-)
--
73, Cecil http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

61. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 00:23:41 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bt3h95$2q1gg$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84802
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

>
> Just like you should! I'm amazed by the number of hams that seem to
> thing that the ARRL has to agree with all their personal opinions. I
> wonder how many of those type are married! 8^)
>

I wouldn't say they should have to agree 100% but logic would dictate that
at least about 1/2 of all or so should be in agreement.

> I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
> granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.

Prove it. Prove it without circumstantial or coincidental evidence.

Ryan KC8PMX

--
"The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any
more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but
to make him a priest."

62. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 00:33:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bt3h97$2q1gg$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:F9_Hb.24986$Pg1.11333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Elmering.
>
> SKN is an elmering opportunity. If you know the code, and you want to see
> it continue as part of our ham radio culture, you have to pass it on.
> Nobody teaches CW any more. We used to have converts from the military,
> where CW ops were to learn code or face a courtmartial. They got to 20WPM
> in a couple of weeks but had a gun to their heads for 8 hours a day to do
> it. Learning CW is a one-on-one activity and each of us CW ops needs to
> feel an obligation to our elmers to pass it on.

You don't learn CW as a language, you learn morse code. One is a method of transmission and one is an encoding scheme sometimes carried over a method of radio transmission. There is a difference.

Ryan KC8PMX
--
"The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but to make him a priest."

63. Re: Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 00:35:37 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bt3h98$2q1gg$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

True Mike, if they are not gonna bother to use personal hygiene practices
at home, they probably are not gonna bother with it at a hamfest
either!!!!!!

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you
still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

>
> > Kiosks, where the kits will be sold on the convention floor, will
> > have large signs over them with the words, "Hams Stink."
> > "That alone will get people's attention," said Michael.
>
> Don't quit your day job.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

64. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 00:39:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101193920.25815.00005591@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84737

Of course hams tip.

All you have to do to get a ham to tip
is to apply sufficient lateral force
above the ham's center of gravity.

This result is, of course, completely
and accurately predicted by
Fudd's First Law of Opposition:

"If you push something hard enough, it will fall over."

73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

65. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 00:58:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bt3h99$2q1gg$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84805

> 50 seems to be a reasonable number for the average applicant. This
> isn't, and shouldn't be, a Bar Exam because folks who pass the rules
> exam are not expected to be qualified to do interpretation and
> analysis to the level and precision that an attorney does.
>

As I stated here before, I would like to see the exams get expanded to something similar as to what has been required in the fire service, at least all of the ones I have taken. The least amount of questions was 150, and the most questions was 250. AND THE QUESTION POOLS WERE NOT PUBLISHED.

Now, what is interesting, in the 2+ foot tall stack of books I had to use for my Firefighter 1 and Firefighter 2 certifications had all of the questions within the chapter tests, quizes, pre-tests etc. So, basically if one did the homework like they were supposed to, then they have actually seen the questions. I distinctly remember when I took my test, seeing the same identical question on a piece of homework that was on the final exam, many times. I actually like the way IFSTA organizes and sets up their instruction books. Not only do you have a main book for the instruction/reading, but workbooks to put the chapter's contents to practical use.

I would definitely like to see all three tests (tech, general, extra) go up to at least 100 questions each. And if the question pool is released, at least only release the questions, and not the answers. At least then the potential testee would have to look the material up. Hell, I would even re-test if I had too under this type of test. In fact, if ham radio is "sooo important" and "actually saves lives" I would think that retesting every ten years would actually be a good thing. Not only would it show that the licensee retained knowledge but might even show if he/she progressed at all.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

66. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 01:37:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqtzs7c.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84738

On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 19:50:25 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:

>Work with me a little bit, Jim! This can be a fun exercise. See what
>you can come up with based on what I gave you so far.

Based on what you gave so far, those volunteers would be sworn in as members of the Sheriff's Radio Reserve and given assigments to use commercial equipment and departmental procedures on those frequencies, similar in a lot of respects to CAP and MARS operation.

The local Sheriff's Deparment tried to do that when we (AREC/RACES) approached them to be a "served agency". Because we were organized and operational before that, we could tell them to play another tune on their trombone because we report to the Emergency Management folks some of whom are hams anyhow.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

67. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 01:37:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqu0zad.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84739

On 01 Jan 2004 14:56:22 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>And the question remains - was that bailout a "conservative" or a "liberal"
>action?

I define a "conservative" as someone who wants the government to
stay out of his/her life but to be on call to squash any opponent of
his/hers.

I define a "liberal" as what I was in 1955..... <ggg>

Neither have any bearing on what those labels are applied to today.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

68. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 01:37:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqu168e.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84740

On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 16:44:10 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Every liberal I
>hear from is always looking to use more of my money to create
>larger and more involved government programs to do ever more
>for the "poor, unwashed public".

Nah...this "liberal" is always looking to use more of eveyone's
money to create larger and more involved government programs to do
ever more for me and my family... <ggg>

Happy New Year, Bill -

Lay your hand on the radio and feel the healing power of the B+.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

69. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 03:31:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
>>>SNIP
>>>
>>>>YES! No code is killing
>>>>ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
>>>
>>>And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
>>>that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
>>>
>>>Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>>Bill K2UNK
>>
>>May I, Bill?
>>
>>While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe
>
> it
>
>>is fostering a bad mindset.
>>
>>If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
>>Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
>>aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA.
>
> However,
>
>>there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some
>>pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
>>
>>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>>
>>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements

>>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
>>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>
>
> Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.

This is an excellent point, Bill! And the answer is YES, they did! I have a wife and kid that cannot drive a standard transmission auto or truck. I can drive standard as well as automatic transmissioned vehicles. Who knows more?

- Mike KB3EIA -

70. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 04:10:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xa6Jb.20154$P%1.18969079@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84742

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:36YIb.18835$IM3.12005@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Yes they can be. I've known several.
> > They too often fall in the "know it all"
> > category.
>
>
> That hasn't been my experience. First, I haven't seen that many rule
> violations across the board. Most operators tend to stick to the rules, or
> at least make a darn good effort to do so. But, second, I certainly
haven't
> seen that among those who tend to be technically oriented. If anything,
they
> tend to go overboard on the rules.
>

I've seen them have to learn the rules "the hard way" because they weren't required to learn them for the test. Generally this has just been informal warnings from other hams or warning notices from Official Observers. Good intentions don't get anyone anywhere.

>
> > I think 50 to 100 questions ought to
> > do it. Only the pool would need to
> > be several hundred questions, just as
> > today's pools are far larger than the
> > number of questions actually
> > occurring on any one exam.
>
>
> I assume you want an equal number of questions for each exam. If so, you
> still haven't answered the key point of my last message. The current exam
> concept is basic exams for entry into each license class. Since you're
> advocating much more extensive exams, are you saying the current concept
> should be thrown away?

Nope you assume wrong. I suggested simply adding a separate rules test, perhaps taking the place of the code test by the way although I prefer a code test stay. The remaining tests would stay the same except that the rules questions in the current tests be replaced with other material. i.e. The Tech test stays 35 questions but those 5 rules questions would be replace by 5 other questions. I stated that in other posts and suggested

areas from which such material could be chosen. I was illustrating that there is a wealth of material available.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

71. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 04:17:07 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Hd6Jb.575$Pn5.432@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 84743

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040101193920.25815.00005591@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Of course hams tip.
>
> All you have to do to get a ham to tip
> is to apply sufficient lateral force
> above the ham's center of gravity.
>
> This result is, of course, completely
> and accurately predicted by
> Fudd's First Law of Opposition:
>
> "If you push something hard enough, it will fall over."
>
> 73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

LOL! Is "ham-tipping" anything like "cow tipping"?

73

Jerry

72. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 04:49:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <KL6Jb.4687$6B.4113@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84744

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> I've seen them have to learn the rules
> "the hard way" because they weren't
> required to learn them for the test.
> Generally... (snip)

Different experiences, I guess.

> Nope you assume wrong. (snip)

Sorry for the wrong assumption. I'm still not convinced of a need to change the license exams, but I'll let it go with what has already been said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

73. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 04:57:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101235701.23171.00003065@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84745

In article <FRycnYljLeMevmmiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Were it not for the no-code tech license since 1990, I'd bet we'd have
>about 1/2 the number of licensed hams in the US that we have now.

Not a good bet, Carl! Good thing nobody will take you up on it.

For one thing, the Tech license lost its code test Feb 14, 1991, not in 1990.
But that's a minor point.

Take a look at the number of new hams per year and the growth of US licenses
from Feb 1991 until today. Then compare to the number of new hams per year and
the growth in a time period of the same length previous to Feb 1991. You'll see
that that the Tech's loss of its code test in Feb 1991 did cause an increase in
the number of new hams. But without that increase, we would not be down to
340,000 US hams by any reasonable scenario. Heck, there are ~423,000 US hams
today who are *not* Techs - that's a lot more than 1/2 the ~683,000.

Yes, there are almost 260,000 Techs today - but a large number of them are
actually Tech Pluses whom the FCC renewed as Techs since April 2000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

74. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 04:57:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040101235701.23171.00003064@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84746

In article <u7YIb.18841$IM3.13944@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031231185647.22081.00002876@mb-m17.aol.com...
>> In article <nwBIb.16932$IM3.5849@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >> Personally I think good true conservative idea is to allow people on
>> >> the air with no licencing requirements whatsoever, then cull out the
>> >> ones that violate the rules.
>> >
>> >Wrong. A true conservative desires the least practical government
>> >intervention in life.
>>
>> A true liberal desires the least practical government intervention in life
>> as well.
>
>ROTFLMAO...

Why?

>Guess I have truly never met such a "true liberal." Every liberal I
>hear from is always looking to use more of my money to create
>larger and more involved government programs to do ever more
>for the "poor, unwashed public".

That's the same as what conservatives want - except that their definitions of the "poor unwashed public" are different.

>
>> The devil is in the details of what "least practical government
>> intervention" really means.
>>
>> Just one example: The government used tax dollars to rescue Chrysler about
>> 20 years ago.

As K2ASP pointed out, this was in the form of loan guarantees, not actual loans to Chrysler. But the fact remains that if Chrysler had gone under the Feds would have been on the hook for those loan guarantees.

>> Now - was the bailout a "liberal" move to save workers' jobs and try to
>> manage
>> the economy? Some "conservatives" would say that companies that get in
>> trouble
>> should be allowed to fail in a 'free market' and not propped up with tax

>> dollars.
>>
>> OTOH, was the bailout a "conservative" move to save investors' money? Or
>> to
>> give some help to an industry bedeviled with safety, pollution and economy
>> regulations *and* the double whammy of foreign competiton and two oil
>> crises?
>>
>> Some "liberals" would say that Big Business should not be propped up with
>> tax dollars. (Ma's Diner wouldn't get such a bailout)

See how it's all in the definitions? Some would call the Chrysler bailout and
other
similar deals "corporate welfare". Others would say they were a smart move that
resulted in more jobs, more economic growth and more ROI for investors.

Take a good look at any of those government programs for the "poor unwashed
public"
and you'll see that most of them can be viewed either way.

>> >Clearly a "free-for-all" no license approach
>> >to ham radio wouldn't cut it and, as such, I and other conservative
>> >minded individuals do support ham licensing.
>>
>> Most "conservatives", anyway. The exact same is said by most "liberals".
>>
>> >Where we depart from
>> >the current approach is in the recognition that the "incentives" of
>> >today's licensing do NOT dovetail with the knowledge needed
>> >to pass the higher level license exams.
>>
>> Not perfectly, anyway.
>
>Not even very imperfectly.
>
Consider the old "ABC" scheme, though.

There were basically two levels of license back then - Class A, with all privs,
and Class B/C, who could not work 'phone on any HF band between 3 and 25 MHz.
(Class Bs and Cs could only work 'phone on 160, 11, 10 and VHF/UHF).

Both licenses required the same code tests. The Class A required the Class B
written *and* a more advanced written test that focused on theory, particularly
'phone techniques. Class A also required a year's experience as a Class B or C,
and the tests for Class A (all of them - code and theory) had to be passed in
front of an FCC examiner.

The philosophy (as I understand it) was that it took more technical knowledge
and practical know-how to put a 'phone transmitter on the air properly. So the
FCC required more tests and experience before a ham could use 'phone on the
most-crowded and longest-range phone ham bands then in use.

Of course there were all sorts of unintended consequences. Hams who had little or no interest in 'phone had no reason to go for Class A. 160, 11 and 10 were busy with Class B 'phone ops. The system worked a real hardship on hams who lived a ways from an FCC exam point, too.

Buit maybe that sort of system is a starting point for what you're talking about, Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

75. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 07:10:14 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <mynews@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <2o5avvca693c5u69j067b42vndllh676un@4ax.com>
Source record: 84747
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 17:43:00 -0600, Cecil Moore
<Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.ONEDOT.org> wrote:

>Roger Halstead wrote:
>> I always use a "tag line". which they refer to as an arresting
>> harness. Actually it's a double line with two clips and they are only
>> a bit over 3 feet long. So, if I slip I won't fall far, but it's gonna
>> hurt!
>
>I have my Purple Martin birdhouse mounted on my tower at a height
>of about 20 ft. Last year, I wished I had not been wearing my safety
>harness when I was surprised by a six foot long rat snake during a
>nest check. The harness forced me to face the snake when I would have
>much rather jumped. :-)

Everything is a compromise<:-)) Although I'd say finding the snake
would require a lot higher odds than seat belts Vs being thrown out of
a car. <:-))

Bout all we have in Michigan are Rattle snakes (Missaguga - usually a
little feller) and assorted non poisonous ones. Naturally you know
which kind got me in the upper arm when trimming the hedge around the
house.<sigh> I was black and blue from darn near elbow to shoulder
although at least it didn't make me sick. Then again it was only
about 14 inches long.

Like you I was looking at a bird's nest, which in this case was in the
hedge. I reached in to look at the birds (4 little ones in the nest)
when I felt a burning on my upper arm. I thought I'd picked up a
splinter and the pine sap was burning until I saw the two little holes
in my arm.

The drawback to tag lines and safety belts at 100 feet is the likely
hood of coming across a Yellow jackets nest inside the mast or boom.
They are nasty tempered little suckers.

I was just looking to see if I had any photos of the nests I've run
across in the back yard up on my web site, but didn't find any. I
have a couple to put up that show one nest about a foot across.

The last two years I have destroyed about 30 to 40 nests a year on our
lot which is only 200 feet on a side.

Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
(N833R, S/N CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
www.rogerhalstead.com

76. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 09:50:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401020150.140d453@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84748

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>
> > >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> > >really want?
> >
> > One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>
> It is a "TIRED" radio structure. If you want Merit Badges, join the
> BSA (or CAP). There is no need to have class distinctions between
> hams artificially created by the FCC. Allow the ham to distinguish
> himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.

It is only "tired" if you don't have the cajones to keep up,
Brain.

It's not about "class distinctions", unless that's all you fixate
on, Brain. It's about meeting the requirements of the Basis and
Purpose of Part 97, and meeting Congress' expectation that in return
for our generous allocations.

By the way, our allocations are by no means guaranteed. Too bad
people like you can't see past your own selfishness to see that.

> > Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of the
> > Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as one of
> > "self-training".
>
> I do. -Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
> you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
> There is nothing more to be learned!

I don't know where you got that "obviously" stuff, Brain, except
to make it up.

I've very clearly stated on several occassions that my learning
curve didn't stop with my Extra.

Please stop being arrogant.

> You couldn't be more wrong. Again.

I'm not the one who just made a very obvious assumption based
upon a personal prejudice, Brain.

> > A "single license" concept does not support that premise, Brain.
>
> It does. Unless you believe that once you obtain Amateur Extra that
> all learning stops because there is nothing new to be learned.

Ok, MinnieLennie...Here again is yet another opportunity for you
to "show (me)up" by providing a quote FROM ME wherein I stated
anything even remotely like "...all learning stops with the Amateur
Extra test".

> > A tiered one does.
>
> No more than a one license ARS.

Then this proves you ignorant of the facts, Brain.

There is not a single aspect of our lives that suggests a
"one-size-fits-all" ANYTHING works, Brainless. Our educational
system, our society in general, religions, politics, etc.

Unless you can provide some tangible examples that contradict
that?

> > Was that too difficult for you?
>
> Trying hard to keep your position at the top of the hill is sooo
> transparent.

I don't have a hill to be on top of, Brain.

That you percieve that I do means you have an inferiorty problem
that keeps you in a subjugated position. Deal with it, Brain.

> Allow the ham to show the world his real achievements, not some
> government supported and forced Merit Badge system of false
> achievements.

You are truly lost, Brain....wrapped up in symbology, rhetoric
and the need to denigrate and demean anything you cannot or will not
endeavor to understand or accept.

Pity you.

Steve, K4YZ

77. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 09:57:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401020157.7c992987@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84749

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> > >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
> > >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
> > >There is nothing more to be learned!
> >
> > Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said Extra has
> > demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>
> You and Steve have a lot in common - being wrong.
>
> For Steve's assertion to be true, there would have to be a license
> class above Amateur Extra, and when a person achieved that, to fufill
> Steve's vision "self-training" there would have to be another level
> above that. And so on.

Steve's assertion said NOTHING about any learning curve
terminating with the Amateur Extra class license, Your Arrogantness.

> I.E., a merit badge system.

No more than having my old grade cards from school years were
"merit badges".

No more than having my old EMS and nursing certifications are
"merit badges"

No more than...Ahhhh, never mind, you'll never get the point.

You're starting off the New Year on the wrong foot, Brain...By
making assertions that are not substantiated by factual evidence.

Welcome to 2004, MinnieLennie.

Steve, K4YZ

78. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 10:05:58 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bt3h9a$2q1gg$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84806

Should that not have been something that should have been done at least 10,
20 or even 30 years ago???

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?"

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqpsog8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 30 Dec 2003 14:38:08 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely
to
> >rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the
> >technical elements for the license classes. One should not be able to
get
> >on the air if they miss a significant percentage of the rules.
>
> I agree with you 150 %.
>
> Let's have the present Element 1 replaced by this "rules" element -
> it is more relevant to all amateurs on any band, any class, any mode.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

79. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 10:11:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401020211.3ac8aafa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84750

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> >I've built HF and VHF antennas,
> >some from a box, some from a reel of wire and bamboo poles. And I've
> >operated on HF from Nebraska, ROK, Guam, Illinois, Somalia, Florida,
> >and Ohio, in that order.
>
> Who is puffing out his chest now?

BAM!

The hammer on THAT nail HAD to hurt!

> But you can't seem to tell us anything about the /T5 operation.
> >
> >Just don't be so jealous.
>
> I'm not.

...Jealous of what? Fantasizing?
>
> >Besides, I don't see your name behind "Invented SSTV."
>
> Nor yours besides "invented anything".

BAM AGAIN!

The hammer falls again and accurately so!

> >> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
> >>
> >> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.
>
> >> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
> >
> >What? No learners permit?
>
> Nope. You said you want one class of license, no class distinctions, no merit
> badges. A learner's permit would mean a two-tiered structure.
>
> You said one license. That means one class of license - no learner's permit.
>
> Or were you lying about wanting one class of license?

It wasn't "lying", Jim...it was Creative Rhetorical Alternative
Posting. I'll let you enjoy the acronym.

> >> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all have
> >> passed the same test to get it.

No, we wouldn't. Regardless of how many times we re-invent the
wheel, those of us currently licensed will never have gone through the
same "drill" to get where we are.

73

Steve, K4YZ

80. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 10:22:36 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401020222.148a43ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> Your observation
> was absent any clarification that it was only YOUR observation,
> unsubstantiated by any true facts.
>
> > Get you head out the sand and look around. See
> > all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
> > nothing? is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's? Are new
> > folks welcomed? Is help provided?
> > If so then consider yourself lucky.
>
> One aspect of almost all hobbies" is the cost to play
> which often results in an older cross-section of participants.
> The same is true for antique cars, model railroading, etc.
> Add to that the available "free time" which most older
> folks, especially retirees, have.
>

My observation is as substantiated as yours. You can't prove anything.
Regarding cost to play, Ham radio only costs what you want it to cost.
I have put together a station for under $100 US. Not new and certainly
not the station I really wanted but it did work and I did QSO many
other stations. Cost is not a factor. Free time is what you want of
it. At 20 I had time if I wanted to take it and at 50 I can still find
time for the important things or what is important at this time.
Regarding costs, ther lays part of the problem. In the 60's I always
wanted that Drake '4' line. Couldn't afford it. Settled on a used
equipment and homebrewed many accy's. Todays out of the box operator
couldn't solder a connection if their life depended on it. Can't
trouble shoot a broken receiver or transmitter. Can't draw a circiut
for a simple crystal controlled transmitter, can't figure the length
of a half wave dipole, can't scrounge parts, etc.....

81. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 10:35:27 UTC
From: Roger Gt <Xenot@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <PPbJb.4475$U%2.4084@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84807
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Roger Halstead" <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> wrote in message
news:2o5avvca693c5u69j067b42vndllh676un@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 17:43:00 -0600, Cecil Moore
> <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.ONEDOT.org> wrote:
>
> >Roger Halstead wrote:
> >> I always use a "tag line". which they refer to as an arresting harness.
<snip>
> >
> >I have my Purple Martin birdhouse mounted on my tower at a height
> >of about 20 ft. Last year, I wished I had not been wearing my safety
> >harness when I was surprised by a six foot long rat snake during a
> >nest check. The harness forced me to face the snake when I would have
> >much rather jumped. :-)
>
> Everything is a compromise<:-)) Although I'd say finding the snake
> would require a lot higher odds than seat belts Vs being thrown out of
> a car. <:-))
>
> Bout all we have in Michigan are Rattle snakes
<snip>
> The drawback to tag lines and safety belts at 100 feet is the likely
> hood of coming across a Yellow jackets nest inside the mast or boom.
> They are nasty tempered little suckers.
<snip>

At least I have never encountered snakes or wasps on those rare occasions I needed to go aloft to fix or retrieve a lose halyard. It's only 35 feet above deck but at sea in a light chop it swings about two to three feet with no one up there, add my weight it swings about five to seven feet. So I tie myself a safety harness from 3 strands of 5/8 inch Yacht Braid and secure a double line for hauling to a rigging ring. It's safer than a belt, and while you can't fall out you can get a bad case of motion sickness. I use flying jam cleats to serve as climbers so up and down are slow. There are no mast steps nor anything to grab except at the spreaders. So I try to avoid going up if at all possible. I sail mostly in the winter, and the water is cold!
My antennas are all hinged, so I never climb them!
I think you need to make some accommodation when you pass 65.

Roger Gt

82. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 11:25:12 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >
> > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> >
> > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
> > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>
> Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.

Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
with an automatic transmission, your driving privilidges were limited
to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
"priviliges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.

Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the dirver ahead of
him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?

> The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
> of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as
> an international treaty element.

The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
into, the ARS.

> > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if
> > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements
> > we *want* to meet.)
>

> I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added priviliges
> have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.

Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!

> > I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles
> > on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions
> and
> > their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim
> > an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe
> to
> > say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.
> >
> > What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can
> be
> > reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for
> Technician
> > "+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than
> squeaked.
>
> Fair enough.

Indeed.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

73 de Bert
WA2SI

83. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 12:00:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <JM-cnafi68NNwGiiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84809

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040101235701.23171.00003065@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <FRycnYljLeMevmmiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >Were it not for the no-code tech license since 1990, I'd bet we'd have
> >about 1/2 the number of licensed hams in the US that we have now.
>
> Not a good bet, Carl! Good thing nobody will take you up on it.
>
> For one thing, the Tech license lost its code test Feb 14, 1991, not in
1990.
> But that's a minor point.

You're right, of course ... the Proceeding was in 90, but the changes
didn't take effect until 91.

> Take a look at the number of new hams per year and the growth of US
licenses
> from Feb 1991 until today. Then compare to the number of new hams per year
and
> the growth in a time period of the same length previous to Feb 1991.
You'll see
> that that the Tech's loss of its code test in Feb 1991 did cause an
increase in
> the number of new hams. But without that increase, we would not be down to
> 340,000 US hams by any reasonable scenario. Heck, there are ~423,000 US
hams
> today who are *not* Techs - that's a lot more than 1/2 the ~683,000.

Jim,

Of that 423k US hams who are not Techs, how many do you suppose started
out as Techs and have since upgraded? How many SKs and dropouts would
have reduced the population without the newcomers coming in to replace them.

Maybe 50% is a slight stretch, but I'd guess not by a lot.

>
> Yes, there are almost 260,000 Techs today - but a large number of them are
> actually Tech Pluses whom the FCC renewed as Techs since April 2000.

Out of 10 years of NCTs, only a few years worth would fall into that
category.
I would bet that a LOT of the Tech Pluses that existed in April of 2000 are
now

Generals or Extras, rather than having been renewed as Techs with code credit.

73,
Carl - wk3c

84. Re: Ham Radio in The Information Age and Terrorism

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 12:02:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt3mhs$hi3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84810

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bstgh0$vld@library2.airnews.net...
> According to a story in the Washington Post, by Dan Eggen, on Tuesday,
Dec.
> 30, 2003:
> An FBI intelligence bulletin sent to law enforcement agencies last week
> warned that "terrorist operatives may rely on almanacs to assist with
target
> selection and pre-operational planning" because they include detailed
> information on bridges, tunnels and other U.S. landmarks, officials said.
>
> OK, fault me and sneer at me all you want but, isn't the above just going
> way too far? (the rest of the story can be read on the Washington Post
> website--just do a search on the word almanac and it should be around the
> second item in the list). I mean, I understand the fear, the tendency to
> jump to safety, but even if terrorists are using almanacs, do we want to
be
> "caught" with one if we are thought to be acting "suspicious" as is
> mentioned in the article?
>
> Sheesh, what about ham radio?! One of the most widely used communication
> mediums in this country and maybe the world, right? What do we open
> ourselves up for by being on the air and "just talking?"
>
> --
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Follow-Up: Went to the bookstore to grab a copy of "Execution" (a business book) and, while I was at it, I went ahead and purchased a "World Almanac 2004." While I was checking out, the sales associate grinned when he scanned the Almanac. Turns out they've been selling like hotcakes!

As an aside, anyone know if ham radio is ever in a almanac? I thought there'd be some stuff on hobbies, but haven't found it yet. Jim, N2EY, would probably make some bucks if he'd write and publish a Almanac of Ham Radio!

Kim W5TIT

85. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 13:02:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401020502.51bdeb58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84811

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GfpIb.12512$lo3.10605@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
> what do
> > we use?
>
> Incentive?

Sure. Your proposed two-class system is an incentive system. The
incentives to upgrade are two: more power and the prospect of being
put off the air at the end of 10 years.
>
> You're either qualified for a ham license or you're not qualified.

That's in direct contradiction to your "no renewal" entry level
license idea.

Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
if they were willing to retest for the same license?

Whether or not a person is qualified depends in part the privileges
granted by the license. A person could be qualified for a license that
grants some privileges but unqualified for a license that grants all
privileges. Which is the reason for having more than one license class
in the first place.

> This
> incentive notion (and Steve Robeson's 'structured occupancy' notion) are
> liberal ideas whose time has gone.
>
Since the license and test rules restrict individuals far more than
organizations, that would make those notions "conservative".

73 de Jim, N2EY

86. Why don't you like this cross posted to rec.radio.cb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 13:29:53 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102082953.232$cK_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84812
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Because most topics that are cross posted to this many groups
end up being worthless tripe.

87. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 14:09:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <hYeJb.4937$6B.3708@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84813
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >
> >>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >>news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >>>"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
> >>>SNIP
> >>>
> >>>>YES! No code is killing
> >>>>ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
> >>>
> >>>And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
> >>>that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
> >>>
> >>>Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>>Bill K2UNK
> >>
> >>May I, Bill?
> >>
> >>While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe
> >
> > it
> >
> >>is fostering a bad mindset.
> >>
> >>If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
> >>Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
> >>aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA.
> >
> > However,
> >
> >>there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with
some
> >>pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
> >>
```

> >>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> >>
> >>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> >>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
> >>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> >
> >
> > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> > when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>
> This is an excellent point, Bill! And the answer is YES, they did! I
> have a wife and kid that cannot drive a standard transmission auto or
> truck. I can drive standard as well as automatic transmissioned
> vehicles. Who knows more?

Does it make any difference at all. The point is that there is
no reason for states to test on manual gearbox
autos because 95% of new vehicles are automatic. Those
that want to will learn to drive a manual without any licensing
intervention needed from the state.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

88. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 14:14:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84814
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > >
> > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> > >
> > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
toward
> > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> >
> > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> > when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>
> Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
> license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
> with an automatic transmission, your driving privilidges were limited
> to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
> "priviliges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
> bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
> correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
>
> Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
> that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
> mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the dirver ahead of
> him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
> years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
> though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
> us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
> VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
>
> > The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
> > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as
> > an international treaty element.
>
> The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
> into, the ARS.
```

So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
The anology is a joke. There is ZERO element of safety involved with
CW knowledge/testing. Had there been any relavent safety
aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.

> > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as
if
> > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
requirements
> > > we *want* to meet.)
> >
> > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added priviliges
> > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
>
> Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!

So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
on the only two all-CW only bands. Use does not justify
the requirement since there's nothing detrimental about learning
on the air at even a one word per minute, look it up on a table
rate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

89. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 16:08:05 UTC
From: JQ <712@jhnetno.net>
Message-ID: <bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84815
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
window:

"Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"

JQ

90. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 16:35:45 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <B5hJb.2085$uF6.787244@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84816
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:F9_Hb.24986$Pg1.11333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>Elmering.
>>
>>SKN is an elmering opportunity. If you know the code, and you want to see
>>it continue as part of our ham radio culture, you have to pass it on.
>>Nobody teaches CW any more. We used to have converts from the military,
>>where CW ops were to learn code or face a courtmartial. They got to 20WPM
>>in a couple of weeks but had a gun to their heads for 8 hours a day to do
>>it. Learning CW is a one-on-one activity and each of us CW ops needs to
>>feel an obligation to our elmers to pass it on.
>
>
> You don't learn CW as a language, you learn morse code. One is a method of
> transmission and one is an encoding scheme sometimes carried over a method
> of radio transmission. There is a difference.
>

NOT SUR IF I AGRE WID U OM = I CAN QRS IF U WANT 73 BK

Clearly that was not English. Compare to the clear text version:

I'm not sure that I completely agree with you, you young upstart
whipper-snapper. From your comments, you aren't proficient in Morse
Code, Q-signals, or even how to use the "release-to-listen" button, but
I'll use smaller words if that improves your comprehension.

So now, have fun on 11 meters, and back to you.

==

Also, see http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/continuous+wave

where it says (in part):

Many (especially radio amateurs) continue to understand "CW" to mean
transmission by means a signal of a single frequency which is either on
or off (e.g. Morse code), as opposed to a carrier which varies
continuously in amplitude, frequency or phase. Some would even call the
former "unmodulated" even though turning on and off is actually an
extreme form of amplitude modulation.

91. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 16:38:54 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <y8hJb.2086$uF6.787886@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan Jatowski wrote:

> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.

And certainly has paid off her student loan from Cornell by now. Maybe she can buy that trailer that she's had to rent all this time with her husband/cousin.

92. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 16:53:26 UTC
From: N8IE <dot.com@dot.com>
Message-ID: <amhJb.107$Dp5.53@fe3.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 84818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Change "Linda Sue" to " Mary Ann", and the poster from "Alan Jatowski" to "Shovel Head" and you have a very old post. LOL

"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.
>
> Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>
> Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> they have.
>
> "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> hours after they're gone.
>
> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.555 / Virus Database: 347 - Release Date: 12/23/2003

93. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 16:57:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102115721.29660.00002343@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 84819

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hqu0zad.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 01 Jan 2004 14:56:22 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>And the question remains - was that bailout a "conservative" or a "liberal"
>>action?
>
> I define a "conservative" as someone who wants the government to
> stay out of his/her life but to be on call to squash any opponent of
> his/hers.
>
> I define a "liberal" as what I was in 1955..... <ggg>
>
> Neither have any bearing on what those labels are applied to today.
>
HAW! Well, those are two definitions. Here are some more:

In general,

- A "conservative" wants the govt. to control individuals' behavior more than organizations' behavior.

- A "liberal" wants the govt. to control organizations' behavior more than individuals' behavior.

Of course there are exceptions (like gun control).

73 de Jim, N2EY

94. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 17:54:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84820

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gsBIb.16918$IM3.6633@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031230185607.07961.00000897@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > In article <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
> > >> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > >> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
> > >> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > >> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> > >> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> > >> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> > >> >> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > First off, there's bound to be disagreement about what constitutes a
> > "rational relationship"
> >
> > Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
> > what do we use?
> >
> > If we use power (as Hans suggests), there's little incentive for QRP and
> > low power folks to upgrade.
>
> The irony, however, is that I would bet most people that
> are dedicated QRPers are much more tehnically oriented
> to begin with and more likly to upgrade.

Agreed!

And you can bet that most dedicated QRPers are also primarily CW ops.

> On the other hand,
> IF a QRPer is content with the entry level power limits

> and doesn't choose to upgrade, what's the harm?

Depends on the observer, really.

> One can
> look at all those that don't upgrade today...even with
> spectrum privileges as the enhancement...to see folks that
> are content at their current license level and are also good
> hams.

Yet there are those who claim that large numbers of "technically
oriented" hams *would* upgrade except for the "barrier" of the
code test......
>
> > And since we're supposed to use the minimum power
> > required by the situation anyway.....
>
> True, but the FCC has never made a big case of checking to
> see that everyone is running at the least practical power.
> Additionally, I suspect the FCC concern on the "least power"
> is driven more by those running "big" power rather than
> anyone run a basic rig of 100 watts or less.

Exactly. Also there's the interference considerations.
>
> > If we use modes as the incentive, which modes do we use for the incentive?
>
> I don't see modes as an incentive.

Then there's not much left.
>
> > There's also the question of enforcement. You can tell right away if
> > someone is outside their allocated spectrum, but power is another issue.
>
> Yet it has been an aspect of Novice license for over 50 years.
> I agree the enforcement would have its problems, but I suspect
> the gross violations could be detected (e.g. if limit is 200 watts
> and someone is running a kilowatt).

Depends on the antenna and conditions. On HF I have heard amazing
signals from QRP stations because of really good antennas. And
really poor signals from QRO stations because of poor antennas.

> In the end, I believe "most"
> hams want to operate legally and will do so.

That's because it's part of the tradition and culture of amateur
radio to do so, not because of large amounts of enforcement. I'm all
for more and better enforcement, but it's clear that those who think
Riley can do it all are mistaken.

> Those that might run
> double their allowed power (say 400 when limited to 200) are

> only fooling themselves.

Big difference between 400 vs. 200 hp under the hood, or between 80
MPH and 40 MPH on the highway. But it's only 3 dB on the air. Tough
concept for some...
>
> > >> >What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
> > >> >operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
> > >> >operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
> > >>
> > >> Not much!
> > >
> > >Not any as I see it.
> > >
> > Exactly.The difference is in operating skills and knowledge.
> > The Extra part is where the DX often goes.
>
> Maybe we could tie some power limits to frequency
> spectrum which would then create a valid reason to not allow
> a lower level licesnse in that spectrum slot.

I'm not sure what you're proposing. Do you mean having some parts of a
band allowed 1500 W and others only, say, 150 W, as is done now in the
Novice parts of 80/40/15?

> > >> But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
> > >> technical knowledge with more privileges.
> > >
> > >I don't oppose the concept, I oppose the illogical implementation.
> >
> > We can agree to disagree about the logic.
> >
> > But what should be used for an incentive besides spectrum?
>
> I agree with Hans that power certanly can be and has been.

That's one possiblity.

> Also, at the risk of being stoned, how has the Canadian
> entry level license been going which restricts those hams to
> commercial equipment only? Perhaps an entry level USA
> license could have a restriction of commercial only rigs
> "OR" hmebrew transmitter "IF" the homebrew has been
> checked out and signed off as OK by an Extra class ham.

I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
inconsistencies in the written testing....

The problem with such an "Appliance Class" license is that it cuts
off those who hold it from one of the main reasons for the ARS to
exist

in the USA. (Remember that the "basis and purpose" is an FCC/Part 97
thing
and other countries have different ones, or none at all). Not being
allowed to homebrew, modify or repair one's own gear is simply a bad
idea. It would
encourage new hams to become even more dependent on manufacturers
rather
than their own ingenuity.

Some of the greatest experiences I have had in amateur radio have been
in
taking an idea and some parts and turning them into a working radio
station, then making contacts with that station. Started doing that
sort
of thing as a kid and never got out of the habit. Led me to EE
degrees, a
career and a bunch of other things. Never would have happened if I'd
had
to use only "approved" gear.
and
>
> Allowing "homebrew" via an Extra certification process would
> foster positive relationships and Elmering (IMHO).

Maybe. OTOH, having to get one's projects approved by another ham
slows
down the process enormously and could result in all kinds of trouble.
Add
to that the fact that the current written tests are by no means
adequate
to ensure that all Extras know everything they need to know in order
to
sign off on another's work.

And what problem does such an "Appliance Class" license really solve?
Do we have lots of problems here in the USA with homebrewing hams'
creations mucking up the bands and causing interference? I don't
think so.
>
> > >> >> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about
> > >> >> amateur
> > >> >> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra
> has
> > >> >> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
> > >> >
> > >> >The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
> > >> >additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
> > >> >additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
> > >> >Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
> > >>
> > >> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.

> > >
> > >It only flows as to "pure incentive". It doesn't flow or relate
> > >at all to the additional knowledge tested to pass the license.
> >
> > Some of the knowledge does, such as HF propagation.
>
> Yet the "only" difference between technicians not allowed
> any HF and those allowed on the "novice" segments is a code test...
> no additional knowledge of HF needed for Tech with code
> to operate the Novice segments.

Sure - because that HF knowledge is tested in the written for Tech,
and was tested for in the Novice when it was available.
>
> > >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
> > >> For that matter, what about the General?
> > >
> > >Did I even hint at that.
> >
> > Not at all!
> >
> > >The answer is basically no...although
> > >I have NO preference for or against changing license structure
> > >to a more rational basis for added privileges.
> > >
> > My point is simply that being anticodetest does *not* necessarily mean
> > someone
> > wants to water dwon the writtens or eliminate license classes.
>
> THANK YOU Jim!

You're welcome.
>
> I wish certain others in this newsgroup had the ability to
> understand that.

But let's be honest about the situation, Bill. There *are* some folks
who
want to further reduce *written* testing. (Not me!) Just look at the
"21st Century" paper for one example - particularly the attitude it
projects.
One of its rallying cries is that we need more new hams at any cost,
and not only is the code test scapegoated as a barrier, but also the
written test. That paper came from a NCVEC committee, too, and you can
bet they will push that agenda.

> > A lot of things we thought impossible have come to pass. Heck, FCC never
> > imagined that cb would get out of their control...
>
> In hindsight, the FCC certainly should have seen it coming.

Of course! But they didn't. They simply could not imagine that what
happened to cb could occur. It was simply not part of their mindset,
even though all of the indications were there.

> The big mistake,
> in my opinion, was the failure of the FCC to take into account the
> basic "plug-n-play aspect of CB, the multitude of sales outlets via Radio
> Shack (Tandy), and the constantly lowering of CB set costs, especially
> once they became all solid state.

All of those things were considered *desirable* by the FCC! The whole
reason
that service was created by FCC was so that Everyman could get on the
air with inexpensive, easy-to-set-up-and-use radios for personal,
short-range communications. Particularly mobile.

And if that's not bad enough, lookit BPL.

The main point of all this is that FCC wasn't and isn't an infallible
bunch that Knows What Is Best For Radio. Let alone what is best for
ham radio.
They're simply the folks in charge, who have the unenviable task of
balancing
all the competing demands, and doing it with limited resources and
under
various forms of pressure.

So it's up to us hams to make our case and set our path, not FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

95. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 17:58:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8jiJb.16109$lo3.14854@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84821

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
> person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
> ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
> if they were willing to retest for the same license?
>

It's a learners permit, NOT a license. If they couldn't/didn't learn enough
in 10 years to pass the examination for a license, then they are obviously
not qualified for a license.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: Since it's my proposal, I get to define the terminology. Class "B" is a
learners permit. Class "A" is a license.

96. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 18:13:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QwiJb.2131$uF6.808015@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84822

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>> 50 seems to be a reasonable number for the average applicant. This
>> isn't, and shouldn't be, a Bar Exam because folks who pass the rules
>> exam are not expected to be qualified to do interpretation and
>> analysis to the level and precision that an attorney does.
>>
>
>
>
> As I stated here before, I would like to see the exams get expanded to
> something similar as to what has been required in the fire service, at least
> all of the ones I have taken. The least amount of questions was 150, and
> the most questions was 250. AND THE QUESTION POOLS WERE NOT PUBLISHED.

Before we go too far in this, I agree that it would be nice to get the
tests expanded.

Now to the rant!.....

So What, Ryan? If you are going to give a test, the answers have to be
somewhere. So what if they are in a book in text form? All that means is
that you read and memorize the book and not a question pool.

Or are you suggesting that the answers to the test questions be in NO
book at all? 8^)

>
> Now, what is interesting, in the 2+ foot tall stack of books I had to use
> for my Firefighter 1 and Firefighter 2 certifications had all of the
> questions within the chapter tests, quizes, pre-tests etc.

Oops, I should have read a little further down!

> So, basically if
> one did the homework like they were supposed to, then they have actually
> seen the questions. I distinctly remember when I took my test, seeing the
> same identical question on a piece of homework that was on the final exam,
> many times. I actually like the way IFSTA organizes and sets up their
> instruction books. Not only do you have a main book for the
> instruction/reading, but workbooks to put the chapter's contents to
> practical use.

I doubt that having quizzes and pre-tests would go over very well for
the VE's! Although there are some classes where this happens, those are
all voluntary.

> I would definitely like to see all three tests (tech, general, extra) go up
> to at least 100 questions each. And if the question pool is released, at
> least only release the questions, and not the answers. At least then the
> potential testee would have to look the material up. Hell, I would even
> re-test if I had too under this type of test.

What I did was indeed to look up any answers I missed. When I studied
for the General and Extra, I'd take one of the online tests, and for any
question I missed, I would go find out why the right answer was right.
THat was a lot easier than rote memorization, and less tricky, for at
least on the Extra test, the "pick a winner" letter was very often *not*
the letter in the question pool.

And when you get down to it, many of the questions are handled just
fine by a question pool setup. Regulations and bands are one part that
comes to mind.

> In fact, if ham radio is
> "sooo important" and "actually saves lives" I would think that retesting
> every ten years would actually be a good thing. Not only would it show that
> the licensee retained knowledge but might even show if he/she progressed at
> all.

That would probably be a real disaster! What would they be tested for?
There are Hams that have been licensed for a long time, and are
operating comfortably within what they were tested for a long time ago.
Others keep up very well, but all are doing just fine.

> "Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you
> still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

Everyone makes me happy; some when I see them come in the door, some
when I last see them go out....

- Mike KB3EIA -

97. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 18:18:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EBiJb.2133$uF6.809402@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84823
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>>Just like you should! I'm amazed by the number of hams that seem to
>>thing that the ARRL has to agree with all their personal opinions. I
>>wonder how many of those type are married! 8^)
>>
>
>
> I wouldn't say they should have to agree 100% but logic would dictate that
> at least about 1/2 of all or so should be in agreement.
>
>
>>I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
>>granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.
>
>
> Prove it. Prove it without circumstantial or coincidental evidence.

Well, the first thing would be getting back on the air after WW1. Some
might disagree on the particulars, but ARRL had a big part in it. I read
that in "200 Meters and Down".

But remember I said I wonder. Wasn't really claiming anything. 8^)

> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> --
> "The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any
> more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but
> to make him a priest."

I love the quotes, Ryan!!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

98. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 18:57:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0ajJb.2137$uF6.817489@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84824

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>
>>Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
>>person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
>>ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
>>if they were willing to retest for the same license?
>>
>
>
> It's a learners permit, NOT a license. If they couldn't/didn't learn enough
> in 10 years to pass the examination for a license, then they are obviously
> not qualified for a license.

I might just buy that if it was something like 2 years.

> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: Since it's my proposal, I get to define the terminology. Class "B" is a
> learners permit. Class "A" is a license.

Sure enough!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

99. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 19:03:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4gjJb.2139$uF6.818793@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84825
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>>news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
>>>>>SNIP
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>YES! No code is killing
>>>>>>ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
>>>>>
>>>>>And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
>>>>>that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
>>>>>
>>>>>Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>Bill K2UNK
>>>>
>>>>May I, Bill?
>>>>
>>>>While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe
>>>
>>>it
>>>
>>>
>>>>is fostering a bad mindset.
>>>>
>>>>If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
>>>>Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse

>>>>aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA.
>>>
>>>However,
>>>
>>>
>>>>there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with
>
> some
>
>>>>pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
>>>>
>>>>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>>>>
>>>>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
>>>>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
>>>>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>>>
>>>
>>>Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
>>>when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>>
>>This is an excellent point, Bill! And the answer is YES, they did! I
>>have a wife and kid that cannot drive a standard transmission auto or
>>truck. I can drive standard as well as automatic transmissioned
>>vehicles. Who knows more?
>
>
> Does it make any difference at all. The point is that there is
> no reason for states to test on manual gearbox
> autos because 95% of new vehicles are automatic. Those
> that want to will learn to drive a manual without any licensing
> intervention needed from the state.

My XYL refuses to parallel park, as do a number of others. She also doesn't do three point turns. Your logic would eliminate those from the test also. A person CAN drive for years and years, and if they do things a certain way, they don't have to PP or TPT. She can drive 100 percent of the time without it. Of course the odd emergency situation may come up.

Bill, if you don't want a Morse code test, that is fine, but you shouldn't use a flawed argument to support it. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

100. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 19:10:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JmjJb.2142$uF6.820876@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>>news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>>
>>>>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>>>>
>>>>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
>>>>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
>
> toward
>
>>>>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>>>
>>>Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
>>>when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>>
>>Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
>>license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
>>with an automatic transmission, your driving privilidges were limited
>>to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
>>"priviliges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
>>bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
>>correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
>>
>>Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
>>that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
>>mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the dirver ahead of
>>him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
>>years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
>>though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
>>us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
>>VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
>>
>>
>>>The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body

>>>of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as
>>>an international treaty element.
>>
>>The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
>>today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
>>we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
>>into, the ARS.
>
>
> So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
> The anology is a joke. There is ZERO element of safety involved with
> CW knowledge/testing. Had there been any relavent safety
> aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.

This is your analogy, Bill, not ours. I don't think the analogy fits, I
think people should be required to test on standard, or at least not be
allowed to drive a standard unless tested for it.
>>>>2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as
>
> if
>
>>>>it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
>>>>requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
>
> requirements
>
>>>>we *want* to meet.)
>>>
>>>I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added priviliges
>>>have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
>>
>>Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
>
>
> So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> on the only two all-CW only bands. Use does not justify
> the requirement since there's nothing detrimental about learning
> on the air at even a one word per minute, look it up on a table
> rate.

one of two answers:

1. It's a goofed up rule

2. It's a good way to get Tech's to practice Morse code.

Either is probably irrelevant because most tech's that aren't planning
on upgrading probably aren't all that interested in Morse code at all,
and there are plenty of goofed up rules.

- Mike KB3EIA -

101. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 19:13:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2pjJb.20228$P%1.19145150@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:4gjJb.2139$uF6.818793@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> My XYL refuses to parallel park, as do a number of others. She also
> doesn't do three point turns. Your logic would eliminate those from the
> test also. A person CAN drive for years and years, and if they do things
> a certain way, they don't have to PP or TPT. She can drive 100 percent
> of the time without it. Of course the odd emergency situation may come up.
>
> Bill, if you don't want a Morse code test, that is fine, but you
> shouldn't use a flawed argument to support it. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

In Michigan, you will fail your driving exam if you can't parallel park and
do a 3 point turn. They are mandatory test elements. You can fail one but
not both.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

102. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 19:19:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pvjJb.20229$P%1.19146028@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84828

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:8jiJb.16109$lo3.14854@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> >
> > Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
> > person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
> > ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
> > if they were willing to retest for the same license?
> >
>
> It's a learners permit, NOT a license. If they couldn't/didn't learn
enough
> in 10 years to pass the examination for a license, then they are obviously
> not qualified for a license.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: Since it's my proposal, I get to define the terminology. Class "B" is
a
> learners permit. Class "A" is a license.

If you truly mean "learner's permit" and that it is not a license, then they really should be supervised each and every time they are on the air. If they are allowed on the air without supervision, then in reality it is a license not a learner's permit regardless of the limitations and whether or not it is renewable.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

103. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 19:28:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <hDjJb.16367$lo3.2566@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84829

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

>
> If you truly mean "learner's permit" and that it is not a license, then
they
> really should be supervised each and every time they are on the air. If
> they are allowed on the air without supervision, then in reality it is a
> license not a learner's permit regardless of the limitations and whether
or
> not it is renewable.
>

It is if I say it is and if I can convince the FCC that it is.

73, de Hans, K0HB

104. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 19:54:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <60kJb.21046$IM3.6892@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84830

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> > Let's have the present Element 1
> > replaced by this "rules" element -
> > it is more relevant to all amateurs
> > on any band, any class, any mode.
>
>
> Should that not have been something
> that should have been done at least 10,
> 20 or even 30 years ago???

Or 40, 50, or even 60, years ago. Which makes one wonder why this, and some of the other extended test ideas, are being advocated now. I cannot help but suspect this is another example of the intolerance of newcomers by some existing Hams (and also a way for some to build themselves up by putting others down). Darn few of us knew everything when we started (I still don't). Every single person in this newsgroup, every existing Ham, has made mistakes (even those who started 40, 50, and even 60 years ago). Yet, when a newcomer does the same today, it is not simply inexperience, but instead malicious, or ignorance, or even the ruin of Amateur Radio. Some point to it to show how much better they are than that. And calls for a solution to this pending crisis are shouted from the rooftops. There is no need for proof of a wider problem - a few isolated examples are always enough for the intolerant. And, once ignited, intolerance fuels itself. I truly hope I'm wrong about this, but that suspicion continues to grow.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

105. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 20:53:43 UTC
From: polycarbonate blue <tingting@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4d0ab$3ff5da70$d1cc59b7$12139@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
> window:
>
> "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
>
> JQ

(..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
us amongst the local business establishments
'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')

>"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.
>
> Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>
> Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> they have.
>
> "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> hours after they're gone.
>

> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
>
>
>
>

106. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 21:56:36 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401021356.1193770@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > >
> > > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> > > >
> > > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> > > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
> toward
> > > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> > >
> > > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> > > when they stopped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
> >
> > Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
> > license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
> > with an automatic transmission, your driving privileges were limited
> > to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
> > "privileges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
> > bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
> > correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
> >
> > Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
> > that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
> > mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the driver ahead of
> > him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
> > years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
> > though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
> > us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
> > VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
> >
> > > The reality is the Morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
> > > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate Morse as
> > > an international treaty element.
> >
> > The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> > today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> > we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry

> > into, the ARS.
>
> So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?

Oh, I don't know, Billï¿½let's see. Let's ask that fellow who just passed Element 2 and just couldn't wait to get OTA. So he bought a nifty little dual-bander, a "killer" Mirage amp, and pumped a few hundred Watts or VHF or UHF RF into his nice long Yagi (You know, the one marketed as a "Boomer.") pointed toward a distant repeaterï¿½right through the second floor of his neighbor's house. Heck, he mounted it on the mast that formerly hosted a TV antennaï¿½that ought to be good enough, right?

After all, I'm sure that someone who is so bothered at the notion of having to learn and be tested on a skill he deems irrelevant to how he plans on operating, that he joins an "international" movement to remove said offensive taskï¿½would certainly be concerned and cognizant of any harmful RF his equipment might be radiating. Heck, he did pass that 35 multiple-guessï¿½er, I meant choice test that proclaimed him "ready." I am fairly certain though that his mode of choice was not CW. ;-)

> The analogy is a joke.

Actually, I am pretty much joking around with you, Bill. (Lighten up.) HOWEVER, the potential for physical harm is there and somewhere the above scenario may be playing out as you read these wordsï¿½and that's no joke.

> There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW knowledge/testing.

Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt conscientiously ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's be honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even call themï¿½"slackers.")

BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants to bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater folks feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex operation who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred Watts mentioned above.

> Had there been any relevant safety
> aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.

You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer the BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"

> > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as
> if
> > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
> requirements
> > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > >
> > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
> >
> > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
>
> So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> on the only two all-CW only bands.

That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a
safe environment before venturing onto the highway.

> Use does not justify
> the requirement since there's nothing detrimental about learning
> on the air at even a one word per minute, look it up on a table
> rate.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

73 de Bert
WA2SI

107. Re: Why is this thread so lame? - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:43:46 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102174346.661$hP_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84833
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote:
> That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a
> safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
>
Look out for the hangin'judge too, if'n yore runnin'whiskey
in a big block Plymouth, or Ferd, or Cheby.

108. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175137.08626.00002439@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84841

In article <2pjJb.20228$P%1.19145150@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:4gjJb.2139$uF6.818793@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>> Bill Sohl wrote:
>> My XYL refuses to parallel park, as do a number of others. She also
>> doesn't do three point turns. Your logic would eliminate those from the
>> test also. A person CAN drive for years and years, and if they do things
>> a certain way, they don't have to PP or TPT. She can drive 100 percent
>> of the time without it. Of course the odd emergency situation may come up.
>>
>> Bill, if you don't want a Morse code test, that is fine, but you
>> shouldn't use a flawed argument to support it. 8^)
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>In Michigan, you will fail your driving exam if you can't parallel park and
>do a 3 point turn. They are mandatory test elements. You can fail one but
>not both.

Okay, make up a petition to put before the FCC that all HF-privileged radio amateurs demonstrate proficiency with a manual gearbox.

LHA

109. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175139.08626.00002441@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84842

In article <20040101235701.23171.00003065@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Yes, there are almost 260,000 Techs today - but a large number of them are
>actually Tech Pluses whom the FCC renewed as Techs since April 2000.

Still on that standard excuse, ey?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...back BEFORE restructuring there were about 200 thousand NO-CODE Technician licenses granted. That was separate from the "Technician-Plus" class then.

You haven't admitted that so many NO-CODE licensees got their license grants in the first 9 years of that class.

You keep waltzing around that, misdirecting into other rationalizations such as "they won't renew" or other statements of invalidity.

The Novice class was dropping in numbers before restructuring and it continues dropping. The League of Misinformed Gentlemen finally acquiesced and stated that the Tech license is the "entry level" class for US ham radio.

Now you keep making the pitiful case of "Tech-plus renewals get made Technicians and thus 'distort' the no-code numbers" and conveniently forget the numbers prior to restructuring.

I guess mighty macho morsemen are into Convenience Amnesia.

LHA

110. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175139.08626.00002440@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84848

In article <b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> >
>> > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>> >
>> > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
>> > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
>> > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>>
>> Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
>> when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>
>Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
>license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
>with an automatic transmission, your driving privilidges were limited
>to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
>"priviliges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
>bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
>correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
>
>Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
>that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
>mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the dirver ahead of
>him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
>years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
>though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
>us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
>VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
>
>> The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
>> of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as
>> an international treaty element.
>
>The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
>today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
>we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
>into, the ARS.

Well, if one is only second-best, then you have to try harder!

[hardly anyone talks about those who finish in second place...]

LHA

111. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175140.08626.00002442@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84844

In article <YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>This is an excellent point, Bill! And the answer is YES, they did! I
>have a wife and kid that cannot drive a standard transmission auto or
>truck. I can drive standard as well as automatic transmissioned
>vehicles. Who knows more?

I can drive you to distraction if you like... :-)

LHA

112. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175141.08626.00002444@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84834

In article <3FF46C90.478C0E25@nospam.iserv.net>, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
writes:

>I misplaced my can of 'Thread Be Gone', does someone know where I can get a
>replacement?

You can't get any unless you pass a federal morse test.

It's the law.

Of this jungle...

LHA

113. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175141.08626.00002443@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84849

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401011423.59897410@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>> > And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
>> > that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
>> >
>> > Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
>> >
>> > Cheers,
>> > Bill K2UNK
>>
>> May I, Bill?
>>
>> While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe it
>> is fostering a bad mindset.
>>
>> If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
>> Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
>> aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA. However,
>> there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some
>> pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
>>
>> IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>>
>> 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
>> through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
>> higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>>
>> 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if
>> it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
>> requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements
>> we *want* to meet.)
>>
>> I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles
>> on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions and
>> their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim
>> an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe to
>> say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.
>>
>> What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can be
>> reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for
>Technician
>> "+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than squeaked.
>>

>> 73 es HNY de Bert
>> WA2SI
>
>Yep, the dumbing down of America. The masses can't pass the test so we
>will make the test easier. Notice how they skirt the issue of having
>passed any test in front of a FCC examiner.

No problem, olde tymer. I passed my First Phone test the first time
in March, 1956, in the FCC's Chicago field office. Much later I went
to the Long Beach, CA, field office to complete paperwork on a
(now) PLMRS license. Real, live FCC employees, leased FCC
office space!

>The VEC program is another
>farce. Why not put the little piece of paper in a corn flakes box. At
>least you would have breakfast.

Make it MREs, mighty macho morseman. Update. Ham radio is
a SERVICE!

Hup, too, tree, foah...march, march, march...

LHA

114. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175143.08626.00002446@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84845

In article <geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
>SNIP
>> YES! No code is killing
>> ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
>
>And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
>that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
>
>Odds are you haven't a single rational example.

It should be obvious, Bill. US ham radio is all about "working
DX on HF with CW."

It is against the law to operate on HF without morsemanship.

Probably the law of physics, even.....! :-)

LHA

115. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175143.08626.00002445@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84847

In article <rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
>> SNIP
>> > YES! No code is killing
>> > ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
>>
>> And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
>> that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
>>
>> Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>May I, Bill?
>
>While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe it
>is fostering a bad mindset.

Of course...it was STARTED by a 20 WPM code-tested Extra.

>If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
>Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
>aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA. However,
>there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some
>pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.

Yes, make those heathen no-coders sit in the back of the EM
bus! Banish them to VHF and above!

No-coders "don't belong" on HF!

>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>
>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."

And some olde tyme hammes have been hoisting too many at a bar.

Ah! "Mass petition!" How dare no-coders do that!

Ahem...take a look at the carbon-copy Comments on the FISTS
petition. Would you like to halt "mass petitioning" against CW
testing?

>2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if
>it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
>requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements
>we *want* to meet.)

Of course. US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."

Emphasis on CW. Morsemanship. Just like it was in the 1930s.

>I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles
>on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions and
>their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim
>an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe to
>say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.

Not all ascribe to the "morse is best" notion, either.

>What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can be
>reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for Technician
>"+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than squeaked.

Well then, it's all about pride in being better than most, isn't it?

In 2003 morsemanship for licensing is an Artificial Standard.

If you want to retitle Part 97 the "Aritificial Radiotelegraphy Servce,"
be my guest.

LHA

116. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175144.08626.00002448@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84835

In article <kAOIb.1574$uF6.332916@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
>granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.

Absolutely NONE, Michael.

How do I know that, you may ask? Why the ARRL "told me" that in
print for years... :-)

LHA

117. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175144.08626.00002447@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84837

In article <nhWIb.19970$P%1.18769244@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>None as the ARS would have remained closed down after World War I.

All of you olde tyme hammes were around then, I can't fault such expert advice...

>There
>was no intent on the government part to ever re-establish those privileges.
>While this is in the distant past, we don't have to look too far back to see
>loss of spectrum and proposals from the government for loss of spectrum.

Absolutely...look at all the "lost spectrum" over the last 24 years!

LHA

118. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175145.08626.00002449@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84839

In article <B5hJb.2085$uF6.787244@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Dave Bushong
<dbushong@adelphia.net> writes:

>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:F9_Hb.24986$Pg1.11333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>Elmering.
>>>
>>>SKN is an elmering opportunity. If you know the code, and you want to see
>>>it continue as part of our ham radio culture, you have to pass it on.
>>>Nobody teaches CW any more. We used to have converts from the military,
>>>where CW ops were to learn code or face a courtmartial. They got to 20WPM
>>>in a couple of weeks but had a gun to their heads for 8 hours a day to do
>>>it. Learning CW is a one-on-one activity and each of us CW ops needs to
>>>feel an obligation to our elmers to pass it on.
>>
>>
>> You don't learn CW as a language, you learn morse code. One is a method of
>> transmission and one is an encoding scheme sometimes carried over a method
>> of radio transmission. There is a difference.
>>
>
>NOT SUR IF I AGRE WID U OM = I CAN QRS IF U WANT 73 BK
>
>Clearly that was not English. Compare to the clear text version:
>
>I'm not sure that I completely agree with you, you young upstart
>whipper-snapper. From your comments, you aren't proficient in Morse
>Code, Q-signals, or even how to use the "release-to-listen" button, but
>I'll use smaller words if that improves your comprehension.

Incorrect, olde tymer. You "spoke" Morse Jargon with abbreviated
ENGLISH and only one "Q code." The correct translation is:

"Not sure if I agree with you, old man...I can send more slowly
if you want...best regards...break (back to you)."

Sorry, olde tymer, I was on HF 50 1/2 years ago and never, ever
had to use such abbreviations communicating trans-Pacific. Since
then I've been on HF for two other radio services and privately
(not on CB, a few months ago), all without having to use morse
or being required to test for morse in order to operate legally.

>So now, have fun on 11 meters, and back to you.

Stuffit sweetums.

Back to your 1930s Standards and Practices and being the mighty macho morseman.

LHA

119. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175148.08626.00002451@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84838

In article <20031224102156.12501.00004836@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:

>> There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE.
>
>Says who?

The Field First Sergeant of your SERVICE company when you
fall out for roll call at 0530.

Answer "here" as your name is called...sound off like you got a
pair...

Hup, too, tree, foah...

LHA

120. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175148.08626.00002450@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84846

In article <c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<gsBIb.16918$IM3.6633@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20031230185607.07961.00000897@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> > In article <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>> Sohl"
>> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >
>> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > >news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> > >> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Bill
>> Sohl"
>> > >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> > >>
>> > >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > >> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> > >> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
>> > >> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> > >> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> > >> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> > >> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> > >> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> > >> >> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>

>> Also, at the risk of being stoned, how has the Canadian
>> entry level license been going which restricts those hams to
>> commercial equipment only? Perhaps an entry level USA
>> license could have a restriction of commercial only rigs
>> "OR" hmebrew transmitter "IF" the homebrew has been
>> checked out and signed off as OK by an Extra class ham.
>
>I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
>I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
>inconsistencies in the written testing....

[nobody can realistically expect you to "shut up," jimmie...:-)]

>The problem with such an "Appliance Class" license is that it cuts
>off those who hold it from one of the main reasons for the ARS to exist

>in the USA. (Remember that the "basis and purpose" is an FCC/Part 97
>thing and other countries have different ones, or none at all). Not being
>*allowed* to homebrew, modify or repair one's own gear is simply a bad
>idea. It would
>*encourage* new hams to become even more dependent on manufacturers
>rather than their own ingenuity.

So, where is the official, certified, withoutadoubtaccurate POLL
on how many of today's hams are appliance operators and how
many use their homebuilts as their main radio?

What's the percentage of appliance operators? 97%? 98%? 99%?

>Some of the greatest experiences I have had in amateur radio have been in
>taking an idea and some parts and turning them into a working radio
>station, then making contacts with that station. Started doing that sort
>of thing as a kid and never got out of the habit. Led me to EE degrees, a
>career and a bunch of other things. Never would have happened if I'd had
>to use only "approved" gear.
>and

A few hundred thousand EEs have made career paths WITHOUT
getting a ham license first. IEEE has a bunch of them in their
membership. Are they in the "never would have happened" category?

>> Allowing "homebrew" via an Extra certification process would
>> foster positive relationships and Elmering (IMHO).
>
>Maybe. OTOH, having to get one's projects approved by another ham slows
>down the process enormously and could result in all kinds of trouble. Add
>to that the fact that the current written tests are by no means adequate
>to ensure that all Extras know everything they need to know in order to
>sign off on another's work.

:-)

Right on...like every Extra is an automatic EE who can "certify" a
piece of work.

Nooo...for too many Extras, a Tx without a morse key attachment
thingy is a FAILED design! Would probably get an automatic
REJECT tag if it had a microphone attached...

>And what problem does such an "Appliance Class" license really solve?
>Do we have lots of problems here in the USA with homebrewing hams'
>creations mucking up the bands and causing interference? I don't
>think so.

What's the percentage of US amateurs operating "appliance rigs?"

Do all hams make their "Southgate Type 7" rigs their main one?

[what IS a "Southgate Type 7?" don't show up on a search...]

>> Yet the "only" difference between technicians not allowed
>> any HF and those allowed on the "novice" segments is a code test...
>> no additional knowledge of HF needed for Tech with code
>> to operate the Novice segments.
>
>Sure - because that HF knowledge is tested in the written for Tech,
>and was tested for in the Novice when it was available.

Nobody can operate on HF without morse code knowledge and
skill. "Everyone knows that."

That's why all the other radio services on HF demand their ops
learn, love, honor, and obey morse code.

Don't they?

>> I wish certain others in this newsgroup had the ability to
>> understand that.
>
>But let's be honest about the situation, Bill. There *are* some folks who
>want to further reduce *written* testing. (Not me!) Just look at the
>"21st Century" paper for one example - particularly the attitude it projects.

Terrible attitude. Clearly not what St. Hiram would have approved
in His day.

Never mind that the NCVEC leaders are 20 WPM code tested
Extras. Never mind that NCI was begun by a 20 WPM code tested
Extra. Everyone MUST demonstrate morse skill in order to operate
on HF. It's the divine law of physics.

>> > A lot of things we thought impossible have come to pass. Heck, FCC never
>> > imagined that cb would get out of their control...
>>
>> In hindsight, the FCC certainly should have seen it coming.

Absolutely. Unlike the olde tyme hammes the FCC is "obviously"
deficient and certainly was in 1958.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...how dare the FCC allow "civilians" on HF without
the morse test? And on an old, underused ham band, too!

Imagine...NO test at all to get a license to operate on HF some
45 years ago!

Terrible, terrible, terrible...!

>Of course! But they didn't. They simply could not imagine that what
>happened to cb could occur. It was simply not part of their mindset,
>even though all of the indications were there.

Well, YOU "knew" it all 45 years ago, didn't you? :-)

>> The big mistake,
>> in my opinion, was the failure of the FCC to take into account the
>> basic "plug-n-play aspect of CB, the multitude of sales outlets via Radio

>> Shack (Tandy), and the constantly lowering of CB set costs, especially
>> once they became all solid state.
>
>All of those things were considered *desirable* by the FCC!

Not in 1958.

But...you "knew" all about that 45 years ago...

Me, I only lived through it as an adult, watched it happen. Since "CB"
(Class D under the original rules) was on HF and I'm not "morse
qualified" by test, I can't possibly judge anything like that... :-)

>The whole reason
>that service was created by FCC was so that Everyman could get on the
>air with inexpensive, easy-to-set-up-and-use radios for personal,
>short-range communications. Particularly mobile.

God forbid that "Everyman" should get on HF without being morse
tested! Sacrilege! Heresy!

>And if that's not bad enough, lookit BPL.

"lookit?" [a kit for a toilet? :-)]

How does BPL get into this? That's a WIRED communications
thing.

>The main point of all this is that FCC wasn't and isn't an infallible
>bunch that Knows What Is Best For Radio. Let alone what is best for
>ham radio.

Only tried and true HF morsemen "Know What Is Best For Radio!"

Don't know morse? Shove them in the back of the EM bus up
on VHF and higher. HF belongs to morsemen!

>They're simply the folks in charge, who have the unenviable task of balancing
>all the competing demands, and doing it with limited resources and under
>various forms of pressure.

In civil radio in the USA, the FCC is THE LAW.

>So it's up to us hams to make our case and set our path, not FCC.

Only tried and true HF Morsemen Know What Is Best For Ham
Radio!

LHA

121. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175149.08626.00002452@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84836

In article <DCZIb.29483$Pg1.3348@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>> Only on a one-time basis.
>>
>
>If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if the
>"fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees would
>increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra Class"
>would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or tomorrows rules.

Flawless accuracy, bonded and certified by independent
authorities, even comes with a gilt-edged certificate of compliance
(suitable for framing).

>> > Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can
>> >reasonably > plead that any examination more comprehensive
>> > than the current General discriminates against new applicants.
>>
>> They can plead all they want...doesn't make it so. The FCC could
>> certainly counter argue the upgrades were a one-time need to
>> simplify the overall license structure.
>
>Their counter argument would utterly fail, because they'd first need to
>prove that the "one-time need" over-rides the harm of a massive influx of
>underqualified (by their own rules) individuals into the top class of
>amateur operators. Judges rule on logic, not administrative convenience.

Flawless logic..."everyone knows" that morse code is an absolute
requirement to operate on HF...that's why all the other users of
HF require all HF operators to know, use, and love morse code.

Don't they?

>> The question still is, what is the harm of such a one-time "fix."
>>
>Trivializing this as a one-time "fix" shows how little you've examined the
>issue. Instead of a one-time "fix", it would be a one-time "hammer blow".
>The answer still is exactly as stated in my previous message.

Yes, we are all aware that YOUR PLAN is logical without peer.

Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.

That is a given.

LHA

122. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175150.08626.00002453@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84840

In article <4V%Ib.19277$IM3.16720@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:DCZIb.29483$Pg1.3348@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...

>The FCC doesn't have to prove anything. The burden of proof would
>be on those that oppose what was done. Government regulations have a
>presumption of legality to start with.
>
>> > The question still is, what is the harm of such a one-time "fix."
>>
>> Trivializing this as a one-time "fix" shows how little you've examined the
>> issue. Instead of a one-time "fix", it would be a one-time "hammer blow".
>> The answer still is exactly as stated in my previous message.
>>
>> Cheerios and bran flakes to you to,

Careful, Bill, Hans might report you to somebody...or, at least,
vote against you in the next election... :-)

LHA

123. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:51:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102175150.08626.00002454@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 84843

In article <Pn0Jb.29749$Pg1.12522@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Bill, when are the next NCI elections for Director? I look forward to
>voting for whoever runs in opposition to you. You are irresponsible and
>dangerous.

What next, reporting Bill to Homeland Security?!? :-)

LHA

124. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 22:53:30 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102175330.134$Aw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
> Bill, if you don't want a Morse code test, that is fine, but you
> shouldn't use a flawed argument to support it. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Put a friggin asterisk next to their call, like Jim said.

* = code lover. Voluntarily added, for the CW fans. No biggie.

-whatever-

125. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 23:21:01 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84901
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
>
> http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
>
No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)

(replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)

126. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 23:39:20 UTC
From: wf3h@ptnosm.com
Message-ID: <3ff60111.141947166@usenet.ptd.net>
Source record: 84902
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 2 Jan 2004 15:53:43 -0500, "polycarbonate blue"
<tingting@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>"JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net...
>>
>> Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
>> window:
>>
>> "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
>>
>> JQ
>
>(..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
>folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
>the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
>from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
>weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
>us amongst the local business establishments
>'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')
>

restaurants generally automatically add a gratuity to the bill for
groups.

---
to see who "wf3h" is, go to "qrz.com"
and enter 'wf3h' in the field

check my blog at:
http://www.bobview.blogspot.com/

127. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 23:53:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zvnJb.5522$6B.295@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84903

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Pn0Jb.29749$Pg1.12522@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> I wrote:
>
> > > If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if
> the
> > > "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees
would
> > > increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra
> > > Class" would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or
> > > tomorrows rules.
>
> Bill Sohl blew it off with .....
>
> >
> > Doesn't bother me.
> >
>
> Bill, when are the next NCI elections for Director? I look forward to
> voting for whoever runs in opposition to you. You are irresponsible and
> dangerous.

I can't drive within the speed limit either :-)

Isn't it amazing no great harm was encountered when all those hams in
the 50s/60s only had to be General for full priviliges?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

128. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 23:53:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <QvnJb.20274$P%1.19211163@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84904
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
> >
> > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> >
> No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
>
> (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)

I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his behavior thus I
cannot comment. By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

129. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-02 23:57:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <mznJb.5529$6B.2830@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84905

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:DCZIb.29483$Pg1.3348@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > Only on a one-time basis.
>
> If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if the
> "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees would
> increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra
Class"
> would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or tomorrows
rules.
>
> > > Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can
> > >reasonably > plead that any examination more comprehensive
> > > than the current General discriminates against new applicants.
> >
> > They can plead all they want...doesn't make it so. The FCC could
> > certainly counter argue the upgrades were a one-time need to
> > simplify the overall license structure.
>
> Their counter argument would utterly fail, because they'd first need to
> prove that the "one-time need" over-rides the harm of a massive influx of
> underqualified (by their own rules) individuals into the top class of
> amateur operators. Judges rule on logic, not administrative convenience.

So how come when the Generals "lost" privileges in 1968 they didn't
win that same argument...i.e. you can't take privileges
from me because the new requirements aren't justified
since I already had those privileges via a lower class
license?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

130. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:02:42 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102190242.514$AT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84906
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
> > >
> > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> > >
> > No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
> >
> > (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)
>
> I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his behavior thus I
> cannot comment.
>
That's ok, you're better off by not being familiar with him. That
tinyurl link sums him up pretty well tho. He likes to post in
rec.radio.cb, like you've been doing, but he only posts homosexual
references.
>
> By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.
>
Right across the river from n8wwm, maybe.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

131. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:18:08 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021618.258eba44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
>> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>> > > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> > > >
>> > > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
>> > >
>> > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
>> > >
>> > No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
>> >
>> > (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)
>>
>> I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his behavior
thus
>I
>> cannot comment.
>>
>That's ok, you're better off by not being familiar with him. That
>tinyurl link sums him up pretty well tho. He likes to post in
>rec.radio.cb, like you've been doing, but he only posts homosexual
>references.
>>
>> By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.
>>
>Right across the river from n8wwm, maybe.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee that is Steve Oarks from Medina OH he is trolling in ham groups
now when not trolling in rec.radio.cb. Of course he complains a lot
about hams but that is his hypocratic nature. You see how he barged
into this thread and tried to start trouble with n8wwm's call sign.
That is what he is about.

132. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:23:35 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102192335.072$yf@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >> > > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> > > >
> >> > > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
> >> > >
> >> > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> >> > >
> >> > No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
> >> >
> >> > (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)
> >>
> >> I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his behavior
> thus
> >I
> >> cannot comment.
> >>
> >That's ok, you're better off by not being familiar with him. That
> >tinyurl link sums him up pretty well tho. He likes to post in
> >rec.radio.cb, like you've been doing, but he only posts homosexual
> >references.
> >>
> >> By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.
> >>
> >Right across the river from n8wwm, maybe.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> Dee that is Steve Oarks from Medina OH he is trolling in ham groups
> now when not trolling in rec.radio.cb. Of course he complains a lot
> about hams but that is his hypocratic nature. You see how he barged
> into this thread and tried to start trouble with n8wwm's call sign.
> That is what he is about.
>
Hey dumbass, this is cross posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.shortwave,

rec.radio.cb .

See the last group, shit-wit? Are you really that stupid, or just drunk?

133. Re: Why don't you like this cross posted to rec.radio.cb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:23:54 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021623.3b2e51ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84909
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040102082953.232$cK_-_@newsreader.com>...
> Because most topics that are cross posted to this many groups
> end up being worthless tripe.

Look here is Steveo trolling ham groups again why am I not surprised.

134. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:26:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <h%nJb.5583$6B.252@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84910

```
"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gsBIb.16918$IM3.6633@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031230185607.07961.00000897@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > In article <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> > Sohl"
> > > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
> > > >> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> > Sohl"
> > > >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > > >>
> > > >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > > >> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
> > > >> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > >> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> > > >> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> > > >> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >> >> >> >Message-id:
<f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > > First off, there's bound to be disagreement about what constitutes a
> > > > "rational relationship"
> > >
> > > Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an
incentive,
> > > what do we use?
> > >
> > > If we use power (as Hans suggests), there's little incentive for QRP
and
> > > low power folks to upgrade.
> >
> > The irony, however, is that I would bet most people that
> > are dedicated QRPers are much more tehnically oriented
> > to begin with and more likly to upgrade.
```

>
> Agreed!
>
> And you can bet that most dedicated QRPers are also primarily CW ops.
>
> > On the other hand,
> > IF a QRPer is content with the entry level power limits
> > and doesn't choose to upgrade, what's the harm?
>
> Depends on the observer, really.

OK, as yourself as the observer, what's the harm?

> > One can
> > look at all those that don't upgrade today...even with
> > spectrum privileges as the enhancement...to see folks that
> > are content at their current license level and are also good
> > hams.
>
> Yet there are those who claim that large numbers of "technically
> oriented" hams *would* upgrade except for the "barrier" of the
> code test......

And you well know I'm not one of those that make that claim.

> > > And since we're supposed to use the minimum power
> > > required by the situation anyway.....
> >
> > True, but the FCC has never made a big case of checking to
> > see that everyone is running at the least practical power.
> > Additionally, I suspect the FCC concern on the "least power"
> > is driven more by those running "big" power rather than
> > anyone run a basic rig of 100 watts or less.
>
> Exactly. Also there's the interference considerations.
> >
> > > If we use modes as the incentive, which modes do we use for the
incentive?
> >
> > I don't see modes as an incentive.
>
> Then there's not much left.
> >
> > > There's also the question of enforcement. You can tell right away if
> > > someone is outside their allocated spectrum, but power is another
issue.
> >
> > Yet it has been an aspect of Novice license for over 50 years.
> > I agree the enforcement would have its problems, but I suspect
> > the gross violations could be detected (e.g. if limit is 200 watts
> > and someone is running a kilowatt).

>
> Depends on the antenna and conditions. On HF I have heard amazing
> signals from QRP stations because of really good antennas. And
> really poor signals from QRO stations because of poor antennas.

But (IMHO) an occasional "great signal" would never be the only thing
the FCC relied on for a notice of power violations.

> > In the end, I believe "most"
> > hams want to operate legally and will do so.
>
> That's because it's part of the tradition and culture of amateur
> radio to do so, not because of large amounts of enforcement. I'm all
> for more and better enforcement, but it's clear that those who think
> Riley can do it all are mistaken.

Agreed.

> > Those that might run
> > double their allowed power (say 400 when limited to 200) are
> > only fooling themselves.
>
> Big difference between 400 vs. 200 hp under the hood, or between 80
> MPH and 40 MPH on the highway. But it's only 3 dB on the air. Tough
> concept for some...

Exactly my point. The FCC would likly focus on 1000W vs 200W,
not the cheater running 400.

> > > >> >What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
> > > >> >operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a
General
> > > >> >operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
> > > >>
> > > >> Not much!
> > > >
> > > >Not any as I see it.
> > > >
> > > Exactly.The difference is in operating skills and knowledge.
> > > The Extra part is where the DX often goes.
> >
> > Maybe we could tie some power limits to frequency
> > spectrum which would then create a valid reason to not allow
> > a lower level licesnse in that spectrum slot.
>
> I'm not sure what you're proposing. Do you mean having some parts of a
> band allowed 1500 W and others only, say, 150 W, as is done now in the
> Novice parts of 80/40/15?

Something to think about. Consider the discussion a "green-light"
session. No proposal get's immediately shot down while trying to
draw out as many new ideas/concepts as possible.

> > > >> But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
> > > >> technical knowledge with more privileges.
> > > >
> > > >I don't oppose the concept, I oppose the illogical implementation.
> > >
> > > We can agree to disagree about the logic.
> > >
> > > But what should be used for an incentive besides spectrum?
> >
> > I agree with Hans that power certanly can be and has been.
>
> That's one possiblity.
>
> > Also, at the risk of being stoned, how has the Canadian
> > entry level license been going which restricts those hams to
> > commercial equipment only? Perhaps an entry level USA
> > license could have a restriction of commercial only rigs
> > "OR" hmebrew transmitter "IF" the homebrew has been
> > checked out and signed off as OK by an Extra class ham.
>
> I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
> I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
> inconsistencies in the written testing....

Who wanted to shut you down? We can discuss all we want. I'd
be careful, however, with certain ideas presented officially
to FCC.

> The problem with such an "Appliance Class" license is that it cuts
> off those who hold it from one of the main reasons for the ARS to
> exist
> in the USA. (Remember that the "basis and purpose" is an FCC/Part 97
> thing and other countries have different ones, or none at all). Not
> being *allowed* to homebrew, modify or repair one's own gear is
> simply a bad idea. It would
> *encourage* new hams to become even more dependent on manufacturers
> rather than their own ingenuity.

I'll ask again, what IS the experience in Canada. What "bad" things are
happening or not happening?

> Some of the greatest experiences I have had in amateur radio have been
> in
> taking an idea and some parts and turning them into a working radio
> station, then making contacts with that station. Started doing that
> sort
> of thing as a kid and never got out of the habit. Led me to EE
> degrees, a
> career and a bunch of other things. Never would have happened if I'd
> had
> to use only "approved" gear.
> and

But any "commercial" limitation would only apply to transmitters.
That still leaves receiver circuits, etc to experiment with.
In fact, no one needs any license to build and use their own
homebrew receiver.

> > Allowing "homebrew" via an Extra certification process would
> > foster positive relationships and Elmering (IMHO).
>
> Maybe. OTOH, having to get one's projects approved by another ham
> slows
> down the process enormously and could result in all kinds of trouble.

As above, not ALL projects would need approval. Also,
can you give an idea about "could result in all kinds of trouble.?"

> Add
> to that the fact that the current written tests are by no means
> adequate
> to ensure that all Extras know everything they need to know in order
> to
> sign off on another's work.

You just created Catch 22. Based on your perspective, even Extras
today shouldn't be allowed to homebrew without some additional
"certification" because the current Extra syllabus is inadequate to
ensure the Extra knows enough to homebrew.

> And what problem does such an "Appliance Class" license really solve?
> Do we have lots of problems here in the USA with homebrewing hams'
> creations mucking up the bands and causing interference? I don't
> think so.

I didin't say there was any problem. I merely suggested
another "incentive" that could better be tied to knowledge
at a certain license level.
>
> > > >> >The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
> > > >> >additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
> > > >> >additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
> > > >> >Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
> > > >>
> > > >> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
> > > >
> > > >It only flows as to "pure incentive". It doesn't flow or relate
> > > >at all to the additional knowledge tested to pass the license.
> > >
> > > Some of the knowledge does, such as HF propagation.
> >
> > Yet the "only" difference between technicians not allowed
> > any HF and those allowed on the "novice" segments is a code test...
> > no additional knowledge of HF needed for Tech with code
> > to operate the Novice segments.
>

> Sure - because that HF knowledge is tested in the written for Tech,
> and was tested for in the Novice when it was available.

OK

> > > >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
> > > >> For that matter, what about the General?
> > > >
> > > >Did I even hint at that.
> > >
> > > Not at all!
> > >
> > > >The answer is basically no...although
> > > >I have NO preference for or against changing license structure
> > > >to a more rational basis for added privileges.
> > > >
> > > My point is simply that being anticodetest does *not* necessarily mean
> > > someone
> > > wants to water dwon the writtens or eliminate license classes.
> >
> > THANK YOU Jim!
>
> You're welcome.
> >
> > I wish certain others in this newsgroup had the ability to
> > understand that.
>
> But let's be honest about the situation, Bill. There *are* some folks
> who
> want to further reduce *written* testing. (Not me!) Just look at the
> "21st Century" paper for one example - particularly the attitude it
> projects.

Those that truly want to "further reduce written testing" are but
a handful and, except for W5YI, who you may put in that
category, they don't speak at all for a significant majority of
hams (IMHO, YMMV)

> One of its rallying cries is that we need more new hams at any cost,
> and not only is the code test scapegoated as a barrier, but also the
> written test. That paper came from a NCVEC committee, too, and you can
> bet they will push that agenda.

Has that paper been submitted as official NCVEC input to the FCC?

> > > A lot of things we thought impossible have come to pass. Heck, FCC
never
> > > imagined that cb would get out of their control...
> >
> > In hindsight, the FCC certainly should have seen it coming.
>
> Of course! But they didn't. They simply could not imagine that what

> happened to cb could occur. It was simply not part of their mindset,
> even though all of the indications were there.

Water over the dam.

> > The big mistake,
> > in my opinion, was the failure of the FCC to take into account the
> > basic "plug-n-play aspect of CB, the multitude of sales outlets via
Radio
> > Shack (Tandy), and the constantly lowering of CB set costs, especially
> > once they became all solid state.
>
> All of those things were considered *desirable* by the FCC! The whole
> reason
> that service was created by FCC was so that Everyman could get on the
> air with inexpensive, easy-to-set-up-and-use radios for personal,
> short-range communications. Particularly mobile.
>
> And if that's not bad enough, lookit BPL.
>
> The main point of all this is that FCC wasn't and isn't an infallible
> bunch that Knows What Is Best For Radio. Let alone what is best for
> ham radio.
> They're simply the folks in charge, who have the unenviable task of
> balancing
> all the competing demands, and doing it with limited resources and
> under various forms of pressure.
>
> So it's up to us hams to make our case and set our path, not FCC.

That's why I am in ARRL and have been so since before NCI was
even created. I'll restate my position on the purpose of NCI as it
relates to me. Once the code testing is actually gone, then I'll
cease to be an NCI member as the goal will have been achieved.
If any of the other NCI directors/members want NCI to
continue on a different, expanded purpose, they will do so
without me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

135. Re: Why don't you like this cross posted to rec.radio.cb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:32:00 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102193200.265$UT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84911
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040102082953.232$cK_-_@newsreader.com>...
> > Because most topics that are cross posted to this many groups
> > end up being worthless tripe.
>
> Look here is Steveo trolling ham groups again why am I not surprised.
>
Cuz you're too fucking stoopid to read the cross post thru four NG's?

Dumbass.

136. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:34:01 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021634.66e53787@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84912
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
>> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> >> news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
>> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>> >> > > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
>> >> > >
>> >> > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
>> >> > >
>> >> > No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
>> >> >
>> >> > (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)
>> >>
>> >> I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his
behavior
>> thus
>> >I
>> >> cannot comment.
>> >>
>> >That's ok, you're better off by not being familiar with him. That
>> >tinyurl link sums him up pretty well tho. He likes to post in
>> >rec.radio.cb, like you've been doing, but he only posts homosexual
>> >references.
>> >>
>> >> By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.
>> >>
>> >Right across the river from n8wwm, maybe.
>> >>
>> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>> Dee that is Steve Oarks from Medina OH he is trolling in ham groups
>> now when not trolling in rec.radio.cb. Of course he complains a lot
>> about hams but that is his hypocratic nature. You see how he barged
>> into this thread and tried to start trouble with n8wwm's call sign.
>> That is what he is about.
>>
```

>Hey dumbass, this is cross posted to:
>rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc,
rec.radio.shortwave,
>rec.radio.cb .
>
>See the last group, shit-wit? Are you really that stupid, or just
drunk?

Hey Dee D. you see how he operates he is a troll and not only that he is an illegal freebander and HF bootlegger. Ask him about his Collins S-Line he operates without a license and why it is set up to transmit all over the spectrum he will go quiet real fast.

137. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:38:08 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102193808.549$pZ@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84913
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> >> news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
> >> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> >> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >> >> > > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
> >> >> > > >
> >> >> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> >> > > >
> >> >> > > > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
> >> >> > > >
> >> >> > > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> >> >> > > >
> >> >> > > No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)
> >> >> >
> >> >> I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his
> behavior
> >> thus
> >> >I
> >> >> cannot comment.
> >> >>
> >> >That's ok, you're better off by not being familiar with him. That
> >> >tinyurl link sums him up pretty well tho. He likes to post in
> >> >rec.radio.cb, like you've been doing, but he only posts homosexual
> >> >references.
> >> >>
> >> >> By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.
> >> >>
> >> >Right across the river from n8wwm, maybe.
> >> >>
> >> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> >
> >> Dee that is Steve Oarks from Medina OH he is trolling in ham groups
> >> now when not trolling in rec.radio.cb. Of course he complains a lot
> >> about hams but that is his hypocratic nature. You see how he barged
> >> into this thread and tried to start trouble with n8wwm's call sign.
> >> That is what he is about.

> >>
> >Hey dumbass, this is cross posted to:
> >rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc,
> rec.radio.shortwave,
> >rec.radio.cb .
> >
> >See the last group, shit-wit? Are you really that stupid, or just
> drunk?
>
> Hey Dee D. you see how he operates he is a troll and not only that he
> is an illegal freebander and HF bootlegger. Ask him about his Collins
> S-Line he operates without a license and why it is set up to transmit
> all over the spectrum he will go quiet real fast.
>
Wrong again, do you need it beat in to you with a clue by four?

138. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:39:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <2boJb.5607$6B.2705@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84914
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:4gjJb.2139$uF6.818793@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >>>news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >>>>news:geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>news:5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com...
> >>>>>SNIP
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>YES! No code is killing
> >>>>>ham radio. See you on channel 22 good buddy.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
> >>>>>that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Cheers,
> >>>>>Bill K2UNK
> >>>>
> >>>>May I, Bill?
> >>>>
> >>>>While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do
believe
> >>>
> >>>it
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>is fostering a bad mindset.

> >>>>
> >>>>If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that
the
> >>>>Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
> >>>>aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA.
> >>>
> >>>However,
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with
> >
> > some
> >
> >>>>pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
> >>>>
> >>>>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> >>>>
> >>>>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> >>>>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
toward
> >>>>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> >>>when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
> >>
> >>This is an excellent point, Bill! And the answer is YES, they did! I
> >>have a wife and kid that cannot drive a standard transmission auto or
> >>truck. I can drive standard as well as automatic transmissioned
> >>vehicles. Who knows more?
> >
> >
> > Does it make any difference at all. The point is that there is
> > no reason for states to test on manual gearbox
> > autos because 95% of new vehicles are automatic. Those
> > that want to will learn to drive a manual without any licensing
> > intervention needed from the state.
>
> My XYL refuses to parallel park, as do a number of others. She also
> doesn't do three point turns. Your logic would eliminate those from the
> test also. A person CAN drive for years and years, and if they do things
> a certain way, they don't have to PP or TPT. She can drive 100 percent
> of the time without it. Of course the odd emergency situation may come up.

Apparently the state DOES see a continuing need for PP or TPT...
but does NOT see any public purpose, safety issue, or licensing
ommision by not testing for manual gearboxes.

> Bill, if you don't want a Morse code test, that is fine, but you
> shouldn't use a flawed argument to support it. 8^)

The point is that there is ZERO harm if a new ham never
passes a code test and then decides to get on the air and
jump into a code QSO to learn while doing.

The state apparently thinks the same is true for
manual gearbox driving and many other aspects of driving
which aren't tested at all. I can and do drive an extended cab PU-truck
pulling a 5000 lb trailer, combined length about 40 feet.

To the best of my knowledge, no state
tests anyone for that combination of skills.
All that is needed is a regular driver's license.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

139. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:48:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <6joJb.5613$6B.5183@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84915
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:JmjJb.2142$uF6.820876@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >
> > news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >>>news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >>>
> >>>>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> >>>>
> >>>>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> >>>>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
> >
> > toward
> >
> >>>>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> >>>
> >>>Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> >>>when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
> >>
> >>Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
> >>license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
> >>with an automatic transmission, your driving privilidges were limited
> >>to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
> >>"priviliges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
> >>bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
> >>correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
> >>
> >>Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
> >>that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
> >>mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the dirver ahead of
> >>him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
> >>years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
> >>though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
> >>us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
> >>VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
> >>

> >>
> >>>The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
> >>>of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as
> >>>an international treaty element.
> >>
> >>The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> >>today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> >>we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
> >>into, the ARS.
> >
> >
> > So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
> > The anology is a joke. There is ZERO element of safety involved with
> > CW knowledge/testing. Had there been any relavent safety
> > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
>
> This is your analogy, Bill, not ours. I don't think the analogy fits, I
> think people should be required to test on standard, or at least not be
> allowed to drive a standard unless tested for it.

Which standard, should there be separate licenses for 3 speed column,
4 speed, 5 speed, 6 speed, which shift pattern?

Apparently there is insufficient state
concern to worry about passing a license test with automatic and
then getting behind the wheel of a manual gearbox vehicle. It's
been that way for decades now with no ill results.

> >>>>2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as
> >
> > if
> >
> >>>>it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> >>>>requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
> >
> > requirements
> >
> >>>>we *want* to meet.)
> >>>
> >>>I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added priviliges
> >>>have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
> >>
> >>Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> >
> > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> > on the only two all-CW only bands. Use does not justify
> > the requirement since there's nothing detrimental about learning
> > on the air at even a one word per minute, look it up on a table
> > rate.
>
> one of two answers:

>
> 1. It's a goofed up rule
>
> 2. It's a good way to get Tech's to practice Morse code.

Why wouldn't it be a good way to get anone on HF to
practice also if there's no code test at all? That's
the point, there is no rational justification for a CW
mode skill test. The FCC has addressed and dismissed
every known pro-code argument...as has the ITU also
since Code is gone now as a mandatory treaty requirment.

> Either is probably irrelevant because most tech's that aren't planning
> on upgrading probably aren't all that interested in Morse code at all,
> and there are plenty of goofed up rules.

ITU treaty is goofed up too?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

140. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:48:45 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-DF677D.16484502012004@news.sf.sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 84916
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <20040102193808.549$pZ@newsreader.com>,
Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:

> questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> > Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> > >questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> > >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> > >> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > >> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > >> >> news:20040102182101.386$HF@newsreader.com...
> > >> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > >> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > >> >> > > > Be an example of what you think a ham ought to be.
> > >> >> > > >
> > >> >> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >> >> > > >
> > >> >> > > Should a ham be like N8WWM!?
> > >> >> > >
> > >> >> > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> > >> >> > >
> > >> >> > No comment, Dee D? I'm in Ohio too. ;)
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > (replying from rec.radio.cb, where n8wwm hangs out)
> > >> >>
> > >> >> I am not familiar with N8WWM and so have no notion of his
> > behavior
> > >> >> thus
> > >> >>I
> > >> >> cannot comment.
> > >> >>
> > >> >That's ok, you're better off by not being familiar with him. That
> > >> >tinyurl link sums him up pretty well tho. He likes to post in
> > >> >rec.radio.cb, like you've been doing, but he only posts homosexual
> > >> >references.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> By the way, I am in Michigan not Ohio.
> > >> >>
> > >> >Right across the river from n8wwm, maybe.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >> >>
> > >> Dee that is Steve Oarks from Medina OH he is trolling in ham groups
> > >> now when not trolling in rec.radio.cb. Of course he complains a lot

> > >> about hams but that is his hypocratic nature. You see how he barged
> > >> into this thread and tried to start trouble with n8wwm's call sign.
> > >> That is what he is about.
> > >>
> > >Hey dumbass, this is cross posted to:
> > >rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc,
> > rec.radio.shortwave,
> > >rec.radio.cb .
> > >
> > >See the last group, shit-wit? Are you really that stupid, or just
> > drunk?
> >
> > Hey Dee D. you see how he operates he is a troll and not only that he
> > is an illegal freebander and HF bootlegger. Ask him about his Collins
> > S-Line he operates without a license and why it is set up to transmit
> > all over the spectrum he will go quiet real fast.
> >
> Wrong again, do you need it beat in to you with a clue by four?

So I would like to take this latest exchange by requesting the good people of rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc groups delete rec.radio.shortwave, rec.radio.cb from the newsgroup line since this thread is off topic in these groups.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

141. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:49:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84917

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
> inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
>

I knew you'd agree with me.

73, de Hans, K0HB

142. BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 00:50:57 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102195057.591$oS_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84918
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> ITU treaty is goofed up too?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?

Updates?

143. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:12:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5GoJb.5632$6B.3229@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84919
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401021356.1193770@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the
requirements
> > > > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
> > toward
> > > > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> > > > >
> > > > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> > > > when they stopped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
> > >
> > > Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
> > > license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
> > > with an automatic transmission, your driving privileges were limited
> > > to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
> > > "privileges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
> > > bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
> > > correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
> > >
> > > Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
> > > that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
> > > mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the driver ahead of
> > > him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
> > > years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
> > > though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
> > > us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
> > > VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
> > >
> > > > The reality is the Morse test is past its prime...and the entire
body
> > > > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate Morse as
> > > > an international treaty element.
```

> > >
> > > The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> > > today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> > > we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
> > > into, the ARS.
> >
> > So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
>
> Oh, I don't know, Bill.let's see. Let's ask that fellow who just
> passed Element 2 and just couldn't wait to get OTA. So he bought a
> nifty little dual-bander, a "killer" Mirage amp, and pumped a few
> hundred Watts or VHF or UHF RF into his nice long Yagi (You know, the
> one marketed as a "Boomer.") pointed toward a distant repeater.right
> through the second floor of his neighbor's house. Heck, he mounted it
> on the mast that formerly hosted a TV antenna.that ought to be good
> enough, right?

And none of this would have happened if only he had known
code? Give me a break.

Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
the harm, danger, etc?

> After all, I'm sure that someone who is so bothered at the notion of
> having to learn and be tested on a skill he deems irrelevant to how he
> plans on operating, that he joins an "international" movement to
> remove said offensive task.would certainly be concerned and cognizant
> of any harmful RF his equipment might be radiating. Heck, he did pass
> that 35 multiple-guess.er, I meant choice test that proclaimed him
> "ready." I am fairly certain though that his mode of choice was not
> CW. ;-)
>
> > The analogy is a joke.
>
> Actually, I am pretty much joking around with you, Bill. (Lighten up.)
> HOWEVER, the potential for physical harm is there and somewhere the
> above scenario may be playing out as you read these words.and that's
> no joke.

The potential for harm, physical or otherwise is NOT tied
to anyone's knowledge of code. THAT is the point.

> > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW knowledge/testing.
>
> Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
> problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors
> are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt conscientiously
> ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that
> would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's be
> honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance

> themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even call
> them."slackers.")

The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of
any continued need for code skills to be mandated for
any HF access. There was, in the past, a rational reason
or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
It is that simple.

> BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
> no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one
> poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants to
> bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater folks
> feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex operation
> who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
> Watts mentioned above.

Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of
current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
code testing. PERIOD!

> > Had there been any relevant safety
> > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
>
> You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer the
> BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"

Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
stop the FCC.

> > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement
appear as
> > if
> > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
> > requirements
> > > > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > > > >
> > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
> > >
> > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> >
> > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> > on the only two all-CW only bands.
>
> That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a

> safe environment before venturing onto the highway.

If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?
What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
non-highway?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

144. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:20:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FF618DC.6010107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84920
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan Jatowski wrote:

> Their body odor lingers for
>hours after they're gone.
>
>
>
It's not just old hams, many old non-hams are stinky too.
I don't know why many people from the WW2 generation
don't shower every day.

>
>

145. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:23:41 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021723.5615c41d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84921
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

>Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
>> Hey Dee D. you see how he operates he is a troll and not only that
he
>> is an illegal freebander and HF bootlegger. Ask him about his
Collins
>> S-Line he operates without a license and why it is set up to
transmit
>> all over the spectrum he will go quiet real fast.
>
>Wrong again, do you need it beat in to you with a clue by four?

You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent he has a real problem with anger first thing you know he is threatening to beat someone LOL. But the part about his bootleg Collins HF station is true he brags about it many times on rec.radio.cb ask him you know you hear about these pirating radio spectrum outlaws in the FCC reports but I bet you never met one well here he is his name is Steve Parks.

146. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:26:46 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102202646.912$R3@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> >Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
> >> Hey Dee D. you see how he operates he is a troll and not only that
> he
> >> is an illegal freebander and HF bootlegger. Ask him about his
> Collins
> >> S-Line he operates without a license and why it is set up to
> transmit
> >> all over the spectrum he will go quiet real fast.
> >
> >Wrong again, do you need it beat in to you with a clue by four?
>
> You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent?
>
A clue by four is violent? Leave Dee alone already, leghumper.

147. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:31:03 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021731.a3c8dba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84923
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
>> >Wrong again, do you need it beat in to you with a clue by four?
>>
>> You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent?
>>
>A clue by four is violent? Leave Dee alone already, leghumper.

Look at the thread you busted in on her so you started it dickwad.

148. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:35:06 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102203506.218$tX@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
> Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
> >> >Wrong again, do you need it beat in to you with a clue by four?
> >>
> >> You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent?
> >>
> >A clue by four is violent? Leave Dee alone already, leghumper.
>
> Look at the thread you busted in on her so you started it dickwad.
>
No, I've replied to Dee before, without your moderation. What
made you decide to chime in with your worthless tripe this time?

149. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:40:27 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021740.4a175756@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84925
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
> >> >You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent?
> >>>
> >>A clue by four is violent? Leave Dee alone already, leghumper.
>
> >Look at the thread you busted in on her so you started it dickwad.
>
>No, I've replied to Dee before, without your moderation. What
>made you decide to chime in with your worthless tripe this time?

Because your a TROLLLLLL Steveo and Dee D. needs to know it she was clearly puzzled by you throwing N8WWMs name into the mix for no good reason other than to cause trouble and lets face it you need to be moderated, asslick.

150. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:46:45 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102204645.960$Qo@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84926
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote:
lets face it you need to be
> moderated, asslick.
>
Asslick? I'll re-direct you to a pretty good ass binarie group,

alt.binaries.great.ass.paulina . Thank me later, loser.

(don't use up your whole 1 gb at once)

151. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 01:47:17 UTC
From: Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com
Message-ID: <2276e708079b3d0bc970785b3c045b5b@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 84927
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

No No Not George wrote:
> met one well here he is his name is Steve Parks.

Youv'e been bamboozled, Sparky.
http://www.steve-park.com/

Bamboozled by a NA$CAR fan. That can't be good!
--

Truckers get the best $20 whores

152. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:07:18 UTC
From: Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com
Message-ID: <ad5c0587383bc9a126731cf8930b785e@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 84931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:
> <Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
>> No No Not George wrote:
>>> met one well here he is his name is Steve Parks.
>>
>> Youv'e been bamboozled, Sparky.
>> http://www.steve-park.com/
>>
>> Bamboozled by a NA$CAR fan. That can't be good!
>>
> No, he's right. Mine has an s at the end. I gave my name up
> freely to these jackass's a long time ago, along with where
> I live.
>
> No problems here.

Take off an 's', and your driver sucks. But hey, I'm just sayin.

--

Truckers get the best $20 whores

153. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:07:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102210749.710$3x@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84928
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

<Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
> No No Not George wrote:
> > met one well here he is his name is Steve Parks.
>
> Youv'e been bamboozled, Sparky.
> http://www.steve-park.com/
>
> Bamboozled by a NA$CAR fan. That can't be good!
>
No, he's right. Mine has an s at the end. I gave my name up
freely to these jackass's a long time ago, along with where
I live.

No problems here.

154. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:11:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102211110.07961.00000950@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84929

In article <60kJb.21046$IM3.6892@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>>
>> "Phil Kane" wrote:
>>
>> > Let's have the present Element 1
>> > replaced by this "rules" element -
>> > it is more relevant to all amateurs
>> > on any band, any class, any mode.
>>
>>
>> Should that not have been something
>> that should have been done at least 10,
>> 20 or even 30 years ago???
>
>
> Or 40, 50, or even 60, years ago. Which makes one wonder why this, and
>some of the other extended test ideas, are being advocated now. I cannot
>help but suspect this is another example of the intolerance of newcomers by
>some existing Hams (and also a way for some to build themselves up by
>putting others down). Darn few of us knew everything when we started (I
>still don't). Every single person in this newsgroup, every existing Ham, has
>made mistakes (even those who started 40, 50, and even 60 years ago). Yet,
>when a newcomer does the same today, it is not simply inexperience, but
>instead malicious, or ignorance, or even the ruin of Amateur Radio. Some
>point to it to show how much better they are than that. And calls for a
>solution to this pending crisis are shouted from the rooftops. There is no
>need for proof of a wider problem - a few isolated examples are always
>enough for the intolerant. And, once ignited, intolerance fuels itself. I
>truly hope I'm wrong about this, but that suspicion continues to grow.

"Suspicion?!?" :-)

Dwight, did you just realize the outpourings of nasty intolerance
and bigotry exhibited by those olde-tymers or did it take you this
long to express your succinct thoughts?

Morse code is the heart and soul of amateur radio...so sayeth the
mighty macho morsemen of the group.

Losing the morse test WILL be the dumbing down of US amateur
radio...as perceived by the mighty macho morsemen.

LHA

155. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:11:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102211113.07961.00000951@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84930

In article <b7d1465c.0401021356.1193770@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>> news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> > > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > > >
>> > > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>> > > >
>> > > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the
>requirements
>> > > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
>> toward
>> > > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>> > >
>> > > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
>> > > when they stopped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>> >
>> > Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
>> > license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
>> > with an automatic transmission, your driving privileges were limited
>> > to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
>> > "privileges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
>> > bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
>> > correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
>> >
>> > Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
>> > that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
>> > mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the driver ahead of
>> > him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
>> > years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
>> > though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
>> > us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
>> > VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
>> >
>> > > The reality is the Morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
>> > > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate Morse as
>> > > an international treaty element.
>> >

>> > The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
>> > today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
>> > we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
>> > into, the ARS.
>>
>> So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
>
>Oh, I don't know, Bill…let's see. Let's ask that fellow who just
>passed Element 2 and just couldn't wait to get OTA. So he bought a
>nifty little dual-bander, a "killer" Mirage amp, and pumped a few
>hundred Watts or VHF or UHF RF into his nice long Yagi (You know, the
>one marketed as a "Boomer.") pointed toward a distant repeater…right
>through the second floor of his neighbor's house. Heck, he mounted it
>on the mast that formerly hosted a TV antenna…that ought to be good
>enough, right?
>
>After all, I'm sure that someone who is so bothered at the notion of
>having to learn and be tested on a skill he deems irrelevant to how he
>plans on operating, that he joins an "international" movement to
>remove said offensive task…would certainly be concerned and cognizant
>of any harmful RF his equipment might be radiating. Heck, he did pass
>that 35 multiple-guess…er, I meant choice test that proclaimed him
>"ready." I am fairly certain though that his mode of choice was not
>CW. ;-)

Of course...a no-coder is lazy, slothful, ignorant, has no common
sense let alone intelligence.

On the other hand, coders are superior in all ways, not just in radio.

>> The analogy is a joke.
>
>Actually, I am pretty much joking around with you, Bill. (Lighten up.)
>HOWEVER, the potential for physical harm is there and somewhere the
>above scenario may be playing out as you read these words…and that's
>no joke.

I sense a lot of bigotry and intolerance in what you've tried to write.

If you want to proclaim yourself "superior," then I'd suggest you
halt the coders-are-the-top-of-the-food-chain attitude.

There is NO evidence that morsemanship ever imbued another
with intelligence, common sense, or any other qualities other than
to send on-off keying on an acceptible level.

>> There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW knowledge/testing.
>
>Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
>problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors
>are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt conscientiously
>ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that

>would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's be
>honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
>themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even call
>them…"slackers.")

Total bigotry and intolerance...plus the arrogance of "I had to do it so
all you others damn well have to do it."

That's very tiresome as well as totally invalid.

>BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
>no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one
>poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants to
>bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater folks
>feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex operation
>who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
>Watts mentioned above.

Of course there is...and you have dutifully reported that same
organization to the FCC, right?

>> Had there been any relevant safety
>> aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
>
>You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer the
>BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"

How did BPL suddenly become a part of NCI?

The FCC still has a NOI, a Notice of Inquiry, ABOUT BPL...it isn't
advocating it or "threatening" an NPRM.

There are over 5000 documents in the FCC ECFS database just on
03-104. I'd suggest you begin at the beginning and educate
yourself on what it is really about.

>> > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear
>as
>> if
>> > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
>> > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
>> requirements
>> > > > we *want* to meet.)
>> > >
>> > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
>> > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
>> >
>> > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
>>
>> So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
>> on the only two all-CW only bands.
>
>That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a

>safe environment before venturing onto the highway.

You are free to make a petition to the FCC to put driving tests
into the amateur radio license exam if that is your fervent wish.

Ptui.

LHA

156. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:28:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102212839.123$vl@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84932
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
<Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > <Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
> >> No No Not George wrote:
> >>> met one well here he is his name is Steve Parks.
> >>
> >> Youv'e been bamboozled, Sparky.
> >> http://www.steve-park.com/
> >>
> >> Bamboozled by a NA$CAR fan. That can't be good!
> >>
> > No, he's right. Mine has an s at the end. I gave my name up
> > freely to these jackass's a long time ago, along with where
> > I live.
> >
> > No problems here.
>
> Take off an 's', and your driver sucks. But hey, I'm just sayin.
>
Oh believe me I've had all kinds of fun with this name. Funny
thing is, I've never been a fan of his even, before the crash
that rang his bell. I hope he files Workman's comp, and retires.

He scares me.
```

157. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:55:40 UTC
From: Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com
Message-ID: <f2ffc627f05975b6fde6e7e096bba594@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 84935
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:
> He scares me.

He would only scare me if he started driving in NW Georgia.

--

Truckers get the best $20 whores

158. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 02:56:41 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401021856.624c8aa0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84933

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040102175141.08626.00002443@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <5a5fcb7b.0401011423.59897410@posting.google.com>,
> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:
>
> >> > And just what "facts" do you preent to back-up your claim
> >> > that: "No Code is killing ham radio?"
> >> >
> >> > Odds are you haven't a single rational example.
> >> >
> >> > Cheers,
> >> > Bill K2UNK
> >>
> >> May I, Bill?
> >>
> >> While I do not think No-Code Int'l. is "killing" ham radio, I do believe it
> >> is fostering a bad mindset.
> >>
> >> If there were truly no no-code AR license available, I'd agree that the
> >> Morse code exam is a barrier to those who neither possess the "Morse
> >> aptitude" (For lack of a better term.) nor wish to utilize it OTA. However,
> >> there's been a no-code ticket available for over a decade now...with some
> >> pretty generous RF real estate and power limitations I might add.
> >>
> >> IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> >>
> >> 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
> >> through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive toward
> >> higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> >>
> >> 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as if
> >> it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> >> requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the requirements
> >> we *want* to meet.)
> >>
> >> I've read enough posts here and on the countless code vs. no-code articles
> >> on the various ham radio web forums (As well as the actual RM petitions and
> >> their respective comments.) to confidently say that neither side can claim
> >> an overwhelming numerical advantage over the other. So I think it's safe to
> >> say that not all ascribe to the "barrier" notion.
> >>
> >> What will happen? Well, the squeaky wheel gets the oil so I think we can be
> >> reasonably assured of the elimination of Element 1...at least for
> > Technician

> >> "+" privies. Personally, I'm prouder to have achieved rather than squeaked.
> >>
> >> 73 es HNY de Bert
> >> WA2SI
> >
> >Yep, the dumbing down of America. The masses can't pass the test so we
> >will make the test easier. Notice how they skirt the issue of having
> >passed any test in front of a FCC examiner.
>
> No problem, olde tymer. I passed my First Phone test the first time
> in March, 1956, in the FCC's Chicago field office. Much later I went
> to the Long Beach, CA, field office to complete paperwork on a
> (now) PLMRS license. Real, live FCC employees, leased FCC
> office space!
>
> >The VEC program is another
> >farce. Why not put the little piece of paper in a corn flakes box. At
> >least you would have breakfast.
>
> Make it MREs, mighty macho morseman. Update. Ham radio is
> a SERVICE!
>
> Hup, too, tree, foah...march, march, march...
>
> LHA

Don't see where a morse test was ever required for a 1st phone. Did
you ever pass a ham exem at the FCC office? Just another wanna be?

159. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 03:00:28 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401021900.77e13392@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84934
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<EI2dne22pLqfm26iRVn-jg@gbronline.com>...
> JEP wrote:
> > Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> > belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
> > magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> > every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> > clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap.
>
> Then go to your library and read it, assuming you know what a library is.

Kinda hard to sit on crapper looking at QST if it's at the library.

160. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 03:30:33 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040102223033.117$p8@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84936
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

<Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > He scares me.
>
> He would only scare me if he started driving in NW Georgia.
>
F#cker better not be driving nextel! (still ain't use to saying nextel)

Isn't cross posting great?

161. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 03:46:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102224617.23307.00005631@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84937

In article <WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
>> inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
>>
>I knew you'd agree with me.

How could it be otherwise?

You are the Chief of the Boat in this SSBN, olde-tymer. If anyone disagrees with your plan you go ballistic.

LHA

162. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 03:57:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102225709.15462.00005374@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84938

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401021856.624c8aa0@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>Don't see where a morse test was ever required for a 1st phone.

Not only are you an anonymous bigot but you have reading
difficulty as well.

You asked only if anyone passed "a test" at an FCC office.

>Did you ever pass a ham exem at the FCC office?

Never tried to, not even for an exam rather than an "exem."

>Just another wanna be?

Hardly. I started as a hobbyist in electronics in 1947. After my
military service I made a career out of electronics engineering.
I'm still doing that even if I don't keep regular hours.

What is your excuse, anonymous one?

LHA

163. How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 04:05:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84939

The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as the speed increases.

The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat, dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700 kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!

Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt of the fun out of it.

What the heck , over?

- Mike KB3EIA -

164. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 04:22:58 UTC
From: polycarbonate blue <tingting@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <7d8b6$3ff643b6$d1cc5940$29774@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84940
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bob" <wf3h@ptnosm.com> wrote in message
news:3ff60111.141947166@usenet.ptd.net...
> restaurants generally automatically add a gratuity to the bill for
> groups.

....seems some of the restaurants felt they had to remind some patrons
of that, specifically over the weekend of the Dayton Hamvention.

(I wonder why...? grin :)

I guess they wanted to avoid an argument from some 'groups'
or 'seasonal itinerant patrons' who might have thought they
were getting scammed on their bill or something else. :)

I *also noted* VERY amusingly, that the motel across the street from
us had posted a 15" by 15" sign in their office window, reminding
his 'patrons' for Hamvention weekend, that there was a *strict
maximum limit of two adults occupancy to each single and
four adults to each double room*. (I guess the indian owner
got tired of seeing 8 or 12 stinky overweight middle-aged
white men, leaving a 20 by 20 foot motel room carrying sleeping
bags and leaving a mess like modern-day gypsy traders
whilst only 4 were actual paying patrons...)

:) :)

165. Re: Why don't you like this cross posted to rec.radio.cb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 04:25:57 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com>
Message-ID: <pvrJb.5175$Nz4.4062@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84941
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Path:
newssvr29.news.prodigy.com!newssvr25.news.prodigy.com!newsdbm01!newsdbm01.news.prodigy.com
!newsc
on07.news.prodigy.com!newsmst01.news.prodigy.com!prodigy.com!newsfeed.telusplanet.net!news
feed.t
elus.net!news3.optonline.net!cyclone.rdc-nyc.rr.com!news.maxwell.syr.edu!postnews1.google.
com!no
t-for-mail
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George)
Newsgroups:
rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike
Date: 2 Jan 2004 17:40:27 -0800
Organization: http://groups.google.com
Lines: 14
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021740.4a175756@posting.google.com>
References: <792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>
<5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com>
<geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
<rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
<YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net>
<hYeJb.4937$6B.3708@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
<4gjJb.2139$uF6.818793@news1.news.adelphia.net>
<2pjJb.20228$P%1.19145150@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 172.130.12.226
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1073094027 24547 127.0.0.1 (3 Jan 2004 01:40:27 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 3 Jan 2004 01:40:27 +0000 (UTC)
Xref: newsmst01.news.prodigy.com rec.radio.amateur.policy:258259
rec.radio.amateur.misc:239839
rec.radio.shortwave:365822 rec.radio.cb:352598

Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
> >> >You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent?
> >>>
> >>A clue by four is violent? Leave Dee alone already, leghumper.
>
> >Look at the thread you busted in on her so you started it dickwad.
>
>No, I've replied to Dee before, without your moderation. What

>made you decide to chime in with your worthless tripe this time?

>Because your a TROLLLLLL Steveo and Dee D. needs to know it she was
>clearly puzzled by you throwing N8WWMs name into the mix for no good
>reason other than to cause trouble and lets face it you need to be
>moderated, asslick.

I see that George wa3moj@aol.com
is back to trolling from his AOL account.
Please note the word "asslick":

Re: N8WWM goes down in flames, again
Dunno, he was last heard jamming repeaters, they tossed him on the rain report
for it..as I recall. I heard you tossed a few salads in your day. asslick
rec.radio.amateur.policy - Jul 30, 2003 by Cool Breeze - View Thread (2 articles)

Re: Feel the love here
... No surprises here. Asslick, you again seem to be retarded you brought
up another mans weight, do you want to have sex with george? ...
rec.radio.cb - May 11, 2003 by PhilC - View Thread (19 articles)

Re: Oxendine Alert
... And your a dick with ears and you do use six,,, --
Your ass sucks wind you know nothing of me asslick and just as ...
rec.radio.cb - May 7, 2003 by PhilC - View Thread (25 articles)

Only George use's that saying in this group.

166. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 04:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102235644.11891.00003364@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 84943

In article <8jiJb.16109$lo3.14854@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>> Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
>> person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
>> ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
>> if they were willing to retest for the same license?
>>
>
>It's a learners permit, NOT a license.

What's the difference?

Here in PA, a person with a learner's permit for driving cannot drive alone. Could your learner's permit hams operate their own rigs all by themselves? If so, it's a license.

>If they couldn't/didn't learn enough
>in 10 years to pass the examination for a license, then they are obviously
>not qualified for a license.

But they're qualified to have a learner's permit for 10 years.

This is a major problem with a one-shot "permit", Hans. Sooner or later (probably sooner), someone will ask why a ham with a B license is qualified one day and not qualified the next - even if said ham is willing and able to pass the test again.

Can you name any other license where, if you don't upgrade within a specified time, you lose the license you have?

73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>PS: Since it's my proposal, I get to define the terminology. Class "B" is a
>learners permit. Class "A" is a license.

It's not me you have to convince, it's FCC. FCC has always called them licenses.

And no matter what they're called, it's a two-class system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

167. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 04:56:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102235645.11891.00003365@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 84944

In article <JM-cnafi68NNwGiiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040101235701.23171.00003065@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <FRycnYljLeMevmmiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >Were it not for the no-code tech license since 1990, I'd bet we'd have
>> >about 1/2 the number of licensed hams in the US that we have now.
>>
>> Not a good bet, Carl! Good thing nobody will take you up on it.
>> Take a look at the number of new hams per year and the growth of US
>>licenses
>> from Feb 1991 until today. Then compare to the number of new hams per >>
year
>> and
>> the growth in a time period of the same length previous to Feb 1991.
>> You'll see
>> that that the Tech's loss of its code test in Feb 1991 did cause an
>> increase in
>> the number of new hams. But without that increase, we would not be down to
>> 340,000 US hams by any reasonable scenario. Heck, there are ~423,000 US
>> hams
>> today who are *not* Techs - that's a lot more than 1/2 the ~683,000.
>
>Jim,
>
>Of that 423k US hams who are not Techs, how many do you suppose started
>out as Techs and have since upgraded?

I don't know, exactly. Neither do you, I bet ;-)

But why does it matter?

You are assuming that if the Tech still had a code test, none of those hams who
got Techs would have gotten a ham license. That's not a reasonable assumption
at all.

From 1979 to 1991, the number of US hams grew from about 350,000 to about
550,000 - all of them code-tested. From 1991 to 2003, the number grew from
about 550,000 to about 683,000. (If someone has more accurate numbers, please
post them!). We had growth with code tests and growth without code tests.

Back in 1991 there were about 550,000 US hams, all of them code-tested. By
April of 2000 there were about 675,000 US hams, of which about 205,000 were

Techs. Since then the renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs clouds the issue.

>How many SKs and dropouts would
>have reduced the population without the newcomers coming in to replace them.

Depends on the dropout rate. The important thing is you *assume* that we wouldn't have any newcomers if they all had to pass code tests. That's simply not a reasonable assumption.

>Maybe 50% is a slight stretch, but I'd guess not by a lot.

I'd say an awful lot. Look up how many new hams we got per year in the '80s compared to the '90s.
>
>> Yes, there are almost 260,000 Techs today - but a large number of them are
>> actually Tech Pluses whom the FCC renewed as Techs since April 2000.
>
>Out of 10 years of NCTs, only a few years worth would fall into that
>category.

The Tech hasn't had a code test for almost 13 years.

FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for 3 years, 8 months and 18 days. If no rules changes are made, there will not be any Tech Pluses at all in 6 years, 3 months and 13 days from now.

>I would bet that a LOT of the Tech Pluses that existed in April of 2000 are
>now
>Generals or Extras, rather than having been renewed as Techs with code
>credit.

How many is "a lot"? The number of Tech Pluses has dropped by about half since April 2000. Some of that drop is due to upgrades. Some of it is due to dropouts. And some of it is due to renewal as Techs.

To say that we'd only have 340,000 hams today if all hams were code-tested is simply not reasonable.

Here are some numbers:

In order to grow from 350K to 550K in 12 years, the number of newcomers would have to be at least 17,000 per year, even if there were no dropouts at all.

Now let's suppose that the changes of 1991 never happened, and that we were still getting only 17,000 new hams per year. And suppose that the dropout rate of those 1991 hams from then to the present was 2.5% per year .(average ham "career" of 40 years).

Then in the 12 years, we'd have lost about 26% of those who were hams in 1991. That's a loss of 143,000 hams, bringing the total down to 407,000. We'd have gained 204,000 new hams, bringing the total up to 611,000.

That's a long way from 340,000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

168. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 04:56:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040102235646.11891.00003366@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 84942

In article <bt3h95$2q1gg$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>> I wonder how many of the priveliges we enjoy - and many take for
>> granted - in the ARS, would be around if not for the ARRL.
>
>Prove it. Prove it without circumstantial or coincidental evidence.
>
Simple.

After WW1, it was the ARRL that sent people to Washington to get the wartime ban on amateur radio lifted. This ban included both receiving and transmitting, btw. There were several parties, including the Navy Dept., that wanted amateur radio to simply not resume after WW1.

In the 1920s there were several international radio conferences, mostly in Paris. It was at these conferences that amateur radio was established as an internationally-recognized radio service. ARRL sent representatives to all of these conferences. There was serious opposition from several countries to the very existence of amateur radio, and were it not for ARRL representation, amateur radio would not have gotten past 1925 or so.

There are plenty of other examples.

Now some might argue that if ARRL hadn't done the job, someone else would have done it. But the historical fact is that nobody else did.

But enough ancient history. Look at the BPL situation - who is leading the fight? ARRL, once more.

73 de Jim, N2EY

169. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 05:31:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF653BF.D0204D01@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84945

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:

> >The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> >today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> >we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
> >into, the ARS.
>
> Well, if one is only second-best, then you have to try harder!
>
> [hardly anyone talks about those who finish in second place...]

Funny you should mention it. Anyone holding an amateur radio license
finished first. You, on the other hand, are in second place.

Perhaps, since you're only second best, you should try harder.

Dave K8MN

170. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 05:34:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF65476.C695DAAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84946

Len Over 21 wrote:

> It should be obvious, Bill. US ham radio is all about "working
> DX on HF with CW."

Same old song, huh? You wrote it and you're the only one singing it.
HF amateur radio is many things to many people, but you aren't one of
them.

Dave K8MN

171. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 11:02:23 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401030302.4dd5ae51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84947

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040102225709.15462.00005374@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <5a5fcb7b.0401021856.624c8aa0@posting.google.com>,
> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:
>
> >Don't see where a morse test was ever required for a 1st phone.
>
> Not only are you an anonymous bigot but you have reading
> difficulty as well.
>
> You asked only if anyone passed "a test" at an FCC office.
>
> >Did you ever pass a ham exem at the FCC office?
>
> Never tried to, not even for an exam rather than an "exem."
>
> >Just another wanna be?
>
> Hardly. I started as a hobbyist in electronics in 1947. After my
> military service I made a career out of electronics engineering.
> I'm still doing that even if I don't keep regular hours.
>
> What is your excuse, anonymous one?
>
> LHA

Hey stupid. The thread is about "Why I hate ARRL". This concerns HAM
RADIO. Ham radio operators operate on shortwave. Glad to have you
correct my spelling anytime oh great one. Anonymous? Naw. I have a
valid email address listed in each and every header. Anyway, if you
check out the thread you will find it does not concern you.

172. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 11:10:39 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401030310.c9a9e6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84948

> Yes, make those heathen no-coders sit in the back of the EM
> bus! Banish them to VHF and above!
>
> No-coders "don't belong" on HF!
> Well then, it's all about pride in being better than most, isn't it?
>
> In 2003 morsemanship for licensing is an Artificial Standard.
>
> If you want to retitle Part 97 the "Aritificial Radiotelegraphy Servce,"
> be my guest.
>
> LHA

Hey LHA. Are you even a ham? did you pass your HAM test in front of a FCC examiner? Are you a 'NO CODE TECH'? You are correct, no coders do NOT belong on HF. They do belong somewhere though. Maybe using kids walkie talkies. Can't get into too much trouble there. Just check out 2 meters now. Not one put 50 ever passed a real FCC test at a FCC office. Most used the VEC program. Just slip uncle Homer 20 bucks and receive your Tech ticket in 4 weeks.

JEP

173. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 13:27:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt6fvo$med@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84949

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040102235645.11891.00003365@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <JM-cnafi68NNwGiiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> >Jim,
> >
> >Of that 423k US hams who are not Techs, how many do you suppose started
> >out as Techs and have since upgraded?
>
> I don't know, exactly. Neither do you, I bet ;-)
>
> But why does it matter?
>

There's a more poignant question that it reveals on the surface. Why *does* it matter how many licensed amateurs upgrade at any given point--and what determines whether they do or not? Anyone truly interested in the growth of the ARS needs to know those answers for effective marketing, esepecially if the concern is driven from a desire to see the ARS grow, rather than maintain numbers.

For me, personally, I am happy with my Tech License and see no reason to upgrade "just for the hell of it." The "just for the hell of it" idea has never been a motivational factor for me in anything--personal, hobby, or professional. So, what marketing campaign would: #1 *reach* me and, #2 motivate me to change my mind?

The ARRL has never reached me yet (can't speak for others) on a campaign to motivate me to upgrade. The only thing the ARRL apparently successfully *helps* with (but is not solely responsible for) is getting *new* hams involved. If that statement is true--and it's probably more true than not--then what does the ARRL need to do to move past just getting new folks to the hobby/service of amateur radio? I suspect it has *nothing* to do with license class or even requirements. When I decided to become a licensed amateur radio operator I gave no thought at all to what it would take to get my license; only that I needed to meet the requirements at hand. It was only *after* I entered the service that any conginitive thought was made as to license upgrades for the purpose of more bandwidth, privileges, etc.

>
> You are assuming that if the Tech still had a code test, none of those
hams who
> got Techs would have gotten a ham license. That's not a reasonable

assumption
> at all.
>

I agree with that. Based on what I said above. At the moment I considered the hobby/service of ham radio, I gave no thought to the idea that maybe the requirements would change. Well, in fact, I gave no thought at all to the requirements--other than that I had to meet them to achieve my ambition of getting a license. I think there would be a preponderance of folks who aren't even going to be that aware of requirements and necessity at the time they are considering entering the ARS.

If this thread is indeed still discussing the ARRL(?)--the ARRL itself needs to consider these questions--probably needs to poll current hams and get a professional marketing agency to figure out how to move beyond just being a welcome mat and deciding if they also need to take on the task of getting people to migrate to higher license classes or what those higher license classes "get" you (because there may not always take a higher license classes along with the privileges of the "extra" bandwidth, etc.).

>
> From 1979 to 1991, the number of US hams grew from about 350,000 to about
> 550,000 - all of them code-tested. From 1991 to 2003, the number grew from
> about 550,000 to about 683,000. (If someone has more accurate numbers,
please
> post them!). We had growth with code tests and growth without code tests.
>

It's those fluctuations in the numbers that need to be analyzed. What was going on economically, politically, educationally, even migrationally, in this country at those times? 200,000 vs. 133,000 in growth in two entirely different phases of years, but the same number of years. And, Jim, I know ('least I think I know) you will agree that CW testing or not may have nothing at all to do with the fact whether there was more or less growth at either time. It could have nothing *at all* to do with testing structure because, as I said, I didn't really take enough time to say, "wait a minute, what are the requirements and will they ever change?," etc.

>
> Back in 1991 there were about 550,000 US hams, all of them code-tested. By
> April of 2000 there were about 675,000 US hams, of which about 205,000
were
> Techs. Since then the renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs clouds the issue.
>
> >How many SKs and dropouts would
> >have reduced the population without the newcomers coming in to replace
them.
>

Now, there's a question that would be really hard to get answered, but it could be done. However, based on this discussion alone (the appearance of growth being influenced only by whether there is a CW test or not); I think

there are more people driven by their ambition that driven by requirements. I think if I *want* to upgrade, I am going to do it regardless of test requirements. Really. Yes, there are some that are driven more by the requirements--but I don't think it would end up being revealed that they are in a majority at all. Test requirements are not a stifler or an encouragement--either way.

>
> Depends on the dropout rate. The important thing is you *assume* that we
> wouldn't have any newcomers if they all had to pass code tests. That's simply
> not a reasonable assumption.
>

As much as I, being on the side of eliminating a CW (or any other mode) requirement, would like to jump on that bandwagon, I think it's a mistake to do so and get any real positive results out of it. However, the sum of all the avenues of non-CW testing folks is probably the only way there will ever be enough support to end CW testing <grin>.

> >
> >Maybe 50% is a slight stretch, but I'd guess not by a lot.
>
> I'd say an awful lot. Look up how many new hams we got per year in the '80s
> compared to the '90s.
> >
> >> Yes, there are almost 260,000 Techs today - but a large number of them are
> >> actually Tech Pluses whom the FCC renewed as Techs since April 2000.
> >
> >Out of 10 years of NCTs, only a few years worth would fall into that
> >category.
>
> The Tech hasn't had a code test for almost 13 years.
>

Is that a good comparison? The Tech may not have...but what about the Tech+ who, incidentally, has HF privileges and was that the motivating factor or did they just want a higher class of license. How many Generals and Extras are out there that upgraded (with or without CW) and don't ever really *use* their privileges. Remember that the ARRL's interest would also be in having enough numbers of hams to drive their "use them or lose them" campaigns (boring as they may be). This, by the way, is also why I believe the ARRL is not the successful agency it would like to believe it is. It is very apparent that the ARRL has failed to move past being a welcome mat.

>
> FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for 3 years, 8 months and 18 days.
> If no rules changes are made, there will not be any Tech Pluses at all in 6

> years, 3 months and 13 days from now.
>

Hmmmm, but I will still have the same privileges as I do as a Tech+. So, for someone who cares, where's the downside of that? I don't care if I'm called a Tech or a Tech+--that concept is only important to some but not all hams--but I do care whether I can get on the radio or not. And the radio I care to get on is a FM transceiver using 2M predominantly (if at all because, heck, I haven't been on the radio in over a year).

> >
> >I would bet that a LOT of the Tech Pluses that existed in April of 2000 are
> >now
> >Generals or Extras, rather than having been renewed as Techs with code
> >credit.
>
> How many is "a lot"? The number of Tech Pluses has dropped by about half since
> April 2000. Some of that drop is due to upgrades. Some of it is due to
> dropouts. And some of it is due to renewal as Techs.
>

I think Carl would find his statement to be false, or closer to false than truth.

>
> To say that we'd only have 340,000 hams today if all hams were code-tested is
> simply not reasonable.
>
> Here are some numbers:
>
> In order to grow from 350K to 550K in 12 years, the number of newcomers would
> have to be at least 17,000 per year, even if there were no dropouts at all.
>
> Now let's suppose that the changes of 1991 never happened, and that we were
> still getting only 17,000 new hams per year. And suppose that the dropout rate
> of those 1991 hams from then to the present was 2.5% per year .(average ham
> "career" of 40 years).
>
> Then in the 12 years, we'd have lost about 26% of those who were hams in 1991.
> That's a loss of 143,000 hams, bringing the total down to 407,000. We'd have
> gained 204,000 new hams, bringing the total up to 611,000.

>
> That's a long way from 340,000.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I agree, Jim. And, if NCI *and* the ARRL are ever going to change, or even understand, fluctuations in the numbers and in the numbers of license classes way more study and analysis needs to be done. Some, in fact, would be better than none.

Kim W5TIT

174. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 13:33:05 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84950
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<5GoJb.5632$6B.3229@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0401021356.1193770@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the
> requirements
> > > > > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
> toward
> > > > > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> > > > > >
> > > > > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> > > > > when they stopped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
> > > >
> > > > Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
> > > > license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
> > > > with an automatic transmission, your driving privileges were limited
> > > > to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
> > > > "privileges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
> > > > bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
> > > > correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.
> > > >
> > > > Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
> > > > that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
> > > > mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the driver ahead of
> > > > him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
> > > > years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
> > > > though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
> > > > us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
> > > > VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
> > > >
> > > > > The reality is the Morse test is past its prime...and the entire
> body
```

> > > > > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate Morse as
> > > > > an international treaty element.
> > > > >
> > > > > The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> > > > > today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> > > > > we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
> > > > > into, the ARS.
> > > >
> > > > So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
> > >
> > Oh, I don't know, Bill.let's see. Let's ask that fellow who just
> > passed Element 2 and just couldn't wait to get OTA. So he bought a
> > nifty little dual-bander, a "killer" Mirage amp, and pumped a few
> > hundred Watts or VHF or UHF RF into his nice long Yagi (You know, the
> > one marketed as a "Boomer.") pointed toward a distant repeater.right
> > through the second floor of his neighbor's house. Heck, he mounted it
> > on the mast that formerly hosted a TV antenna.that ought to be good
> > enough, right?
>
> And none of this would have happened if only he had known
> code? Give me a break.

I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
about how one never plans on using it. I'm not much into the newer
digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
leads through some learning and testing re. said subjectsï¿½no problem.
(Psst, it's a character issue.)

> Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
> code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> the harm, danger, etc?

None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing
away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.

> > After all, I'm sure that someone who is so bothered at the notion of
> > having to learn and be tested on a skill he deems irrelevant to how he
> > plans on operating, that he joins an "international" movement to
> > remove said offensive task.would certainly be concerned and cognizant
> > of any harmful RF his equipment might be radiating. Heck, he did pass

> > that 35 multiple-guess.er, I meant choice test that proclaimed him
> > "ready." I am fairly certain though that his mode of choice was not
> > CW. ;-)
> >
> > > The analogy is a joke.
> >
> > Actually, I am pretty much joking around with you, Bill. (Lighten up.)
> > HOWEVER, the potential for physical harm is there and somewhere the
> > above scenario may be playing out as you read these words.and that's
> > no joke.
>
> The potential for harm, physical or otherwise is NOT tied
> to anyone's knowledge of code. THAT is the point.

Sorry, Bill. That may be the point you'd like to key on, (No pun intended) but that's not the point I'm stressing. I agree 100% with the sentence above. It's the slacker-mentality (Sorry, time to shoot from the hip.) that I deplore. If we really want to get young folks involved in AR, this is not a principle I'd like to see them learn. If you complain enough, the bar will be lowered for you. As a youth, the concept of achievement (As well as a well-rounded education.) was constantly stressed and I thank God I had folks (Parents, teachers, guidance counselors, etc.) that cared enough to strongly encourage us to achieve rather complain. I feel so sorry for the kids that are recently got that curve on their Regents exam rather than enroll in a summer program to increase their knowledge to the appropriate level. Some will perform poorly in college and if enough of them complain that their college curriculum is unfairly difficult, perhaps that bar will be lowered as well. Interestingly enough, I now tend to seek out those Elmers who will push me to become a better operator. IMHO, they have my best interests at heart.

> > > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW knowledge/testing.
> >
> > Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
> > problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors
> > are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt conscientiously
> > ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that
> > would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's be
> > honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
> > themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even call
> > them."slackers.")
>
> The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
> of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of any continued need for code skills
> to be mandated for any HF access.

I disagree, I truly believe that it's almost all about the required effort. Again, drop those published Q&A pools and watch the squirming commence. Folks just don't want to be made to have to sit down for 20 mins., twice daily, for a month or two and memorize 43 Morse code

characters.

> There was, in the past, a rational reason
> or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
> It is that simple.

There still is. It's the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
today.

> > BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
> > no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one
> > poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants to
> > bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater folks
> > feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex operation
> > who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
> > Watts mentioned above.
>
> Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of
> current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
> code testing. PERIOD!

Again, my dialogue is addressing the character issue involved re.
squeaking vs. achieving. Do you really want to focus on the code test,
Bill. Quite frankly, Element 1 is NOT much of a code test to focus on
and very rarely leaves anybody with any level of OTA proficiency. So
you see, it's not the actual code knowledge or lack thereof that makes
for the dangerous scenarioï¿½it's the associated mentality of those
who'd rather squeak than achieve that can possibly lead to harm.

> > > Had there been any relevant safety
> > > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
> >
> > You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer the
> > BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"
>
> Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
> FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
> errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
> or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
> amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
> stop the FCC.

Quite frankly, Billï¿½I'm no big fan of the FCC. You are, however,
correctï¿½they're the only game in town. Do I think they make mistakes?
Sure, but I'm not sufficiently motivated to file a court action
against them. A few letters to my elected representatives and some
recreational debate on R.R.A.P suffices.

Trust me, my bubble is very much intact. I came into AR approx. three
years ago pretty much oblivious to the code vs. no-code debate. All I
knew was that I wanted to be an ARO and operate HF. Like I've said
before, remove the whing and passion from both sides of the debate and

the obvious remains like a purple elephant in the living room.

> > > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement
> appear as
> if
> > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
> > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
> requirements
> > > > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
> > > > >
> > > > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> > > >
> > > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> > > on the only two all-CW only bands.
> >
> > That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a
> > safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
>
> If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?

Not at all. I consider myself a relatively new ham and I continue to
increase my code proficiency OTA. After all, the license is really
just a ticket to learn.

> What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
> non-highway?

Thanks for makin' it easy, Bill. How about the CW only portion of
2-meters? I think that sounds like a groovy place to practice some
seriously slow code with a code-buddy. Then, if I like it, perhaps I'd
pass Element 1 and hop on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands to increase my
proficiency. Thos are some examples of "rural routes."

The highway, hmmï¿½ Would you really encourage a brand newbie to hop on
7026 kHz and mix it up w/the 35-wpm+ crowd, Bill? Think they'd feel
encouraged? I've had a couple of ops QRS from 20-wpm down to 19-wpm
for me and lemme tell ya, it wasn't fun. Conversely, I have had guys
switch to some really nice Farnsworth style 25-wpm character speed
spaced apart to about 8-wpm and an hour and a half ragchew QSO just
breezed on by with very little effort or tension.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Cheers indeed. :-)

Vy 73 de Bert
WA2SI

175. Re: Ham Radio in The Information Age and Terrorism

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 13:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103085644.07961.00000980@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84852

In article <bt3mhs$hi3@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Jim, N2EY,
>would probably make some bucks if he'd write and publish a Almanac of Ham
>Radio!

There's a bunch of folks already doing that. They're at 225 Main Street,
Newington, CT, 06111.

73 de Jim, N2EY

176. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 13:56:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103085646.07961.00000982@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84851

In article <dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
>the speed increases.

Mike,

The bandwidth of a Morse signal is determined by the rise and fall times of the leading and trailing edges of each dit or dah, and the shape of the rise and fall.

>
>The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast.

Who is "we", Mike?

>And it's some 700
>kHz wide!!!

How did you determine the bandwidth?

>And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!

Yep. Such a bandwidth would require extremely "hard" keying, though. Or a modulated carrier.
>
>Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
>ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
>of the fun out of it.

Was the AGC on?

73 de Jim, N2EY

177. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 14:06:54 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401030606.33b7a452@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84853

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> the speed increases.

Mike, I believe the bandwidth actually decreases as the speed increases.

> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
> Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> of the fun out of it.

Bummer, hope it was just a one-time anomaly.

> What the heck , over?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73 de Bert
WA2SI

178. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 14:19:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <II6dnQDUxOgVUmuiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84854

Mike,

Sounds to me like you were experiencing front end overload in your receiver ... when the signal exceeds the dynamic range of your receiver, all sorts of things happen and the signal can appear to be MUCH wider than it actually is.

To verify this, turn off the preamp (if you have one), and switch in about 20 dB of attenuation before the front end of the receiver and see if it all gets better ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> the speed increases.
>
> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
> Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> of the fun out of it.
>
> What the heck , over?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

179. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:01:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84855
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<5GoJb.5632$6B.3229@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0401021356.1193770@posting.google.com...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the
> > requirements
> > > > > > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to
strive
> > toward
> > > > > > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
> > > > > > when they stopped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
> > > > >
> > > > > Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first
driver's
> > > > > license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car
equipped
> > > > > with an automatic transmission, your driving privileges were
limited
> > > > > to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
> > > > > "privileges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we
ALL
> > > > > bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
> > > > > correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the
ARS.
> > > > >
> > > > > Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
> > > > > that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic
stop,
```

> > > > > mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the driver ahead
of
> > > > > him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about
ten
> > > > > years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him
slide
> > > > > though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why
make
> > > > > us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
> > > > > VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
> > > > >
> > > > > > The reality is the Morse test is past its prime...and the entire
> > body
> > > > > > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate Morse as
> > > > > > an international treaty element.
> > > > >
> > > > > The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
> > > > > today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
> > > > > we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for
entry
> > > > > into, the ARS.
> > > >
> > > > So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
> > >
> > > Oh, I don't know, Bill.let's see. Let's ask that fellow who just
> > > passed Element 2 and just couldn't wait to get OTA. So he bought a
> > > nifty little dual-bander, a "killer" Mirage amp, and pumped a few
> > > hundred Watts or VHF or UHF RF into his nice long Yagi (You know, the
> > > one marketed as a "Boomer.") pointed toward a distant repeater.right
> > > through the second floor of his neighbor's house. Heck, he mounted it
> > > on the mast that formerly hosted a TV antenna.that ought to be good
> > > enough, right?
> >
> > And none of this would have happened if only he had known
> > code? Give me a break.
>
> I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
> addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
> meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
> about how one never plans on using it.

Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.

> I'm not much into the newer
> digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
> communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
> leads through some learning and testing re. said subjects.no problem.
> (Psst, it's a character issue.)

No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
mode is set on that pedestal.

> > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
> > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> > the harm, danger, etc?
>
> None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
> skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
> challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
> same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
> many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
> their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing
> away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
> yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.

You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
have done so.

> > > After all, I'm sure that someone who is so bothered at the notion of
> > > having to learn and be tested on a skill he deems irrelevant to how he
> > > plans on operating, that he joins an "international" movement to
> > > remove said offensive task.would certainly be concerned and cognizant
> > > of any harmful RF his equipment might be radiating. Heck, he did pass
> > > that 35 multiple-guess.er, I meant choice test that proclaimed him
> > > "ready." I am fairly certain though that his mode of choice was not
> > > CW. ;-)
> > >
> > > > The analogy is a joke.
> > >
> > > Actually, I am pretty much joking around with you, Bill. (Lighten up.)
> > > HOWEVER, the potential for physical harm is there and somewhere the
> > > above scenario may be playing out as you read these words.and that's
> > > no joke.
> >
> > The potential for harm, physical or otherwise is NOT tied
> > to anyone's knowledge of code. THAT is the point.
>
> Sorry, Bill. That may be the point you'd like to key on, (No pun
> intended) but that's not the point I'm stressing. I agree 100% with
> the sentence above. It's the slacker-mentality (Sorry, time to shoot
> from the hip.) that I deplore. If we really want to get young folks
> involved in AR, this is not a principle I'd like to see them learn.

You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.

> If
> you complain enough, the bar will be lowered for you. As a youth, the
> concept of achievement (As well as a well-rounded education.) was
> constantly stressed and I thank God I had folks (Parents, teachers,
> guidance counselors, etc.) that cared enough to strongly encourage us
> to achieve rather complain. I feel so sorry for the kids that are
> recently got that curve on their Regents exam rather than enroll in a
> summer program to increase their knowledge to the appropriate level.
> Some will perform poorly in college and if enough of them complain
> that their college curriculum is unfairly difficult, perhaps that bar
> will be lowered as well. Interestingly enough, I now tend to seek out
> those Elmers who will push me to become a better operator. IMHO, they
> have my best interests at heart.

My my, I guess the end of all amateur upgrading
and new learning will be tied to the end of code
testing. You must have really been disappointed when
states stopped testing drivers on manual gearboxes.
For me it was no problem. When my kids wanted
to drive they learned or they had no car to drive as
all our vehicles had been standard shift. Those that
want to learn will. Trying to claim some great
philosophical tie of ending code testing being
the start of an end to new/old hams continuing to
learn is just bunk.

> > > > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW knowledge/testing.
> > > >
> > > Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
> > > problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors
> > > are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt conscientiously
> > > ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that
> > > would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's be
> > > honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
> > > themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even call
> > > them."slackers.")
> > >
> > The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
> > of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of any continued need
for code skills
> > to be mandated for any HF access.
> >
> I disagree, I truly believe that it's almost all about the required
> effort.

So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
trying to have in place for any license level?

> Again, drop those published Q&A pools and watch the squirming
> commence.

It will never happen and I don't care if it did. The old
ARRL and AMECO learners guides were just as easy to
memorize sufficiently to pass. I did the General test in
the late 50s exactly that way.

> Folks just don't want to be made to have to sit down for 20
> mins., twice daily, for a month or two and memorize 43 Morse code
> characters.

Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
determinator.

> > There was, in the past, a rational reason
> > or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
> > It is that simple.
>
> There still is. It's the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> today.

Yet that failed to convince the FCC and, more
recently the ITU. The point is that those bodies
recognize that no one needs to know morse just to be
issued a license. Those that wish to engage in
morse contacts are free to learn morse and use it.
The issue is solely the test requirement and has no
link to actual morse use by anyone.

> > > BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
> > > no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one
> > > poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants to
> > > bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater folks
> > > feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex operation
> > > who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
> > > Watts mentioned above.
> >
> > Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of
> > current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
> > code testing. PERIOD!
>
> Again, my dialogue is addressing the character issue involved re.
> squeaking vs. achieving.

That's just the old tripe argument that has convinced no one.
The rony of your claim is that most of us that are the
nucleus of NCI activity had already done the morse
test at 5, 13 and/or 20 wpm. Nothing to gain now
if code testing goes altogether.

> Do you really want to focus on the code test,
> Bill. Quite frankly, Element 1 is NOT much of a code test to focus on

> and very rarely leaves anybody with any level of OTA proficiency. So
> you see, it's not the actual code knowledge or lack thereof that makes
> for the dangerous scenario.it's the associated mentality of those
> who'd rather squeak than achieve that can possibly lead to harm.

Yawn.

> > > > Had there been any relevant safety
> > > > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
> > >
> > > You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer the
> > > BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"
> >
> > Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
> > FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
> > errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
> > or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
> > amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
> > stop the FCC.
>
> Quite frankly, Bill.I'm no big fan of the FCC. You are, however,
> correct.they're the only game in town. Do I think they make mistakes?
> Sure, but I'm not sufficiently motivated to file a court action
> against them. A few letters to my elected representatives and some
> recreational debate on R.R.A.P suffices.

What, no motivation? :-) :-)

> Trust me, my bubble is very much intact. I came into AR approx. three
> years ago pretty much oblivious to the code vs. no-code debate. All I
> knew was that I wanted to be an ARO and operate HF. Like I've said
> before, remove the whing and passion from both sides of the debate and
> the obvious remains like a purple elephant in the living room.

The FCC removed the winning/passion when they issued the R&O
for 98-143. If you haven't read that yet, I suggest you do.

> > > > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement
> > appear as
> > if
> > > > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet
the
> > > > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
> > requirements
> > > > > > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
> > > > >
> > > > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> > > >
> > > > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW

> > > > on the only two all-CW only bands.
> > >
> > > That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a
> > > safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
> >
> > If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?
>
> Not at all. I consider myself a relatively new ham and I continue to
> increase my code proficiency OTA. After all, the license is really
> just a ticket to learn.

Exactly. So then why the need for code skill testing...oh,
I remember, the FCC must impose a mystical quantity
of effort for all ham licensing.

> > What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
> > non-highway?
>
> Thanks for makin' it easy, Bill. How about the CW only portion of
> 2-meters? I think that sounds like a groovy place to practice some
> seriously slow code with a code-buddy. Then, if I like it, perhaps I'd
> pass Element 1 and hop on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands to increase my
> proficiency. Thos are some examples of "rural routes."
>
> The highway, hmm. Would you really encourage a brand newbie to hop on
> 7026 kHz and mix it up w/the 35-wpm+ crowd, Bill? Think they'd feel
> encouraged?

IF they did so, so what? They'd either make a QSO or not.
Nothing ventured, nothing gained. If they felt out of
place they'd shift to calmer waters.

> I've had a couple of ops QRS from 20-wpm down to 19-wpm
> for me and lemme tell ya, it wasn't fun. Conversely, I have had guys
> switch to some really nice Farnsworth style 25-wpm character speed
> spaced apart to about 8-wpm and an hour and a half ragchew QSO just
> breezed on by with very little effort or tension.

To each his own. What ever floats your boat. I see no problem
with newbie hams doing morse at slow speeds anywhere morse
is allowed as long as they do so within the rules.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

180. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:02:52 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <MIBJb.46022$m83.10181@fed1read01>
Source record: 84856

From the ARRL License Manual 1976:
CW Bandwidth = wpm X 4 (e.g., 40 WPM = 160 Hz)
"With proper shaping, the necessary keying bandwidth is equal to 4
times the speed in words per minute for International Morse Code;
e.g. at 25 words per minute, the bandwidth is approximately 100 cycles."

--
73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
==========
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> the speed increases.
>
> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
> Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> of the fun out of it.
>
> What the heck , over?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

181. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:08:03 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <DNBJb.46023$m83.45312@fed1read01>
Source record: 84857

From the ARRL License Manual 1976:
CW Bandwidth = wpm X 4 (e.g., 40 WPM = 160 Hz)
"With proper shaping, the necessary keying bandwidth is equal to 4
times the speed in words per minute for International Morse Code;
e.g. at 25 words per minute, the bandwidth is approximately 100 cycles."

Also -- suspect your receiver bandwidth and dynamic range -- try some
attenuation and reduce RF gain or Kenwoods AIP -- helps with strong adjacent
signals.

73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
> ==========
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> > the speed increases.
> >
> > The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> > dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> > kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
> >
> > Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> > ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> > of the fun out of it.
> >
> > What the heck , over?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
>

182. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:09:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401030809.48d3f418@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84858

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040102175148.08626.00002450@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:

> >I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
> >I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
> >inconsistencies in the written testing....
>
> [nobody can realistically expect you to "shut up," jimmie...:-)]

Nor can we expect you, Leonard H. Andserson, to heed your own
advice, ie not using belittling endearments when addressing others.

Scumbags rarely do. And you ARE a scumbag.

> A few hundred thousand EEs have made career paths WITHOUT
> getting a ham license first. IEEE has a bunch of them in their
> membership. Are they in the "never would have happened" category?

And a few hundred thousand HAVE....

Your point?

> >Sure - because that HF knowledge is tested in the written for Tech,
> >and was tested for in the Novice when it was available.
>
> Nobody can operate on HF without morse code knowledge and
> skill. "Everyone knows that."

I'd ask you to please cite where "morse code knowledge" was
mentioned, but I hate to rub your nose in little details...

> That's why all the other radio services on HF demand their ops
> learn, love, honor, and obey morse code.

NONE of the other "radio services on HF" have the same Basis and
Purpose as the Amateur Service.

> Don't they?

No, but then "other radio services" are not the Amateur Radio
Service.

> Absolutely. Unlike the olde tyme hammes the FCC is "obviously"
> deficient and certainly was in 1958.

It was in regards to placing what was supposed to be a "low
power, short range personal communications service" on to an HF

allocation known to propagate globally...And THEN tell the licensees
to not take advantage of it.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...how dare the FCC allow "civilians" on HF without
> the morse test? And on an old, underused ham band, too!

That's not the point, but then you know that.

Lennie's trolling, trolling, trolling...

> >The whole reason
> >that service was created by FCC was so that Everyman could get on the
> >air with inexpensive, easy-to-set-up-and-use radios for personal,
> >short-range communications. Particularly mobile.
>
> God forbid that "Everyman" should get on HF without being morse
> tested! Sacrilege! Heresy!

It wasn't about being "on HF", Your Scumminess...

It was about a SHORT RANGE radio service. The FCC screwed up.
The Amateur Service lost out, the FCC made fools of themselves, and
the intended market for the service lost out since that "service" is
completely useless for the intended application.

> >And if that's not bad enough, lookit BPL.
>
> "lookit?" [a kit for a toilet? :-)]
>
> How does BPL get into this? That's a WIRED communications
> thing.

A "WIRED" communications service that has the potential to create
havoc to ALL high frequency spectrum users...code or no code.

> >The main point of all this is that FCC wasn't and isn't an infallible
> >bunch that Knows What Is Best For Radio. Let alone what is best for
> >ham radio.
>
> Only tried and true HF morsemen "Know What Is Best For Radio!"
>
> Don't know morse? Shove them in the back of the EM bus up
> on VHF and higher. HF belongs to morsemen!

You're still waving that "morsemen" flag, Lennie, and Morse Code
is not germane to this post.

Why are you doing that? To look foolish? You succeeded.

> >They're simply the folks in charge, who have the unenviable task of balancing
> >all the competing demands, and doing it with limited resources and under
> >various forms of pressure.
>
> In civil radio in the USA, the FCC is THE LAW.

Seems you convieniently FORGET that when trying to lay blame for
the state of Amateur Radio testing, Lennie.

> >So it's up to us hams to make our case and set our path, not FCC.
>
> Only tried and true HF Morsemen Know What Is Best For Ham
> Radio!

Then why are YOU still here, Your Putziness?

Mama Lennie take your therapy couch away from you?

Steve, K4YZ

183. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:12:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cSBJb.6380$6B.4406@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84859

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> the speed increases.
>
> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!

Did you mean 700Hz wide (you typed 700kHz).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

184. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:26:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401030826.4138771b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84860

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401021640.4f949fc@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401020157.7c992987@posting.google.com>...

> > No more than...Ahhhh, never mind, you'll never get the point.
>
> Make your point rational and I'll get it.

Many of us have tried to get YOU to be rational, Brain, but you
defy logic and, well, rationality.

You make unsubstantiated assertions you cannot or will not back
up, then ask us to just accept it without the proof.

> > You're starting off the New Year on the wrong foot, Brain...By
> > making assertions that are not substantiated by factual evidence.
> >
> > Welcome to 2004, MinnieLennie.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, you said that the Basis and Purpose of self-learning cannot be
> achieved after a person has achieved their first license in a
> one-license system. That the Basis and Purpose can only be achieved
> in a multiple-license system.

A "one license" system does not promote learning.

A "one license" system promotes stagnation and mediocrity. Look
what a "classless" society did to Central Europe for 70+ years.

As deftly pointed out by Jim, N2EY, the TRUE stagnation of the
Amateur Radio Service occured BEFORE Incentive Licensing.

Was the way the FCC implemented it wrong? Sure it was. But the
system worked.

> I asked if self-learning occurs after the Extra license is achieved.

Sure it does. And there are some cases where the licensee brings
his "self-learning" with him/her from an engineering
point-of-view...but thsoe folks are few and far between.

> Give me a rational answer why it cannot occur after someone achieves a
> license in a one-license system.

Can it occur? Sure it can. Does it usually or routinely occur?
Nope.

Now, here's one for YOU, Brain...cite for me some grand example
of "one size fits all and promotes learning" example from ANY aspect
of our society...One that can't be refuted at some level.

I'll be waiting, but I won't be holding my breath.

Steve, K4YZ

185. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:48:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401030848.9444a55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84861

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<zvnJb.5522$6B.295@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:Pn0Jb.29749$Pg1.12522@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > I wrote:
> >
> > > > If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate, and if
> the
> > > > "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees
> would
> > > > increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra
> > > > Class" would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or
> > > > tomorrows rules.
> >
> > Bill Sohl blew it off with ......
> >
> > >
> > > Doesn't bother me.
> > >
> >
> > Bill, when are the next NCI elections for Director? I look forward to
> > voting for whoever runs in opposition to you. You are irresponsible and
> > dangerous.
>
> I can't drive within the speed limit either :-)
>
> Isn't it amazing no great harm was encountered when all those hams in
> the 50s/60s only had to be General for full priviliges?

It must have been just awful, all those undeserving Generals just
helping themselves to those frequencies and modes.

There shoulda been a law!

If only Sen McCarthy had been aware...

186. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:51:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401030851.24be451e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84862

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<60kJb.21046$IM3.6892@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > "Phil Kane" wrote:
> >
> > > Let's have the present Element 1
> > > replaced by this "rules" element -
> > > it is more relevant to all amateurs
> > > on any band, any class, any mode.
> >
> >
> > Should that not have been something
> > that should have been done at least 10,
> > 20 or even 30 years ago???
>
>
> Or 40, 50, or even 60, years ago. Which makes one wonder why this, and
> some of the other extended test ideas, are being advocated now. I cannot
> help but suspect this is another example of the intolerance of newcomers by
> some existing Hams (and also a way for some to build themselves up by
> putting others down). Darn few of us knew everything when we started (I
> still don't). Every single person in this newsgroup, every existing Ham, has
> made mistakes (even those who started 40, 50, and even 60 years ago). Yet,
> when a newcomer does the same today, it is not simply inexperience, but
> instead malicious, or ignorance, or even the ruin of Amateur Radio. Some
> point to it to show how much better they are than that. And calls for a
> solution to this pending crisis are shouted from the rooftops. There is no
> need for proof of a wider problem - a few isolated examples are always
> enough for the intolerant. And, once ignited, intolerance fuels itself. I
> truly hope I'm wrong about this, but that suspicion continues to grow.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Dwight, nice explanation. Brian

187. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 16:56:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103115657.00545.00003317@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 84863

In article <6447bcd3.0401011424.3dc279dc@posting.google.com>, blackm00@cam.org (Michael Black) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>> Here is a hypothetical situation:
>>
>> Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back
>their
>> access to the airwaves after WW1.
>>
>> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
>> with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>>
>> What should the testing regimen be?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>It wouldn't be amateur radio.
>
>Amateur radio derives from that time and place where radio began.
>It was there before there were rules, or most of the technology that
>came later. It also came before there was much clue about what
>the new technology could be used for, and before there were well defined
>radio services.
>
>Anateur radio exists because hams staked out the territory before
>most people knew about radio. Amateur radio did not see others
>making use of the technology and then claim they needed space;
>they put the technology to use, and helped push the technology
>and the applications that came later.
>
>For something to start now, one has to wonder what the purpose
>would be? It's certainly not about getting in on emerging technology.
>Without the history of radio behind it, then there is no way it
>would be the same sort of service. Even things like contesting
>derive from those early days, when being able to reach further
>and further was a reflection of the effort put into the equipment
>and antennas, and the contests were a means of testing it, or
>testing radio itself. Witness the TransAtlantic Tests in December
>of 1921; a form of contest yet the whole point was to see if
>those useless shortwave frequencies where hams had been relegated
>once rules were set in place could actually be used to span the
>Atlantic.

>
>People are forever saying that amateur radio can't compete with
>today's technology, when everyone can get a cellphone or an FRS
>transceiver, and use the internet. Put in those terms,
>there is no point to amateur radio. And anything created
>today would take that into consideration.
>
>A very important part of amateur radio is it's history, because
>it's an important history, not just to the hobby but to radio
>itself. Take that away, and it could not be anything close
>to what it is now.

Every word of that bears repeating.

For once I can't think of anything to add except "WELL SAID"

73 de Jim, N2EY

188. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 17:39:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <v7DJb.2546$uF6.1079235@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84864
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Bill, I trimmed the cb and shortwave groups out of this reply. We should
all give those folk a break.

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:JmjJb.2142$uF6.820876@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>>>news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>>
>>>news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>>>>news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the requirements
>>>>>>through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to strive
>>>
>>>toward
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>>>>>
>>>>>Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
>>>>>when they stoped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>>>>
>>>>Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first driver's
>>>>license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car equipped
>>>>with an automatic transmission, your driving privilidges were limited
>>>>to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
>>>>"priviliges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we ALL
>>>>bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
>>>>correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the ARS.

>>>>
>>>>Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
>>>>that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic stop,
>>>>mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the dirver ahead of
>>>>him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about ten
>>>>years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him slide
>>>>though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why make
>>>>us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
>>>>VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>The reality is the morse test is past its prime...and the entire body
>>>>>of international countries have seen fit to eliminate morse as
>>>>>an international treaty element.
>>>>
>>>>The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
>>>>today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
>>>>we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for entry
>>>>into, the ARS.
>>>
>>>
>>>So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
>>>The anology is a joke. There is ZERO element of safety involved with
>>>CW knowledge/testing. Had there been any relavent safety
>>>aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
>>
>>This is your analogy, Bill, not ours. I don't think the analogy fits, I
>>think people should be required to test on standard, or at least not be
>>allowed to drive a standard unless tested for it.
>
>
> Which standard, should there be separate licenses for 3 speed column,
> 4 speed, 5 speed, 6 speed, which shift pattern?
>
> Apparently there is insufficient state
> concern to worry about passing a license test with automatic and
> then getting behind the wheel of a manual gearbox vehicle. It's
> been that way for decades now with no ill results.
>
>
>>>>>2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement appear as
>>>
>>>if
>>>
>>>
>>>>>it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet the
>>>>>requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
>>>
>>>requirements

>>>
>>>
>>>>>we *want* to meet.)
>>>>>
>>>>>I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added priviliges
>>>>>have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
>>>>
>>>>Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
>>>
>>>So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
>>>on the only two all-CW only bands. Use does not justify
>>>the requirement since there's nothing detrimental about learning
>>>on the air at even a one word per minute, look it up on a table
>>>rate.
>>
>>one of two answers:
>>
>>1. It's a goofed up rule
>>
>>2. It's a good way to get Tech's to practice Morse code.
>
>
> Why wouldn't it be a good way to get anone on HF to
> practice also if there's no code test at all?

No argument there, Bill.

> That's
> the point, there is no rational justification for a CW
> mode skill test. The FCC has addressed and dismissed
> every known pro-code argument...as has the ITU also
> since Code is gone now as a mandatory treaty requirment.

You know what I think about the rationality of any testing regimen. We
are at the point that we can do away with any testing whatsoever. I
don't want to tho'. Others may differ.

>>Either is probably irrelevant because most tech's that aren't planning
>>on upgrading probably aren't all that interested in Morse code at all,
>>and there are plenty of goofed up rules.
>
>
> ITU treaty is goofed up too?

Who sed that?

- Mike KB3EIA -

189. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 17:57:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103125700.25815.00005665@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84865

In article <MUqIb.9223$Vv2.4058285@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <ZG6Ib.8566$Vv2.3772948@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
>>>>technical knowledge with more privileges.

>>> And so do I! The arguments of tying technical knowledge to priveleges
>>>is completely bogus, irritating, and eventually self defeating. That
>>>many NCTA's used it as an argument against Morse code testing does not
>>>make it less so. It's just that now, that bird will come home to roost.

>> You mean like in the "21st Century" paper?
>
>Yes! So many of the arguments used in priceless instruments like that
>can be used against any knowledge requirements whatsoever.

Not just in theory. They're doing it. The plan is spelled out in their paper.
In fact they say we should wait until there's an NPRM...
>
>Why should I have to learn about (fill in the blank), I never intend
>to(fill in the blank)?

Or how about:

"What harm will happen if a ham doesn't know X and never intends to do anyhting
that involves X?"
>
>Why sould anyone be discriminated against? Even NCVEC wants a entry
>level license that is geared toward an average 6th grader.

I got my Novice license at the start of 7th grade. I could have passed the test
a year or two earlier if I'd known about ARRL publications earlier. So even the
old entry-level requirements weren't that tough.

There are hams of all license classes who passed their license exams well
before the 6th grade. And anyone familiar with the curriculum in a decent
school district knows that there's nothing in any current ham exam that's
beyond the capabilities of a typical 6th grader IF said 6th grader wants to
learn the stuff.
>
>Any tying of knowledge to priveliges is unwarranted social engineering.
>I mean what are ya, a liberal? (must be said with a sneer)
>

>Any tying of priveliges to knowledge is hazing. What is this anyhow,
>some sort of radio God fraternity?
>
>Technology has brought us to the point that with a few minor adjustments
>(modified radios to eliminate band edge problems, elimination of
>homebrewing to get rid of dangerous experimentation, perhaps even
>potting the interiors of transcievers) we will be able to transform Ham
>radio into the true PEOPLES radio service.
>
>True Amateur Radio Nirvana
>
> from your humble Cassandra, Mike.

The "21st Century" folks want entry level hams limited to rigs that use no more
than 30 volts.

Even more amazing, they suggest taking much of the *regulations* out of the
test, and simply requiring a signed statement....
>
>>>>For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
>>>operating
>>>>CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I
>>>wrote
>>>>*technical*)
>>>
>>> What is the technical comptency difference between the Extra operating
>>>in his or her segment of a HF band and an unlicensed CB'er running a
>>>linear?
>>
>>
>> Legality, for one.
>
> Sure, but let us go past legality for a minute. Those jokers get on the

>air and don't fry themselves in the process. They put out a signal too,
>even if it is often overmodulated to an extreme. But there they are,
>exhibit one. At the lowes common denominator, NO license needed.

And some of them are quite accomplished RADIO PROFESSIONALS, too...
>
>>>>>This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about
>amateur
>>>>>>radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>>>>>>demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>>>>>
>>>>>The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>>>>>additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>>>>>additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>>>>>Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>>>>
>>>>

>>>>It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
>>>
>>>I look at it as more of a philosophy thing than specific logic. They
>>>seem to want people to learn things. Tying knowledge to priveliges is a
>>>good philosophy in my estimation.
>>
>> Some people seem to disagree.
>
>Yeah, well I think they are wrong. And I think I know enough about human
>nature to give myself pretty good odds of being right.
>
It will be interesting to see the reaction to the "21st Century" paper if it
ever becomes a proposal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

190. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:00:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84866
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim the groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about BPL.

Steveo wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>>
>
> What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
> hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
>
> Updates?

FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"

DERA has noted:

"DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful interference to licensed radio services."

AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a half mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too susceptable to interference.

from ARRL site:
AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in the BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.

back to me:

So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna

can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet out.

As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.

- Mike KB3EIA -

191. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:04:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8vDJb.22175$IM3.14192@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84867

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040103085646.07961.00000982@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> >the speed increases.
>
> Mike,
>
> The bandwidth of a Morse signal is determined by the rise and fall times
of the
> leading and trailing edges of each dit or dah, and the shape of the rise
and
> fall.
>
> >
> >The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> >dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast.
>
> Who is "we", Mike?
>
> >And it's some 700
> >kHz wide!!!
>
> How did you determine the bandwidth?
>
> >And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
> Yep. Such a bandwidth would require extremely "hard" keying, though. Or a
> modulated carrier.
> >
> >Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> >ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> >of the fun out of it.
>
> Was the AGC on?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Part of the equation here is the receiver, as Jim N2EY was bringing up. A
lot of folks don't understand that actual bandwidth and apparant bandwith as
determined by a receiver are not the same in most cases.

Also I really don't see the problem, why did you just sit there? Were you all rock bound or what?

Move frequency, were not channelized, yet.

Dan/W4NTI

192. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:06:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <AwDJb.22179$IM3.18318@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84868

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401030606.33b7a452@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> > the speed increases.
>
> Mike, I believe the bandwidth actually decreases as the speed increases.
>
> > The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> > dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> > kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
> >
> > Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> > ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> > of the fun out of it.
>
> Bummer, hope it was just a one-time anomaly.
>
> > What the heck , over?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

A one time anomaly????? W1AW is a bulletin station. Been there, on or
about for 90 years.

Dan/W4NTI

193. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:07:37 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040103130737.207$Zw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84869
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
> I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim the
> groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
> this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about
> BPL.
>
> Steveo wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> >>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
> >>
> >>Cheers,
> >>Bill K2UNK
> >>
> >
> > What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
> > hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
> >
> > Updates?
>
> FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
>
> DERA has noted:
>
> "DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
> emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout
> North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
> currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
> remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
> interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
> interference to licensed radio services."
>
> AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a half
> mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
> susceptable to interference.
>
> from ARRL site:
> AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer
> ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
> transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
> ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in the
> BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.

>
> back to me:
>
> So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
> interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
> can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet
> out.
>
> As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
I'm in rec.radio.cb, Mike. That's pretty much what I'm hearing
about BPL also.

Thanks.

194. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:08:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RyDJb.2562$uF6.1082549@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84870

N2EY wrote:

> In article <6447bcd3.0401011424.3dc279dc@posting.google.com>, blackm00@cam.org
> (Michael Black) writes:
>
>
>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:<AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>>
>>>Here is a hypothetical situation:
>>>
>>> Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back
>>
>>their
>>
>>>access to the airwaves after WW1.
>>>
>>> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
>>>with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>>>
>>> What should the testing regimen be?
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>It wouldn't be amateur radio.
>>
>>Amateur radio derives from that time and place where radio began.
>>It was there before there were rules, or most of the technology that
>>came later. It also came before there was much clue about what
>>the new technology could be used for, and before there were well defined
>>radio services.
>>
>>Anateur radio exists because hams staked out the territory before
>>most people knew about radio. Amateur radio did not see others
>>making use of the technology and then claim they needed space;
>>they put the technology to use, and helped push the technology
>>and the applications that came later.
>>
>>For something to start now, one has to wonder what the purpose
>>would be? It's certainly not about getting in on emerging technology.
>>Without the history of radio behind it, then there is no way it
>>would be the same sort of service. Even things like contesting
>>derive from those early days, when being able to reach further
>>and further was a reflection of the effort put into the equipment

>>and antennas, and the contests were a means of testing it, or
>>testing radio itself. Witness the TransAtlantic Tests in December
>>of 1921; a form of contest yet the whole point was to see if
>>those useless shortwave frequencies where hams had been relegated
>>once rules were set in place could actually be used to span the
>>Atlantic.
>>
>>People are forever saying that amateur radio can't compete with
>>today's technology, when everyone can get a cellphone or an FRS
>>transceiver, and use the internet. Put in those terms,
>>there is no point to amateur radio. And anything created
>>today would take that into consideration.
>>
>>A very important part of amateur radio is it's history, because
>>it's an important history, not just to the hobby but to radio
>>itself. Take that away, and it could not be anything close
>>to what it is now.
>
>
> Every word of that bears repeating.
>
> For once I can't think of anything to add except "WELL SAID"
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Sure it is. The whole situation is hypothetical, and yes, the hobby would be different, especially if it started up again today after a long long absence.

Okay, I give up. This was an attempt to get people to use their imaginations, but other than Hans, no one want to play.

Let's get back to debating Morse code!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

195. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:15:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ZEDJb.22196$IM3.12240@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84871
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim the
> groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
> this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about BPL.
>
> Steveo wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> >>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
> >>
> >>Cheers,
> >>Bill K2UNK
> >>
> >
> > What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
> > hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
> >
> > Updates?
>
> FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
>
> DERA has noted:
>
> "DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
> emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout
> North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
> currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
> remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
> interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
> interference to licensed radio services."
>
> AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a half
> mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
> susceptable to interference.
>
> from ARRL site:
> AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer
> ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
> transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
> ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in the
> BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.

>
> back to me:
>
> So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
> interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
> can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet out.
>
> As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

A test of BPL was run in Alabama. A engineer friend of mine told me it was not coming up to what was advertised in Birmingham. Repeaters were needed way too often, thus jacking up the expense.

Unless the FCC is totally braindead I think BPL, as proposed will die by itself. However what they want is INCREASE the power of BPL over and above what is presently allowed under part 15.

They may take that route. We shall see.

Dan/W4NTI

196. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 18:15:51 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <mynews@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <bg1evv46cfae9qlilofhkla5c81nibe7q9@4ax.com>
Source record: 84872
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 02 Jan 2004 10:35:27 GMT, "Roger Gt" <Xenot@pacbell.net>
wrote:

>
>"Roger Halstead" <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> wrote in message
>news:2o5avvca693c5u69j067b42vndllh676un@4ax.com...
>> On Thu, 01 Jan 2004 17:43:00 -0600, Cecil Moore
>> <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.ONEDOT.org> wrote:
>>
>> >Roger Halstead wrote:
>> >> I always use a "tag line". which they refer to as an arresting harness.
><snip>
>> >
>> >I have my Purple Martin birdhouse mounted on my tower at a height
>> >of about 20 ft. Last year, I wished I had not been wearing my safety
>> >harness when I was surprised by a six foot long rat snake during a
>> >nest check. The harness forced me to face the snake when I would have
>> >much rather jumped. :-)
>>
>> Everything is a compromise<:-)) Although I'd say finding the snake
>> would require a lot higher odds than seat belts Vs being thrown out of
>> a car. <:-))
>>
>> Bout all we have in Michigan are Rattle snakes
><snip>
>> The drawback to tag lines and safety belts at 100 feet is the likely
>> hood of coming across a Yellow jackets nest inside the mast or boom.
>> They are nasty tempered little suckers.
><snip>
>
>At least I have never encountered snakes or wasps on those rare occasions I
>needed to go aloft to fix or retrieve a lose halyard. It's only 35 feet
>above deck but at sea in a light chop it swings about two to three feet with
>no one up there, add my weight it swings about five to seven feet. So I tie

I've climbed towers for years and I'm also a pilot, but I want my
tower to hold still! <:-)) If you do much of it, I guess a person,
or some people could get used to it. I do know of guys going up
there, but most preferred to lay the mast down. <:-))

>myself a safety harness from 3 strands of 5/8 inch Yacht Braid and secure a
>double line for hauling to a rigging ring. It's safer than a belt, and
>while you can't fall out you can get a bad case of motion sickness. I use
>flying jam cleats to serve as climbers so up and down are slow. There are

>no mast steps nor anything to grab except at the spreaders. So I try to
>avoid going up if at all possible. I sail mostly in the winter, and the
>water is cold!
>My antennas are all hinged, so I never climb them!
>I think you need to make some accommodation when you pass 65.

My first wife's father was still roofing barns well past the age of
80. Those steep, hip roofed barns! Not me, I wouldn't climb up one
of those for anything.

Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
(N833R, S# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
www.rogerhalstead.com
>
>Roger Gt
>
>
>

197. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:19:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103141922.29660.00002352@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 84873

In article <1_AIb.16878$IM3.13697@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The point is that no other licensing (federal or state) takes such a
>position....i.e. where the additional privileges are not otherwise
>a function of additional knowledge required for the license.

What other licensing includes things like a Basis and Purpose that the licensees are expected to fulfill? Drivers sure don't have such.

>
>> >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
>> >> For that matter what about the General?
>> >
>> > If we adopt the philosophy, it could be done. Insane, but stranger
>> >things have happened.
>
>There are, as we have discussed, valid privileges which could be
>tied to the increased license knowledge. Power would be a good
>example (IMHO). Most of us have agreed that it makes almost
>no sense to have the entry level license (technician) allowed to
>run 1500 watts based on a knowledge base of so little technical
>and theory.

Agreed! But FCC doesn't see it that way - yet.

Bill, your argument simply points down the path of getting rid of the Extra, even if you don't intend it that way.

73 de Jim, N2EY

198. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:30:31 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt758n01v0l@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84875
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <ZEDJb.22196$IM3.12240@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI says...
>
>
>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>> I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim the
>> groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
>> this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about BPL.
>>
>> Steveo wrote:
>>
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
>> >>
>> >>Cheers,
>> >>Bill K2UNK
>> >>
>> >
>> > What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
>> > hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
>> >
>> > Updates?
>>
>> FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
>>
>> DERA has noted:
>>
>> "DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
>> emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout
>> North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
>> currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
>> remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
>> interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
>> interference to licensed radio services."
>>
>> AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a half
>> mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
>> susceptable to interference.
>>
>> from ARRL site:
>> AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer

>> ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
>> transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
>> ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in the
>> BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.
>>
>> back to me:
>>
>> So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
>> interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
>> can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet out.
>>
>> As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>A test of BPL was run in Alabama. A engineer friend of mine told me it was
>not coming up to what was advertised in Birmingham. Repeaters were needed
>way too often, thus jacking up the expense.
>
>Unless the FCC is totally braindead I think BPL, as proposed will die by
>itself. However what they want is INCREASE the power of BPL over and above
>what is presently allowed under part 15.
>
>They may take that route. We shall see.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I can
afford something besides a dial up connection.

199. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:33:17 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt75dt01vf7@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84876
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo says...
>
>I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim the
>groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
>this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about BPL.
>
>Steveo wrote:
>
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>>>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>>Bill K2UNK
>>>
>>
>> What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
>> hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
>>
>> Updates?
>
>FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
>
>DERA has noted:
>
>"DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
>emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout
>North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
>currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
>remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
>interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
>interference to licensed radio services."
>
>AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a half
>mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
>susceptable to interference.
>
>from ARRL site:
>AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer
>ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
>transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
>ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in the
>BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.

>
>back to me:
>
>So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
>interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
>can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet out.
>
>As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Will it wipe out my 2 meter handheld?

200. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:44:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XYEJb.2579$uF6.1099065@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84874

N2EY wrote:

> In article <dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
>>the speed increases.
>
>
> Mike,
>
> The bandwidth of a Morse signal is determined by the rise and fall times of the
> leading and trailing edges of each dit or dah, and the shape of the rise and
> fall.
>
>
>>The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>>dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast.
>
>
> Who is "we", Mike?

Just a number of Hams using PSK31. I was only monitoring, so I didn't
keep track of callsigns.

>>And it's some 700
>>kHz wide!!!
>
>
> How did you determine the bandwidth?

On the waterfall display, you can look at the BW pretty directly. A good
psk31 signal doesn't take up a whole lot of space, maybe 40 hz.

This CW signal had spikes on the end that extended almost 400 hz on
each side. It ripped into the PSK signal and wiped it out. When it got
really bad, everyone just gave up.

>>And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
>
> Yep. Such a bandwidth would require extremely "hard" keying, though. Or a
> modulated carrier.
>
>>Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and

>>ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
>>of the fun out of it.
>
>
> Was the AGC on?

Both on and off. I often have to turn it off when a strong signal desenses the reciever and I'm working a weak station.

Your modulated carrier thing may just be a big clue. When the signal ended up putting spikes over the whole section of the band, I removed the connection to the computer to listen to the signal. It sounded pretty strange. I'll have to check what the signal again to see what it sounds like on ssb or even AM.

But in these K1MAN days, it would be a good idea for ARRL to keep a good clean signal, and not do the eqivelant of K1MAN - that is to just start the transmission and stomp all over everyone else nearby.

201. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:48:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <l0FJb.2580$uF6.1099932@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84878

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> Mike,
>
> Sounds to me like you were experiencing front end overload in your
> receiver ... when the signal exceeds the dynamic range of your receiver,
> all sorts of things happen and the signal can appear to be MUCH wider
> than it actually is.
>
> To verify this, turn off the preamp (if you have one), and switch in about
> 20 dB of attenuation before the front end of the receiver and see if it
> all gets better ...

Will do. Thanks Carl. The other users wer complaining about it too, but
they could have been experiencing the same problem.

- Mike KB3EIA -

202. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:52:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <H3FJb.2582$uF6.1100557@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84877

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
>>the speed increases.
>>
>>The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>>dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
>>kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
>
> Did you mean 700Hz wide (you typed 700kHz).

Yikes! Yep that was 700 Hz. A 700 kHz signal would be something indeed!
I see I misspelled Morse too......

Just got a new computer, and was probably too excited last night! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

203. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:56:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <S7FJb.2583$uF6.1100769@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84879
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

WA3MOJ wrote:

> Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I can
> afford something besides a dial up connection.

As long as you're satisfied with something that doesn't work!

- Mike

204. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 19:58:43 UTC
From: Paul Keenleyside <nospambcpl@tellus.net>
Message-ID: <T9FJb.149570$ss5.88545@clgrps13>
Source record: 84880
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Kinda of gives a bit of argument:

Why tip for expected average service?

Tips are a reward for exceptional service, not average service.

If the waitress went out of her way to provide extra service other than carrying a plate of food or a cup of coffee (which is what she does anyway), why tip?

Tips are for service over and beyond the call of duty, such as being a bit more friendly to visitors, rather than the run of the mill service. (Take the order and deliver the food and drink). A tip isn't given to a waitress that is crabby because her boyfriend came home drunk as a skunk and still has to get the brakes on his 68 Ford pickup truck fixed.

Tips are an option for extra service, not a wage.

I'll tip if I get very nice friendly service, but will not tip if the service is average. I tip 10% (that way I don't have to do much arithmetic, but will round up to the nearest dollar.

For taxis,let's say for a $16.00 fare, I'll give the driver $20.00 and he can keep the change if he gets me to where I'm goin' safely and efficiently, the cab is well kept and clean. I've been in cabs that should have been taken off the road, and the cab driver gone through a wash, rinse and spin cycle a few times.

As for ham people being stinky and overweight, the same can be said for any other group of people. Be it tennis players, doctors, lawyers, business owners.

If an empty helmet waitress writes in that ham people are stinky, give her a tip as in a written one on a folded peice of paper that says on the front

"Thanks for the food, it was great! Here's your tip:

Folded up in a square as an envelope, but inside is this:

If you go Seattle, Ivar's Seafood Restaurant has the best seafood in Washington State. There's one on the Seattle waterfront, and if you're taking the ferry to Whidbey Island, there's an Ivar's restaurant at Mulkiteo."

As for this Linda Sue, one wonders if she has a hick boyfriend with a shaggly moustace, keg belly and an '83 Ford F-150 with a gun rack in the back , has a bit of rust on it and works at the local

mechanic shop as a tool monkey. She's probably
a country music lover as well, and they both live in a trailer on the
southside of town.

"polycarbonate blue" <tingting@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:4d0ab$3ff5da70$d1cc59b7$12139@allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
> > window:
> >
> > "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
> >
> > JQ
>
> (..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
> folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
> the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
> from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
> weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
> us amongst the local business establishments
> 'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')
>
>
> >"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
> news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> > Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> > a judge of male character.
> >
> > Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> > come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> > a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> > The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> > Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> > Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
> >
> > Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> > Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> > the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> > service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> > The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> > computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> > how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> > they have.
> >
> > "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> > said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> > and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for

> > hours after they're gone.
> >
> > "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

205. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 20:01:39 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt7733024j5@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84881
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <S7FJb.2583$uF6.1100769@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo says...
>
>WA3MOJ wrote:
>
>
>> Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I can
>> afford something besides a dial up connection.
>
> As long as you're satisfied with something that doesn't work!
>
> - Mike
>
Clueless newbie.

206. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 20:21:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6vFJb.34725$Pg1.16475@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84882

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> the speed increases.

There are three different bandwidths that come into play. They are "necessary bandwidth", "effective (or actual) bandwidth", and "apparent bandwidth"

Necessary bandwidth in hertz for copying a morse signal is defined as Bn=BK where B is modulation rate measured in Baud, and K is an overall numerical factor which depends on the allowable signal distortion. The commonly used values of K are 3 for non-fading paths, 5 for fading paths, and 8 for fading/multipath smearing. From the formula you can see that higher speeds (Baud) require more bandwidth, just as you supposed. The nominal "necessary bandwidth" presumed for CW is 100Hz which is based on 25WPM (20 Baud) over a fading path (B=20, K=5). Quite honestly, "necessary bandwidth" is primarily an academic exercise and planners tool, as it ignores some practical 'real world' issues and doesn't answer the question raised in your subject line.

Effective bandwidth is an actual on-the-air measurement of the width of the signal at some designated level, most commonly -60dB referenced to the peak. To understand what is being measured, you need to recognize that Morse is sent as an amplitude modulated carrier (AM) and that it contains sidebands. Like any AM signal, those sidebands extend nominally plus/minus the carrier at the frequency of the modulation, or BW=2M. Modulation of this signal contains two components.

The first component is the baud rate of the actual on/off keying (see "necessary bandwidth" above). Were it only for this component, measured CW signals would be very narrow, <100Hz, and dependent totally on keying speed.

The second modulation component is related to the rise time of the radiated signal. Fast rise times (where the RF envelope resembles a square wave) generate signals rich in harmonics and as these harmonics mix with the primary signal and each other in the transmitter stages, they produce sum and difference signals which become part of the sidebands of the radiated signal. The sharper the rise time and the more non-linear the transmitter stages, the more energy there is in the harmonics, and thus the bandwidth is wider (as measured at -60dB skirt points). Controlling this component of bandwidth can take the form of regulating the rise time (shaping in the keying circuit) and ovoiding overdriving of transmitter circuits.

The third kind of bandwidth is "apparent bandwidth". This bandwidth is determined by the effective bandwidth (see above) AND the performance of the receiver environment. If a receiver were "perfect", then effective and

apparent bandwidth would be equal (the receiver would perfectly reproduce the desired signal in the form it arrived at its antenna and would reject the effects of all non-target signals present.)

But receivers aren't perfect (well, maybe my Sherwood equipped R4C is close). Extremely loud signals (your neighbor 3 doors away) will sound ("apparent") several hundred kHz wide, because your receivers AGC will pump, RF and IF stages will be overloaded, and the faster he sends the worse it will be. I'm giving the obvious extreme example, but just to make the point. Many times just some reasonable adjustments of your receiver such as turning off noise blankers, reducing the preamp level, or turning your antenna will reduce the apparent bandwidth down in line with the actual bandwidth of the transmitted signal.

73, de Hans, K0HB

207. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 20:37:45 UTC
From: Ghost Writer <SPAMFREE@SPAMFREE.COM>
Message-ID: <DKFJb.4850$5M.105111@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 84883
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul Keenleyside" <nospambcpl@tellus.net> wrote in message
news:T9FJb.149570$ss5.88545@clgrps13...
> Kinda of gives a bit of argument:
>
> Why tip for expected average service?
>
> Tips are a reward for exceptional service, not average service.
>
> If the waitress went out of her way to provide extra service other than
> carrying a plate of food or a cup of coffee (which is
> what she does anyway), why tip?
>
> Tips are for service over and beyond the call of duty, such as being a bit
> more friendly to visitors, rather than the run of the
> mill service. (Take the order and deliver the food and drink). A tip isn't
> given to a waitress that is crabby because her boyfriend came home drunk
as
> a skunk and still has to get the brakes on his 68 Ford pickup truck
fixed.
>
> Tips are an option for extra service, not a wage.
>

I tip a great majority of the time. Some times I may only have enough to buy the food with as I've not planned ahead to dine out. Any tip depends on how much I buy depending on how hungry I am and what on the menu appeals to me given what I have in my pockets to carry me through the total. I dine out on a whim most of the time. IF I have the cash, I pay 20% of my total or whatever close to it I can make. IF I don't have it, I at least thank them. I do NOT tip when drinking at a bar, as they are paid and don't do much outside of opening a bottle or filling a glass and setting in front of you then collecting your $1 or so for it. I don't use cabs, so no worries there. Went to a new Barber - New Years Eve. Haircut - $10. He made sure it was to perfection. I tipped him $2 which he thanked me for at least 3 times. I do NOT empty my wallet or coins of all just to tip. I do what I can - up to the 20%. I can't speak for ALL hams, but this HAM DOES TIP WHEN POSSIBLE. Like anything else, this smells of placing all in one barrel. Just because "a" ham doesn't tip, doesn't make us all "cheap". G.W.

208. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 20:39:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uMFJb.20392$P%1.19452849@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84884
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bt758n01v0l@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <ZEDJb.22196$IM3.12240@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >> I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim
the
> >> groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
> >> this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about
BPL.
> >>
> >> Steveo wrote:
> >>
> >> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> >
> >> >>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
> >> >>
> >> >>Cheers,
> >> >>Bill K2UNK
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> > What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
> >> > hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
> >> >
> >> > Updates?
> >>
> >> FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
> >>
> >> DERA has noted:
> >>
> >> "DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
> >> emergency communications systems in several licensed services
throughout
> >> North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
> >> currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
> >> remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
> >> interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
> >> interference to licensed radio services."
> >>

> >> AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a
half
> >> mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
> >> susceptable to interference.
> >>
> >> from ARRL site:
> >> AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data
transfer
> >> ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
> >> transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
> >> ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in
the
> >> BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.
> >>
> >> back to me:
> >>
> >> So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
> >> interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
> >> can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet
out.
> >>
> >> As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >A test of BPL was run in Alabama. A engineer friend of mine told me it
was
> >not coming up to what was advertised in Birmingham. Repeaters were
needed
> >way too often, thus jacking up the expense.
> >
> >Unless the FCC is totally braindead I think BPL, as proposed will die by
> >itself. However what they want is INCREASE the power of BPL over and
above
> >what is presently allowed under part 15.
> >
> >They may take that route. We shall see.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I
can
> afford something besides a dial up connection.
>

According to independent analysts, BPL will not cost any less and will probably cost more. While they may have low introductory rates to get their foot in the door, after the first few months it will go up. Afterall the

need to install a LOT of additional hardware to do this. They can't just feed the signal in. In addition, you will need special hardware in your home computer to be able to access the signal. Finally, the signal will be easy to pick up since the lines are totally unshielded so that the problem of identity theft, among other things, will be even more serious.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

209. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 20:40:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XMFJb.20393$P%1.19453041@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84885
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bt75dt01vf7@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
says...
> >
> >I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim the
> >groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
> >this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about
BPL.
> >
> >Steveo wrote:
> >
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>>Bill K2UNK
> >>>
> >>
> >> What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
> >> hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
> >>
> >> Updates?
> >
> >FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
> >
> >DERA has noted:
> >
> >"DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
> >emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout
> >North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
> >currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
> >remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
> >interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
> >interference to licensed radio services."
> >
> >AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a half
> >mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
> >susceptable to interference.
> >
> >from ARRL site:
> >AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer

> >ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
> >transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
> >ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in the
> >BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.
> >
> >back to me:
> >
> >So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
> >interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
> >can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet
out.
> >
> >As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> Will it wipe out my 2 meter handheld?
>

Yes, it will.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

210. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 20:44:23 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3FF729A6.9026D95E@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 84886
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Guess I'll need to order a whole case of Thread Be Gone...

polycarbonate blue wrote:

> "JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
> > window:
> >
> > "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
> >
> > JQ
>
> (..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
> folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
> the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
> from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
> weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
> us amongst the local business establishments
> 'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')
>
> >"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
> news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> > Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> > a judge of male character.
> >
> > Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> > come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> > a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> > The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> > Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> > Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
> >
> > Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> > Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> > the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> > service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> > The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> > computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> > how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> > they have.
> >
> > "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"

> > said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> > and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> > hours after they're gone.
> >
> > "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
> >
> >
> >
> >

211. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 21:18:24 UTC
From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401031318.37366275@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84887
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net wrote:
"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bt758n01v0l@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <ZEDJb.22196$IM3.12240@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
[snip]
>Finally, the signal will be easy to pick up since the
>lines are totally unshielded so that the problem
>of identity theft, among other things, will be even
>more serious.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

FYI Speaking of identity theft the person posting as WA3MOJ is not
WA3MOJ but a CBer from rec.radio.cb attempting to "hassle" hams that
disagree with illegal cb operation.

212. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 21:32:45 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt7cdt02l9o@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <e7a52aa9.0401031318.37366275@posting.google.com>, No No Not George says...
>
>"Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net wrote:
>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
>news:bt758n01v0l@drn.newsguy.com...
>> In article <ZEDJb.22196$IM3.12240@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>Dan/W4NTI
>> says...
>[snip]
>>Finally, the signal will be easy to pick up since the
>>lines are totally unshielded so that the problem
>>of identity theft, among other things, will be even
>>more serious.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>FYI Speaking of identity theft the person posting as WA3MOJ is not
>WA3MOJ but a CBer from rec.radio.cb attempting to "hassle" hams that
>disagree with illegal cb operation.
>
Excuse me? Who said anything about cb radio operation? Why would anyone believe someone who posts as No No Not George ?

The topic is bpl do you even know what that is mr cber?

213. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 21:36:52 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401031336.60544ee0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84888

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<AwDJb.22179$IM3.18318@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0401030606.33b7a452@posting.google.com...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> > > the speed increases.
> >
> > Mike, I believe the bandwidth actually decreases as the speed increases.
> >
> > > The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> > > dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> > > kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
> > >
> > > Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> > > ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> > > of the fun out of it.
> >
> > Bummer, hope it was just a one-time anomaly.
> >
> > > What the heck , over?
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> A one time anomaly????? W1AW is a bulletin station. Been there, on or
> about for 90 years.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Geez Dan, I thought it might've been a malfunction at W1AW...hence the
"anomaly" statement.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

214. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 21:52:28 UTC
From: Herbert Khaury <Herbert@tiptoe.tp>
Message-ID: <gMOdnaX0wo0ApGqi4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 84890

"Aww, he's no fun. He fell right over."

--

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040101193920.25815.00005591@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Of course hams tip.
>
> All you have to do to get a ham to tip
> is to apply sufficient lateral force
> above the ham's center of gravity.
>
> This result is, of course, completely
> and accurately predicted by
> Fudd's First Law of Opposition:
>
> "If you push something hard enough, it will fall over."
>
> 73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

215. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 21:58:34 UTC
From: Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com
Message-ID: <3a5b2962c3f0576f0f30f03d0104a120@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 84891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
Steveo wrote:
> <Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
>> Steveo wrote:
>>> He scares me.
>>
>> He would only scare me if he started driving in NW Georgia.
>>
> F#cker better not be driving nextel! (still ain't use to saying
> nextel)

How is it that Park gets a ride before LaJoie?

--

___________________________
Truckers get the best $20 whores
```

216. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:18:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FF73FB2.9090509@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84892

Mike Coslo wrote:

> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider
> as the speed increases.

CW code signals are around 100Hz wide, IIRC.

>
>
> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!

It might seem so if your receiver was in SSB mode. A narrowband signal
will still be
heard throughout the passband of a filter set for a wideband mode.
Also, if you were in CW receive mode instead, the receiver's AGC will
make the
attenuation of that filter's side skirts seem worse. What would be 10dB
down without
AGC will look like only say 3dB if the AGC is enabled. Especially as
you mentioned
(below) that w1aw was a strong signal.

>
>
> Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> of the fun out of it.

217. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:19:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103171913.12300.00002500@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 84893

In article <XYEJb.2579$uF6.1099065@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> How did you determine the bandwidth?
>
>On the waterfall display, you can look at the BW pretty directly. A good
>psk31 signal doesn't take up a whole lot of space, maybe 40 hz.

A Morse signal set up for optimal BW at 50 wpm takes up about 200 Hz.
>
> This CW signal had spikes on the end that extended almost 400 hz on
>each side. It ripped into the PSK signal and wiped it out. When it got
>really bad, everyone just gave up.

Key clicks. Could be caused by a problem at Newington, or by a problem at the
receiver end.
>
>>>And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!

>> Yep. Such a bandwidth would require extremely "hard" keying, though. Or a
>> modulated carrier.
>>
>>>Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
>>>ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
>>>of the fun out of it.
>>
>> Was the AGC on?
>
>Both on and off. I often have to turn it off when a strong signal
>desenses the reciever and I'm working a weak station.

But did you also turn down the RF gain and turn up the AF? Or kick in an
attenuator?

What WK3C posted earlier is correct - if a strong signal overloads your
receiver, its bandwidth may appear to be wider than it really is. If someone is
running PSK31 using the usual SSB-rig-feeding-a-soundcard approach, overload of
the receiver is a real possibility.

What was your setup?
>
>Your modulated carrier thing may just be a big clue. When the signal
>ended up putting spikes over the whole section of the band, I removed
>the connection to the computer to listen to the signal. It sounded
>pretty strange. I'll have to check what the signal again to see what it
>sounds like on ssb or even AM.

Sure.

btw, W1AW's 80m CW freq is advertised as 3581.5 IIRC.

Oddly enough, last night I was "reading the mail" from W1AW on 40 meters while packing up some parts I sold. Signal was very clean on my Southgate Type 7. I'm not sure of the exact time, but the transmission ended with "END OF 35 WPM" ;-)

>
> But in these K1MAN days, it would be a good idea for ARRL to keep a
>good clean signal, and not do the eqivelant of K1MAN - that is to just
>start the transmission and stomp all over everyone else nearby.
>
The transmitters at W1AW are all Harris "professional grade" transceivers, one for each band plus a spare. Computer controlled from the main console, no adjustments needed to the rig itself. But even Harris stuff can have problems.

Separate antennas for each band, too - the 80/75 antenna is a cage dipole between two of the towers. 80 feet up if it's a foot.

I'll tune down to 80 tonight if I get the chance and see how W1AW sounds.

73 de Jim, N2EY

218. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:30:19 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt7fpr02ue2@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84896
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Go buy a clue also.

In article <3FF729A6.9026D95E@nospam.iserv.net>, N8KDV says...
>
>Guess I'll need to order a whole case of Thread Be Gone...
>
>polycarbonate blue wrote:
>
>> "JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net...
>> >
>> > Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
>> > window:
>> >
>> > "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
>> >
>> > JQ
>>
>> (..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
>> folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
>> the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
>> from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
>> weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
>> us amongst the local business establishments
>> 'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')
>>
>> >"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
>> news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
>> > Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
>> > Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
>> > a judge of male character.
>> >
>> > Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
>> > come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
>> > a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
>> > The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
>> > Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
>> > Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>> >
>> > Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
>> > Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
>> > the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
>> > service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
>> > The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm

>> > computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
>> > how many people work for them and how many college degrees
>> > they have.
>> >
>> > "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
>> > said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
>> > and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
>> > hours after they're gone.
>> >
>> > "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>

219. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:32:03 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0401031432.2d46227d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84894

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040102235644.11891.00003364@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <8jiJb.16109$lo3.14854@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> >> Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
> >> person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
> >> ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
> >> if they were willing to retest for the same license?
> >>
> >
> >It's a learners permit, NOT a license.
>
> What's the difference?

It's provisional, intended to assist in gaining full qualification for
an amateur license.

>
> Here in PA, a person with a learner's permit for driving cannot drive alone.
> Could your learner's permit hams operate their own rigs all by themselves? If
> so, it's a license.
>
> >If they couldn't/didn't learn enough
> >in 10 years to pass the examination for a license, then they are obviously
> >not qualified for a license.
>
> But they're qualified to have a learner's permit for 10 years.
>

Do you have aproblem with 10 years? Should we make it 10 weeks?

> Can you name any other license where, if you don't upgrade within a specified
> time, you lose the license you have?

There are no such amateur licenses extant, but for the majority of
it's availability the Novice license was exactly like that. That was
probably the most effective method ever devised of introducing
non-amateurs to ham radio with a "sample sized" operating permit.
Easy to get, with limited power so you didn't trash the
RF-neighborhood too badly, and of a duration long enough to decide if
you wanted to become a ham and to gain experience for the
qualification tests. Then they spoiled it by making it renewable.

73, de Hans, K0HB

220. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:35:42 UTC
From: tanda@extremezone.com
Message-ID: <dda7bc89.0401031435.4015f080@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3FF618DC.6010107@ix.netcom.com>...
> Alan Jatowski wrote:
>
> > Their body odor lingers for
> >hours after they're gone.
> >
> >
> >
> It's not just old hams, many old non-hams are stinky too.
> I don't know why many people from the WW2 generation
> don't shower every day.
>
> >
> >

you are a dumbass
```

221. Re: Why don't you like this cross posted to rec.radio.cb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:50:58 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401031450.35ae3586@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com> wrote in message
news:<pvrJb.5175$Nz4.4062@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>...
> Path:
> newssvr29.news.prodigy.com!newssvr25.news.prodigy.com!newsdbm01!newsdbm01.news.prodigy.com!newsc
> on07.news.prodigy.com!newsmst01.news.prodigy.com!prodigy.com!newsfeed.telusplanet.net!newsfeed.t
> elus.net!news3.optonline.net!cyclone.rdc-nyc.rr.com!news.maxwell.syr.edu!postnews1.google.com!no
> t-for-mail
> From: questionkeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George)
> Newsgroups:
rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb
> Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike
> Date: 2 Jan 2004 17:40:27 -0800
> Organization: http://groups.google.com
> Lines: 14
> Message-ID: <e7a52aa9.0401021740.4a175756@posting.google.com>
> References: <792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>
> <5a5fcb7b.0401010501.493327d8@posting.google.com>
> <geYIb.18860$IM3.6316@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> <rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
> <6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> <YB5Jb.1899$uF6.611839@news1.news.adelphia.net>
> <hYeJb.4937$6B.3708@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> <4gjJb.2139$uF6.818793@news1.news.adelphia.net>
> <2pjJb.20228$P%1.19145150@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 172.130.12.226
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
> X-Trace: posting.google.com 1073094027 24547 127.0.0.1 (3 Jan 2004 01:40:27 GMT)
> X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 3 Jan 2004 01:40:27 +0000 (UTC)
> Xref: newsmst01.news.prodigy.com rec.radio.amateur.policy:258259
rec.radio.amateur.misc:239839
> rec.radio.shortwave:365822 rec.radio.cb:352598
>
> Steveo (Moparholic@hotmail.com) wrote:
> > >> >You see Dee D. how Steveo gets violent?
> > >>>
> > >>A clue by four is violent? Leave Dee alone already, leghumper.
>
> > >Look at the thread you busted in on her so you started it dickwad.

> >
> >No, I've replied to Dee before, without your moderation. What
> >made you decide to chime in with your worthless tripe this time?
>
> >Because your a TROLLLLLL Steveo and Dee D. needs to know it she was
> >clearly puzzled by you throwing N8WWMs name into the mix for no good
> >reason other than to cause trouble and lets face it you need to be
> >moderated, asslick.
>
> I see that George wa3moj@aol.com
> is back to trolling from his AOL account.
> Please note the word "asslick":
>
> Re: N8WWM goes down in flames, again
> Dunno, he was last heard jamming repeaters, they tossed him on the rain report
> for it..as I recall. I heard you tossed a few salads in your day. asslick
> rec.radio.amateur.policy - Jul 30, 2003 by Cool Breeze - View Thread (2 articles)
>
> Re: Feel the love here
> ... No surprises here. Asslick, you again seem to be retarded you brought
> up another mans weight, do you want to have sex with george? ...
> rec.radio.cb - May 11, 2003 by PhilC - View Thread (19 articles)
>
> Re: Oxendine Alert
> ... And your a dick with ears and you do use six,,, --
> Your ass sucks wind you know nothing of me asslick and just as ...
> rec.radio.cb - May 7, 2003 by PhilC - View Thread (25 articles)
>
>
>
> Only George use's that saying in this group.

he hasn't used snapperhead in a while....

222. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 22:53:22 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3FF747E1.6691642D@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 84898
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

```
WA3MOJ wrote:

> Go buy a clue also.

And of course I'll be happy to pick up a couple dozen for you! :-)

>
>
> In article <3FF729A6.9026D95E@nospam.iserv.net>, N8KDV says...
> >
> >Guess I'll need to order a whole case of Thread Be Gone...
> >
> >polycarbonate blue wrote:
> >
> >> "JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450s$goj$0@pita.alt.net...
> >> >
> >> > Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
> >> > window:
> >> >
> >> > "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
> >> >
> >> > JQ
> >>
> >> (..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
> >> folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
> >> the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
> >> from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
> >> weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
> >> us amongst the local business establishments
> >> 'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')
> >>
> >> >"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
> >> news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> >> > Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> >> > Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> >> > a judge of male character.
> >> >
> >> > Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> >> > come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> >> > a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> >> > The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> >> > Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> >> > Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
> >> >
```

> >> > Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> >> > Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> >> > the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> >> > service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> >> > The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> >> > computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> >> > how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> >> > they have.
> >> >
> >> > "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> >> > said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> >> > and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> >> > hours after they're gone.
> >> >
> >> > "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >

223. Re: Look for the Union Label (was: The 14 Petitions)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-03 23:06:19 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <JoGdnc4IrMtw12qiRVn-uw@comcast.com>
Source record: 84899

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqonb02.pminews@netnews.comcast.n
et...
> On Mon, 29 Dec 2003 01:14:22 GMT, Dave Head
wrote:
>
> >The problem with engineering and IT is that the
laws of physics, and the
> >principles of good software design and
construction, are universal. What works
> >in India, Russia, and Korea works here, and
vice-versa.
>
> Tell that to my wife who spent several years
correcting and re-doing
> the engineering designs of Russian-educated
emigre engineers in the
> US who across the board act as if electrical
codes and Ohm's Law are
> mere suggestions. She's now on the staff of
the world's largest
> environmental engineering consulting company,
and there's no union
> or need for one. She would never have joined
them if there was, and
> if one comes in, she's gone.
>
> >I'm a government engineer. I work for the
Navy. Don't need a union, right?
>
> I had 30 years as an engineer and enforcement
manager with The Uncle -
> wannna' trade horror stories? Especially
those where "the union"
> stood by and did nothing?
>
> >Wrong! In the 1980's, the OPM illegally capped
the across the board raises of
> >engineers on the advanced engineering pay
scale. Who should step up to the
> >plate but the Treasury Employee's Union, and
sued the socks off the government
> >for 2 decades. Finally won the case last year.

Last week I got a check as
> >partial payment for compensation for that
misdeed - $1090.95.
>
> My folks were represented by the NTEU and in
fact a good friend was
> the "field VP" of the local. He finally saw
the light as to what
> "the union" would do or not do and resigned.
He's now retired, as
> am I.
>
> Navy engineer, huh? Remember the
"demonstration project" at the
> Naval Ocean Systems Center (San Diego) where
all statutory
> protections of employees were suspended and
all pay raises made
> discretionary? Where was the union on that
one? A close buddy was
> denied the step increase that he would
otherwise been entitled to by
> regulation. As a result he retired after 33
years as a specialized
> acoustic engineer with the Navy. Guess who
was the loser (Answer:
> not him...)
>
> The union couldn't or wouldn't do a damn thing
when the chairman of
> the FCC decided to RIF several hundred
engineers, technicians, and
> non-technical enforcement agents because he
didn't understand the
> need for field enforcement. Two of the folks
working for me,
> excellent performers, got caught up in that
mess, and they didn't
> deserve it.
>
> Ham radio, as well as all other radio
services, are still suffering
> the results of that ill-informed decision
almost 10 years later.
>
> Enough of this...this is not the place to
argue this point.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

>
> Retired and loving every minute of it....
> Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

The problem in this country is not a lack of unions, but the value system we have. For example where else can you find somebody with nothing more than a high school education, if that, making millions of dollars a year playing a kids game, basketball. Same goes for other sports like football, hockey, and baseball. Then there are those who make fortunes in the music industry because of their voice, or in the movies. None of these people contribute to the general well being of society on a day to day basis like the engineers, technicians etc. who design and repair the products that are taken for granted.

I find it really a twisted sense of value when a highly skilled technical person has to give up doing technical work if they want to have any hope of advancing their pay and career. Businesses value the marketing types, and the MBA's, above those who actually design the products. Very few forward looking companies have realized this and have done something about it. Those that have now implement a dual track system, one in to management for those who want it, the other keeps those interested in the technical area doing what they like, and both allows for greater advancement in salary and career.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

Charter member of the
Lawrence Technological University
Wireless Society W8LTU

224. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 00:15:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <LWIJb.33153$KZ5.9204@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 84900

Mike,

You're received a number of good answers. As for measuring bandwidth, I've used exactly two receivers that would be suitable for accurate measurement, and I couldn't afford either of them. With stability measured in 10 to the 9th power and accuracy at 10 to the 8th, these little babes were well over $50,000 in the mid 90s. LOL. Oh, and that doesn't include the cost of the IF spectrum analyser that was connected to one of them, nor any other costs such as calibrated antennas.

As stated, the rise and fall times of the waveform determine the bandwidth; often the receiver can deceive you as to what the bandwidth is.

Of course, it is possible there may have been a problem at W1AW.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
> the speed increases.
>
> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
> Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
> ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
> of the fun out of it.
>
> What the heck , over?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.558 / Virus Database: 350 - Release Date: 1/2/04

225. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 01:06:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <LGJJb.35463$Pg1.2011@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84951
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> I don't know why many people from the WW2 generation
> don't shower every day.

Robert, have you ever run into someone that you felt you just didn't like very well, but you couldn't identify a good reason for that feeling. You've just given me my good reason. You're an asshole, and you're damned good at it.

Hans

226. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 01:07:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gHJJb.7039$6B.6571@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84952
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bt758n01v0l@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <ZEDJb.22196$IM3.12240@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:trDJb.2558$uF6.1082538@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >> I'm not sure which group you're posting from Steve, so I didn't trim
the
> >> groups. Once I know, I'll trim 'em out. cb and shortwave don't need all
> >> this stuff (though shortwave listeners should be VERY concerned about
BPL.
> >>
> >> Steveo wrote:
> >>
> >> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> >
> >> >>ITU treaty is goofed up too?
> >> >>
> >> >>Cheers,
> >> >>Bill K2UNK
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> > What about that BPL thing, I know their using it in Manasass, anyone
> >> > hear how good or bad it is to HF comms?
> >> >
> >> > Updates?
> >>
> >> FEMA has expressed "grave concerns"
> >>
> >> DERA has noted:
> >>
> >> "DERA concludes that serious interference to and disruption of critical
> >> emergency communications systems in several licensed services
throughout
> >> North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as
> >> currently proposed," DERA's comments said. Endorsing FEMA's earlier
> >> remarks, DERA said proposed BPL systems don't just pose a risk of
> >> interference, they've already been shown to "actually cause harmful
> >> interference to licensed radio services."
> >>

> >> AMRAD has provided data that suggests that a Operating Ham within a
half
> >> mile radius will likely knock out BPL. The service is simply too
> >> susceptable to interference.
> >>
> >> from ARRL site:
> >> AMRAD found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data
transfer
> >> ceased in the face of a 100-W signal on 3980 kHz from a mobile
> >> transmitter. Adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer
> >> ceased in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 W in
the
> >> BPL operating band of from 4 to 21 MHz.
> >>
> >> back to me:
> >>
> >> So BPL is a big source of interference to devices it isn't allowed to
> >> interfere with, and it looks like a QRP or CB rig with a good antenna
> >> can knock it out, but certainly a 100 watt rig will take BPL internet
out.
> >>
> >> As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >A test of BPL was run in Alabama. A engineer friend of mine told me it
was
> >not coming up to what was advertised in Birmingham. Repeaters were
needed
> >way too often, thus jacking up the expense.
> >
> >Unless the FCC is totally braindead I think BPL, as proposed will die by
> >itself. However what they want is INCREASE the power of BPL over and
above
> >what is presently allowed under part 15.
> >
> >They may take that route. We shall see.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I
can
> afford something besides a dial up connection.
>

Since you already admitted to the fact that you are braindead... I agree.

Dan/W4NTI

227. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 01:09:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2JJJb.7042$6B.2915@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84953
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bt7733024j5@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <S7FJb.2583$uF6.1100769@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
says...
> >
> >WA3MOJ wrote:
> >
> >
> >> Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I
can
> >> afford something besides a dial up connection.
> >
> > As long as you're satisfied with something that doesn't work!
> >
> > - Mike
> >
> Clueless newbie.
>

Sorry, you are clueless. How about reading some of the information about how crappy this BPL will be before inserting foot in your mouth?

You are either a total fool, or, and this is probably the case..... unworthy of calling yourself a ham. Why you ask? because your a dumbass.

Dan/W4NTI

228. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 01:13:10 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040103201310.258$WT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84954
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

<Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > <Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com> wrote:
> >> Steveo wrote:
> >>> He scares me.
> >>
> >> He would only scare me if he started driving in NW Georgia.
> >>
> > F#cker better not be driving nextel! (still ain't use to saying
> > nextel)
>
> How is it that Park gets a ride before LaJoie?
>
He must have naked pics of someone and is blackmailing his
way.

229. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 01:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103205644.25815.00005680@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84955

In article <AwDJb.22179$IM3.18318@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>W1AW is a bulletin station. Been there, on or
>about for 90 years.

Actually about 66 years (1938). In all that time there have been only three main rigs - the original rackpanel jobs, the 1960s ones installed about the time the "new" Hq building went up, and the Harris setup from the mid-90s renovations. Something like 25-30 years of service per setup.

Trivia Quiz:

There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?

There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

230. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 01:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103205644.25815.00005681@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84956

In article <T9FJb.149570$ss5.88545@clgrps13>, "Paul Keenleyside"
<nospambcpl@tellus.net> writes:

>Why tip for expected average service?
>
>Tips are a reward for exceptional service, not average service.

In every part of the USA that I've been to, tipping is customary in
full-service restaurants and certain other situations. That's for *average*
service.
>
>If the waitress went out of her way to provide extra service other than
>carrying a plate of food or a cup of coffee (which is
>what she does anyway), why tip?

Because it's expected. In fact, it's so expected that wages for waitpersons are
low *and* the feds expect anyone in certain occupations to report a certain
amount of tip income that doesn't show on their W2.

>Tips are for service over and beyond the call of duty, such as being a bit
>more friendly to visitors, rather than the run of the
>mill service. (Take the order and deliver the food and drink).

Where did you get that idea?

>A tip isn't
>given to a waitress that is crabby because her boyfriend came home drunk as
>a skunk and still has to get the brakes on his 68 Ford pickup truck fixed.

Sure. That's not *average* service - it's poor service.

>Tips are an option for extra service, not a wage.
>
>I'll tip if I get very nice friendly service, but will not tip if the
>service is average. I tip 10% (that way I don't have to do much arithmetic,
>but will round up to the nearest dollar.

15 % is customary.
>
>For taxis,let's say for a $16.00 fare, I'll give the driver $20.00 and he
>can keep the change if he gets me to where I'm goin' safely and efficiently,
>the cab is well kept and clean. I've been in cabs that should have been
>taken off the road, and the cab driver gone through a wash, rinse and spin
>cycle a few times.

That's a lot more than 10%!

Shouldn't *average* cab service include all those things?

231. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 02:00:39 UTC
From: Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com
Message-ID: <7ae19cd9c171993d0dac300083d8f8e7@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 84957
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:
>> How is it that Park gets a ride before LaJoie?
>>
> He must have naked pics of someone and is blackmailing his
> way.

Ewww. Bill France in drag at a Rainbow march. That's just so wrong, at
too many levels.

--

Truckers get the best $20 whores

232. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 02:11:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqxrmi1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84958

On Sat, 03 Jan 2004 20:21:22 GMT, K&#65533;HB wrote:

>Effective bandwidth is an actual on-the-air measurement of the width of the
>signal at some designated level, most commonly -60dB referenced to the peak.

IIRC the accepted standard for measuring occupied bandwidth is -26
dB, which includes 99% of the signal.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

233. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 02:49:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF77F3B.188B87D9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84959

N2EY wrote:

> Trivia Quiz:
>
> There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?

W1MK, I think located near Brainard Field, Hartford.

> There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?

Memory fails...

Dave K8MN

234. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:00:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040103220020.11891.00003405@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 84960

In article <bt6fvo$med@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040102235645.11891.00003365@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> In article <JM-cnafi68NNwGiiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >
>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >Of that 423k US hams who are not Techs, how many do you suppose started
>> >out as Techs and have since upgraded?
>>
>> I don't know, exactly. Neither do you, I bet ;-)
>>
>> But why does it matter?
>
>There's a more poignant question that it reveals on the surface.

I'm glad somebody picked up on that!

>Why *does*
>it matter how many licensed amateurs upgrade at any given point

It's an indication of how well the ARS is meeting one of its B&Ps.

>--and what
>determines whether they do or not? Anyone truly interested in the growth of
>the ARS needs to know those answers for effective marketing, esepecially if
>the concern is driven from a desire to see the ARS grow, rather than
>maintain numbers.

Agreed! And they also have to realize that there are a large number of
factors at work, not just the tests or the license structure.

>For me, personally, I am happy with my Tech License and see no reason to
>upgrade "just for the hell of it."

Exactly. You have the privs you want, and a callsign you like. What would
upgrading
get you that you don't have already?

>The "just for the hell of it" idea has
>never been a motivational factor for me in anything--personal, hobby, or
>professional. So, what marketing campaign would: #1 *reach* me and, #2
>motivate me to change my mind?

The only one I could think of would be to find something you want that you *don't* have now, and make upgrading the way to get it. But since you already have what you want, that's pretty tough to do.

It's like trying to sell me another refrigerator. The one I have now is 4 years old, works great, fits the available space and in general does the job. I'd like a bigger one but in this house I don't have room. The one I have is pretty energy-efficient, so it a more energy-efficient model would have to be a lot more efficient to make economic sense. I've never seen an icemaker that worked consistently, and they take up too much freezer room anyway. And after what this one cost to buy I'm not going to buy another one "just for the hell of it" either!

>The ARRL has never reached me yet (can't speak for others) on a campaign to >motivate me to upgrade.

I don't think anyone could, because there's nothing that you want from an upgrade.

Now when I got started, I couldn't wait to upgrade, because I wanted full access to the bands - all the bands. The requirements were no big deal - the worst of it was the 2 year wait between Advanced and Extra. (Try telling a 14 year old to wait 2 years for something...)

And it was cheaper to pay the license test fee than to build a 25 kHz calibrator to know the subband edges...;-)

But that's just me. Others were and are perfectly happy with what they've got.

> The only thing the ARRL apparently successfully >*helps* with (but is not solely responsible for) is getting *new* hams >involved. If that statement is true--and it's probably more true than >not--then what does the ARRL need to do to move past just getting new folks >to the hobby/service of amateur radio?

Publicity is a big thing, but it can be hard to come by because most people just aren't going to "get" amateur radio.

> I suspect it has *nothing* to do >with license class or even requirements.

I think you're right.

> When I decided to become a >licensed amateur radio operator I gave no thought at all to what it would

>take to get my license; only that I needed to meet the requirements at hand.
>It was only *after* I entered the service that any conginitive thought was
>made as to license upgrades for the purpose of more bandwidth, privileges,
>etc.
>
Exactly! Once you decided you wanted in, the tests were simply a task to be
performed to get the license.

>> You are assuming that if the Tech still had a code test, none of those
>> hams who
>> got Techs would have gotten a ham license. That's not a reasonable
>> assumption
>> at all.
>
>I agree with that. Based on what I said above. At the moment I considered
>the hobby/service of ham radio, I gave no thought to the idea that maybe the
>requirements would change. Well, in fact, I gave no thought at all to the
>requirements--other than that I had to meet them to achieve my ambition of
>getting a license. I think there would be a preponderance of folks who
>aren't even going to be that aware of requirements and necessity at the time
>they are considering entering the ARS.

Sure.
>
>If this thread is indeed still discussing the ARRL(?)--the ARRL itself needs
>to consider these questions--probably needs to poll current hams and get a
>professional marketing agency to figure out how to move beyond just being a
>welcome mat and deciding if they also need to take on the task of getting
>people to migrate to higher license classes or what those higher license
>classes "get" you (because there may not always take a higher license
>classes along with the privileges of the "extra" bandwidth, etc.).

But why should they upgrade if they're satisfied with what they've got - like
you are, Kim? Sure, offer help and information, but if someone's happy,
don;t push.

Look how many Advanceds and Generals have *not* upgraded to Extra, even though
all it takes is one little 50 question written test.
>
>> From 1979 to 1991, the number of US hams grew from about 350,000 to about
>> 550,000 - all of them code-tested. From 1991 to 2003, the number grew from
>> about 550,000 to about 683,000. (If someone has more accurate numbers,
>> please
>> post them!). We had growth with code tests and growth without code tests.
>
>It's those fluctuations in the numbers that need to be analyzed. What was
>going on economically, politically, educationally, even migrationally, in
>this country at those times? 200,000 vs. 133,000 in growth in two entirely
>different phases of years, but the same number of years.

Well, a bunch of things, from the economy to the politics to lifestyle changes.
Then there's the 'net and cellphones and (as you pointed out some time back)

people having less time for organized hobbies and other activities.

I remember 20 years ago that lots of new hams came into amateur radio for "honeydew" reasons. Whole families got their licenses (with code, btw) so they could communicate with handhelds, mobiles, and home stations. Great stuff - but now they all have cellphones.

>And, Jim, I know
>('least I think I know) you will agree that CW testing or not may have
>nothing at all to do with the fact whether there was more or less growth at
>either time.

EXACTLY!

And yet code testing - even the 5 wpm test that's all we have left - is held up as some sort of "barrier" that is keeping out huge numbers of wonderful people who will bring about a new Golden Age....

You know the sales pitch. "Bring amateur radio into the 21st century" and all that. As if!

>It could have nothing *at all* to do with testing structure
>because, as I said, I didn't really take enough time to say, "wait a minute,
>what are the requirements and will they ever change?," etc.
>
Sure. Oh, there will be a surge of growth - but then it will drop off.
>>
>> Back in 1991 there were about 550,000 US hams, all of them code-tested. By
>> April of 2000 there were about 675,000 US hams, of which about 205,000
>> were
>> Techs. Since then the renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs clouds the issue.
>>
>> >How many SKs and dropouts would
>> >have reduced the population without the newcomers coming in to replace
>> them.
>>
>
>Now, there's a question that would be really hard to get answered, but it
>could be done. However, based on this discussion alone (the appearance of
>growth being influenced only by whether there is a CW test or not); I think
>there are more people driven by their ambition that driven by requirements.
>I think if I *want* to upgrade, I am going to do it regardless of test
>requirements. Really.

Heck, Kim, from what I know of you, if you got it into your head that you wanted
an Extra, you'd have one soon after the next VE session. Whatever it took.

>Yes, there are some that are driven more by the
>requirements--but I don't think it would end up being revealed that they are
>in a majority at all. Test requirements are not a stifler or an
>encouragement--either way.
>

>> Depends on the dropout rate. The important thing is you *assume* that we
>> wouldn't have any newcomers if they all had to pass code tests. That's
>> simply not a reasonable assumption.
>
>As much as I, being on the side of eliminating a CW (or any other mode)
>requirement, would like to jump on that bandwagon, I think it's a mistake to
>do so and get any real positive results out of it. However, the sum of all
>the avenues of non-CW testing folks is probably the only way there will ever
>be enough support to end CW testing <grin>.
>> >
>> >Maybe 50% is a slight stretch, but I'd guess not by a lot.
>>
>> I'd say an awful lot. Look up how many new hams we got per year in the
>> '80s compared to the '90s.
>> >
>> >> Yes, there are almost 260,000 Techs today - but a large number of them
>> >> are
>> >> actually Tech Pluses whom the FCC renewed as Techs since April 2000.
>> >
>> >Out of 10 years of NCTs, only a few years worth would fall into that
>> >category.
>>
>> The Tech hasn't had a code test for almost 13 years.
>
>Is that a good comparison? The Tech may not have...but what about the Tech+
>who, incidentally, has HF privileges and was that the motivating factor or
>did they just want a higher class of license.

Back before 1991, there was no choice. If somebody wanted a ham license they
had to do 5 wpm code. I know Techs who have been hams for 40+ years. Their
main interest is local work or VHF/UHF, and HF holds no appeal to them. I've
heard many say they're far more interested in talking to people who are
neighbors
and who they will actually interact with in person, rather than strangers
hundreds or
thousands of miles away that they will probably never meet and who they may
never
even QSO more than once.

>How many Generals and Extras
>are out there that upgraded (with or without CW) and don't ever really *use*
>their privileges.

I know plenty who are inactive or nearly so because their lives simply don't
allow it. I went through several years when my only operating was 2 meter
FM because I didn't have the time or space for an HF station or antenna.

>Remember that the ARRL's interest would also be in having
>enough numbers of hams to drive their "use them or lose them" campaigns
>(boring as they may be). This, by the way, is also why I believe the ARRL
>is not the successful agency it would like to believe it is. It is very

>apparent that the ARRL has failed to move past being a welcome mat.

Well, maybe, but there are other factors. For one, how many of the 683,000
hams in the database are active at all? With 10 year licenses, many of them
are SKs, or have lost interest, or are on hiatus for a while.

Just consider the SK situation. Suppose that just 2% of the amateur population
dies in any given year. In most cases, they will still be in the database until
their
license runs out. With 10 year licenses, that means the *average* SK stays in
the database for 5 years after he/she has gone to the Big Hamshack......

5 years at 2% a year means that 10% of the database is actually SKs. That's
over 68,000 hams!
>
>> FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for 3 years, 8 months and 18
>> days.
>> If no rules changes are made, there will not be any Tech Pluses at all in
>> 6 years, 3 months and 13 days from now.
>
>Hmmmm, but I will still have the same privileges as I do as a Tech+.

Yep - as long as you keep old license documents showing that you held a T+.

>So,
>for someone who cares, where's the downside of that? I don't care if I'm
>called a Tech or a Tech+--that concept is only important to some but not all
>hams--but I do care whether I can get on the radio or not. And the radio I
>care to get on is a FM transceiver using 2M predominantly (if at all
>because, heck, I haven't been on the radio in over a year).

My point is simply that some people may point to the large number of Techs
as "proof" of something or other, denying the fact that a growing number of
them are actually Tech Pluses.
>
>> >I would bet that a LOT of the Tech Pluses that existed in April of 2000
>> >are now
>> >Generals or Extras, rather than having been renewed as Techs with code
>> >credit.
>>
See? Carl denies that a large number of Tech Pluses may be perfectly happy
with their licenses.

>> How many is "a lot"? The number of Tech Pluses has dropped by about half
>> since
>> April 2000. Some of that drop is due to upgrades. Some of it is due to
>> dropouts. And some of it is due to renewal as Techs.
>
>I think Carl would find his statement to be false, or closer to false than
>truth.

Me, too. Remember too that code waivers have been around even longer than
a no-code-test license, so anyone who wanted to upgrade and found the code

tests above 5 wpm to be a "barrier" could have done so by the waiver route.
And many did just that.
>
>> To say that we'd only have 340,000 hams today if all hams were code-tested
>> is simply not reasonable.
>>
>> Here are some numbers:
>>
>> In order to grow from 350K to 550K in 12 years, the number of newcomers
>> would
>> have to be at least 17,000 per year, even if there were no dropouts at
>> all.
>>
>> Now let's suppose that the changes of 1991 never happened, and that we
>> were
>> still getting only 17,000 new hams per year. And suppose that the dropout
>> rate
>> of those 1991 hams from then to the present was 2.5% per year .(average
>> ham
>> "career" of 40 years).
>>
>> Then in the 12 years, we'd have lost about 26% of those who were hams in
>> 1991.
>> That's a loss of 143,000 hams, bringing the total down to 407,000. We'd
>> have
>> gained 204,000 new hams, bringing the total up to 611,000.
>>
>> That's a long way from 340,000.
>
>I agree, Jim. And, if NCI *and* the ARRL are ever going to change, or even
>understand, fluctuations in the numbers and in the numbers of license
>classes way more study and analysis needs to be done. Some, in fact, would
>be better than none.

Sure - but it's tough to do studies because the target keeps changing. For example, the FCC started issuing 10 year licenses (up from 5 years) back in 1984. That change means there were *no* expirations at all from 1989 to 1994. How do we figure that into the numbers game? Or the changes in vanity call rules that affect when licenses expire?

73 de Jim, N2EY

235. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:07:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <srLJb.2790$uF6.1179950@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84961
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

WA3MOJ wrote:
> In article <S7FJb.2583$uF6.1100769@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo says...
>
>>WA3MOJ wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Well I must be braindead too then.I hope that bpl comes to my town so I can
>>>afford something besides a dial up connection.
>>
>> As long as you're satisfied with something that doesn't work!
>>
>> - Mike
>>
>
> Clueless newbie.

Got me pegged! 8^)

236. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:12:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <%wLJb.2794$uF6.1180759@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84962

Bert Craig wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<AwDJb.22179$IM3.18318@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>>news:b7d1465c.0401030606.33b7a452@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>
>> news:<dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>>
>>>>The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
>>>>the speed increases.
>>>
>>>Mike, I believe the bandwidth actually decreases as the speed increases.
>>>
>>>
>>>>The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>>>>dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
>>>>kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>>>>
>>>>Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
>>>>ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
>>>>of the fun out of it.
>>>
>>>Bummer, hope it was just a one-time anomaly.
>>>
>>>
>>>>What the heck , over?
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>73 de Bert
>>>WA2SI
>>
>>A one time anomaly????? W1AW is a bulletin station. Been there, on or
>>about for 90 years.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Geez Dan, I thought it might've been a malfunction at W1AW...hence the
> "anomaly" statement.

I was kind of hoping that it was a problem too. I've seen other CW signals on the waterfall, and they aren't that wide or nasty looking. Hopefully W1AW has been putting out a better looking signal for most of thos 90 years! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

237. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:14:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lyLJb.2795$uF6.1181160@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84963

Robert Casey wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider
>> as the speed increases.
>
>
> CW code signals are around 100Hz wide, IIRC.
>
>>
>>
>> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
>> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>
>
> It might seem so if your receiver was in SSB mode. A narrowband signal
> will still be
> heard throughout the passband of a filter set for a wideband mode.
> Also, if you were in CW receive mode instead, the receiver's AGC will
> make the
> attenuation of that filter's side skirts seem worse. What would be 10dB
> down without
> AGC will look like only say 3dB if the AGC is enabled. Especially as
> you mentioned
> (below) that w1aw was a strong signal.

Okay, but would it wreck the other signals as a matter of course? That's
what I worry about.

>>
>>
>> Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
>> ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
>> of the fun out of it.
>
>
>
>

238. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:22:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BFLJb.2799$uF6.1182597@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84964

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Mike,
>
> You're received a number of good answers. As for measuring bandwidth, I've
> used exactly two receivers that would be suitable for accurate measurement,
> and I couldn't afford either of them. With stability measured in 10 to the
> 9th power and accuracy at 10 to the 8th, these little babes were well over
> $50,000 in the mid 90s. LOL. Oh, and that doesn't include the cost of the
> IF spectrum analyser that was connected to one of them, nor any other costs
> such as calibrated antennas.
>
> As stated, the rise and fall times of the waveform determine the bandwidth;
> often the receiver can deceive you as to what the bandwidth is.
>
> Of course, it is possible there may have been a problem at W1AW.

W1AW trouble would be my guess. The signal didn't "look right", which
is to say it didn't look like the CW signals we've coexisted with on
3580 until now. And the other ops were complaining about it too, and
some were a good deal further from W1AW than I am.

- Mike KB3EIA -

239. WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:50:46 UTC
From: Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com>
Message-ID: <bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 84965
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
grind against anyone who complains about illegal
radio operation and notice please that none of them
have a license. They target hams and pick random
call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
and harassment.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sun Jan 4 04:50:46 2004 depuis l'IP : ac896116.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

240. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:58:04 UTC
From: Peterbilt@RunOverYoreMomma.com
Message-ID: <b4622bf0a99b2888c9260f8ff060bd7a@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 84967
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Bonnie Prince Charlie wrote:
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.

How much does he charge for an ounce of kind bud?

--

___________________________
Truckers get the best $20 whores
```

241. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 03:58:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF78F72.664BB8E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84966

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >> The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider
> >> as the speed increases.
> >
> >
> > CW code signals are around 100Hz wide, IIRC.
> >
> >>
> >>
> >> The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
> >> dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
> >> kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
> >
> >
> > It might seem so if your receiver was in SSB mode. A narrowband signal
> > will still be
> > heard throughout the passband of a filter set for a wideband mode.
> > Also, if you were in CW receive mode instead, the receiver's AGC will
> > make the
> > attenuation of that filter's side skirts seem worse. What would be 10dB
> > down without
> > AGC will look like only say 3dB if the AGC is enabled. Especially as
> > you mentioned
> > (below) that w1aw was a strong signal.
>
> Okay, but would it wreck the other signals as a matter of course? That's
> what I worry about.

Don't know if anyone has yet quizzed you as to whether you had your
noise blanker activated. That could cause the things you mention.

Dave K8MN

242. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 04:09:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt83i6$r40@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84968

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040103220020.11891.00003405@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <bt6fvo$med@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040102235645.11891.00003365@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >> In article <JM-cnafi68NNwGiiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >Of that 423k US hams who are not Techs, how many do you suppose
started
> >> >out as Techs and have since upgraded?
> >>
> >> I don't know, exactly. Neither do you, I bet ;-)
> >>
> >> But why does it matter?
> >>
> >There's a more poignant question that it reveals on the surface.
>
> I'm glad somebody picked up on that!
>

I like the between the line part of discussions; good "listening" will hear
what's really being said and going on in the background, right?

>
> > The only thing the ARRL apparently successfully
> >*helps* with (but is not solely responsible for) is getting *new* hams
> >involved. If that statement is true--and it's probably more true than
> >not--then what does the ARRL need to do to move past just getting new
folks
> >to the hobby/service of amateur radio?
>
> Publicity is a big thing, but it can be hard to come by because most
people
> just aren't going to "get" amateur radio.
>

I agree...and even if they "get" it, the draw of the internet, cellular
phones (heck we may as well start calling them cellular devices), etc. will
detract from any interest they may have in radio. People can now transmit
pictures, video, and even play games and chat over cellular phones. The

cost is substantially less than it was and nearly anyone can afford them these days. I've heard of parents who give cellular phones to the kids so they can all keep in touch (man, that woulda been a real bummer for me...but) ;)

>
> > When I decided to become a
> >licensed amateur radio operator I gave no thought at all to what it would
> >take to get my license; only that I needed to meet the requirements at hand.
> >It was only *after* I entered the service that any conginitive thought was
> >made as to license upgrades for the purpose of more bandwidth, privileges,
> >etc.
> >
> Exactly! Once you decided you wanted in, the tests were simply a task to be
> performed to get the license.
>

And, it is *that* desire, emotion, need, want--whatever--that the ARRL needs to capitalize on. I am not a professional marketer...I only dabble in the concepts, but it can be done. Somehow. That moment of catching someone who turns their eye and interest at exactly the right moment...what is it that did that to them? Harness that, and the ARRL walks away from being a status quo organization to getting more folks into the hobby...hmmm, I just did a little bit of turnabout on my opinion there, didn't I? I criticized the ARRL for being a welcome mat and that is exactly what I meant they should be! What the criticism should be is that they *don't* have more strategies to grow the ARS--they merely maintain.

I think the discussion got a little diluted with mention of the "to upgrade or not to" issue. But, that's OK, I can keep up ;)

> >
> >If this thread is indeed still discussing the ARRL(?)--the ARRL itself needs
> >to consider these questions--probably needs to poll current hams and get a
> >professional marketing agency to figure out how to move beyond just being a
> >welcome mat and deciding if they also need to take on the task of getting
> >people to migrate to higher license classes or what those higher license
> >classes "get" you (because there may not always take a higher license
> >classes along with the privileges of the "extra" bandwidth, etc.).
>
> But why should they upgrade if they're satisfied with what they've got - like
> you are, Kim? Sure, offer help and information, but if someone's happy,
> don;t push.

>

See? We got a little diluted, there. HOWEVER, I agree...there is no reason people should feel pressured to upgrade; if they do they are buying into the masses that attempt to make them feel that way. By the way, rewrite *everything* up above about the ARRL from the perspective that what they need to do is figure out how to move beyond being a status quo organization and *become* a welcome mat for the ARS... Gads, I wasn't even drinking...LOL

> >
> >> From 1979 to 1991, the number of US hams grew from about 350,000 to about
> >> 550,000 - all of them code-tested. From 1991 to 2003, the number grew from
> >> about 550,000 to about 683,000. (If someone has more accurate numbers,
> >> please
> >> post them!). We had growth with code tests and growth without code tests.
> >
> >It's those fluctuations in the numbers that need to be analyzed. What was
> >going on economically, politically, educationally, even migrationally, in
> >this country at those times? 200,000 vs. 133,000 in growth in two entirely
> >different phases of years, but the same number of years.
>
> Well, a bunch of things, from the economy to the politics to lifestyle changes.
> Then there's the 'net and cellphones and (as you pointed out some time back)
> people having less time for organized hobbies and other activities.
>

Yeah, and I truly think that the above is a hard thing to overcome in terms of keeping the ARS out in front of people to get them interested. The only thing I could think of that would work--and it would have to be a culture thing rather than just an ARS thing--is working at it from a "tradition" perspective. There will always be people who can inspire an appreciation for tradition. And, there's a *lot* of tradition in ham radio.

If the games of football, basketball, etc., can "get" people, then the ARS can. We also have to remember that it's probably a 50/50 effort between the ARS and amateurs who can take up the torch for the ARS. And, as mentioned above--we're running short on time. :(

>
> >And, Jim, I know
> >('least I think I know) you will agree that CW testing or not may have
> >nothing at all to do with the fact whether there was more or less growth at
> >either time.

>
> EXACTLY!
>
> And yet code testing - even the 5 wpm test that's all we have left - is
held up
> as some sort of "barrier" that is keeping out huge numbers of wonderful
> people who will bring about a new Golden Age....
>

Psshawww, the CW test is no barrier and that is pure hogwash. There are
folks who post to this newsgroup who are bigger barriers to the ARS than
CW...

>
> >It could have nothing *at all* to do with testing structure
> >because, as I said, I didn't really take enough time to say, "wait a
minute,
> >what are the requirements and will they ever change?," etc.
> >
> Sure. Oh, there will be a surge of growth - but then it will drop off.
> >>
> >> Back in 1991 there were about 550,000 US hams, all of them code-tested.
By
> >> April of 2000 there were about 675,000 US hams, of which about 205,000
> >> were
> >> Techs. Since then the renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs clouds the issue.
> >>
> >> >How many SKs and dropouts would
> >> >have reduced the population without the newcomers coming in to replace
> >> them.
> >>
> >
> >Now, there's a question that would be really hard to get answered, but it
> >could be done. However, based on this discussion alone (the appearance
of
> >growth being influenced only by whether there is a CW test or not); I
think
> >there are more people driven by their ambition that driven by
requirements.
> >I think if I *want* to upgrade, I am going to do it regardless of test
> >requirements. Really.
>
> Heck, Kim, from what I know of you, if you got it into your head that you
> wanted
> an Extra, you'd have one soon after the next VE session. Whatever it took.
>

Uh oh...I am spending too much time here again :)

>
> >How many Generals and Extras

> >are out there that upgraded (with or without CW) and don't ever really
use
> >their privileges.
>
> I know plenty who are inactive or nearly so because their lives simply
don't
> allow it. I went through several years when my only operating was 2 meter
> FM because I didn't have the time or space for an HF station or antenna.
>

Yep. And, I love the couch potatoe upgraders who sneer at those who don't upgrade! It's so funny to hear them snarling and then ask them, "hey, where's your HF setup?"

> >
> >Remember that the ARRL's interest would also be in having
> >enough numbers of hams to drive their "use them or lose them" campaigns
> >(boring as they may be). This, by the way, is also why I believe the
ARRL
> >is not the successful agency it would like to believe it is. It is very
> >apparent that the ARRL has failed to move past being a welcome mat.
>
> Well, maybe, but there are other factors. For one, how many of the 683,000
> hams in the database are active at all? With 10 year licenses, many of
them
> are SKs, or have lost interest, or are on hiatus for a while.
>
> Just consider the SK situation. Suppose that just 2% of the amateur
population
> dies in any given year. In most cases, they will still be in the database
until
> their
> license runs out. With 10 year licenses, that means the *average* SK stays
in
> the database for 5 years after he/she has gone to the Big Hamshack......
>
> 5 years at 2% a year means that 10% of the database is actually SKs.
That's
> over 68,000 hams!
> >
> >> FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for 3 years, 8 months and 18
> >> days.
> >> If no rules changes are made, there will not be any Tech Pluses at all
in
> >> 6 years, 3 months and 13 days from now.
> >
> >Hmmmm, but I will still have the same privileges as I do as a Tech+.
>
> Yep - as long as you keep old license documents showing that you held a
T+.
>

ROFLMAO!!! Larry'll be so happy to hear that!

> >
> >So,
> >for someone who cares, where's the downside of that? I don't care if I'm
> >called a Tech or a Tech+--that concept is only important to some but not
all
> >hams--but I do care whether I can get on the radio or not. And the radio
I
> >care to get on is a FM transceiver using 2M predominantly (if at all
> >because, heck, I haven't been on the radio in over a year).
>
> My point is simply that some people may point to the large number of Techs
> as "proof" of something or other, denying the fact that a growing number
of
> them are actually Tech Pluses.
> >

Oh, I know. I was "writing out loud." I looked my call up on QRZ today (wow what a bunch of hits...but I digress) and I thought this was the year I had to renew my license, but it's in 2008. I guess that has something to do with changing my callsign...don't know, because it's been "around" ten years that I've been licensed...or it seems so anyway.

> >> >I would bet that a LOT of the Tech Pluses that existed in April of
2000
> >> >are now
> >> >Generals or Extras, rather than having been renewed as Techs with code
> >> >credit.
> >>
> See? Carl denies that a large number of Tech Pluses may be perfectly happy
> with their licenses.
>

Y'know...I didn't catch that the first time around. Is there an implication from Carl that there should be some kind of stigma attached to being "renewed at Techs with code credit"? I don't get that at all, if so. Are there really people who would think anything of that?!

> >>
> >> How many is "a lot"? The number of Tech Pluses has dropped by about
half
> >> since
> >> April 2000. Some of that drop is due to upgrades. Some of it is due to
> >> dropouts. And some of it is due to renewal as Techs.
> >
> >I think Carl would find his statement to be false, or closer to false
than
> >truth.
>
> Me, too. Remember too that code waivers have been around even longer than
> a no-code-test license, so anyone who wanted to upgrade and found the code
> tests above 5 wpm to be a "barrier" could have done so by the waiver

route.
> And many did just that.
> >
> >> To say that we'd only have 340,000 hams today if all hams were
code-tested
> >> is simply not reasonable.
> >>
> >> Here are some numbers:
> >>
> >> In order to grow from 350K to 550K in 12 years, the number of newcomers
> >> would
> >> have to be at least 17,000 per year, even if there were no dropouts at
> >> all.
> >>

Well, you've done some of the work for the ARRL...grin. And, they better
get busy!

> >>
> >> Now let's suppose that the changes of 1991 never happened, and that we
> >> were
> >> still getting only 17,000 new hams per year. And suppose that the
dropout
> >> rate
> >> of those 1991 hams from then to the present was 2.5% per year .(average
> >> ham
> >> "career" of 40 years).
> >>
> >> Then in the 12 years, we'd have lost about 26% of those who were hams
in
> >> 1991.
> >> That's a loss of 143,000 hams, bringing the total down to 407,000. We'd
> >> have
> >> gained 204,000 new hams, bringing the total up to 611,000.
> >>
> >> That's a long way from 340,000.
> >
> >I agree, Jim. And, if NCI *and* the ARRL are ever going to change, or
even
> >understand, fluctuations in the numbers and in the numbers of license
> >classes way more study and analysis needs to be done. Some, in fact,
would
> >be better than none.
>
> Sure - but it's tough to do studies because the target keeps changing. For
> example, the FCC started issuing 10 year licenses (up from 5 years) back
in
> 1984. That change means there were *no* expirations at all from 1989 to
1994.
> How do we figure that into the numbers game? Or the changes in vanity call
> rules that affect when licenses expire?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

The target may not be as elusive as that. The "spark" that gets ignited with ham radio has nothing to do with "all that" and everything to do with the fascination of picking up a microphone and talking into it (sorry CW lovers...it's the truth for the majority). It's at the moment that the interest is sparked that the "deal has to be made." In other words, I think the only way to "grow" the ARS is to have venues (and I'm not talking about ham radio clubs) for ham radio. Childrens' wards at hospitals, scouting and other civil organizations, YM/YWCAs, etc. Why not develop a "Salvation Army" of ham radio?

Oh good grief...I'm the trainer and I tell people every day...you came up with the idea, you run with it. Uh uh...I was just "writing out loud again" and I am going to go have a drink and forget it...<grin>

Kim W5TIT

243. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 04:27:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cDMJb.36029$Pg1.11974@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84969

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote

>
> IIRC the accepted standard for measuring occupied bandwidth is -26
> dB, which includes 99% of the signal.
>

For regulatory purposes, I think you're probably correct (or close to correct --- -30dB sticks in my mind). Path engineering types tend to be more conservative because we actually have to make the circuit work. Since bandwidth is a constrained resource, communications planners tend to treat it like money and "make less do more" --- when you're aiming for BER's of better than 1 x 10 to minus10, your 1% of remaining energy can pretty badly farkle up an adjacent path.

73, de Hans, K0HB

244. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 04:51:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7ZMJb.36054$Pg1.12973@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84970

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?

-----> W1MK

> There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?

-----> W1INF

More trivia: There is an IARU HQ call sign. What is it? While it may
have a certain familiarity about it, especially the suffix, what is the
significance of the prefix?

73, de Hans, K0HB

245. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 05:06:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ne6fvv4i13pbsltal1mhl5md8f2q39h668@4ax.com>
Source record: 84971

Mike,

I didn't get very far with this concept when I tried to introduce it a few months back either. I thought at the time that it might at least get some out-of-the-box thinking going, and remove the bonds of history and tradition which so often form the basis of reason for discussions in this forum -- but alas, it met a simlilar fate......

Ironicaly, one of the responses that you received was, with respect to the history of amateur radio, "Take that away, and it could not be anything close to what it is now". Say, wasn't that the whole point of the discussion? :)

Good try, though!

73, Leo

On Sat, 03 Jan 2004 18:08:49 GMT, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>snip
>
>Okay, I give up. This was an attempt to get people to use their
>imaginations, but other than Hans, no one want to play.
>
>Let's get back to debating Morse code!! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

246. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 05:10:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ifNJb.2836$uF6.1203615@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84975

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider
>>>>as the speed increases.
>>>
>>>
>>>CW code signals are around 100Hz wide, IIRC.
>>>
>>>
>>>>The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>>>>dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast. And it's some 700
>>>>kHz wide!!! And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>>>
>>>
>>>It might seem so if your receiver was in SSB mode. A narrowband signal
>>>will still be
>>>heard throughout the passband of a filter set for a wideband mode.
>>>Also, if you were in CW receive mode instead, the receiver's AGC will
>>>make the
>>>attenuation of that filter's side skirts seem worse. What would be 10dB
>>>down without
>>>AGC will look like only say 3dB if the AGC is enabled. Especially as
>>>you mentioned
>>>(below) that w1aw was a strong signal.
>>
>>Okay, but would it wreck the other signals as a matter of course? That's
>>what I worry about.
>
>
> Don't know if anyone has yet quizzed you as to whether you had your
> noise blanker activated. That could cause the things you mention.

Nope, Just checked, and it is off. Not going to be much PSK on 3580
tonight. Must be an RTTY contest going on. Never saw so many RTTY
signals at one time!

- Mike KB3EIA -

247. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 05:41:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <fWqdnftD6LNTOmqiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84972

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqxrmi1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 03 Jan 2004 20:21:22 GMT, Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
> >Effective bandwidth is an actual on-the-air measurement of the width of
the
> >signal at some designated level, most commonly -60dB referenced to the
peak.
>
> IIRC the accepted standard for measuring occupied bandwidth is -26
> dB, which includes 99% of the signal.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

That's the ANSI standard spec ... however it's not universally used.

Carl - wk3c

248. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 05:45:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <MWWdnWoMQL8nNWqiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84973

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:7ZMJb.36054$Pg1.12973@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?
>
> -----> W1MK
>
>
> > There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?
>
> -----> W1INF
>
>
> More trivia: There is an IARU HQ call sign. What is it? While it may
> have a certain familiarity about it, especially the suffix, what is the
> significance of the prefix?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

4U1ITU is the station of the International Amateur Radio Club at ITU
HQ in Geneva ... I've operated the station. The significance of the
prefix is that 4U's are UN callsigns.

73,
Carl - wk3c

249. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 05:45:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kMNJb.2840$uF6.1210845@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84974

Leo wrote:

> Mike,
>
> I didn't get very far with this concept when I tried to introduce it a
> few months back either. I thought at the time that it might at least
> get some out-of-the-box thinking going, and remove the bonds of
> history and tradition which so often form the basis of reason for
> discussions in this forum -- but alas, it met a simlilar fate......
>
> Ironicaly, one of the responses that you received was, with respect to
> the history of amateur radio, "Take that away, and it could not be
> anything close to what it is now". Say, wasn't that the whole point
> of the discussion? :)
>
> Good try, though!

Hey Leo, Good to see you on my screen again! Tell you what. I'll start with what I think would happen, and if you like, you can join in. Maybe we can P**s off someone that they might comment.....;^)

Okay, here goes:

With a new service coming into play, a major mode would be digital voice. Repeaters will be allowed, and these repeaters on the 144 mHz band will also be digital FM, as will HT's. Repeaters and the HT's would be allowed to send images as well as voice.

Digital non-voice modes would include a PSK mode for typewritten material, and a high speed packet network would be allowed (remember that it takes some time to get these things going, and although allowed, would not happen for some time.

Small portions of each band would be set aside for experimentation, and here is the place where unusual methods of communication could be used. This would include things like OOK Morse or other encoding schemes or SSB.

Testing would be quite different that today. The most obvious difference is that there would be a lot more digital material covered in the tests. I would envision the basic digital building blocks tested. In addition, there would be the basic electrical theory and of course those questions about the various bands. (of course this would be a lot easier, since there would be less bands to cover) There would also be questions regarding proper operating etiquette.

A newly formed group, the Radio Readiness Association for Preparedness (RRAP) is formed, and sets up the first contest/practice run in this

year. Sorry - I couldn't resist! 8^)

One license, one class. 1KW maximum. No Morse code test.

- Mike KB3EIA -

250. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 06:06:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <p3OJb.36165$Pg1.31168@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84976

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

> 4U1ITU is the station of the International Amateur Radio Club at ITU
> HQ in Geneva ... I've operated the station. The significance of the
> prefix is that 4U's are UN callsigns.

I'm not speaking of the ITU but the IARU (not the same thing at all). The
IARU HQ station is not associated with the UN (nor the ITU) so does not have
a "4U" prefix.

73, de Hans, K0HB

251. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 09:04:16 UTC
From: Paul Jordan <pauljordan@gci.net>
Message-ID: <vvflnpo3ugnpef@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 84977
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Well, if you're going to get that many clues, make sure you leave a decent sized tip.. Don't want the clue salesmen in here whining about hams not tipping..

"N8KDV" <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net> wrote in message news:3FF747E1.6691642D@nospam.iserv.net...
>
>
> WA3MOJ wrote:
>
> > Go buy a clue also.
>
> And of course I'll be happy to pick up a couple dozen for you! :-)
>
> >
> >
> > In article <3FF729A6.9026D95E@nospam.iserv.net>, N8KDV says...
> > >
> > >Guess I'll need to order a whole case of Thread Be Gone...
> > >
> > >polycarbonate blue wrote:
> > >
> > >> "JQ" <712@jhnetno.net> wrote in message news:bt450sgoj0@pita.alt.net...
> > >> >
> > >> > Last year in Dayton one restaurant had a sign in the
> > >> > window:
> > >> >
> > >> > "Ham Radio Groups Have 15% Gratuity Added To Check"
> > >> >
> > >> > JQ
> > >>
> > >> (..don't laugh, or on second thought, DO laugh
> > >> folks, he ain't kidding. I saw just such a sign in
> > >> the window of an eatery about 1 mile away
> > >> from the Hara Arena during Hamvention
> > >> weekend - apparently our "reputation preceeds
> > >> us amongst the local business establishments
> > >> 'grape vine' whenever it's 'ham fest weekend')
> > >>
> > >> >"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
> > >> news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >> > Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country

> > >> > Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> > >> > a judge of male character.
> > >> >
> > >> > Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> > >> > come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> > >> > a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> > >> > The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> > >> > Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> > >> > Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
> > >> >
> > >> > Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> > >> > Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> > >> > the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> > >> > service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> > >> > The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> > >> > computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> > >> > how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> > >> > they have.
> > >> >
> > >> > "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> > >> > said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few
pennies
> > >> > and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> > >> > hours after they're gone.
> > >> >
> > >> > "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >
>

252. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 09:24:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401040124.65b328b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84978

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401031632.55e2c848@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401020150.140d453@posting.google.com>...

> > It is only "tired" if you don't have the cajones to keep up,
> > Brain.
>
> A little chest puffery?

It ain't braggin' if ya done it, Brain.

ULS will acknowledge that >>I<< did it.

> > It's not about "class distinctions", unless that's all you fixate
> > on, Brain. It's about meeting the requirements of the Basis and
> > Purpose of Part 97, and meeting Congress' expectation that in return
> > for our generous allocations.
>
> Did that a long time ago.

Still puttering along at General, I see.

> > By the way, our allocations are by no means guaranteed. Too bad
> > people like you can't see past your own selfishness to see that.
>
> Too bad people like you can't see it. Too busy being self-important.

I've been proactive in the Spectrum Protection bills, Brain.

Don't remember seeing your name or call in there anywhere.

And not for "self", but for everyone...Protect It Or Lose It.

> > I've very clearly stated on several occassions that my learning
> > curve didn't stop with my Extra.
>
> Yet your climb up the ARS ladder did. Why, with a one license ARS
> would learning stop???

In a small..repeat SMALL..percent, it wouldn't. But the majority
would.

> > Please stop being arrogant.
>
> Rational argument is arrogance?

No, it's not. And when you offer something rational, we'll
discuss it. So far you have nothing rational to offer.

> > > You couldn't be more wrong. Again.
> >
> > I'm not the one who just made a very obvious assumption based
> > upon a personal prejudice, Brain.
>
> State the assumption.

YOUR assertion that I "stated" that learning stops when you get
to Extra.

I never said anything of the like.

And we're STILL waiting for YOU to cite the post wherein I said
it...That request was four or five exchanges ago, and you ahve yet to
produce anything.

An assertion of fact without basis in fact is a lie. Why did you
lie?

> State the personal prejudice.

Yours against me.

> Why, if learning doesn't stop with the Amateur Extra exam, would it
> stop with a one exam ARS?
>
> This is a test in rational discussion. Do try your best to pass it.

FACTS prove that when people are not engaged with a challenge to
excel, they become complacent and stagnant.

Our entire society is based upon goal-oriented achivement. You
do just enough to "get by", then "get by" is all you get. You make
your mark on Wall Street, you get the keys to the executive washroom.

> > > > A tiered one does.
> > >
> > > No more than a one license ARS.
> >
> > Then this proves you ignorant of the facts, Brain.
>
> Enlighten me.

We've tried. You've resisted.

> Stebe, countless garments at the store claim "one size fits all."

A page from Daddy, I see.

Yes, many items >CLAIM< to be "one size fits all".

Now...DO they...?!?!

> > Unless you can provide some tangible examples that contradict
> > that?
>
> Pantyhose.

Oooops...still doesn't work. Betcha I can find a pair of "one
size fits all" pantyhose that won't fit my 12 year old daugher >>OR<<
my ex-mother-in-law.

(Try again...everyone hates someone who wimps out the first time
they get their nose bloodied...)

> > That you percieve that I do means you have an inferiorty problem
> > that keeps you in a subjugated position. Deal with it, Brain.
>
> You're much easier to deal with.

I dare say so.

Many people who share your problem always find it easier to solve
other peoples "problems" than to face their own.

> > > Allow the ham to show the world his real achievements, not some
> > > government supported and forced Merit Badge system of false
> > > achievements.
> >
> > You are truly lost, Brain....wrapped up in symbology, rhetoric
> > and the need to denigrate and demean anything you cannot or will not
> > endeavor to understand or accept.
> >
> > Pity you.
>
> The King of Denigration has spoken.

It ain't denigration if it's true, Brain.

Sucks to be you.

Steve, K4YZ

253. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 09:24:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401040124.5ea69a53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84979

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401031632.55e2c848@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401020150.140d453@posting.google.com>...

> > It is only "tired" if you don't have the cajones to keep up,
> > Brain.
>
> A little chest puffery?

It ain't braggin' if ya done it, Brain.

ULS will acknowledge that >>I<< did it.

> > It's not about "class distinctions", unless that's all you fixate
> > on, Brain. It's about meeting the requirements of the Basis and
> > Purpose of Part 97, and meeting Congress' expectation that in return
> > for our generous allocations.
>
> Did that a long time ago.

Still puttering along at General, I see.

> > By the way, our allocations are by no means guaranteed. Too bad
> > people like you can't see past your own selfishness to see that.
>
> Too bad people like you can't see it. Too busy being self-important.

I've been proactive in the Spectrum Protection bills, Brain.

Don't remember seeing your name or call in there anywhere.

And not for "self", but for everyone...Protect It Or Lose It.

> > I've very clearly stated on several occassions that my learning
> > curve didn't stop with my Extra.
>
> Yet your climb up the ARS ladder did. Why, with a one license ARS
> would learning stop???

In a small..repeat SMALL..percent, it wouldn't. But the majority
would.

> > Please stop being arrogant.
>
> Rational argument is arrogance?

No, it's not. And when you offer something rational, we'll
discuss it. So far you have nothing rational to offer.

> > > You couldn't be more wrong. Again.
> >
> > I'm not the one who just made a very obvious assumption based
> > upon a personal prejudice, Brain.
>
> State the assumption.

YOUR assertion that I "stated" that learning stops when you get
to Extra.

I never said anything of the like.

And we're STILL waiting for YOU to cite the post wherein I said
it...That request was four or five exchanges ago, and you ahve yet to
produce anything.

An assertion of fact without basis in fact is a lie. Why did you
lie?

> State the personal prejudice.

Yours against me.

> Why, if learning doesn't stop with the Amateur Extra exam, would it
> stop with a one exam ARS?
>
> This is a test in rational discussion. Do try your best to pass it.

FACTS prove that when people are not engaged with a challenge to
excel, they become complacent and stagnant.

Our entire society is based upon goal-oriented achivement. You
do just enough to "get by", then "get by" is all you get. You make
your mark on Wall Street, you get the keys to the executive washroom.

> > > > A tiered one does.
> > >
> > > No more than a one license ARS.
> >
> > Then this proves you ignorant of the facts, Brain.
>
> Enlighten me.

We've tried. You've resisted.

> Stebe, countless garments at the store claim "one size fits all."

A page from Daddy, I see.

Yes, many items >CLAIM< to be "one size fits all".

Now...DO they...?!?!

> > Unless you can provide some tangible examples that contradict
> > that?
>
> Pantyhose.

Oooops...still doesn't work. Betcha I can find a pair of "one
size fits all" pantyhose that won't fit my 12 year old daugher >>OR<<
my ex-mother-in-law.

(Try again...everyone hates someone who wimps out the first time
they get their nose bloodied...)

> > That you percieve that I do means you have an inferiorty problem
> > that keeps you in a subjugated position. Deal with it, Brain.
>
> You're much easier to deal with.

I dare say so.

Many people who share your problem always find it easier to solve
other peoples "problems" than to face their own.

> > > Allow the ham to show the world his real achievements, not some
> > > government supported and forced Merit Badge system of false
> > > achievements.
> >
> > You are truly lost, Brain....wrapped up in symbology, rhetoric
> > and the need to denigrate and demean anything you cannot or will not
> > endeavor to understand or accept.
> >
> > Pity you.
>
> The King of Denigration has spoken.

It ain't denigration if it's true, Brain.

Sucks to be you.

Steve, K4YZ

254. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 09:42:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401040142.115c8b1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84980

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401031619.7d475228@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401030826.4138771b@posting.google.com>...

> Stebe, just because you can spell rational doesn't mean you are
> rational.

OK...I will acept taht...however with the caveat that I am MORE
rational than you or your "mentor", Sir Creepy of Kalifornia

> > You make unsubstantiated assertions you cannot or will not back
> > up, then ask us to just accept it without the proof.
>
> I merely commented on your Basis and Purpose comment. Then I backed
> it up. You need to make a rational comment why the basis and purpose
> is satisfied by inventive licensing, but cannot be satisfied by a one
> license ARS.

Beacuse it's been PROVEN within the Amateur Community itself that
when rewards are withdrawn for achievement, that achievement stops.
How many people "upgraded" from General to Extra in the pre-Incentive
period, Brain?

> > > > You're starting off the New Year on the wrong foot, Brain...By
> > > > making assertions that are not substantiated by factual evidence.
> > > >
> > > > Welcome to 2004, MinnieLennie.
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > Steve, you said that the Basis and Purpose of self-learning cannot be
> > > achieved after a person has achieved their first license in a
> > > one-license system. That the Basis and Purpose can only be achieved
> > > in a multiple-license system.
> >
> > A "one license" system does not promote learning.
>
> Why not? What License have you been working toward since you earned
> Extra?

Registered Nurse.

GROL.

Commercial Pilot with Instructor and Instrument

> > A "one license" system promotes stagnation and mediocrity. Look
> > what a "classless" society did to Central Europe for 70+ years.
>
> Are you just begging for Len to come in here with his Hitler remarks?

Ahhhhh, yes...Lennie and his assertions of affiliation with the
Nazis for anyone who dares to cross HIS version of Life In Radio.

YOUR mentor, Brain...YOU said so.

> You are an idiot!

Not when compared to you, Brain.

> > As deftly pointed out by Jim, N2EY, the TRUE stagnation of the
> > Amateur Radio Service occured BEFORE Incentive Licensing.
>
> Did not.

OK...Need to go over the number again, Brain?

250,000 BEFORE Incentive Licensing, over 600,000 after.

Is there something in that math I missed?

> > Was the way the FCC implemented it wrong? Sure it was. But the
> > system worked.
> >
> > > I asked if self-learning occurs after the Extra license is achieved.
> >
> > Sure it does. And there are some cases where the licensee brings
> > his "self-learning" with him/her from an engineering
> > point-of-view...but thsoe folks are few and far between.
> >
> > > Give me a rational answer why it cannot occur after someone achieves a
> > > license in a one-license system.
> >
> > Can it occur? Sure it can.
>
> Thank you. Finally an honest answer from one of you PCTA. I'll mark
> my calendar.

You get LOTS of "honest answers". That you care to ignore them
is YOUR choice, not a lack of facts.

> Does it usually or routinely occur?

Routinely. Again, you proactively ignore them.

Your bust.

> > Nope.
>
> Doesn't occur after Extra either. And ex-communicated Jim's proposal
> was for all the pools to be combined, so it was the equavilant of
> Extra.

>
> So, in the end, you just don't know what you're talking about.

Uh huh...right.

> > Now, here's one for YOU, Brain...cite for me some grand example
> > of "one size fits all and promotes learning" example from ANY aspect
> > of our society...One that can't be refuted at some level.
> >
> No.

That's what I thought.

> > I'll be waiting, but I won't be holding my breath.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Oh, please do.

Sorry...I have things to do.

Steve, K4YZ

255. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 12:08:34 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040104070834.695$DE@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84981
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> and harassment.
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Jan 4 04:50:46 2004 depuis l'IP : ac896116.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> 532284301978]
>
You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the man in the moon
too, jackass.

Be careful when accusing people, you putz. Paybacks can be a real
bitch.

256. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 12:29:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104072950.29660.00002360@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 84982

In article <7ZMJb.36054$Pg1.12973@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?
>
> -----> W1MK

You are correct, sir! And before that, it was 1MK

>> There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?
>
> -----> W1INF
>
"It's Never Finished" - again correct.

>More trivia: There is an IARU HQ call sign. What is it?

That's easy: NU1AW

>While it may
>have a certain familiarity about it, especially the suffix, what is the
>significance of the prefix?

The original system for licensed amateur calls was a number and two or three letters. Maxim held 1AW, for example. This worked fine until amateur began working internationally and there was no way to tell what country a ham was in. When the first shortwave QSO was made by in November of 1925, the stations involved were 1QP, 1MO and 8AB - the last one being in France.

So amateurs invented the idea of unofficial prefixes. "NU" meant "North america, United states". So while Maxim's call was shown on the license as 1AW, on the air he would use NU1AW to indicate where he was. Other countries had different prefixes, all according to the unoffficial system

To emphasize that the prefixes were unofficial, they were usually written lower case: nu1AW

The situation was finally sorted out at one of the radio conferences of the '20s (1927, I think) and the USA decided that American ham calls would all start with W (in CONUS) and K (outside CONUS).

73 de Jim, N2EY

257. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 13:54:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MWUJb.20521$P%1.19646882@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84983

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031225180555.09599.00001473@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 12/25/03 5:01 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312251501.133978ef@posting.google.com>
> >
> > >Sounds like what we've inherited today. Let's do something rational
instead.
> >
> > It will be interesting to see what YOU call "rational".
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, you never pay attention, do you?
>
> I've said it many, many times. One amateur radio service, one amateur
> radio license. And maybe a learners permit as Hans suggests.
>
> How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> really want?

You will of course expect the licensing exam to be equivalent to the sum of
knowledge required for Tech, General and Extra for this single full
privilege license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

258. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 13:56:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104085657.07346.00002367@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84984

In article <gMOdnaX0wo0ApGqi4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Herbert Khaury"
<Herbert@tiptoe.tp> writes:

>"Aww, he's no fun. He fell right over."
>
"I spell my name...DANGER"

"Everyone knew her as Nancy"

"Don't crush that dwarf, hand me the pliers"

73 de Jim "still waiting for the electrician" N2EY

259. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:04:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <74VJb.20523$P%1.19648772@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84985

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040103220020.11891.00003405@mb-m11.aol.com...
> Sure - but it's tough to do studies because the target keeps changing. For
> example, the FCC started issuing 10 year licenses (up from 5 years) back
in
> 1984. That change means there were *no* expirations at all from 1989 to
1994.
> How do we figure that into the numbers game? Or the changes in vanity call
> rules that affect when licenses expire?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

After playing around search the FCC database, the previous license of the vanity holder appears to be marked as terminated not expired so that the vanity call rules do not effect the numbers if the search is done correctly. If one searches for expired only, what they get as a result are only those that have lapsed due to non-renewal not those terminated due to changes in call sign and not those terminated due to disciplinary actions by the FCC.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

260. Re: How wide is a Morse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:12:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BbVJb.20525$P%1.19649814@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84987

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ifNJb.2836$uF6.1203615@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>
> Nope, Just checked, and it is off. Not going to be much PSK on 3580
> tonight. Must be an RTTY contest going on. Never saw so many RTTY
> signals at one time!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yup, it's the ARRL RTTY Roundup. This is probably the biggest of the RTTY
contests.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

261. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:13:09 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0401040613.3f921416@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message news:<bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com>...
> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> and harassment.

Sorry, Charlie (really Georgie-girl Busch WA3MOJ). It's hardly > random < for someone to choose your callsign since you are the biggest TROLL in the cb newsgroup. If they target > you < it's because you deserve it for making so many fag posts and personal attacks on people you don't even know.

Why are you complaining about "forges" when > you < have been forging N8WWMs callsign for a couple of months now?

Nobody forges Jerry's name or callsign because he isn't a TROLL. And nobody else "may be next": Only you and DouGay Adair because you > are < TROLLs.

But it's really quite simple, simpleton: You stop and they'll stop. But that's too simple for your drunken mind to comprehend, isn't it?

262. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:16:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XeVJb.20526$P%1.19650430@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84988

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0401040124.65b328b2@posting.google.com...
>
> > Stebe, countless garments at the store claim "one size fits all."
>
> A page from Daddy, I see.
>
> Yes, many items >CLAIM< to be "one size fits all".
>
> Now...DO they...?!?!
>
> > > Unless you can provide some tangible examples that contradict
> > > that?
> >
> > Pantyhose.
>
> Oooops...still doesn't work. Betcha I can find a pair of "one
> size fits all" pantyhose that won't fit my 12 year old daugher >>OR<<
> my ex-mother-in-law.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I can guarantee you that the "one size fits all" pantyhose really don't.
Been there, done that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

263. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:20:18 UTC
From: Willy <hou@newcitynmail.net>
Message-ID: <bt97ejtto0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84989
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sadly, the White Trash element is taking over ham radio in
ever increasing numbers.

2 meters = CB
Hamfest = Freak Fest

Do you expect White Trash to leave a tip? No, but you do
expect them & 12 of their white trash butties to cram into a
motel room intended for two guests.

Even funnier, give White Trash a ham license, and they suddenly
become "enforcers" of CB radio rules.

Thanks ARRL!

Willy
Houston

264. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:33:51 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84990
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
<Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
> > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
> > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
> > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
> > about how one never plans on using it.
>
> Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
> even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.

That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most popular
mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r 20.

> > I'm not much into the newer
> > digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
> > communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
> > leads through some learning and testing re. said subjects.no problem.
> > (Psst, it's a character issue.)
>
> No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
> about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
> for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
> mode is set on that pedestal.

Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?

> > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
> > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> > > the harm, danger, etc?
> >
> > None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
> > skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
> > challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
> > same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
> > many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
> > their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing

> > away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
> > yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.
>
> You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
> have done so.

The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the entire ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.

> > Sorry, Bill. That may be the point you'd like to key on, (No pun
> > intended) but that's not the point I'm stressing. I agree 100% with
> > the sentence above. It's the slacker-mentality (Sorry, time to shoot
> > from the hip.) that I deplore. If we really want to get young folks
> > involved in AR, this is not a principle I'd like to see them learn.
>
> You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
> except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
> NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.

YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you! Yes, I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode that is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN AMATEUR USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry into, the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS today. Too easy, Bill.

> > If
> > you complain enough, the bar will be lowered for you. As a youth, the
> > concept of achievement (As well as a well-rounded education.) was
> > constantly stressed and I thank God I had folks (Parents, teachers,
> > guidance counselors, etc.) that cared enough to strongly encourage us
> > to achieve rather complain. I feel so sorry for the kids that are
> > recently got that curve on their Regents exam rather than enroll in a
> > summer program to increase their knowledge to the appropriate level.
> > Some will perform poorly in college and if enough of them complain
> > that their college curriculum is unfairly difficult, perhaps that bar
> > will be lowered as well. Interestingly enough, I now tend to seek out
> > those Elmers who will push me to become a better operator. IMHO, they
> > have my best interests at heart.
>
> My my, I guess the end of all amateur upgrading
> and new learning will be tied to the end of code
> testing. You must have really been disappointed when
> states stopped testing drivers on manual gearboxes.
> For me it was no problem. When my kids wanted
> to drive they learned or they had no car to drive as
> all our vehicles had been standard shift. Those that
> want to learn will. Trying to claim some great
> philosophical tie of ending code testing being

> the start of an end to new/old hams continuing to
> learn is just bunk.

We both know the manual gearshift analogy really doesn't work, so I'll skip that part. However, on the subject of you kids, weren't you the least bit concerned that some other impatient jackass might choose to jump in his college roomates car and just "wing it" down to the store for a pack of cigarettes? I've seen this at Wagner College in Staten Island. The "down" part refers to "down the hill" to Targee Ave. as cigarette machines were not allowed on campus. This is the jerk who'll say he's sorry over and over for hitting your kid's car. I guess that's why defensive driving is so important. Still...I'd sure be concerned.

> > > > > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW
knowledge/testing.
> > > >
> > > > Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
> > > > problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors
> > > > are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt
conscientiously
> > > > ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that
> > > > would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's
be
> > > > honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
> > > > themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even
call
> > > > them."slackers.")
> > >
> > > The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
> > > of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of any continued
need
> for code skills
> > > to be mandated for any HF access.
> >
> > I disagree, I truly believe that it's almost all about the required
> > effort.
>
> So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
> unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
> trying to have in place for any license level?

No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm) effort for two (Not any.) license levels.

> > Again, drop those published Q&A pools and watch the squirming
> > commence.
>
> It will never happen and I don't care if it did. The old
> ARRL and AMECO learners guides were just as easy to
> memorize sufficiently to pass. I did the General test in
> the late 50s exactly that way.

I have the Ameco Novice guide and I kinda like it.

> > Folks just don't want to be made to have to sit down for 20
> > mins., twice daily, for a month or two and memorize 43 Morse code
> > characters.
>
> Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
> already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
> on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
> is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
> determinator.

You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a valid test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first most popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the stand-alone, Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike speech.)

> > > There was, in the past, a rational reason
> > > or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
> > > It is that simple.
> >
> > There still is. It's the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> > today.
>
> Yet that failed to convince the FCC and, more
> recently the ITU. The point is that those bodies
> recognize that no one needs to know morse just to be
> issued a license. Those that wish to engage in
> morse contacts are free to learn morse and use it.
> The issue is solely the test requirement and has no
> link to actual morse use by anyone.

The FCC's goal is less work. (Something in common?)

> > > > BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
> > > > no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one
> > > > poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants
to
> > > > bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater
folks
> > > > feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex
operation
> > > > who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
> > > > Watts mentioned above.
> > >
> > > Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of
> > > current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
> > > code testing. PERIOD!
> >
> > Again, my dialogue is addressing the character issue involved re.
> > squeaking vs. achieving.
>
> That's just the old tripe argument that has convinced no one.

> The rony of your claim is that most of us that are the
> nucleus of NCI activity had already done the morse
> test at 5, 13 and/or 20 wpm. Nothing to gain now
> if code testing goes altogether.

Sometimes, the prospect of less work can be a powerful motivator.

> > Do you really want to focus on the code test,
> > Bill. Quite frankly, Element 1 is NOT much of a code test to focus on
> > and very rarely leaves anybody with any level of OTA proficiency. So
> > you see, it's not the actual code knowledge or lack thereof that makes
> > for the dangerous scenario.it's the associated mentality of those
> > who'd rather squeak than achieve that can possibly lead to harm.
>
> Yawn.

Sorry 'bout that.

> > > > > Had there been any relevant safety
> > > > > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
> > > >
> > > > You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer
the
> > > > BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"
> > >
> > > Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
> > > FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
> > > errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
> > > or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
> > > amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
> > > stop the FCC.
> >
> > Quite frankly, Bill.I'm no big fan of the FCC. You are, however,
> > correct.they're the only game in town. Do I think they make mistakes?
> > Sure, but I'm not sufficiently motivated to file a court action
> > against them. A few letters to my elected representatives and some
> > recreational debate on R.R.A.P suffices.
>
> What, no motivation? :-) :-)

Lol. :-)

> > Trust me, my bubble is very much intact. I came into AR approx. three
> > years ago pretty much oblivious to the code vs. no-code debate. All I
> > knew was that I wanted to be an ARO and operate HF. Like I've said
> > before, remove the whing and passion from both sides of the debate and
> > the obvious remains like a purple elephant in the living room.
>
> The FCC removed the winning/passion when they issued the R&O
> for 98-143. If you haven't read that yet, I suggest you do.

Will do.

> > > > > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement
> > > appear as
> > > if
> > > > > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then
meet
> the
> > > > > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just
the
> > > requirements
> > > > > > > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > > > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement
attained.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> > > > > >
> > > > > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> > > > > on the only two all-CW only bands.
> > > >
> > > That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a
> > > safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
> > >
> > If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?
> >
> > Not at all. I consider myself a relatively new ham and I continue to
> > increase my code proficiency OTA. After all, the license is really
> > just a ticket to learn.
>
> Exactly. So then why the need for code skill testing...oh,
> I remember, the FCC must impose a mystical quantity
> of effort for all ham licensing.

1. Second most populat mode in use in the ARS today.

2. Unlike speech, this is a new skill that must be acquired.

3. Because an awfully large portion of licensed ARO's want it.

> > > What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
> > > non-highway?
> >
> > Thanks for makin' it easy, Bill. How about the CW only portion of
> > 2-meters? I think that sounds like a groovy place to practice some
> > seriously slow code with a code-buddy. Then, if I like it, perhaps I'd
> > pass Element 1 and hop on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands to increase my
> > proficiency. Thos are some examples of "rural routes."
> >
> > The highway, hmm. Would you really encourage a brand newbie to hop on
> > 7026 kHz and mix it up w/the 35-wpm+ crowd, Bill? Think they'd feel
> > encouraged?
>

> IF they did so, so what? They'd either make a QSO or not.
> Nothing ventured, nothing gained. If they felt out of
> place they'd shift to calmer waters.

Not very nice, Bill.

> > I've had a couple of ops QRS from 20-wpm down to 19-wpm
> > for me and lemme tell ya, it wasn't fun. Conversely, I have had guys
> > switch to some really nice Farnsworth style 25-wpm character speed
> > spaced apart to about 8-wpm and an hour and a half ragchew QSO just
> > breezed on by with very little effort or tension.
>
> To each his own. What ever floats your boat. I see no problem
> with newbie hams doing morse at slow speeds anywhere morse
> is allowed as long as they do so within the rules.

It's like pairing up Tennis partners. A beginning recreational player is usually not paired up with the club pro unless it's for lessons. (Elmer) BTW, I have a confession. My very first AR CW QSO was on 7031 kHz, but it was wuth my Elmer. ;-)

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

73 de Bert
WA2SI

265. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:39:30 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <CAVJb.33522$g77.7678158@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Thanks, Mike. Hadn't even noticed.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:v7DJb.2546$uF6.1079235@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill, I trimmed the cb and shortwave groups out of this reply. We should
> all give those folk a break.

266. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:58:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401040658.70de024d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84992

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040102175150.08626.00002454@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <Pn0Jb.29749$Pg1.12522@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Bill, when are the next NCI elections for Director? I look forward to
> >voting for whoever runs in opposition to you. You are irresponsible and
> >dangerous.
>
> What next, reporting Bill to Homeland Security?!? :-)
>
> LHA

Maybe they'll put him on the Hollywood Blacklist. He'll never act again.

267. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:58:10 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt99m202bp2@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84997
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c5ecbb69.0401040613.3f921416@posting.google.com>, Richard Cranium says...
>
>Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
>news:<bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com>...
>> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
>> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
>> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
>> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
>> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
>> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
>> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
>> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
>> radio operation and notice please that none of them
>> have a license. They target hams and pick random
>> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
>> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
>> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
>> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
>> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
>> and harassment.
>
>Sorry, Charlie (really Georgie-girl Busch WA3MOJ). It's hardly >
>random < for someone to choose your callsign since you are the biggest
>TROLL in the cb newsgroup. If they target > you < it's because you
>deserve it for making so many fag posts and personal attacks on people
>you don't even know.
>
>Why are you complaining about "forges" when > you < have been forging
>N8WWMs callsign for a couple of months now?
>
>Nobody forges Jerry's name or callsign because he isn't a TROLL. And
>nobody else "may be next": Only you and DouGay Adair because you > are
>< TROLLs.
>
>But it's really quite simple, simpleton: You stop and they'll stop.
>But that's too simple for your drunken mind to comprehend, isn't it?
>
Why does he care what my internet name is?

268. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 14:59:16 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt99o402buq@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Why are you dragging innocent people into your flame war?

In article <bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com>, Bonnie Prince Charlie says...
>
>Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
>is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
>aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
>LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
>comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
>If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
>Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
>grind against anyone who complains about illegal
>radio operation and notice please that none of them
>have a license. They target hams and pick random
>call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
>they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
>have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
>Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
>these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
>and harassment.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>Le : Sun Jan 4 04:50:46 2004 depuis l'IP : ac896116.ipt.aol.com [VIP
>532284301978]

269. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:00:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401040700.31209cba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84993

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
> > inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
> >
>
> I knew you'd agree with me.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

I just happen to agree with Hans' plan. Allow the amateur to
distinguish him or herself through actions rather than an FCC forced
march.

270. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:09:50 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401040709.5a38d881@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84994
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:<bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com>...
> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> and harassment.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Jan 4 04:50:46 2004 depuis l'IP : ac896116.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

cut it out george.....

271. Re: Ham Radio in The Information Age and Terrorism

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:11:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401040711.78e9b07f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84995

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bt3mhs$hi3@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bstgh0$vld@library2.airnews.net...
> > According to a story in the Washington Post, by Dan Eggen, on Tuesday,
> Dec.
> > 30, 2003:
> > An FBI intelligence bulletin sent to law enforcement agencies last week
> > warned that "terrorist operatives may rely on almanacs to assist with
> target
> > selection and pre-operational planning" because they include detailed
> > information on bridges, tunnels and other U.S. landmarks, officials said.
> >
> > OK, fault me and sneer at me all you want but, isn't the above just going
> > way too far? (the rest of the story can be read on the Washington Post
> > website--just do a search on the word almanac and it should be around the
> > second item in the list). I mean, I understand the fear, the tendency to
> > jump to safety, but even if terrorists are using almanacs, do we want to
> be
> > "caught" with one if we are thought to be acting "suspicious" as is
> > mentioned in the article?
> >
> > Sheesh, what about ham radio?! One of the most widely used communication
> > mediums in this country and maybe the world, right? What do we open
> > ourselves up for by being on the air and "just talking?"
> >
> > --
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Follow-Up: Went to the bookstore to grab a copy of "Execution" (a business
> book) and, while I was at it, I went ahead and purchased a "World Almanac
> 2004." While I was checking out, the sales associate grinned when he
> scanned the Almanac. Turns out they've been selling like hotcakes!

I usually get a personal copy about every 4 or 5 years. Used to get
them annually when I was in the contingency business, among other
publications.

> As an aside, anyone know if ham radio is ever in a almanac? I thought
> there'd be some stuff on hobbies, but haven't found it yet. Jim, N2EY,
> would probably make some bucks if he'd write and publish a Almanac of Ham
> Radio!

The flying horse pubs were a nice compilation of ham info worldwide,
but with the advent of the QRZ and other online databases...

272. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:11:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <F_6cnUI_6abesGWiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84996

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:p3OJb.36165$Pg1.31168@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> > 4U1ITU is the station of the International Amateur Radio Club at ITU
> > HQ in Geneva ... I've operated the station. The significance of the
> > prefix is that 4U's are UN callsigns.
>
> I'm not speaking of the ITU but the IARU (not the same thing at all). The
> IARU HQ station is not associated with the UN (nor the ITU) so does not
have
> a "4U" prefix.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Sorry Hans. I misread your query.

73,
Carl - wk3c

273. Re: JD HAVRY The Final Word "May Be Dangerous" JJ aka TailGator aka Radiobuff aka KF4ANC aka leeman aka John aka Kenny aka Brent aka JR aka BJ aka GH aka ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:19:27 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bt9atv02go9@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84999
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

Why are you flaming JJ radiobuff now William Wallace? What did JJ ever do to you?

In article , Ballen says...
>
>On Sat, 03 Jan 2004 22:32:24 GMT, th@t.other.george (Regards, Agent Smith)
>wrote:
>
>
>
>Most excellent! I knew he was hiding something. Maybe they should put out an
>AMBER
>ALERT for him. Does anyone know what type of rig he has?
>
>
>
>>Terry,
>>
>>I did some research and I came up with some of the names he has used in the
>>past. You can Google for any of them to find out more about his
>>multiple personalities. This man may be capable of what you claim. He's armed
>>and claims he has been busted for violent crimes including robbery. If I
>>were you I'd contact the authorities and let them deal with it.
>>
>>
>>Lou Cummings (Camelot@castlegate.net)
>>Tailgator (Tailgator@ix.netcom.com)
>>John (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
>>KF4ANC (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
>>JHaury (SkynyrdBook@cajun.zzn.com)
>>TailGator (skynyrd_book@hotmail.com)
>>leeman (skynyrd_book@hotmail.com)
>>John & Karen (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
>>John TailGator (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
>>J Haury (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
>>JJ (radiobuff@mailcity.net)
>>JR (radiobuff@mailcity.net)
>>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.net)
>>JR (radiobuff0@mailcity.net)
>>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)

>>BJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
>>JR (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
>>GH (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
>>JJ (radiobuff@mailcity.com)
>>JR (radiobuff@mailcity.com)
>>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)
>>TailGator (tailgator@prontomail.com)
>>TailGator (nomail@privacy.net)
>>Kenny (Militaria75@hotmail.com)
>>Brent (brentsco9@yahoo.com)
>>radiobuff (me@privacy.net)
>>radiobuff (radiobuff@hotmail.com)
>>JJ (planetj7@bellsouth.net)
>>Radiobuff (nail3inch@yahoo.com)
>>TailGator (kf4anc@yahoo.com)
>>
>>By his own admission the person posting as J Havry admits that he shot a man,
>>robbed banks in the 80's and is a needle user. He has tried to buy and
>>sell weapons over the internet, carries a gun and is an interstate trucker. He
>>may also be a racist, involved in software piracy and homosexual. He is
>>on his way to California already or soon.
>>
>>.....
....
>>Admits to carrying gun
>>
>>From: "radiobuff"
>>Newsgroups: alt.guitar.bass
>>References: <0Uhlb.92461$0Z5.72935@lakeread03>
>>Subject: Re: What's in YOUR gig bag?
>>Lines: 49
>>X-Priority: 3
>>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
>>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
>>Message-ID:
>>Date: Sun, 09 Nov 2003 20:03:24 GMT
>>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
>>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
>>X-Trace: nwrddc02.gnilink.net 1068408204 4.4.58.104 (Sun, 09 Nov 2003 15:03:24
>>EST)
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 09 Nov 2003 15:03:24 EST
>>
>>
>>kewl thread...my 2 cents
>>
>>extra strings
>>towel
>>string winder
>>9v batteries

>>extra cables
>>Boss tuner
>>spearmint gum
>>Leatherman tool (pliers, wire cutters)
>>BC Powder (YES!)
>>duct tape
>>ear plugs
>>flashlight (mini-maglite)
>>utility knife/lockblade
>>set list
>>digital camera
>>water bottle/holster
>>strap locks
>>extra strap
>>pony tail holders
>>Beretta Compact 9mm Model L semi-automatic pistol (depends what part of town
>>I am in:)
>>extra mag of ammo
>>
>>.....
.....
>>
>>Admits he shot a man in Louisiana, shot dope and robbed banks in the eighties.
>>
>>
>>From: "leeman"
>>Newsgroups: alt.music.southern-rock
>>References:
>>
>>
>>Subject: Re: The LIST
>>Lines: 298
>>X-Priority: 3
>>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
>>X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
>>Message-ID:
>>Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 22:31:11 GMT
>>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
>>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
>>X-Trace: nwrddc03.gnilink.net 1071527471 4.4.58.104 (Mon, 15 Dec 2003 17:31:11
>>EST)
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 17:31:11 EST
>>
>>
>>one thing about the john lee walker band, those guys were true outlaws in
>>the real world. one of those guys was featured in the skynyrd book "an oral
>>history" jhis name was john haury. he was friends with ronnie and the band
>>and they tore up a few bars together. I think he was even busted for
>>shooting a man somewhere in Louisiana and robbing banks in the eighties.

>>they were all pretty hardcore dopers and needle freaks but man could they
>>jam. anybody know what ever happened to them? I saw them once with skynyrd
>>in west va in 76 and they were awesome but very young and inexperienced,
>>i've always wonmdered what became of them. heroin destroiyed a damn good
>>band!!!!
>>
>>lee
>>
>>.....
.....
>>
>>Showing interest in things homosexual.
>>
>>From: "radiobuff0@mailcity.moc"
>>Subject: Gay Pride Picnic 2003 Recap
>>Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc
>>
>>About 270 people, an all time record, came together to celebrate the
>>11th annual Pride Erie Picnic at Presque Isle, Beach 11 on June 14,
>>2003. Once again, we had hot dogs and hamburgers and folks brought a
>>yummy assortment of dishes. There were about 225 people at last year's
>>picnic, which was the previous record amount for attendance.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Date: 28 Jun 2003 22:10:15 -0000
>>Message-ID:
>>From: "JJ"
>>Subject: JJ exclusive N.J. GAY DUOS SUE TO MARRY You go girls
>>Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc
>>Lines: 29
>>
>>
>>June 28, 2003 -- Seven same-sex couples began fighting yesterday for
>>the right to get married in New Jersey — one day after the U.S. Supreme
>>Court stamped out a Texas law that made gay sex a crime.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>.....
.....
>>
>>Looking to pirate some software
>>
>>From: Radiobuff
>>Newsgroups: alt.2600.crackz
>>Subject: adobe Premiere pro v7 expire info

>>Reply-To: nospam.nail3inch@yahoo.com
>>Message-ID:
>>X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.8/32.548
>>MIME-Version: 1.0
>>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
>>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
>>Lines: 5
>>NNTP-Posting-Host: 69.144.209.36
>>X-Complaints-To: abuse@bresnan.net
>>X-Trace: attbi_s52 1067905650 69.144.209.36 (Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT)
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT
>>Organization: Bresnan Online
>>Date: Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT
>>
>>
>>Just woundering if there is a more curent copy of Adobe Premiere Pro
>>v7 out there as the latest one expires March 1 2004 and its version #
>>is c552 8/11/2003/r. If you dodnt believe it, turn your computer
>>clock up to March 1 2004. The last copy I had expired Nov 1 2003. To
>>note the 2 copy`s I put one I used the keygen to do a key.
>>
>>
>>
>>.....
.....
>>
>>Showing how classy and cultured he is
>>
>>From: JJ
>>User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:1.4)
>>Gecko/20030624 Netscape/7.1 (ax)
>>X-Accept-Language: en-us, en
>>MIME-Version: 1.0
>>Newsgroups: ny.politics
>>Subject: UNA's strike again
>>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
>>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
>>Lines: 15
>>Message-ID:
>>X-Trace:
>>npbhgpngjbkmjfegdbdpiflmbcekedmfhojhikkbagflhcboadlfadgbofomnhcjonkedhnjbgmfaelbbgjghfnj
peanimkkhhkbhhlpijajakbmnmfcnpfeoeaakoimjplnlhhaibcdamclomlgcccebcdfdbbm
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 22:31:57 EDT
>>Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 22:32:36 -0400
>>
>>
>>Another UNA (Urban Nigger Ape) proves why some are that. Baboons with
>>clothes.
>>
>>JACKSONVILLE, Florida (AP) -- A 2-year-old left alone for nearly three

>>weeks while her mother was behind bars survived by eating mustard,
>>ketchup, rice and raw pasta, police said.
>>
>>The toddler was watching cartoons when found by her father, police said
>>Monday. She was suffering from malnutrition and was being treated at
>>Wolfson Children's Hospital, police said.
>>
>>Dakeysha Lee, 22, was charged Monday with child abuse because she didn't
>>let anyone know that her daughter was alone in her apartment, police
>>said. She was jailed Sept. 10 on unrelated charges.
>>
>>
>>.....
.....
>>
>>Trying to beat Federal Drug Testing
>>
>>From: "TailGator"
>>Newsgroups: alt.drugs.pot
>>Subject: Medicinal Marijuana
>>Lines: 33
>>X-Priority: 3
>>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
>>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
>>Message-ID:
>>Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 18:03:13 GMT
>>NNTP-Posting-Host: 65.32.220.35
>>X-Complaints-To: abuse@rr.com
>>X-Trace: twister.tampabay.rr.com 1047837793 65.32.220.35 (Sun, 16 Mar 2003
>>13:03:13 EST)
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 13:03:13 EST
>>Organization: RoadRunner - Tampa Bay
>>
>>
>>Hey people, found this newsgroup because I wanted to post and get some
>>opinions.
>>
>>A guy I know used to play and tour with a neo-famous southern rock and roll
>>band in the 70s & early 80s, traveled with folks like Lynyrd Skynyrd,
>>Charlie Daniels, Marshall Tucker, etc, and he lived on the fast lane for a
>>few years, did it all, became a junkie, cleaned up (several times) and did
>>the 12-step thang, all that - and when the southern rock scene fizzled in
>>the early 80s this boy had to clean up his act and get a real job. Welcome
>>to Corporate America.
>>
>>Well, as a result of his dangerous habits, he has since developed diabetes
>>(Type II) and was diagnosed with neuropathic damage to his sciatic nerve
>>(neurapathy), the worst of his diabetes-related ailments - he went
>>undiagnosed for a long time. Until recently, he hasn't smoked pot since

>>1986. He now finds that smoking not only eases the discomfort, but also
>>eases the nausea he feels after glucophage and other meds hit his stomach.
>>He used to be a heavy toker:) but now he smokes when he feels the need,
>>which is once or twice a day. He is strongly opinionated to the fact that it
>>does have medicinal qualities - he's proven that it lowers blood sugar and
>>it makes him feel better. He does it only in the privacy of his own home.
>>It's his business.
>>
>>Unfortunately, he now works for a major corporation that randomly drug
>>tests, and he knows his number is going to be up one of these times. I
>>would like to hear from anyone in a similiar situation, or anyone with any
>>advice on how to really beat the tests, live the way you want to in
>>Corporate America. Any and all advice would be greatly appreciated, but
>>please spare sarcasm and flames. No time for that - thanks!
>>
>>JD
>>
>>
>>.....
....
>>
>>Attempting to buy and sell Weapons over the Internet
>>
>>From: TailGator
>>Subject: FS: SS Ruger Mini-14
>>Date: 1998/04/29
>>Message-ID: <6i8n42$p3o@xring.cs.umd.edu>#1/1
>>Approved: gun-control@cs.umd.edu
>>Organization: Loozyana Bayou, Inc
>>Newsgroups: rec.guns
>>
>>
>>
>>Ruger Mini-14, almost NIB fired twice. Installed Choate flash hider and
>>customized rubber butt pad. Mint condition.
>>
>>Make Offer plus shipping.
>>
>>John
>>KF4ANC
>>
>>
>>
>>From: "TailGator"
>>Newsgroups: rec.knives
>>Subject: Tac Folder Stag?
>>Lines: 15
>>X-Priority: 3
>>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106

>>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
>>Message-ID:
>>Date: Thu, 18 Dec 2003 15:04:44 GMT
>>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
>>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
>>X-Trace: nwrddc01.gnilink.net 1071759884 4.4.58.104 (Thu, 18 Dec 2003 10:04:44
>>EST)
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 18 Dec 2003 10:04:44 EST
>>
>>
>>I'm also looking for a small (4") LL folder with stag handles, replacing one
>>I lost recently. I went to a knife maker here locally in St. Petersburg FL
>>(Roger Gamble) who made me a custom folder with very handsome stag handles,
>>but it's a bit too big and bulky for the pocket - made to be holstered and
>>he included a very nice leather holster with it. Although I love this knife,
>>its not somethng I can carry to work in my pocket. Prefer liner lock, one
>>hand open, possible with pocket clip on it. Any ideas? Thanks
>>
>>The one I lost was called the Tactical Folder, but I'll be darned if I can
>>remember the company name...bought it from a catalog called The Edge many
>>years ago...they are no longer making the knife.
>>
>>TG
>>
>>
>>From: "radiobuff"
>>Newsgroups: rec.knives
>>Subject: FS: Phrobis M-9 Buck
>>Lines: 11
>>X-Priority: 3
>>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
>>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
>>Message-ID:
>>Date: Thu, 23 Oct 2003 19:24:59 GMT
>>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.59.1
>>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
>>X-Trace: nwrddc01.gnilink.net 1066937099 4.4.59.1 (Thu, 23 Oct 2003 15:24:59
>>EDT)
>>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 23 Oct 2003 15:24:59 EDT
>>
>>
>>Like new Buck Phrobis III military field knife/bayonet with scabbard and
>>pouches as it was sold by Buck. Used once on a fishing trip and been in
>>gunsafe since then. Asking $175 - interested parties can email me directily
>>if you want to see a pic - great knife! Only selling it and other items
>>because I am wanting to buy new ham radio. Offering it here for a few days,
>>if no response you will see it on ebay. You will be very pleased with this
>>knife...
>>

>>john
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Good Luck.
>>
>>
>>Regards,
>>-Smith. Agent Smith
>

274. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:53:11 UTC
From: "siroblivion." <sir@oblivion.org>
Message-ID: <IFWJb.135014$a31.64412@fe11>
Source record: 85000
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bonnie Prince Charlie" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com...
> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas

What ever happened to Timmy's website; wasn't it http://www.timnebo.com

Remember checking it out a couple times Timmy displaying his stash, cheap Pawn Shop weaponry, 20 inch Nigga rims and a bunch of crack whores and big bottom black women.

Funniest thing ever!

275. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:55:39 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <%HWJb.5929$%_4.1913@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85051
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040104070834.695$DE@newsreader.com...
> Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> > Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> > is not wa3moj.

Of course George Busch does have an AOL account. He made this
post and forgot to remove his call sign.

http://www.google.com/groups?q=+%22wa3moj%22&start=400&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&scoring
=d&selm=Mgsu7.68301%245A3.25741449%40news1.rdc2.pa.home.com&rnum=440

>> Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> > aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> > LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> > comm band and also on ham bands without a license.

Now this is typical George, deflect the attention away
from me and accuse other people of being me (LMAO!)

> > If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> > Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> > grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> > radio operation and notice please that none of them
> > have a license.

Again, not true. I had mine many many years ago, you
said so in previous posts, don't you remember what you
post? I don't live, nor have I every lived in SF Ca., so
another lie and attempt at deflecting attention from the
fact that you posted this:

http://www.google.com/groups?q=g:thl2482584805d&dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=20011
023161351.17382.00001281%40mb-fo.aol.com

Of course we can't not include this email:

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups

From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

Hello,

This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy
department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings
sent from your SBCIS account.

It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet
newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
wa3moj@aol.com
Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.

Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
(http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
(http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to email
or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise objectionable
material.

If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it will
be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.

Sincerely,
The SBCIS Policy Department

>> They target hams and pick random
> > call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> > they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> > have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> > Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> > these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> > and harassment.

No, you used you're call sign, it was your mistake, not
someone else's. Leland & Jerry have been on RRCB for
more years than you, no one's used there call sign in vain
yet that I know of. Again another way of you trying to
deflect the fact that you are a troll on RRCB, post hundreds
of times a week, under forged screen nics, changing them
to by pass newsreader filters, harass, accuse, use foul
language otherwise know as a TROLL!!

http://www.google.com/groups?q=author:hell%40sween.com&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=wB
A67.15833%24EP6.3963758%40news1.rdc2.pa.home.com&rnum=5

> >
> > =-
> > Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> > Le : Sun Jan 4 04:50:46 2004 depuis l'IP : ac896116.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> > 532284301978]
> >
> You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the man in the moon

> too, jackass.
>
> Be careful when accusing people, you putz. Paybacks can be a real
> bitch.

Please note that the Voila News is being accessed though an
Aol proxy account.

Landshark

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

276. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 15:56:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> (snip) The fact is that Morse code IS
> the second most popular mode in use
> in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself
> is sufficient justification. (snip)

And, in my humble opinion, it is not sufficient justification - no more than the fact that vacuum tubes or circular analog tuning dials were once popular justifies a requirement that they continue to be used. Clearly, unless there is a valid reason otherwise, anyone should be free to use those if he or she wants, but there should be no government regulation mandating that. The same with Morse code.

> Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm
> test, NOT 13 0r 20.

If a person has no interest in code, the speed certainly isn't going to change that.

> (snip) Yes, I would very much "like to
> continue mandating a skill test for a mode
> that is all but gone from the world of
> radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
> AMATEUR USE." Thats because it's a
> skill test for upgrading within, not entry
> into, the ARS (snip)

The Amateur Radio Service does not exist in a vacuum, Bert. The FCC recently said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service." They came to that conclusion after looking at modern communications systems outside Amateur Radio and the changes that have occurred in communications over the last fifty years. They noted that "no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear." And they said reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement would "allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise."

> You mean the second most popular mode
> in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
> requirement determinator. (snip)

If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the second most popular mode, why not argue the same for the third, forth, or even fifth, most popular modes?

By the way, where did you get the idea that CW was the second most popular mode? I agree that SSB is probably the most popular. But, given the sheer numbers of Technicians today and the fact that not all others use CW on a regular basis, certainly far more people use FM than CW today.

Note that the newsgroups "rec.radio.cb" and "rec.radio.shortwave" were removed from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroup).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

277. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 16:14:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tZWJb.20548$P%1.19675179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> [snip] The FCC
> recently said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing
> requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."
> They came to that conclusion after looking at modern communications
systems
> outside Amateur Radio and the changes that have occurred in communications
> over the last fifty years. They noted that "no communication system has
been
> designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the
ability
> to receive messages in Morse code by ear." And they said reducing the
> emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement would "allow
> the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically
inclined
> persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to
learn
> and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs
> expertise."

That deemphasis has already occurred. The no-code tech was instituted in
the late 1980s and the code for the higher classes was dropped to only 5wpm
in 2000. There is no need for further deemphasis. Particularly when the
stated reason was attract technically inclined people. That hasn't happened
so the reason for deemphasis has been proven to be invalid.

> > You mean the second most popular mode
> > in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
> > requirement determinator. (snip)
>
>
> If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the
second
> most popular mode, why not argue the same for the third, forth, or even
> fifth, most popular modes?
>
> By the way, where did you get the idea that CW was the second most
popular
> mode? I agree that SSB is probably the most popular. But, given the sheer
> numbers of Technicians today and the fact that not all others use CW on a
> regular basis, certainly far more people use FM than CW today.
>

The poster should have qualified that by saying "second most popular mode on HF". The usage of FM on HF is very strictly limited and regulated and isn't appropriate for use on bands that are as narrow as the HF bands.

As far as testing for the other modes:

Voice - we've all been talking quite some time, the only additional knowledge needed is procedural, which can easily be covered by the written tests

SSTV - just a matter of hooking up the hardware and then following the correct operating procedures, both of which can easily be covered by the written tests.

Digital modes - just a matter of hooking up the hardware and then following the correct operating procedures, both which can easily be covered by the written tests.

Morse code/CW is unique and cannot be covered by the written tests. Actually I happen to believe that there would be great benefit to requiring candidates to demonstrate other basic skills, such as soldering a PL-259 to coax as an example, for licensing. But I know it won't happen.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

278. Re: WA3MOJ does not post to this NG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 16:19:03 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <X1XJb.3741557$be.586472@news.easynews.com>
Source record: 85054
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 04 Jan 2004 09:01:39 -0600, William Wallace
<wilum@wallace.com> wrote:

>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in
>news:c5ecbb69.0401040613.3f921416@posting.google.com:
>
>> Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
>> news:<bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com>...
>>> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
>>> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
>>> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
>>> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
>>> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
>>> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
>>> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
>>> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
>>> radio operation and notice please that none of them
>>> have a license. They target hams and pick random
>>> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
>>> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
>>> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
>>> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
>>> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
>>> and harassment.
>>
>> Sorry, Charlie (really Georgie-girl Busch WA3MOJ). It's hardly >
>> random < for someone to choose your callsign since you are the biggest
>> TROLL in the cb newsgroup. If they target > you < it's because you
>> deserve it for making so many fag posts and personal attacks on people
>> you don't even know.
>
>
>Sorry assclown, you are really 1 clueless TROLL, do a search on dickiehed
>cranium, and note his trolling ways. George busch does not post to this
>NG, you have some serious serious mental problems.
>

How do you know George Busch doesn't post to this NG? Either you are
him or you have first hand knowledge of which groups he does post in.

279. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 16:30:01 UTC
From: Herbert Khaury <Herbert@tiptoe.tp>
Message-ID: <5qidnRU6lMEXomWiRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 85055

Good evening, mister dang-her. Rocky Roccoco, at your cervix.

... how does he make his voice do that?

:-)

--

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040104085657.07346.00002367@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <gMOdnaX0wo0ApGqi4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Herbert Khaury"
> <Herbert@tiptoe.tp> writes:
>
> >"Aww, he's no fun. He fell right over."
> >
> "I spell my name...DANGER"
>
> "Everyone knew her as Nancy"
>
> "Don't crush that dwarf, hand me the pliers"
>
> 73 de Jim "still waiting for the electrician" N2EY
>
>

280. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 16:30:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <%cXJb.23306$IM3.4720@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
> <Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
> > > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> > > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
> > > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
> > > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
> > > about how one never plans on using it.
> >
> > Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> > Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
> > even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
>
> That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most
popular
> mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
> justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r 20.

We don't require knowledge of second languages just because
one or more languages other than English are used by vast
numbers of non-USA hams.

Why does mode popularity mandate a separate skill test just
because others use it? NO other mode has that special
treatment...and, it appears, the FCC understands that.

> > > I'm not much into the newer
> > > digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
> > > communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
> > > leads through some learning and testing re. said subjects.no problem.
> > > (Psst, it's a character issue.)
> >
> > No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
> > about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
> > for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
> > mode is set on that pedestal.
>
> Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?

Of course it is an issue. Any test requirement that can't be justified has
no reason to exist...regardless of how much or how little effort
may be required.

> > > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> > > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
> > > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> > > > the harm, danger, etc?
> > >
> > > None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
> > > skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
> > > challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
> > > same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
> > > many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
> > > their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing
> > > away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
> > > yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.
> >
> > You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
> > have done so.
>
> The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent
> multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the entire
> ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.

Your elected representatives? Is that ARRL reps? If not, who
else as an elected representative would you expect cares?

> > > Sorry, Bill. That may be the point you'd like to key on, (No pun
> > > intended) but that's not the point I'm stressing. I agree 100% with
> > > the sentence above. It's the slacker-mentality (Sorry, time to shoot
> > > from the hip.) that I deplore. If we really want to get young folks
> > > involved in AR, this is not a principle I'd like to see them learn.
> >
> > You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> > is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
> > except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
> > NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.
>
> YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you!
Yes,
> I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
AMATEUR
> USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry
into,
> the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> today. Too easy, Bill.

Too bad your argument doesn't hold sway with the FCC. Additionally,
a dozen or so other countries have already abandoned morse testing
completely. The dominos are falling...it is just a matter of time. The

USA fully endorsed the end of mandatory code testing in the treaty.
Do you expect a reversal of mindset on the internal (USA only) position
by the FCC?

> > > If
> > > you complain enough, the bar will be lowered for you. As a youth, the
> > > concept of achievement (As well as a well-rounded education.) was
> > > constantly stressed and I thank God I had folks (Parents, teachers,
> > > guidance counselors, etc.) that cared enough to strongly encourage us
> > > to achieve rather complain. I feel so sorry for the kids that are
> > > recently got that curve on their Regents exam rather than enroll in a
> > > summer program to increase their knowledge to the appropriate level.
> > > Some will perform poorly in college and if enough of them complain
> > > that their college curriculum is unfairly difficult, perhaps that bar
> > > will be lowered as well. Interestingly enough, I now tend to seek out
> > > those Elmers who will push me to become a better operator. IMHO, they
> > > have my best interests at heart.
> >
> > My my, I guess the end of all amateur upgrading
> > and new learning will be tied to the end of code
> > testing. You must have really been disappointed when
> > states stopped testing drivers on manual gearboxes.
> > For me it was no problem. When my kids wanted
> > to drive they learned or they had no car to drive as
> > all our vehicles had been standard shift. Those that
> > want to learn will. Trying to claim some great
> > philosophical tie of ending code testing being
> > the start of an end to new/old hams continuing to
> > learn is just bunk.
>
> We both know the manual gearshift analogy really doesn't work, so I'll
skip
> that part. However, on the subject of you kids, weren't you the least bit
> concerned that some other impatient jackass might choose to jump in his
> college roomates car and just "wing it" down to the store for a pack of
> cigarettes? I've seen this at Wagner College in Staten Island. The "down"
> part refers to "down the hill" to Targee Ave. as cigarette machines were
not
> allowed on campus. This is the jerk who'll say he's sorry over and over
for
> hitting your kid's car. I guess that's why defensive driving is so
> important. Still...I'd sure be concerned.

Other than a rather funny tale of an auto thief wo didn't drive a manual
but hijacked a car that was and the bozo lurched the car a couple of times
and then stalled it...I have never heard of anyone being a threat to me
or my kids because they didn't know how to drive a manual gearbox.
Frankly, if you are worried about that happening, you must lead a very
paranoid life. Far greater danger exists from the general driving
public who can't handle their vehicles in anything that resembles
non-perfect driving conditions.

> > > > > > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW
> knowledge/testing.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
> > > > > > problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their
endeavors
> > > > > > are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt
> conscientiously
> > > > > > ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks
that
> > > > > > would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's
> be
> > > > > > honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
> > > > > > themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even
> call
> > > > > > them."slackers.")
> > > > > >
> > > > > The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
> > > > > of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of any continued
> need
> > for code skills
> > > > > to be mandated for any HF access.
> > > > >
> > > > I disagree, I truly believe that it's almost all about the required
> > > effort.
> > >
> > So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
> > unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
> > trying to have in place for any license level?
> >
> No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm) effort
> for two (Not any.) license levels.

And when the FCC ends that requirement, what is your
desire for additional "work effort" requirements?

> > > Again, drop those published Q&A pools and watch the squirming
> > > commence.
> > >
> > It will never happen and I don't care if it did. The old
> > ARRL and AMECO learners guides were just as easy to
> > memorize sufficiently to pass. I did the General test in
> > the late 50s exactly that way.
> >
> I have the Ameco Novice guide and I kinda like it.
>
> > > Folks just don't want to be made to have to sit down for 20
> > > mins., twice daily, for a month or two and memorize 43 Morse code
> > > characters.
> > >
> > Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
> > already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based

> > on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
> > is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
> > determinator.
>
> You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a valid
> test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first most
> popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the stand-alone,
> Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike speech.)

Sorry, not everyone talks as you well know. Based on your claim,
everyone should at least be able to have a "voice" QSO, because voice
IS the most popular mode...yet there is NO requiremnt that anyone
be conversant or have voice skills at all. Yes a significant portion
of hams have natural speaking ability, BUT that is NOT true of 100%
of hams...yet there is NO requirement at all for speaking ability.

> > > > There was, in the past, a rational reason
> > > > or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
> > > > It is that simple.
> > >
> > > There still is. It's the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> > > today.
> >
> > Yet that failed to convince the FCC and, more
> > recently the ITU. The point is that those bodies
> > recognize that no one needs to know morse just to be
> > issued a license. Those that wish to engage in
> > morse contacts are free to learn morse and use it.
> > The issue is solely the test requirement and has no
> > link to actual morse use by anyone.
>
> The FCC's goal is less work. (Something in common?)

Gross oversimplification and very uninformed viewpoint.
The FCC's goal is to have rules and regulations that make
sense. If FCC work were the ONLY driving force, they'd
probably end amateur radio completely.

> > > > > BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
> > > > > no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is
one
> > > > > poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants
> to
> > > > > bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater
> folks
> > > > > feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex
> operation
> > > > > who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
> > > > > Watts mentioned above.
> > > >
> > > > Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of

> > > > current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
> > > > code testing. PERIOD!
> > >
> > > Again, my dialogue is addressing the character issue involved re.
> > > squeaking vs. achieving.
> >
> > That's just the old tripe argument that has convinced no one.
> > The rony of your claim is that most of us that are the
> > nucleus of NCI activity had already done the morse
> > test at 5, 13 and/or 20 wpm. Nothing to gain now
> > if code testing goes altogether.
>
> Sometimes, the prospect of less work can be a powerful motivator.

What or how would ending morse result in less work for me
and/or other NCI folks that previosuly passed any code test?
We gain nothing.

> > > Do you really want to focus on the code test,
> > > Bill. Quite frankly, Element 1 is NOT much of a code test to focus on
> > > and very rarely leaves anybody with any level of OTA proficiency. So
> > > you see, it's not the actual code knowledge or lack thereof that makes
> > > for the dangerous scenario.it's the associated mentality of those
> > > who'd rather squeak than achieve that can possibly lead to harm.
> >
> > Yawn.
>
> Sorry 'bout that.
>
> > > > > > Had there been any relevant safety
> > > > > > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer
> the
> > > > > BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"
> > > > >
> > > > Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
> > > > FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
> > > > errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
> > > > or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
> > > > amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
> > > > stop the FCC.
> > >
> > > Quite frankly, Bill.I'm no big fan of the FCC. You are, however,
> > > correct.they're the only game in town. Do I think they make mistakes?
> > > Sure, but I'm not sufficiently motivated to file a court action
> > > against them. A few letters to my elected representatives and some
> > > recreational debate on R.R.A.P suffices.
> >
> > What, no motivation? :-) :-)
>

> Lol. :-)
>
> > > Trust me, my bubble is very much intact. I came into AR approx. three
> > > years ago pretty much oblivious to the code vs. no-code debate. All I
> > > knew was that I wanted to be an ARO and operate HF. Like I've said
> > > before, remove the whing and passion from both sides of the debate and
> > > the obvious remains like a purple elephant in the living room.
> > >
> > The FCC removed the winning/passion when they issued the R&O
> > for 98-143. If you haven't read that yet, I suggest you do.
> >
> Will do.

If you can't find a copy, let me know. I'm pretty sure its on the FCC
web pages. It may also be on or have a link to it from the
www.nci.org web site.

> > > > > > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher
achievement
> > > > appear as
> > > > if
> > > > > > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then
> meet
> > the
> > > > > > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just
> the
> > > > > requirements
> > > > > > > > > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > > > > > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement
> attained.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> > > > > > > > on the only two all-CW only bands.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in
a
> > > > > safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
> > > > >
> > > > If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?
> > >
> > Not at all. I consider myself a relatively new ham and I continue to
> > increase my code proficiency OTA. After all, the license is really
> > just a ticket to learn.
> >
> Exactly. So then why the need for code skill testing...oh,
> I remember, the FCC must impose a mystical quantity
> of effort for all ham licensing.

>
> 1. Second most populat mode in use in the ARS today.

Failed to convince the FCC...see R&O for 98-143

> 2. Unlike speech, this is a new skill that must be acquired.

Also Failed to convince the FCC...see R&O for 98-143
PLUS, there is no known harm, danger or threat if a ham
does NOT know te code and/or if a ham decided to learn
and practice on the air even though s/he never took a code test.

> 3. Because an awfully large portion of licensed ARO's want it.

Totally failed to convince the FCC...see R&O for 98-143
The rules and regs of amaeur radio are NOT decided by
popular vote of already licensed hams. Even as to a position
of actually what percent of already licensed hams might
want code testing retained, there is no good data that provides
an accurate picture. The last "survey" of any type was done
by the ARRL almost 10 years ago. NCI did an analysis of
comments filed pro/con when 98-143 was open for comment
and which showed the continued drift from support of code
testing. That too is now over 5 years ago.

The bottom line, (you can agree or not) is that ever since the
concept of no code testing began, the amateur community
has not been universally opposed to ending code testing.
From my perspective, the percent of hams that absolutly want
code testing to stay is an ever decreasing percentage. Exactly
what that percentage isn't known...but, if a survey was held
again, I'm sure it is less today than it was a 5 years ago and
will be even less again a year from now since newcomers
are 'generally' not proponents of code testing and as older
hams which constitute the bulk of code testing support
die off. That may seem crass, but that's the truth as I see it.

In the end, again, the FCC isn't going to make any determination
to keep code testing because X perecnt of hams want to keep
a code test. That is, again, very clear in the 98-143 R&O.

> > > > What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
> > > > non-highway?
> > >
> > > Thanks for makin' it easy, Bill. How about the CW only portion of
> > > 2-meters? I think that sounds like a groovy place to practice some
> > > seriously slow code with a code-buddy. Then, if I like it, perhaps I'd
> > > pass Element 1 and hop on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands to increase my
> > > proficiency. Thos are some examples of "rural routes."
> > >
> > > The highway, hmm. Would you really encourage a brand newbie to hop on
> > > 7026 kHz and mix it up w/the 35-wpm+ crowd, Bill? Think they'd feel
> > > encouraged?

> >
> > IF they did so, so what? They'd either make a QSO or not.
> > Nothing ventured, nothing gained. If they felt out of
> > place they'd shift to calmer waters.
>
> Not very nice, Bill.

Life's a bitch and then we die. Those that are uncomfortable as
new drivers at highway speeds stay off the highway. Most
highways have minimum speeds to maintain that mindset. If
segments of amateur spectrum became known as high speed
CW segments, then what;s the problem?

> > > I've had a couple of ops QRS from 20-wpm down to 19-wpm
> > > for me and lemme tell ya, it wasn't fun. Conversely, I have had guys
> > > switch to some really nice Farnsworth style 25-wpm character speed
> > > spaced apart to about 8-wpm and an hour and a half ragchew QSO just
> > > breezed on by with very little effort or tension.
> >
> > To each his own. What ever floats your boat. I see no problem
> > with newbie hams doing morse at slow speeds anywhere morse
> > is allowed as long as they do so within the rules.
>
> It's like pairing up Tennis partners. A beginning recreational player is
> usually not paired up with the club pro unless it's for lessons. (Elmer)
> BTW, I have a confession. My very first AR CW QSO was on 7031 kHz, but it
> was wuth my Elmer. ;-)

I repeat, if a new ham ventures into a band segment that is known
or expected to have high speed CW as the norm...and that ham doesn't
get anyone to respond at his/her slow code speed, that's just
the way it goes. That's part of learning for any new ham.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

281. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 16:34:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9gXJb.23310$IM3.8552@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85057

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040103141922.29660.00002352@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <1_AIb.16878$IM3.13697@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >The point is that no other licensing (federal or state) takes such a
> >position....i.e. where the additional privileges are not otherwise
> >a function of additional knowledge required for the license.
>
> What other licensing includes things like a Basis and Purpose that the
> licensees are expected to fulfill? Drivers sure don't have such.
> >
> >> >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
> >> >> For that matter what about the General?
> >> >
> >> > If we adopt the philosophy, it could be done. Insane, but stranger
> >> >things have happened.
> >
> >There are, as we have discussed, valid privileges which could be
> >tied to the increased license knowledge. Power would be a good
> >example (IMHO). Most of us have agreed that it makes almost
> >no sense to have the entry level license (technician) allowed to
> >run 1500 watts based on a knowledge base of so little technical
> >and theory.
>
> Agreed! But FCC doesn't see it that way - yet.
>
> Bill, your argument simply points down the path of getting rid of the
Extra,
> even if you don't intend it that way.

Not at all. I'd make the Extra the only license allowed 1500 watts.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

282. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 16:57:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <YBXJb.23344$IM3.23102@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85058
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:tZWJb.20548$P%1.19675179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Bert Craig" wrote:
> > [snip] The FCC
> > recently said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing
> > requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."
> > They came to that conclusion after looking at modern communications
> systems
> > outside Amateur Radio and the changes that have occurred in
communications
> > over the last fifty years. They noted that "no communication system has
> been
> > designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the
> ability
> > to receive messages in Morse code by ear." And they said reducing the
> > emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement would
"allow
> > the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically
> inclined
> > persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to
> learn
> > and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs
> > expertise."
>
> That deemphasis has already occurred. The no-code tech was instituted in
> the late 1980s and the code for the higher classes was dropped to only
5wpm
> in 2000. There is no need for further deemphasis. Particularly when the
> stated reason was attract technically inclined people. That hasn't
happened
> so the reason for deemphasis has been proven to be invalid.

I have never accepted the argument that ending code testing would
result in more technically inclined folks becoming hams, BUT...
until access to the full spectrum of ham privileges comes with
no code test at all, the statement that: "That (more tech inclined hams)
hasn't happened so the reason (ending some code testing, but
not all) for deemphasis has been proven to be invalid" IS
on its own merits invalid.

> > > You mean the second most popular mode
> > > in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
> > > requirement determinator. (snip)
> >
> > If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the
> > second most popular mode, why not argue the same for the
> > third, fourth or fifth, most popular modes?
> >
> > By the way, where did you get the idea that CW was the second most
> popular
> > mode? I agree that SSB is probably the most popular. But, given the
sheer
> > numbers of Technicians today and the fact that not all others use CW on
a
> > regular basis, certainly far more people use FM than CW today.
>
> The poster should have qualified that by saying "second most popular mode
on
> HF". The usage of FM on HF is very strictly limited and regulated and
isn't
> appropriate for use on bands that are as narrow as the HF bands.
>
> As far as testing for the other modes:
>
> Voice - we've all been talking quite some time, the only additional
> knowledge needed is procedural, which can easily be covered by the written
> tests

BUT, there are some hams who have NO voice ability at all.
Should they be prohibited from becoming hams? Should we
have a medical waiver for those voice handicapped hams?

> SSTV - just a matter of hooking up the hardware and then following the
> correct operating procedures, both of which can easily be covered by the
> written tests.
>
> Digital modes - just a matter of hooking up the hardware and then
following
> the correct operating procedures, both which can easily be covered by the
> written tests.
>
> Morse code/CW is unique and cannot be covered by the written tests.

Wrong. The ability (the skill) to send/recieve may not
be a written test aspect, but the theory, signal characteristics,
and some other aspects can be and are on the writtens.

> Actually I happen to believe that there would be great benefit to
requiring
> candidates to demonstrate other basic skills, such as soldering a PL-259
to
> coax as an example, for licensing. But I know it won't happen.

Why would you want that? Frankly, soldering has never been
a strong point with me...yet I've been able to do quite well
technically in my career as well as ham radio. I can "get by"
but prefer to have others do some of the connector soldering
chores for me.

Additionally, a soldering test, especially a PL-259 would be
too subjective a determination. Even soldering can't be learned by
all hams. Would we then have a soldering waiver for blind hams
or other hams handicapped by some affliction that didn't allow
them to ever pass a soldering test?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

283. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:04:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt9gvk$2g5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85059

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
> <Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
> > > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> > > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
> > > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
> > > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
> > > about how one never plans on using it.
> >
> > Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> > Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
> > even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
>
> That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most
popular
> mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
> justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r 20.
>

Bert, if you're using popularity as a justification--and the test questions
may have changed to inlcude this since I entered ham radio--then why are
there no questions or demonstration required during testing for the *number
1* most popular mode of operation?

Not that I am arguing against your desire to see CW stay as a test
element--that is your desire and I have no problem with it at all. But, the
argument of popularity probably doesn't, in fact doesn't with me, hold water
for importance--and can be turned around to my question above: why not have
questions based on phone operation and also have the mode tested? A net
condition is easy to establish for testing, doesn't even really require
radio at all (it could be "pretended" in any room with more than one
person).

> >
> > No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
> > about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
> > for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
> > mode is set on that pedestal.
>
> Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?

>

For me, there is an issue at *any* speed for CW testing. It's validity has
waned.

> >
> > You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
> > have done so.
>
> The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent
> multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the entire
> ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.
>

heh heh...see...I haven't sent any, as the issue isn't that important to me
and I can live with it either way. I really never intend on upgrading, and
already 5 wpm. I leave the real meat of this issue to those who are that
passionate about it. :)

> >
> > You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> > is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
> > except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
> > NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.
>
> YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you!
Yes,
> I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
AMATEUR
> USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry
into,
> the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> today. Too easy, Bill.
>

Again, I point out that it would probably not be a plus for the FCC to
continue facilitating a CW test, when it is nearly only the ARS that has it
in use today. I am not sure what costs are associated with administering
the CW test, but one must inlcude any time spent/wasted (depending on your
point of view) for the FCC, congresspersons, etc., to read and deal with the
issue.

> >
> > So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
> > unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
> > trying to have in place for any license level?
>
> No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm) effort
> for two (Not any.) license levels.
>

I think it's OK to have two license levels. But, rather than a CW test, I'd support nearly anything else but a mode test--any mode. Written tests suffice for any level of license.

> >
> > Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
> > already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
> > on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
> > is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
> > determinator.
>
> You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a valid
> test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first most
> popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the stand-alone,
> Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike speech.)
>

Ruh roh...there you go again with the "second most popular mode." If that is justification, then the first most popular mode needs to be tested, not the second. :o

Kim W5TIT

284. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:06:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt9h3f$3ia@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85060

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> >
>
> > You mean the second most popular mode
> > in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
> > requirement determinator. (snip)
>
>
> If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the
second
> most popular mode, why not argue the same for the third, forth, or even
> fifth, most popular modes?
>

OH, NO...Dwight. Now we're thinking alike! Hmmmm, 'cept you forgot to
mention testing *THE* most popular mode!

Kim W5TIT

285. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:08:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt9h7k$423@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85061

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:tZWJb.20548$P%1.19675179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Morse code/CW is unique and cannot be covered by the written tests.
> Actually I happen to believe that there would be great benefit to
requiring
> candidates to demonstrate other basic skills, such as soldering a PL-259
to
> coax as an example, for licensing. But I know it won't happen.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

There ya go!!! Man, I'd love to see establishing a station
tested--AND--that can be done either through written explanation or physical
demonstration. And, soldering would certain be something that I'd agree
with, too!

Kim W5TIT

286. Re:WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:16:46 UTC
From: Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com>
Message-ID: <bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 85062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
>> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
>> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
>> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
>> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
>> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
>> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
>> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
>> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
>> radio operation and notice please that none of them
>> have a license. They target hams and pick random
>> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
>> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
>> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
>> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
>> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
>> and harassment.
>>
>You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the
>man in the moon too, jackass.
>
>Be careful when accusing people, you putz.
>Paybacks can be a real bitch.

Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
and breaking fcc laws etc. The other one is Landshark
aka Mark beck of Fremont CA he had a ham license
but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
for years because he was brave enough to stand up
to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
McCampbell of Florida.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sun Jan 4 18:16:46 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

287. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:19:39 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <LWXJb.38313$g77.8529272@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) The fact is that Morse code IS
> > the second most popular mode in use
> > in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself
> > is sufficient justification. (snip)
>
>
> And, in my humble opinion, it is not sufficient justification - no more
> than the fact that vacuum tubes or circular analog tuning dials were once
> popular justifies a requirement that they continue to be used. Clearly,
> unless there is a valid reason otherwise, anyone should be free to use
those
> if he or she wants, but there should be no government regulation mandating
> that. The same with Morse code.

Nobody's forcing anybody to use it, just learn it...and only for HF privies.

> > Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm
> > test, NOT 13 0r 20.
>
>
> If a person has no interest in code, the speed certainly isn't going to
> change that.

At 5-wpm, it's more a demonstration of discipline than proficiency. That is
where the true crux lies.

> > (snip) Yes, I would very much "like to
> > continue mandating a skill test for a mode
> > that is all but gone from the world of
> > radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
> > AMATEUR USE." Thats because it's a
> > skill test for upgrading within, not entry
> > into, the ARS (snip)
>
>
> The Amateur Radio Service does not exist in a vacuum, Bert. The FCC
> recently said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing
> requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."
> They came to that conclusion after looking at modern communications
systems

> outside Amateur Radio and the changes that have occurred in communications
> over the last fifty years. They noted that "no communication system has
been
> designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the
ability
> to receive messages in Morse code by ear." And they said reducing the
> emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement would "allow
> the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically
inclined
> persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to
learn
> and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs
> expertise."

They've already reduced the emphasis by creating the no-code Technician ticket and further by reducing the required code speed for the General and Extra tickets.

> > You mean the second most popular mode
> > in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
> > requirement determinator. (snip)
>
>
> If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the
second
> most popular mode, why not argue the same for the third, forth, or even
> fifth, most popular modes?

Unique skill, Dwight...decoded by the human brain. Speach for phone and reading ability for digital are skills brought into the fray from day one.

> By the way, where did you get the idea that CW was the second most
popular
> mode? I agree that SSB is probably the most popular. But, given the sheer
> numbers of Technicians today and the fact that not all others use CW on a
> regular basis, certainly far more people use FM than CW today.

My apologies, I should have been more clear. I actually meant Phone vs. Morse code. I used SSB because I almost never use FM, only for ARES work. Additionally, I'm pretty much always on HF.

> Note that the newsgroups "rec.radio.cb" and "rec.radio.shortwave" were
> removed from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroup).

Good call, Dwight. Embarassingly enough, I hadn't even noticed.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

288. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:52:49 UTC
From: BJ <rajohngm@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <RpYJb.596192$0v4.23492614@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 85064
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If she doesn't like what she is earning, I suggest she get a job somewhere
else.
Bob, AA8X

"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
news:bt04se$vc0$0@pita.alt.net...
> Linda Sue Williams, 41, is a waitress at Miss Valinda's Country
> Kitchen. After waitressing for over 20 years, she is somewhat
> a judge of male character.
>
> Linda Sue's customers are mostly blue collar family men. They
> come in, drink coffee, read the paper, order breakfast and make
> a little small talk with Linda Sue and the other waitress staff.
> The one and two dollar tips they leave Linda Sue are appreciated.
> Sometimes on Fridays a large group will sit at one table, and
> Linda Sue may make as much as $20 in tips for the table.
>
> Once a year the ham radio hamfest comes to town, says Linda
> Sue. They demand endless cups of coffee, dump more food on
> the floor than they do in their fat bellies and expect instant
> service, while making lewd remarks to me, says Linda Sue.
> The table is filled with their expensive little toy radios and palm
> computers. They brag endlessly what important jobs they have,
> how many people work for them and how many college degrees
> they have.
>
> "If only their tipping habits were as big as their inflated egos,"
> said Linda Sue. When they leave, I am lucky if I find a few pennies
> and dimes left among all the trash. Their body odor lingers for
> hours after they're gone.
>
> "Hams are smelly cheap braggarts," says Linda Sue.
>
>
>
>

289. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:56:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104125646.05539.00003466@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 85065

In article <74VJb.20523$P%1.19648772@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>After playing around search the FCC database, the previous license of the
>vanity holder appears to be marked as terminated not expired so that the
>vanity call rules do not effect the numbers if the search is done correctly.
>If one searches for expired only, what they get as a result are only those
>that have lapsed due to non-renewal not those terminated due to changes in
>call sign and not those terminated due to disciplinary actions by the FCC.

Agreed on all that but my point was somewhat different.

With one exception, the way the rules have worked for some time now is that you can only renew within a time window of 90 days before or two years after your license expires. So it would seem that the expiration dates would be spread out over time, and not cluster in any particular year.

But a vanity call gets you a renewal regardless of where you are in the license term. And when the vanity rules changed, there was naturally a spike in application numbers - and 10 years later, a spike in expirations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

290. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:57:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ruYJb.38730$g77.8673398@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:%cXJb.23306$IM3.4720@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
> > <Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
> > > > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> > > > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1.
I'm
> > > > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
> > > > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than
complain
> > > > about how one never plans on using it.
> > >
> > > Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> > > Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
> > > even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
> >
> > That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most
> popular
> > mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
> > justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r
20.
>
> We don't require knowledge of second languages just because
> one or more languages other than English are used by vast
> numbers of non-USA hams.
>
> Why does mode popularity mandate a separate skill test just
> because others use it? NO other mode has that special
> treatment...and, it appears, the FCC understands that.

I gotta tell ya, Bill. You're your own worst adversary wrt to this debate.
Did you bother to tell the NCI newbies about the benefit of using Q signals
and prosigns on CW? Remember this post, Bill?

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dypab.37002$NM1.193@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message

> news:bkbd0c$rh5u5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > To me, at least, it just makes sense that a
> > person holding the highest class of license should have a working
> > (practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.
>
> How about knowing Spanish, Chineese, etc...two of the most
> popular languages used on the air after English?

Nah, how about just the *second* most popular language on the air...prosigns and Q signals. They allow us to effectively communicate with the third most popular language...and fourth, and fifth, and so on...

That's right, Bill. Try getting your message across via phone to that JA station who doesn't speak a lick of English, WITHOUT speaking Japanese. I can...and you know why. Too bad your NCI followers don't know why. Didn't you tell them, Bill? Oh, you left that part out. No prob, your secret's safe with me.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. Here's a useful phrase for the <English only speaking> NCTA's next SSB encounter with a JA station, "Ei-go ga dekimasu ka?" (Do you speak English?)

> > > > I'm not much into the newer
> > > > digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
> > > > communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
> > > > leads through some learning and testing re. said subjects.no
problem.
> > > > (Psst, it's a character issue.)
> > >
> > > No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
> > > about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
> > > for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
> > > mode is set on that pedestal.
> >
> > Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?
>
> Of course it is an issue. Any test requirement that can't be justified
has
> no reason to exist...regardless of how much or how little effort
> may be required.

We agree to disagree then.

> > > > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> > > > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO

> > > > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> > > > > the harm, danger, etc?
> > > > >
> > > > > None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
> > > > > skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
> > > > > challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
> > > > > same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
> > > > > many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
> > > > > their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing
> > > > > away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
> > > > > yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.
> > > >
> > > > You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
> > > > have done so.
> > >
> > > The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent
> > > multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the
entire
> > > ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.
> >
> > Your elected representatives? Is that ARRL reps? If not, who
> > else as an elected representative would you expect cares?

Obviously you are unaware of how the vanity call system came about. One ham,
who had his RM proposal denied by the FCC, wrote a letter to his
congressman. Turned out this particular congressman had some influence on
the FCC's budget. Bill Clinton signed the bill that had our vanity system
attached to it...no RM proposal needed. One ham CAN make a difference.
Sounds kinda cliche, eh? "One ham, one letter, one vote!" <ggg>

> > > > Sorry, Bill. That may be the point you'd like to key on, (No pun
> > > > intended) but that's not the point I'm stressing. I agree 100% with
> > > > the sentence above. It's the slacker-mentality (Sorry, time to shoot
> > > > from the hip.) that I deplore. If we really want to get young folks
> > > > involved in AR, this is not a principle I'd like to see them learn.
> > > >
> > > > You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> > > > is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
> > > > except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
> > > > NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.
> > >
> > > YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you!
> > Yes,
> > > I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode
that
> > > is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
> > AMATEUR
> > > USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry
> > into,
> > > the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> > > today. Too easy, Bill.

>
> Too bad your argument doesn't hold sway with the FCC. Additionally,
> a dozen or so other countries have already abandoned morse testing
> completely. The dominos are falling...it is just a matter of time. The
> USA fully endorsed the end of mandatory code testing in the treaty.
> Do you expect a reversal of mindset on the internal (USA only) position
> by the FCC?
>
> > > > If
> > > > you complain enough, the bar will be lowered for you. As a youth,
the
> > > > concept of achievement (As well as a well-rounded education.) was
> > > > constantly stressed and I thank God I had folks (Parents, teachers,
> > > > guidance counselors, etc.) that cared enough to strongly encourage
us
> > > > to achieve rather complain. I feel so sorry for the kids that are
> > > > recently got that curve on their Regents exam rather than enroll in
a
> > > > summer program to increase their knowledge to the appropriate level.
> > > > Some will perform poorly in college and if enough of them complain
> > > > that their college curriculum is unfairly difficult, perhaps that
bar
> > > > will be lowered as well. Interestingly enough, I now tend to seek
out
> > > > those Elmers who will push me to become a better operator. IMHO,
they
> > > > have my best interests at heart.
> > >
> > > My my, I guess the end of all amateur upgrading
> > > and new learning will be tied to the end of code
> > > testing. You must have really been disappointed when
> > > states stopped testing drivers on manual gearboxes.
> > > For me it was no problem. When my kids wanted
> > > to drive they learned or they had no car to drive as
> > > all our vehicles had been standard shift. Those that
> > > want to learn will. Trying to claim some great
> > > philosophical tie of ending code testing being
> > > the start of an end to new/old hams continuing to
> > > learn is just bunk.
> >
> > We both know the manual gearshift analogy really doesn't work, so I'll
> skip
> > that part. However, on the subject of you kids, weren't you the least
bit
> > concerned that some other impatient jackass might choose to jump in his
> > college roomates car and just "wing it" down to the store for a pack of
> > cigarettes? I've seen this at Wagner College in Staten Island. The
"down"
> > part refers to "down the hill" to Targee Ave. as cigarette machines were
> not

> > allowed on campus. This is the jerk who'll say he's sorry over and over
> for
> > hitting your kid's car. I guess that's why defensive driving is so
> > important. Still...I'd sure be concerned.
>
> Other than a rather funny tale of an auto thief wo didn't drive a manual
> but hijacked a car that was and the bozo lurched the car a couple of times
> and then stalled it...

Lol.

> I have never heard of anyone being a threat to me
> or my kids because they didn't know how to drive a manual gearbox

Just because you've never heard of it doesn't mean it doesn't exist.
Remember all it takes is just one jackass.

> Frankly, if you are worried about that happening, you must lead a very
> paranoid life.

Actually, I'm not as cautious as I probably should be.

> Far greater danger exists from the general driving
> public who can't handle their vehicles in anything that resembles
> non-perfect driving conditions.

Agreed. Additionally, overconfident and uninformed SUV drivers come to mind.

> > > > > > > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW
> > knowledge/testing.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have
no
> > > > > > > problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their
> endeavors
> > > > > > > are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt
> > conscientiously
> > > > > > > ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks
> that
> > > > > > > would rather complain about having to put forth some effort
(Let's
> > be
> > > > > > > honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
> > > > > > > themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might
even
> > call
> > > > > > > them."slackers.")
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
> > > > > > > of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of any
continued
> > need
> > > > for code skills

> > > > > to be mandated for any HF access.
> > > >
> > > > I disagree, I truly believe that it's almost all about the required
> > > > effort.
> > >
> > > So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
> > > unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
> > > trying to have in place for any license level?
> >
> > No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm)
effort
> > for two (Not any.) license levels.
>
> And when the FCC ends that requirement, what is your
> desire for additional "work effort" requirements?

None, while I support Element 1's retention, it really doesn't affect me
personally. Don't count your chickens before they're hatched, Bill. They may
just eliminate it for Novice/Tech "+" privies. (Cool by me.)

> > > > Again, drop those published Q&A pools and watch the squirming
> > > > commence.
> > >
> > > It will never happen and I don't care if it did. The old
> > > ARRL and AMECO learners guides were just as easy to
> > > memorize sufficiently to pass. I did the General test in
> > > the late 50s exactly that way.
> >
> > I have the Ameco Novice guide and I kinda like it.
> >
> > > > Folks just don't want to be made to have to sit down for 20
> > > > mins., twice daily, for a month or two and memorize 43 Morse code
> > > > characters.
> > >
> > > Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
> > > already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
> > > on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
> > > is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
> > > determinator.
> >
> > You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a
valid
> > test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first most
> > popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the
stand-alone,
> > Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike speech.)
>
> Sorry, not everyone talks as you well know. Based on your claim,
> everyone should at least be able to have a "voice" QSO, because voice
> IS the most popular mode...yet there is NO requiremnt that anyone
> be conversant or have voice skills at all. Yes a significant portion

> of hams have natural speaking ability, BUT that is NOT true of 100%
> of hams...yet there is NO requirement at all for speaking ability.

Surely you jest, Bill.

> > > > > There was, in the past, a rational reason
> > > > > or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
> > > > > It is that simple.
> > > > >
> > > > > There still is. It's the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> > > > > today.
> > > >
> > > Yet that failed to convince the FCC and, more
> > > recently the ITU. The point is that those bodies
> > > recognize that no one needs to know morse just to be
> > > issued a license. Those that wish to engage in
> > > morse contacts are free to learn morse and use it.
> > > The issue is solely the test requirement and has no
> > > link to actual morse use by anyone.
> >
> > The FCC's goal is less work. (Something in common?)
>
> Gross oversimplification and very uninformed viewpoint.
> The FCC's goal is to have rules and regulations that make
> sense. If FCC work were the ONLY driving force, they'd
> probably end amateur radio completely.

Uh huh...

> > > > > > BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for
all
> > > > > > no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is
> one
> > > > > > poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who
wants
> > to
> > > > > > bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater
> > folks
> > > > > > feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex
> > operation
> > > > > > who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few
hundred
> > > > > > Watts mentioned above.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of
> > > > > current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
> > > > > code testing. PERIOD!
> > > > >
> > > > Again, my dialogue is addressing the character issue involved re.
> > > > squeaking vs. achieving.
> > >

> > > That's just the old tripe argument that has convinced no one.
> > > The rony of your claim is that most of us that are the
> > > nucleus of NCI activity had already done the morse
> > > test at 5, 13 and/or 20 wpm. Nothing to gain now
> > > if code testing goes altogether.
> >
> > Sometimes, the prospect of less work can be a powerful motivator.
>
> What or how would ending morse result in less work for me
> and/or other NCI folks that previosuly passed any code test?
> We gain nothing.

YOU gain nothing. No-code Techs gain the proverbial "free ride."

> > > > Do you really want to focus on the code test,
> > > > Bill. Quite frankly, Element 1 is NOT much of a code test to focus
on
> > > > and very rarely leaves anybody with any level of OTA proficiency. So
> > > > you see, it's not the actual code knowledge or lack thereof that
makes
> > > > for the dangerous scenario.it's the associated mentality of those
> > > > who'd rather squeak than achieve that can possibly lead to harm.
> > > >
> > > Yawn.
> > >
> > Sorry 'bout that.
> >
> > > > > > > Had there been any relevant safety
> > > > > > > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged
it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to
administer
> > the
> > > > > > BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"
> > > > > >
> > > > > Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
> > > > > FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
> > > > > errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
> > > > > or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
> > > > > amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
> > > > > stop the FCC.
> > > >
> > > Quite frankly, Bill.I'm no big fan of the FCC. You are, however,
> > > > correct.they're the only game in town. Do I think they make
mistakes?
> > > > Sure, but I'm not sufficiently motivated to file a court action
> > > > against them. A few letters to my elected representatives and some
> > > > recreational debate on R.R.A.P suffices.
> > >
> > > What, no motivation? :-) :-)

> >
> > Lol. :-)
> >
> > > > Trust me, my bubble is very much intact. I came into AR approx.
three
> > > > years ago pretty much oblivious to the code vs. no-code debate. All
I
> > > > knew was that I wanted to be an ARO and operate HF. Like I've said
> > > > before, remove the whing and passion from both sides of the debate
and
> > > > the obvious remains like a purple elephant in the living room.
> > >
> > > The FCC removed the winning/passion when they issued the R&O
> > > for 98-143. If you haven't read that yet, I suggest you do.
> >
> > Will do.
>
> If you can't find a copy, let me know. I'm pretty sure its on the FCC
> web pages. It may also be on or have a link to it from the
> www.nci.org web site.

I will.

> > > > > > > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher
> achievement
> > > > > appear as
> > > > > if
> > > > > > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then
> > meet
> > > the
> > > > > > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not
just
> > the
> > > > > requirements
> > > > > > > > > > we *want* to meet.)
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
> > > > > > > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement
> > attained.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
> > > > > > > > on the only two all-CW only bands.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive
in
> a
> > > > > > safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?

> > > >
> > > > Not at all. I consider myself a relatively new ham and I continue to
> > > > increase my code proficiency OTA. After all, the license is really
> > > > just a ticket to learn.
> > >
> > > Exactly. So then why the need for code skill testing...oh,
> > > I remember, the FCC must impose a mystical quantity
> > > of effort for all ham licensing.
> >
> > 1. Second most populat mode in use in the ARS today.
>
> Failed to convince the FCC...see R&O for 98-143

I don't really believe the FCC has the ARS' best interests in mind, so that kinda rings hollow from my perspective. Just think BPL.

> > 2. Unlike speech, this is a new skill that must be acquired.
>
> Also Failed to convince the FCC...see R&O for 98-143
> PLUS, there is no known harm, danger or threat if a ham
> does NOT know te code and/or if a ham decided to learn
> and practice on the air even though s/he never took a code test.

Ditto.

> > 3. Because an awfully large portion of licensed ARO's want it.
>
> Totally failed to convince the FCC...see R&O for 98-143
> The rules and regs of amaeur radio are NOT decided by
> popular vote of already licensed hams. Even as to a position
> of actually what percent of already licensed hams might
> want code testing retained, there is no good data that provides
> an accurate picture. The last "survey" of any type was done
> by the ARRL almost 10 years ago. NCI did an analysis of
> comments filed pro/con when 98-143 was open for comment
> and which showed the continued drift from support of code
> testing. That too is now over 5 years ago.
>
> The bottom line, (you can agree or not) is that ever since the
> concept of no code testing began, the amateur community
> has not been universally opposed to ending code testing.
> From my perspective, the percent of hams that absolutly want
> code testing to stay is an ever decreasing percentage. Exactly
> what that percentage isn't known...but, if a survey was held
> again, I'm sure it is less today than it was a 5 years ago and
> will be even less again a year from now since newcomers
> are 'generally' not proponents of code testing and as older
> hams which constitute the bulk of code testing support
> die off. That may seem crass, but that's the truth as I see it.

Fair enough.

> In the end, again, the FCC isn't going to make any determination
> to keep code testing because X perecnt of hams want to keep
> a code test. That is, again, very clear in the 98-143 R&O.

That and $0.25...

> > > > > What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
> > > > > non-highway?
> > > > >
> > > > > Thanks for makin' it easy, Bill. How about the CW only portion of
> > > > > 2-meters? I think that sounds like a groovy place to practice some
> > > > > seriously slow code with a code-buddy. Then, if I like it, perhaps
I'd
> > > > > pass Element 1 and hop on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands to increase
my
> > > > > proficiency. Thos are some examples of "rural routes."
> > > > >
> > > > > The highway, hmm. Would you really encourage a brand newbie to hop
on
> > > > > 7026 kHz and mix it up w/the 35-wpm+ crowd, Bill? Think they'd feel
> > > > > encouraged?
> > > >
> > > > IF they did so, so what? They'd either make a QSO or not.
> > > > Nothing ventured, nothing gained. If they felt out of
> > > > place they'd shift to calmer waters.
> > >
> > > Not very nice, Bill.
> >
> > Life's a bitch and then we die. Those that are uncomfortable as
> > new drivers at highway speeds stay off the highway. Most
> > highways have minimum speeds to maintain that mindset. If
> > segments of amateur spectrum became known as high speed
> > CW segments, then what;s the problem?

I care a tad more about my fellow newbies than the "life's a bitch and then
we die" mindset. Thank goodness my Elmer taught me how to avoid OTA death
syndrome.

> > > > > I've had a couple of ops QRS from 20-wpm down to 19-wpm
> > > > > for me and lemme tell ya, it wasn't fun. Conversely, I have had guys
> > > > > switch to some really nice Farnsworth style 25-wpm character speed
> > > > > spaced apart to about 8-wpm and an hour and a half ragchew QSO just
> > > > > breezed on by with very little effort or tension.
> > > >
> > > > To each his own. What ever floats your boat. I see no problem
> > > > with newbie hams doing morse at slow speeds anywhere morse
> > > > is allowed as long as they do so within the rules.
> > >
> > > It's like pairing up Tennis partners. A beginning recreational player is
> > > usually not paired up with the club pro unless it's for lessons. (Elmer)
> > > BTW, I have a confession. My very first AR CW QSO was on 7031 kHz, but
it

> > was with my Elmer. ;-)
>
> I repeat, if a new ham ventures into a band segment that is known
> or expected to have high speed CW as the norm...and that ham doesn't
> get anyone to respond at his/her slow code speed, that's just
> the way it goes. That's part of learning for any new ham.

We can do better than that, Bill.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

73 de Bert
WA2SI

291. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 17:58:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xvYJb.20223$lo3.11388@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85067

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> You will of course expect the licensing exam to be equivalent to the sum
of
> knowledge required for Tech, General and Extra for this single full
> privilege license.

Yes. Good plan. (Toss in Novice and Advanced while we're on the topic.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

292. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:06:18 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401041006.1cf7cffd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85068
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> > > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> > > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
> > > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> > > > the harm, danger, etc?
> > >

So lets see here. If the new jet airliners will fly and land themselves, the persons that occupy the cockpit don't really need to learn to fly. Makes perfect sense. They don't need to learn to fly because the computer does it for them.

293. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:12:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <tjfgvv4sveahvanufbg7u214hhacoi8od2@4ax.com>
Source record: 85069

Very insightful, Mike! Especially the use of digital voice, and the transmission of images on 144 MHz repeaters. That does make sense! I'm surprised that digital voice in particular is not being played with much today on HF - that may well be the future of radio right there, based on the direction the commercial broadcasters are headed.

I would also expect to see much more emphasis on the convergence of the Internet with amateur radio - IRLP, e-mail servers, wireless messaging and similar concepts, for example. Handheld radios would probably have many cellular-like features - text messaging and built-in cameras, for example.

I am positive that CW would be rediscovered and resurrected by those who wished to experiment with a historic signalling method used in the golden days of long distance communication. Special interest groups would spring up, as they would for RTTY, SITOR and other interesting though antiquated protocols. However, truly outmoded forms of communication common today would not exist at all, such as the repeater phone patch (in an era of cheap cellphones, who would even think up this one?) For emergency use, a similar interface to the public network would be provided, perhaps directly to a PSTN operator. No more personal phone calls, though!).

Without the legacy of all of the current AM, CW, SSB, RTTY etc. equipment from years gone by, the requirement to fully support these modes on the new bands would not exist. What modes would be popular in equipment produced to meet the demands of the amateur service? In addition to standalone radios (at least for handheld service anyway), would we see black boxes designed to interface to PC and antenna, with software to run all manner of digital communication (high speed modem, digital voice, image transmission, low-res full motion video, etc.)?

I would also anticipate that, in the interest of ensuring compliance with regulations, that each commercial radio may be designed to automatically transmit a unique identifier over the air, which would allow authorities to trace back faulty, out-of-band or malicious operation to a particular unit. This feature could be coupled with a built-in GPS receiver, to further aid in localizing the radio if and when necessary. This may well raise privacy concerns, but it could be mandated as part of the operating licence, just as mandatory transmission of the operators' call sign at intervals is today. And, as we are assuming a brand new service, it would be relatively easy to do - with no older units to retrofit. What would happen with homebuilt equipment, though?

With respect to testing, I would anticipate that the regulatory and operating etiquette sections would continue to exist in virtually their present form. Along with the addition of more Digital questions to the theoretical portion of the tests, we may well see questions on interconnection to the Internet, firewalling and network security.

There may be a new test section on emergency traffic handling, radio net and message relay operations - this being the most likely premise that we would be able to convince anyone to hand over all of this valuable radio spectrum to us in the first place! And given the priority of national security in our post-9/11 world, there may be a mandate for the amateur service to link very closely with the various emergency management agencies, upon governmental request?

I would envision a requirement for perhaps two different licence levels, though - one for the basic equipment operator, limited to perhaps 100 or 200 watts, commercially built and type-approved transmitting equipment only, not permitted to act as control operator of repeaters. A higher level licence would be granted upon passing more stringent testing on RF safety and high power operation, repeater commissioning, internetworking and advanced electronic theory, which would remove these restrictions.

Either licence level would have full access to all bands and modes, with no restrictions other than those listed above. The licence levels are not intended to be incentive based, but to ensure competence and safety (both personal and public) when installing and operating multi-user automated-access, internetworked or high RF power output equipment.

Of course, there is the remote possibility that a Usenet group dedicated to the endless (and animated!) discussion of whether RTTY testing should be discontinued might crop up - hopefully very remote :)

Please add or subtract from this list at will!

73, Leo

On Sun, 04 Jan 2004 05:45:52 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>snip
>
>Okay, here goes:
>
>With a new service coming into play, a major mode would be digital
>voice. Repeaters will be allowed, and these repeaters on the 144 mHz
>band will also be digital FM, as will HT's. Repeaters and the HT's would
>be allowed to send images as well as voice.
>
>Digital non-voice modes would include a PSK mode for typewritten
>material, and a high speed packet network would be allowed (remember
>that it takes some time to get these things going, and although allowed,

>would not happen for some time.
>
>Small portions of each band would be set aside for experimentation, and
>here is the place where unusual methods of communication could be used.
>This would include things like OOK Morse or other encoding schemes or SSB.
>
> Testing would be quite different that today. The most obvious
>difference is that there would be a lot more digital material covered in
>the tests. I would envision the basic digital building blocks tested. In
>addition, there would be the basic electrical theory and of course those
>questions about the various bands. (of course this would be a lot
>easier, since there would be less bands to cover) There would also be
>questions regarding proper operating etiquette.
>
> A newly formed group, the Radio Readiness Association for Preparedness
>(RRAP) is formed, and sets up the first contest/practice run in this
>year. Sorry - I couldn't resist! 8^)
>
> One license, one class. 1KW maximum. No Morse code test.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

294. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:12:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <clYJb.38886$g77.8748095@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85070

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bt9gvk$2g5@library1.airnews.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
> > <Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
> > > > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> > > > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1.
I'm
> > > > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
> > > > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than
complain
> > > > about how one never plans on using it.
> > >
> > > Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> > > Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
> > > even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
> >
> > That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most
> popular
> > mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
> > justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r
20.
> >
>
> Bert, if you're using popularity as a justification--and the test
questions
> may have changed to inlcude this since I entered ham radio--then why are
> there no questions or demonstration required during testing for the
*number
> 1* most popular mode of operation?

Because for 99.9% of ARO's, speach is a skill that's already in our toolbox
upon entry into the ARS.

> Not that I am arguing against your desire to see CW stay as a test
> element--that is your desire and I have no problem with it at all. But,
the
> argument of popularity probably doesn't, in fact doesn't with me, hold
water
> for importance--and can be turned around to my question above: why not

have
> questions based on phone operation and also have the mode tested? A net
> condition is easy to establish for testing, doesn't even really require
> radio at all (it could be "pretended" in any room with more than one
> person).

I understand, Kim...and I agree. Whatever the questions or "requirements"
are, bring 'em on. I'd be willing to make the effort to meet the
requirements for the desired privies.

> > >
> > > No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
> > > about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
> > > for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
> > > mode is set on that pedestal.
> >
> > Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?
> >
>
> For me, there is an issue at *any* speed for CW testing. It's validity
has
> waned.

See the language post I pasted into my reply to Bill's post. I can
communicate effectively with my Japanese counterpart without actually
speaking Japanese. Let 'em try that on phone.

> > >
> > > You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
> > > have done so.
> >
> > The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent
> > multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the
entire
> > ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.
> >
>
> heh heh...see...I haven't sent any, as the issue isn't that important to
me
> and I can live with it either way. I really never intend on upgrading,
and
> already 5 wpm. I leave the real meat of this issue to those who are that
> passionate about it. :)

A reasonable stance.

> > >
> > > You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> > > is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
> > > except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
> > > NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.
> >

> > YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you!
> Yes,
> > I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode
that
> > is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
> AMATEUR
> > USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry
> into,
> > the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> > today. Too easy, Bill.
> >
>
> Again, I point out that it would probably not be a plus for the FCC to
> continue facilitating a CW test, when it is nearly only the ARS that has
it
> in use today. I am not sure what costs are associated with administering
> the CW test, but one must inlcude any time spent/wasted (depending on your
> point of view) for the FCC, congresspersons, etc., to read and deal with
the
> issue.

I agree that time and expenditure is at the heart of the FCC's support of
ending code testing.

> > >
> > > So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
> > > unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
> > > trying to have in place for any license level?
> >
> > No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm)
effort
> > for two (Not any.) license levels.
> >
>
> I think it's OK to have two license levels. But, rather than a CW test,
I'd
> support nearly anything else but a mode test--any mode. Written tests
> suffice for any level of license.

Mee too, just can the published Q&A pools.

> > >
> > > Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
> > > already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
> > > on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
> > > is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
> > > determinator.
> >
> > You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a
valid
> > test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first most

> > popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the
stand-alone,
> > Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike speech.)
> >
>
> Ruh roh...there you go again with the "second most popular mode." If that
> is justification, then the first most popular mode needs to be tested, not
> the second. :o

Bring it on.

> Kim W5TIT

73 de Bert
WA2SI

295. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:20:50 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040104132050.986$Mn_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 85071
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> >> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> >> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> >> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> >> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> >> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> >> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> >> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> >> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> >> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> >> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> >> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> >> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> >> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> >> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> >> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> >> and harassment.
> >>
> >You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the
> >man in the moon too, jackass.
> >
> >Be careful when accusing people, you putz.
> >Paybacks can be a real bitch.
>
> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> these guys.> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Jan 4 18:16:46 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> 532284301978]
>
I get along fine with Leland and Jerry, it's -YOU- that's the trouble
maker, George Busch WA3MOJ. You make your bed, you have to sleep in it.

296. Re: Re:WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:27:30 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <mWYJb.6447$is1.3514@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> >> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> >> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> >> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> >> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> >> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> >> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> >> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> >> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> >> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> >> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> >> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> >> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> >> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> >> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> >> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> >> and harassment.
> >>
> >You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the
> >man in the moon too, jackass.
> >
> >Be careful when accusing people, you putz.
> >Paybacks can be a real bitch.
>
>
> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
> and breaking fcc laws etc.
> The other one is Landshark
> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA

But George, you said on the previous post I lived
in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC
again, among numerous others.

> he had a ham license
> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules

Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
have a license, now I lost it for not following
the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
like you on the local ham bands, not because of
"following" rules.

> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
> McCampbell of Florida.
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Jan 4 18:16:46 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP
532284301978]

Now George, you know I have nothing against
Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj
who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
why he create these posts, then cross post them
to cause a flame fest.

Landshark

http://www.google.com/groups?q=author:hell%40sween.com&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=wB
A67.15833%24EP6.3963758%40news1.rdc2.pa.home.com&rnum=5

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

297. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:35:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <j2ZJb.20300$lo3.4640@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85073

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> And when the vanity rules changed, there was naturally a spike in
> application numbers - and 10 years later, a spike in expirations.

We're about 30 months shy of even the leading edge of that spike.

73, Hans, K0HB

298. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 18:51:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <CgZJb.3036$uF6.1363006@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85074
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
>
>>(snip) The fact is that Morse code IS
>>the second most popular mode in use
>>in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself
>>is sufficient justification. (snip)
>
>
>
> And, in my humble opinion, it is not sufficient justification - no more
> than the fact that vacuum tubes or circular analog tuning dials were once
> popular justifies a requirement that they continue to be used. Clearly,
> unless there is a valid reason otherwise, anyone should be free to use those
> if he or she wants, but there should be no government regulation mandating
> that. The same with Morse code.
>

Dwight, how about giving us a good rational reason to continue testing
at all. I can break every reason with either rationale or minor
modifications to equipment.

- Mike KB3EIA -

299. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:02:23 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401041102.3fc67e28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"siroblivion." <sir@oblivion.org> wrote in message news:<IFWJb.135014$a31.64412@fe11>...
> "Bonnie Prince Charlie" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> news:bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com...
> > Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> > is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> > aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> > LaMarque Texas
>
> What ever happened to Timmy's website; wasn't it http://www.timnebo.com
>
> Remember checking it out a couple times Timmy displaying his stash, cheap
> Pawn Shop weaponry, 20 inch Nigga rims and a bunch of crack whores and big
> bottom black women.
>
> Funniest thing ever!

yeh what is bad about it is he thinks those bow legged hairy big booty
girls are cute too!!!!

300. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:11:15 UTC
From: Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com>
Message-ID: <bt9ogjvts1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 85076
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" S3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote:
>"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
>news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
>> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
>> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
>> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
>> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
>> and breaking fcc laws etc.
>> The other one is Landshark
>> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA
>
>But George, you said on the previous post I lived
>in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
>You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
>Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
>You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
>WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC
>again, among numerous others.
>
>> he had a ham license
>> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
>
>Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
>have a license, now I lost it for not following
>the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
>like you on the local ham bands, not because of
>"following" rules.
>
>> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
>> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
>> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
>> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
>> McCampbell of Florida.
>
> Now George, you know I have nothing against
>Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
>nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj
>who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
>why he create these posts, then cross post them
>to cause a flame fest.

Look queersack how many times do I have to
tell you you have no proof that WA3MOJ even posts

in here just because you saw those letters and numbers
at the bottom of someones post means nothing. Dont
take my word for it take Brainbusters he said callsigns
are meaningless in a CB newsgroup and they are just
random letters and numbers could mean anything like
kp82 tim nebo or scott unit 69 or what ever. There may
be some trolls who want you to think I am wa3moj but
they are laughing at you because you are so fucking
stupid how could any one be so stupid.....Now go take
a transexual up your ass.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sun Jan 4 20:11:15 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

301. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:29:39 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com>
Message-ID: <DQZJb.6005$Yx6.3723@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85077
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:bt9ogjvts1@news.x-echo.com...
> "Landshark" S3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote:
> >"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> >news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
> >> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> >> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
> >> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
> >> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
> >> and breaking fcc laws etc.
> >> The other one is Landshark
> >> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA
> >
> >But George, you said on the previous post I lived
> >in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
> >You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
> >Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
> >You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
> >WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC
> >again, among numerous others.
> >
> >> he had a ham license
> >> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
> >
> >Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
> >have a license, now I lost it for not following
> >the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
> >like you on the local ham bands, not because of
> >"following" rules.
> >
> >> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
> >> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
> >> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
> >> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
> >> McCampbell of Florida.
> >
> > Now George, you know I have nothing against
> >Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
> >nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj
> >who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
> >why he create these posts, then cross post them
> >to cause a flame fest.
>

> Look queersack how many times do I have to
> tell you you have no proof that WA3MOJ even posts
> in here just because you saw those letters and numbers
> at the bottom of someones post means nothing. Dont
> take my word for it take Brainbusters he said callsigns
> are meaningless in a CB newsgroup and they are just
> random letters and numbers could mean anything like
> kp82 tim nebo or scott unit 69 or what ever. There may
> be some trolls who want you to think I am wa3moj but
> they are laughing at you because you are so fucking
> stupid how could any one be so stupid.....Now go take
> a transexual up your ass.

Now of course it's you George, why else
would I have gotten the warning letter about posting under your aol screen nic
wa3moj@aol.com :

Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:26 -0500
X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw201648
for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

Hello,

This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy
department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings
sent from your SBCIS account.

It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet
newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
wa3moj@aol.com
Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.

Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
(http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
(http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to email
or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise objectionable
material.

If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it will
be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.

Sincerely,
The SBCIS Policy Department

Now I did that to prove you were really
posting on RRCB and that you did have an
AOL account, but you still show your trolling
ways by the response to the previous posts.
Why else would you be so vehemently denying
that you are George Busch wa3moj trolling
RRCB.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Jan 4 20:11:15 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

Landshark

Now do what is expected and make a denial
from you're Comcast account now.

--
The happy people are those who are producing something;
the bored people are those who are consuming much and
producing nothing.

302. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:36:40 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-22DE67.11364004012004@news.sf.sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 85078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>,
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:

<snip>

> That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most popular
> mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
> justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r 20.

<snip>

That's nice. The thread has moved on to the other main amateur Troll
subject "code." Nobody in rec.radio.shortwave cares. Please trim the
newsgroups.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

303. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:37:47 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040104143747.719$CQ@newsreader.com>
Source record: 85079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com> wrote:
> "Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> news:bt9ogjvts1@news.x-echo.com...
> > "Landshark" S3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote:
> > >"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> > >news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
> > >> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> > >> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
> > >> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
> > >> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
> > >> and breaking fcc laws etc.
> > >> The other one is Landshark
> > >> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA
> > >
> > >But George, you said on the previous post I lived
> > >in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
> > >You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
> > >Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
> > >You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
> > >WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC
> > >again, among numerous others.
> > >
> > >> he had a ham license
> > >> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
> > >
> > >Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
> > >have a license, now I lost it for not following
> > >the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
> > >like you on the local ham bands, not because of
> > >"following" rules.
> > >
> > >> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
> > >> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
> > >> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
> > >> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
> > >> McCampbell of Florida.
> > >
> > > Now George, you know I have nothing against
> > >Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
> > >nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj
> > >who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
> > >why he create these posts, then cross post them
> > >to cause a flame fest.

> >
> > Look queersack how many times do I have to
> > tell you you have no proof that WA3MOJ even posts
> > in here just because you saw those letters and numbers
> > at the bottom of someones post means nothing. Dont
> > take my word for it take Brainbusters he said callsigns
> > are meaningless in a CB newsgroup and they are just
> > random letters and numbers could mean anything like
> > kp82 tim nebo or scott unit 69 or what ever. There may
> > be some trolls who want you to think I am wa3moj but
> > they are laughing at you because you are so fucking
> > stupid how could any one be so stupid.....Now go take
> > a transexual up your ass.
>
> Now of course it's you George, why else
> would I have gotten the warning letter about posting under your aol
> screen nic wa3moj@aol.com :
>
> Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
> 14:07:26 -0500
> X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
> Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
> by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw201648
> for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500
>
> Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
> Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
> To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net
>
> Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
> From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
> Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net
>
> Hello,
>
> This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy
> department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings
> sent from your SBCIS account.
>
> It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet
> newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
> wa3moj@aol.com
> Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.
>
> Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
> (http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
> (http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to
> email or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise
> objectionable material.
>

> If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it
> will be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.
>
> Sincerely,
> The SBCIS Policy Department
>
> Now I did that to prove you were really
> posting on RRCB and that you did have an
> AOL account, but you still show your trolling
> ways by the response to the previous posts.
> Why else would you be so vehemently denying
> that you are George Busch wa3moj trolling
> RRCB.
> >
> Landshark
>
> Now do what is expected and make a denial
> from you're Comcast account now.
>
It's him, he's WA3MOJ the rec.radio.cb leg humper, bagged and tagged.

Notice how the loser trys to drag Leland and Jerry into his pissing
contest? Like those guys are going to defend george, riiiight! lol

304. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:38:45 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-974C7E.11384504012004@news.sf.sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 85080
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <%cXJb.23306$IM3.4720@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

<snip>

> Why does mode popularity mandate a separate skill test just
> because others use it? NO other mode has that special
> treatment...and, it appears, the FCC understands that.

<snip>

This is off topic and not popular in rec.radio.shortwave. Please trim
the newsgroups.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

305. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:41:20 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-BB1CE8.11411804012004@news.sf.sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 85081
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <ruYJb.38730$g77.8673398@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>,
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:

<snip>

> I gotta tell ya, Bill. You're your own worst adversary wrt to this debate.
> Did you bother to tell the NCI newbies about the benefit of using Q signals
> and prosigns on CW? Remember this post, Bill?

<snip>

I got to tell you that you look like a fool discussing ARRL, code and Q
signals in rec.radio.shortwave. Please trim the newsgroups.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

306. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:43:31 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-A65472.11433104012004@news.sf.sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 85082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401041006.1cf7cffd@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) wrote:

> > > > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
> > > > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
> > > > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
> > > > > the harm, danger, etc?
> > > >
>
>
>
> So lets see here. If the new jet airliners will fly and land
> themselves, the persons that occupy the cockpit don't really need to
> learn to fly. Makes perfect sense. They don't need to learn to fly
> because the computer does it for them.

Jet airliners are off topic in rec.radio.shortwave. Please edit the
newsgroups header.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

307. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145909.15462.00005404@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85084

In article <f45722ac.0401030854.650893e6@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040102175148.08626.00002451@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> In article <20031224102156.12501.00004836@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >> There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE.
>> >
>> >Says who?
>>
>> The Field First Sergeant of your SERVICE company when you
>> fall out for roll call at 0530.
>>
>> Answer "here" as your name is called...sound off like you got a
>> pair...
>>
>> Hup, too, tree, foah...
>>
>> LHA
>
>He's still out there, somewhere, marching and calling cadence all by hisself.

Yes...I can hear him even now...<beat of 120 per minute>

"I don't know but I've been told...morse code mode is solid gold!"

:-)

LHA

308. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145910.15462.00005405@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85086

In article <6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Bert Craig" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) The fact is that Morse code IS
>> the second most popular mode in use
>> in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself
>> is sufficient justification. (snip)
>
> And, in my humble opinion, it is not sufficient justification - no more
>than the fact that vacuum tubes or circular analog tuning dials were once
>popular justifies a requirement that they continue to be used. Clearly,
>unless there is a valid reason otherwise, anyone should be free to use those
>if he or she wants, but there should be no government regulation mandating
>that. The same with Morse code.

Irrelevant, Dwight. The amateur community has specifed the criteria
and goals of amateurism.

First and foremost is morsemanship. This is necessary to show the
requisite dedication and commitment of all amateurs to the community,
that they posess the needed self-discipline to learn the most vital and
important mode in radio today, on-off keying by morse code.

>> Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm
>> test, NOT 13 0r 20.
>
> If a person has no interest in code, the speed certainly isn't going to
>change that.

Obviously such individuals are unworthy of amateurism, lacking the
necessary dedication and commitment to morsemanship and
possessing absolutely no self-discpline.

>> (snip) Yes, I would very much "like to
>> continue mandating a skill test for a mode
>> that is all but gone from the world of
>> radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
>> AMATEUR USE." Thats because it's a
>> skill test for upgrading within, not entry
>> into, the ARS (snip)
>
> The Amateur Radio Service does not exist in a vacuum, Bert. The FCC
>recently said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing
>requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."

>They came to that conclusion after looking at modern communications systems
>outside Amateur Radio and the changes that have occurred in communications
>over the last fifty years. They noted that "no communication system has been
>designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability
>to receive messages in Morse code by ear." And they said reducing the
>emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement would "allow
>the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined
>persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn
>and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs
>expertise."

Irrelevant. The amateur community sets standards. FCC, ITU, IARU
has no bearing on standards and practices.

Morsemanship is vital and important to save the world should aliens
arrive from outer space, trying for conquest of the earth.

Morsemanship is vital and important to home security, protecting us
from terrorism.

Morsemanship is vital and important during disasters and
emergencies when all the communications infrastructure fails.

>> You mean the second most popular mode
>> in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
>> requirement determinator. (snip)
>
> If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the second
>most popular mode, why not argue the same for the third, forth, or even
>fifth, most popular modes?

Irrelevant. Morsemanship stands on its own. It does not need
polls or popularity opinions.

Morsemanship is the most important aspect of amateur radio today.

It demonstrates self-discipline, dedication, and commitment to the
amateur community. That is vital and necessary.

> By the way, where did you get the idea that CW was the second most popular
>mode? I agree that SSB is probably the most popular. But, given the sheer
>numbers of Technicians today and the fact that not all others use CW on a
>regular basis, certainly far more people use FM than CW today.

Irrelevant for reasons shown above.

Morsemanship is vital and necessary, stands on its own. It is LAW.

LHA

309. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145912.15462.00005406@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85089

In article <jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>> news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
><Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
>> > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
>> > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
>> > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
>> > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
>> > about how one never plans on using it.
>>
>> Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
>> Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
>> even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
>
>That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most popular
>mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
>justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r 20.

Morse code skill is the epitome of amateur radio.

The morse code test should never, ever be removed from US amateur
radio law.

If fact, the morse code test word rate should be increased to HIGHER
than 20 WPM.

This will inspire even greater self-discipline, dedication, and commitment
to the amateur comunity's goals and standards.

Morse code modes SHOULD be First, not second.

Morsemanship is vital and important.

That morse code modes are merely second shows a definite lack of
self-discipline, dedication, and commitment to the goals of
amateurism.

>> > I'm not much into the newer
>> > digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
>> > communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
>> > leads through some learning and testing re. said subjects.no problem.
>> > (Psst, it's a character issue.)

>>
>> No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
>> about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
>> for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
>> mode is set on that pedestal.
>
>Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?

Absolutely. Morsemanship is vital and important. The test shows
self-discipline, dedication, and commitment to the amateur
community.

>> > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
>> > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
>> > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
>> > > the harm, danger, etc?
>> >
>> > None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
>> > skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
>> > challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
>> > same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
>> > many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
>> > their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing
>> > away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
>> > yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.
>>
>> You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
>> have done so.
>
>The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent
>multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the entire
>ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.

Insufficient self-discipline and dedication to morsemanship.

You can do more.

You are judged a slacker and ne'erdowell, demonstrating insufficient
dedication and commitment to the amateur community.

You have been warned.

LHA

310. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145917.15462.00005407@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85087

```
In article <9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<5GoJb.5632$6B.3229@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>> > news:b7d1465c.0401021356.1193770@posting.google.com...
>> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<31fJb.4967$6B.1128@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>> > > > news:b7d1465c.0401020325.22c43587@posting.google.com...
>> > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<6V%Ib.19278$IM3.4671@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> > > > > > news:rzZIb.27922$Do6.6729932@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > IMHO, No-Code Int'l. has:
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > 1. Encouraged the idea that it is preferable to lower the
>> > requirements
>> > > > > > > through mass petition rather than encourage individuals to
>strive
>> > toward
>> > > > > > > higher achievement. Some refer to it as "lowering the bar."
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > Call it whatever you want. I guess the states "lowered" the bar
>> > > > > > when they stopped testing new drivers on manual gearbox autos.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Funny you should mention that, Bill. You see, I took my first
>driver's
>> > > > > license exam in Jamaica, W.I. where, if you tested in a car
>equipped
>> > > > > with an automatic transmission, your driving privileges were
>limited
>> > > > > to vehicles equipped likewise. It was not really about the
>> > > > > "privileges," but about safety and all understood this. (Though we
>ALL
>> > > > > bemoaned the dreaded ramp test.) So yes, I suppose you did "guess"
>> > > > > correctly although the analogy is not quite appropriate to the
>ARS.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Don't take my word for it. Ask the poor slob who got rear-ended by
```

>> > > > > that person who borrowed his/her friend's car and, in a panic
>stop,
>> > > > > mistook the clutch pedal for the brake pedal when the driver ahead
>of
>> > > > > him/her stopped short. Actually Bill, I was that poor slob about
>ten
>> > > > > years ago...so maybe you should take my word for it. I let him
>slide
>> > > > > though as the damage was minimal with no injuries. Besides, why
>make
>> > > > > us all pay via increased insurance premiums. Hmm, 1500 Watts on
>> > > > > VHF/UHF...perhaps it wasn't a bad analogy after all?
>> > > > >
>> > > > > > The reality is the Morse test is past its prime...and the entire
>> > body
>> > > > > > of international countries have seen fit to eliminate Morse as
>> > > > > > an international treaty element.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > The reality is that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
>> > > > > today and is a part of the big picture. Let's also not forget that
>> > > > > we're talking about the 5-wpm exam for upgrade within, not for
>entry
>> > > > > into, the ARS.
>> > > >
>> > > > So how many rear-enders have no-coders had while using CW?
>> > >
>> > > Oh, I don't know, Bill.let's see. Let's ask that fellow who just
>> > > passed Element 2 and just couldn't wait to get OTA. So he bought a
>> > > nifty little dual-bander, a "killer" Mirage amp, and pumped a few
>> > > hundred Watts or VHF or UHF RF into his nice long Yagi (You know, the
>> > > one marketed as a "Boomer.") pointed toward a distant repeater.right
>> > > through the second floor of his neighbor's house. Heck, he mounted it
>> > > on the mast that formerly hosted a TV antenna.that ought to be good
>> > > enough, right?
>> >
>> > And none of this would have happened if only he had known
>> > code? Give me a break.
>>
>> I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
>> actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1. I'm
>> addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
>> meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than complain
>> about how one never plans on using it.
>
>Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
>Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
>even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.

It's the LAW, Bill. LAW can't be changed.

[normal US democratic principles and the First Amendment of the
US Constitution does not apply to amateur radio law...]

>> I'm not much into the newer
>> digital modes nor am I particularly interested in Satellite assisted
>> communications, however, if the path to upgrading my license/privies
>> leads through some learning and testing re. said subjects.no problem.
>> (Psst, it's a character issue.)
>
>No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
>about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
>for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
>mode is set on that pedestal.

Morse code is the epitome, the ultimate top-most skill that
amateurs can possess.

Morse code skill is absolutely vital and important for all radio
amateurs.

>> > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
>> > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
>> > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
>> > the harm, danger, etc?
>>
>> None. But I suspect you are deliberately missing my point. The code
>> skills themselves are irrelevant. You could substitute any actual
>> challenging aspect of upgrading one's ticket in it's place and the
>> same folks would likely bemoan it. In this "I want it now" culture,
>> many don't want to have to actually put forth much effort to earn
>> their ticket. I'd be all for dropping Element 1 altogether AND doing
>> away with the published Q&A pools. How about just a study guide? Oh
>> yeah, let's make Element 2 50 questions while we're at it.
>
>You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
>have done so.

>> > > After all, I'm sure that someone who is so bothered at the notion of
>> > > having to learn and be tested on a skill he deems irrelevant to how he
>> > > plans on operating, that he joins an "international" movement to
>> > > remove said offensive task.would certainly be concerned and cognizant
>> > > of any harmful RF his equipment might be radiating. Heck, he did pass
>> > > that 35 multiple-guess.er, I meant choice test that proclaimed him
>> > > "ready." I am fairly certain though that his mode of choice was not
>> > > CW. ;-)
>> > >
>> > > > The analogy is a joke.
>> > >
>> > > Actually, I am pretty much joking around with you, Bill. (Lighten up.)
>> > > HOWEVER, the potential for physical harm is there and somewhere the
>> > > above scenario may be playing out as you read these words.and that's
>> > > no joke.
>> >

>> > The potential for harm, physical or otherwise is NOT tied
>> > to anyone's knowledge of code. THAT is the point.
>>
>> Sorry, Bill. That may be the point you'd like to key on, (No pun
>> intended) but that's not the point I'm stressing. I agree 100% with
>> the sentence above. It's the slacker-mentality (Sorry, time to shoot
>> from the hip.) that I deplore. If we really want to get young folks
>> involved in AR, this is not a principle I'd like to see them learn.
>
>You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
>is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
>except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
>NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.

Everything outside of amateur radio is irrelevant.

Amateur radio communications operates outside radio physics
laws applying to every other radio service.

I have been told these TRVTHS as they were engraved on the
marble and granite of other amateur extra's minds and stated
to me.

>> If
>> you complain enough, the bar will be lowered for you. As a youth, the
>> concept of achievement (As well as a well-rounded education.) was
>> constantly stressed and I thank God I had folks (Parents, teachers,
>> guidance counselors, etc.) that cared enough to strongly encourage us
>> to achieve rather complain. I feel so sorry for the kids that are
>> recently got that curve on their Regents exam rather than enroll in a
>> summer program to increase their knowledge to the appropriate level.
>> Some will perform poorly in college and if enough of them complain
>> that their college curriculum is unfairly difficult, perhaps that bar
>> will be lowered as well. Interestingly enough, I now tend to seek out
>> those Elmers who will push me to become a better operator. IMHO, they
>> have my best interests at heart.
>
>My my, I guess the end of all amateur upgrading
>and new learning will be tied to the end of code
>testing.

Absolutely.

>You must have really been disappointed when
>states stopped testing drivers on manual gearboxes.
>For me it was no problem. When my kids wanted
>to drive they learned or they had no car to drive as
>all our vehicles had been standard shift. Those that
>want to learn will. Trying to claim some great
>philosophical tie of ending code testing being
>the start of an end to new/old hams continuing to
>learn is just bunk.

No, it is Divine Law. US amateur radio is all about morse code.

>> > > > There is ZERO element of safety involved with CW knowledge/testing.
>> > >
>> > > Agreed. It's the mindset I find kinda alarming. Folks that have no
>> > > problem with putting forth the effort to advance in their endeavors
>> > > are more likely to exercise that same "work ethic" wrt conscientiously
>> > > ensuring the safe operation of their station. Conversely, folks that
>> > > would rather complain about having to put forth some effort (Let's be
>> > > honest, the effort is rather minimal re. Element 1.) to advance
>> > > themselves are perceived to be "corner-cutters." (Some might even call
>> > > them."slackers.")
>> >
>> > The "effort" has nothing to do with code testing. The goal
>> > of ending code testing is based solely on the lack of any continued need
>for code skills
>> > to be mandated for any HF access.
>>
>> I disagree, I truly believe that it's almost all about the required
>> effort.
>
>So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
>unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
>trying to have in place for any license level?

Absolutely vital, important, and a fact of life that all must
demonstrate SELF-DISCIPLINE, DEDICATION, and
COMMITMENT to olde-tyme hamme tradition.

Morse code skill is an integral ingredient of that tradition.
IT MUST NOT BE BROKEN. EVER!

>> Again, drop those published Q&A pools and watch the squirming
>> commence.
>
>It will never happen and I don't care if it did. The old
>ARRL and AMECO learners guides were just as easy to
>memorize sufficiently to pass. I did the General test in
>the late 50s exactly that way.

Irrelevant, Bill. That does not demonstrate self-discipline and
blind obediance to the traditions of the amateur community.

>> Folks just don't want to be made to have to sit down for 20
>> mins., twice daily, for a month or two and memorize 43 Morse code
>> characters.
>
>Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
>already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
>on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
>is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
>determinator.

Self-discipline demonstrated to the whole of the amateur community.

Vital, important, necessary.

>> > There was, in the past, a rational reason
>> > or set of reasons for code knowledge. Those days are gone.
>> > It is that simple.
>>
>> There still is. It's the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
>> today.
>
>Yet that failed to convince the FCC and, more
>recently the ITU. The point is that those bodies
>recognize that no one needs to know morse just to be
>issued a license. Those that wish to engage in
>morse contacts are free to learn morse and use it.
>The issue is solely the test requirement and has no
>link to actual morse use by anyone.

Option is a failure.

Morse code skill MUST be demonstrated to the amateur community
to show dedication and commitment to olde-tyme hamme radio.

>> > > BIG BIG DISCLAIMER: I am quite aware that this is not true for all
>> > > no-code Technicians and/or NCI members, HOWEVER, all it takes is one
>> > > poor soul getting a cranial soaking from some dunderhead who wants to
>> > > bombard that repeater to validate the concern. Lest the repeater folks
>> > > feel offended, there is a club here on LI devoted to simplex operation
>> > > who support VHF/UHF operation with a tad more than the few hundred
>> > > Watts mentioned above.
>> >
>> > Again, this dialog isn't about the validity or not of
>> > current writtens. My point(s) here are focused only on
>> > code testing. PERIOD!
>>
>> Again, my dialogue is addressing the character issue involved re.
>> squeaking vs. achieving.
>
>That's just the old tripe argument that has convinced no one.
>The rony of your claim is that most of us that are the
>nucleus of NCI activity had already done the morse
>test at 5, 13 and/or 20 wpm. Nothing to gain now
>if code testing goes altogether.

Morse code skill MUST be the prime focus of all amateur radio.

All else is superfluous and irrelevant.

Except membership in ARRL, of course...

>> Do you really want to focus on the code test,
>> Bill. Quite frankly, Element 1 is NOT much of a code test to focus on
>> and very rarely leaves anybody with any level of OTA proficiency. So

>> you see, it's not the actual code knowledge or lack thereof that makes
>> for the dangerous scenario.it's the associated mentality of those
>> who'd rather squeak than achieve that can possibly lead to harm.
>
>Yawn.
>
>> > > > Had there been any relevant safety
>> > > > aspect to justify CW testing the FCC would have acknowledged it.
>> > >
>> > > You slay me, Bill. Is this the same FCC that's ready to administer the
>> > > BPL suppository to AR? "Who's yer daddy now?!"
>> >
>> > Sorry to burst your bubble, but its the only
>> > FCC we have. Indeed, had the FCC seriously
>> > errored in their past decion(s) regarding need
>> > or non-need for code skills testing, then I'm
>> > amazed you and others haven't filed court action to
>> > stop the FCC.
>>
>> Quite frankly, Bill.I'm no big fan of the FCC. You are, however,
>> correct.they're the only game in town. Do I think they make mistakes?
>> Sure, but I'm not sufficiently motivated to file a court action
>> against them. A few letters to my elected representatives and some
>> recreational debate on R.R.A.P suffices.
>
>What, no motivation? :-) :-)

Insufficient dedication and commitment to the amateur community.

ARRL speaks for amateur radio. Individuals do not count.

>> Trust me, my bubble is very much intact. I came into AR approx. three
>> years ago pretty much oblivious to the code vs. no-code debate. All I
>> knew was that I wanted to be an ARO and operate HF. Like I've said
>> before, remove the whing and passion from both sides of the debate and
>> the obvious remains like a purple elephant in the living room.
>
>The FCC removed the winning/passion when they issued the R&O
>for 98-143. If you haven't read that yet, I suggest you do.

The Holy Words of amateurism were written by T.O.M.

Those are the only ones that matter.

>> > > > > > > 2. Made the notion of more privileges via higher achievement
>> > appear as
>> > if
>> > > > > > > > it's fundamentally wrong. If one wishes to upgrade, then meet
>the
>> > > > > > > > requirements necessary to achieve that upgrade. (Not just the
>> > requirements
>> > > > > > > > we *want* to meet.)

>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > I see it as fundamentally wrong when the added privileges
>> > > > > > have no rational link to the added/higher achievement attained.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > Second most popular mode in use today...particularly on HF?!
>> > > > >
>> > > > So how come a no-code tech isn't banned from using CW
>> > > > on the only two all-CW only bands.
>> > >
>> > > That nice slow-code practice you speak of below. Learn to drive in a
>> > > safe environment before venturing onto the highway.
>> >
>> > If new ham goes OnTheAir to learn code, does that trouble you?
>>
>> Not at all. I consider myself a relatively new ham and I continue to
>> increase my code proficiency OTA. After all, the license is really
>> just a ticket to learn.
>
>Exactly. So then why the need for code skill testing...oh,
>I remember, the FCC must impose a mystical quantity
>of effort for all ham licensing.

US amateur radio is all about morse code skill.

All amateurs must exercise self-discipline, dedication, and
commitment to the amateur community by becoming
morsemen.

>> > What part of amateur spectrum is considered highway vs
>> > non-highway?
>>
>> Thanks for makin' it easy, Bill. How about the CW only portion of
>> 2-meters? I think that sounds like a groovy place to practice some
>> seriously slow code with a code-buddy. Then, if I like it, perhaps I'd
>> pass Element 1 and hop on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands to increase my
>> proficiency. Thos are some examples of "rural routes."
>>
>> The highway, hmm. Would you really encourage a brand newbie to hop on
>> 7026 kHz and mix it up w/the 35-wpm+ crowd, Bill? Think they'd feel
>> encouraged?
>
>IF they did so, so what? They'd either make a QSO or not.
>Nothing ventured, nothing gained. If they felt out of
>place they'd shift to calmer waters.

Not relevant. No dedication or commitment to the epitome of
amateur radio skill embodied in morsemanship.

>> I've had a couple of ops QRS from 20-wpm down to 19-wpm
>> for me and lemme tell ya, it wasn't fun. Conversely, I have had guys
>> switch to some really nice Farnsworth style 25-wpm character speed
>> spaced apart to about 8-wpm and an hour and a half ragchew QSO just

>> breezed on by with very little effort or tension.
>
>To each his own. What ever floats your boat. I see no problem
>with newbie hams doing morse at slow speeds anywhere morse
>is allowed as long as they do so within the rules.

Those should be drummed out of the corps, banished to the nether world of VHF and higher. All must show commitment and dedication to the amateur community by maintaining a pool of trained morsemen ready and waiting to save the world from alien invasion.

Everything good in US amateur radio is about morse code skill.

Self-discipline, dedication, committing to the olde-tyme hamme traditions. Showing all one's hard work and efforts.

Words to live by in the amateur lifestyle, the belief system that is the bastion of amateurism. Amen.

LHA

311. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145918.15462.00005408@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85088

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401030302.4dd5ae51@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040102225709.15462.00005374@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <5a5fcb7b.0401021856.624c8aa0@posting.google.com>,
>> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:
>>
>> >Don't see where a morse test was ever required for a 1st phone.
>>
>> Not only are you an anonymous bigot but you have reading
>> difficulty as well.
>>
>> You asked only if anyone passed "a test" at an FCC office.
>>
>> >Did you ever pass a ham exem at the FCC office?
>>
>> Never tried to, not even for an exam rather than an "exem."
>>
>> >Just another wanna be?
>>
>> Hardly. I started as a hobbyist in electronics in 1947. After my
>> military service I made a career out of electronics engineering.
>> I'm still doing that even if I don't keep regular hours.
>>
>> What is your excuse, anonymous one?
>>
>> LHA
>
>Hey stupid. The thread is about "Why I hate ARRL".

Incorrect. The thread subject is titled "Why You Don't Like The
ARRL - More to like than dislike."

Your web browser seems to be defective. Get it corrected.

>This concerns HAM RADIO.

"Ham is the butchered meat of swine." [You can get the same sort
of definition from the official FDA if you like... :-)]

>Ham radio operators operate on shortwave.

"Shortwave?!?" In the electronics industry, the term "shortwave" or
"shortwaves" is becoming common in defining microwaves.

US radio amateurs are allocated a number of HF bands plus one
band within the MF portion of the EM spectrum.

US radio amateurs are also allocated a number of bands above
70 cm which can qualify as "shortwave."

>Glad to have you correct my spelling anytime oh great one.

It's a tough job but someone has to do it.

>Anonymous? Naw. I have a
>valid email address listed in each and every header.

Absolutely NO valid amateur radio identification for you, ANONYMOUS
PERSON.

>Anyway, if you
>check out the thread you will find it does not concern you.

Oh, my, another Raddio Kop, self-imposed guardian of the webways.

Such come out of the webwork like mice or rats, ready and eager
to gnaw on meager morsels of melifluous metaphors of others.

Bon apetit, ANONYMOUS ONE.

LHA
Leonard H. Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

312. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145919.15462.00005409@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85085

In article <f45722ac.0401040700.31209cba@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>
>> >
>> > Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
>> > inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
>> >
>>
>> I knew you'd agree with me.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>I just happen to agree with Hans' plan. Allow the amateur to
>distinguish him or herself through actions rather than an FCC forced
>march.

While I agree on the generality of that, such is impossible under
the present-day Class Distinction Rules of US amateur radio.

ALL perceived expertise is judged by the "amateur community"
as demonstrated by the fancy-bordered license (suitable for
framing) from the federal government.

The Amateur Extra is the epitome of excellence. Once achieved,
nothing else need be learned. Education ends. You have been
told by his Most High Excellency, the Dill Instructor.

All learning comes through having tiers and tiers of classes, of
distinctions (enforced by law) right along with the social need of
call letters written behind the name to signify a "title" all may see
(and admire, respect) as if it is a dukedom, barony, or other
noble rank. That is VERY IMPORTANT. Do not criticize any
statements of the ruling classes of the "community."

US amateur radio seems to have ceased being a hobby, an
avocational activity done for personal recreation. It has become a
LIFESTYLE...a True Belief.

<cut to stock shot of Rod Serling and signpost up ahead, voice
sign-off by Rod...up theme and take black...>

LHA

313. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 19:59:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104145920.15462.00005410@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85083

In article <MWUJb.20521$P%1.19646882@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031225180555.09599.00001473@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> > >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> > >Date: 12/25/03 5:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312251501.133978ef@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> > >Sounds like what we've inherited today. Let's do something rational
>instead.
>> >
>> > It will be interesting to see what YOU call "rational".
>> >
>> > Steve, K4YZ
>>
>> Steve, you never pay attention, do you?
>>
>> I've said it many, many times. One amateur radio service, one amateur
>> radio license. And maybe a learners permit as Hans suggests.
>>
>> How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>> really want?
>
>You will of course expect the licensing exam to be equivalent to the sum of
>knowledge required for Tech, General and Extra for this single full
>privilege license.

All that is required is a test of morsemanship. All else is irrelevant.

Morsemanship is the epitome of amateur radio today.

Passing a morse test shows dedication, commitment, and self-discipline to the amateur community.

That is vital and necessary.

LHA

314. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 20:14:35 UTC
From: tanda@extremezone.com
Message-ID: <dda7bc89.0401041214.34916cf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85090
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"siroblivion." <sir@oblivion.org> wrote in message news:<IFWJb.135014$a31.64412@fe11>...
> "Bonnie Prince Charlie" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> news:bt82imtgl1@news.x-echo.com...
> > Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> > is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> > aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> > LaMarque Texas
>
> What ever happened to Timmy's website; wasn't it http://www.timnebo.com
>
> Remember checking it out a couple times Timmy displaying his stash, cheap
> Pawn Shop weaponry, 20 inch Nigga rims and a bunch of crack whores and big
> bottom black women.
>
> Funniest thing ever!

funny as hell

315. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 20:20:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3A_Jb.20587$P%1.19721133@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85004

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:xvYJb.20223$lo3.11388@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > You will of course expect the licensing exam to be equivalent to the sum
> of
> > knowledge required for Tech, General and Extra for this single full
> > privilege license.
>
> Yes. Good plan. (Toss in Novice and Advanced while we're on the topic.)
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Well of course but that's already been done. The current Tech pool now
covers the old Novice material and the current Extra pool now covers the old
Advanced material.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

316. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 20:35:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104153501.12300.00002528@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 85091

In article <CgZJb.3036$uF6.1363006@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "Bert Craig" wrote:
>>
>>>(snip) The fact is that Morse code IS
>>>the second most popular mode in use
>>>in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself
>>>is sufficient justification. (snip)
>>
>>
>>
>> And, in my humble opinion, it is not sufficient justification - no more
>> than the fact that vacuum tubes or circular analog tuning dials were once
>> popular justifies a requirement that they continue to be used. Clearly,
>> unless there is a valid reason otherwise, anyone should be free to use
>those
>> if he or she wants, but there should be no government regulation mandating
>> that. The same with Morse code.
>>
>
> Dwight, how about giving us a good rational reason to continue testing
>at all. I can break every reason with either rationale or minor
>modifications to equipment.

Passing a morse code test shows vital and important self-discipline,
dedication, and commitment to the amateur community.

That should be self-evident.

Status quo forever.

LHA

317. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 20:35:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104153504.12300.00002529@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 85092

In article <cIYJb.38886$g77.8748095@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:bt9gvk$2g5@library1.airnews.net...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > >
>> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
>> > > news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
>> > <Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
>> > > > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
>> > > > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1.
>I'm
>> > > > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge and
>> > > > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than
>complain
>> > > > about how one never plans on using it.
>> > >
>> > > Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
>> > > Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
>> > > even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
>> >
>> > That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most
>> popular
>> > mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
>> > justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r
>20.
>> >
>>
>> Bert, if you're using popularity as a justification--and the test
>questions
>> may have changed to inlcude this since I entered ham radio--then why are
>> there no questions or demonstration required during testing for the
>*number
>> 1* most popular mode of operation?
>
>Because for 99.9% of ARO's, speach is a skill that's already in our toolbox
>upon entry into the ARS.

I was not able to "speach" a half century ago.

However, after dedicating myself and working up self-discipline (as a
demonstration the community), I'll see if I can test for "speaching."

>> Not that I am arguing against your desire to see CW stay as a test
>> element--that is your desire and I have no problem with it at all. But,
>the
>> argument of popularity probably doesn't, in fact doesn't with me, hold
>water
>> for importance--and can be turned around to my question above: why not
>have
>> questions based on phone operation and also have the mode tested? A net
>> condition is easy to establish for testing, doesn't even really require
>> radio at all (it could be "pretended" in any room with more than one
>> person).
>
>I understand, Kim...and I agree. Whatever the questions or "requirements"
>are, bring 'em on. I'd be willing to make the effort to meet the
>requirements for the desired privies.

"Privies" are many outhouses.

That seems to fit...

>> > > No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
>> > > about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
>> > > for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
>> > > mode is set on that pedestal.
>> >
>> > Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?
>> >
>>
>> For me, there is an issue at *any* speed for CW testing. It's validity
>has
>> waned.
>
>See the language post I pasted into my reply to Bill's post. I can
>communicate effectively with my Japanese counterpart without actually
>speaking Japanese. Let 'em try that on phone.

As a demonstration of my self-discipline and dedication to my
community, I was able to "speach" directly to a Japanese business
associate about three weeks ago. On the telephone. To Japan.

We speached English.

However, you are correct. All foreign amateurs are born knowing
English abbreviations and Q codes used in morse. Morse code
use allows perfect communications around the world and insures
continuation of world peace.

>> > > You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
>> > > have done so.
>> >
>> > The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent

>> > multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the
>entire
>> > ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.
>> >
>>
>> heh heh...see...I haven't sent any, as the issue isn't that important to
>me
>> and I can live with it either way. I really never intend on upgrading,
>and
>> already 5 wpm. I leave the real meat of this issue to those who are that
>> passionate about it. :)
>
>A reasonable stance.

Morsemanship is not a "stance." It shows dedication and commitment
to the amateur community, a vital necessity.

Morsemanship is a way of life.

>> > > You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
>> > > is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
>> > > except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
>> > > NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.
>> >
>> > YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you!
>> Yes,
>> > I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode
>that
>> > is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
>> AMATEUR
>> > USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry
>> into,
>> > the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
>> > today. Too easy, Bill.
>> >
>>
>> Again, I point out that it would probably not be a plus for the FCC to
>> continue facilitating a CW test, when it is nearly only the ARS that has
>it
>> in use today. I am not sure what costs are associated with administering
>> the CW test, but one must inlcude any time spent/wasted (depending on your
>> point of view) for the FCC, congresspersons, etc., to read and deal with
>the
>> issue.
>
>I agree that time and expenditure is at the heart of the FCC's support of
>ending code testing.

Morse code testing shows dedication and commitment to the ideals of
the amateur community, not the FCC.

>> > > So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
>> > > unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
>> > > trying to have in place for any license level?
>> >
>> > No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm)
>effort
>> > for two (Not any.) license levels.
>> >
>>
>> I think it's OK to have two license levels. But, rather than a CW test,
>I'd
>> support nearly anything else but a mode test--any mode. Written tests
>> suffice for any level of license.
>
>Mee too, just can the published Q&A pools.

Put them in with the "privies."

>> > > Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
>> > > already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
>> > > on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
>> > > is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
>> > > determinator.
>> >
>> > You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a
>valid
>> > test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first most
>> > popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the
>stand-alone,
>> > Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike speech.)
>> >
>>
>> Ruh roh...there you go again with the "second most popular mode." If that
>> is justification, then the first most popular mode needs to be tested, not
>> the second. :o
>
>Bring it on.

A test on morsemanship shows vital and necessary dedication and
commitment to the amateur community.

LHA

318. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 20:56:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104155656.07961.00001037@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85093

In article <j2ZJb.20300$lo3.4640@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> And when the vanity rules changed, there was naturally a spike in
>> application numbers - and 10 years later, a spike in expirations.
>
>We're about 30 months shy of even the leading edge of that spike.
>
Yep - and we don't know if it will be a spike, or a bump, or whatever. Or even if it has much of an effect at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

319. Re: JD HAVRY The Final Word "May Be Dangerous" JJ aka TailGator aka Radiobuff aka KF4ANC aka leeman aka John aka Kenny aka Brent aka JR aka BJ aka GH aka ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:11:25 UTC
From: tanda@extremezone.com
Message-ID: <dda7bc89.0401041311.7795fbf9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85094
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

WA3MOJ wrote in message news:...
> Why are you flaming JJ radiobuff now William Wallace? What did JJ ever do to
> you?
>
> In article , Ballen says...
> >
> >On Sat, 03 Jan 2004 22:32:24 GMT, th@t.other.george (Regards, Agent Smith)
> >wrote:
> >
> >
> >
> >Most excellent! I knew he was hiding something. Maybe they should put out an
> >AMBER
> >ALERT for him. Does anyone know what type of rig he has?
> >
> >
> >
> >>Terry,
> >>
> >>I did some research and I came up with some of the names he has used in the
> >>past. You can Google for any of them to find out more about his
> >>multiple personalities. This man may be capable of what you claim. He's armed
> >>and claims he has been busted for violent crimes including robbery. If I
> >>were you I'd contact the authorities and let them deal with it.
> >>
> >>
> >>Lou Cummings (Camelot@castlegate.net)
> >>Tailgator (Tailgator@ix.netcom.com)
> >>John (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>KF4ANC (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>JHaury (SkynyrdBook@cajun.zzn.com)
> >>TailGator (skynyrd_book@hotmail.com)
> >>leeman (skynyrd_book@hotmail.com)
> >>John & Karen (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>John TailGator (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>J Haury (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>JJ (radiobuff@mailcity.net)
> >>JR (radiobuff@mailcity.net)
> >>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.net)
> >>JR (radiobuff0@mailcity.net)

> >>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)
> >>BJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
> >>JR (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
> >>GH (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
> >>JJ (radiobuff@mailcity.com)
> >>JR (radiobuff@mailcity.com)
> >>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)
> >>TailGator (tailgator@prontomail.com)
> >>TailGator (nomail@privacy.net)
> >>Kenny (Militaria75@hotmail.com)
> >>Brent (brentsco9@yahoo.com)
> >>radiobuff (me@privacy.net)
> >>radiobuff (radiobuff@hotmail.com)
> >>JJ (planetj7@bellsouth.net)
> >>Radiobuff (nail3inch@yahoo.com)
> >>TailGator (kf4anc@yahoo.com)
> >>
> >>By his own admission the person posting as J Havry admits that he shot a man,
> >>robbed banks in the 80's and is a needle user. He has tried to buy and
> >>sell weapons over the internet, carries a gun and is an interstate trucker. He
> >>may also be a racist, involved in software piracy and homosexual. He is
> >>on his way to California already or soon.
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>Admits to carrying gun
> >>
> >>From: "radiobuff"
> >>Newsgroups: alt.guitar.bass
> >>References: <0Uhlb.92461$0Z5.72935@lakeread03>
> >>Subject: Re: What's in YOUR gig bag?
> >>Lines: 49
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Sun, 09 Nov 2003 20:03:24 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc02.gnilink.net 1068408204 4.4.58.104 (Sun, 09 Nov 2003 15:03:24
> >>EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 09 Nov 2003 15:03:24 EST
> >>
> >>
> >>kewl thread...my 2 cents
> >>
> >>extra strings
> >>towel
> >>string winder

> >>9v batteries
> >>extra cables
> >>Boss tuner
> >>spearmint gum
> >>Leatherman tool (pliers, wire cutters)
> >>BC Powder (YES!)
> >>duct tape
> >>ear plugs
> >>flashlight (mini-maglite)
> >>utility knife/lockblade
> >>set list
> >>digital camera
> >>water bottle/holster
> >>strap locks
> >>extra strap
> >>pony tail holders
> >>Beretta Compact 9mm Model L semi-automatic pistol (depends what part of town
> >>I am in:)
> >>extra mag of ammo
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Admits he shot a man in Louisiana, shot dope and robbed banks in the eighties.
> >>
> >>
> >>From: "leeman"
> >>Newsgroups: alt.music.southern-rock
> >>References:
> >>
> >>
> >>Subject: Re: The LIST
> >>Lines: 298
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 22:31:11 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc03.gnilink.net 1071527471 4.4.58.104 (Mon, 15 Dec 2003 17:31:11
> >>EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 17:31:11 EST
> >>
> >>
> >>one thing about the john lee walker band, those guys were true outlaws in
> >>the real world. one of those guys was featured in the skynyrd book "an oral
> >>history" jhis name was john haury. he was friends with ronnie and the band
> >>and they tore up a few bars together. I think he was even busted for

> >>shooting a man somewhere in Louisiana and robbing banks in the eighties.
> >>they were all pretty hardcore dopers and needle freaks but man could they
> >>jam. anybody know what ever happened to them? I saw them once with skynyrd
> >>in west va in 76 and they were awesome but very young and inexperienced,
> >>i've always wonmdered what became of them. heroin destroiyed a damn good
> >>band!!!!
> >>
> >>lee
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Showing interest in things homosexual.
> >>
> >>From: "radiobuff0@mailcity.moc"
> >>Subject: Gay Pride Picnic 2003 Recap
> >>Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc
> >>
> >>About 270 people, an all time record, came together to celebrate the
> >>11th annual Pride Erie Picnic at Presque Isle, Beach 11 on June 14,
> >>2003. Once again, we had hot dogs and hamburgers and folks brought a
> >>yummy assortment of dishes. There were about 225 people at last year's
> >>picnic, which was the previous record amount for attendance.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>Date: 28 Jun 2003 22:10:15 -0000
> >>Message-ID:
> >>From: "JJ"
> >>Subject: JJ exclusive N.J. GAY DUOS SUE TO MARRY You go girls
> >>Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc
> >>Lines: 29
> >>
> >>
> >>June 28, 2003 -- Seven same-sex couples began fighting yesterday for
> >>the right to get married in New Jersey — one day after the U.S. Supreme
> >>Court stamped out a Texas law that made gay sex a crime.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Looking to pirate some software
> >>
> >>From: Radiobuff
> >>Newsgroups: alt.2600.crackz

> >>Subject: adobe Premiere pro v7 expire info
> >>Reply-To: nospam.nail3inch@yahoo.com
> >>Message-ID:
> >>X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.8/32.548
> >>MIME-Version: 1.0
> >>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> >>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> >>Lines: 5
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 69.144.209.36
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@bresnan.net
> >>X-Trace: attbi_s52 1067905650 69.144.209.36 (Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT
> >>Organization: Bresnan Online
> >>Date: Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT
> >>
> >>
> >>Just woundering if there is a more curent copy of Adobe Premiere Pro
> >>v7 out there as the latest one expires March 1 2004 and its version #
> >>is c552 8/11/2003/r. If you dodnt believe it, turn your computer
> >>clock up to March 1 2004. The last copy I had expired Nov 1 2003. To
> >>note the 2 copy`s I put one I used the keygen to do a key.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Showing how classy and cultured he is
> >>
> >>From: JJ
> >>User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:1.4)
> >>Gecko/20030624 Netscape/7.1 (ax)
> >>X-Accept-Language: en-us, en
> >>MIME-Version: 1.0
> >>Newsgroups: ny.politics
> >>Subject: UNA's strike again
> >>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
> >>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> >>Lines: 15
> >>Message-ID:
> >>X-Trace:
> >>npbhgpngjbkmjfegdbdpiflmbcekedmfhojhikkbagflhcboadlfadgbofomnhcjonkedhnjbgmfaelbbgjghf
njpeanimkkhhkbhhlpijajakbmnmfcnpfeoeaakoimjplnlhhaibcdamclomlgcccebcdfdbbm
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 22:31:57 EDT
> >>Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 22:32:36 -0400
> >>
> >>
> >>Another UNA (Urban Nigger Ape) proves why some are that. Baboons with
> >>clothes.
> >>

> >>JACKSONVILLE, Florida (AP) -- A 2-year-old left alone for nearly three
> >>weeks while her mother was behind bars survived by eating mustard,
> >>ketchup, rice and raw pasta, police said.
> >>
> >>The toddler was watching cartoons when found by her father, police said
> >>Monday. She was suffering from malnutrition and was being treated at
> >>Wolfson Children's Hospital, police said.
> >>
> >>Dakeysha Lee, 22, was charged Monday with child abuse because she didn't
> >>let anyone know that her daughter was alone in her apartment, police
> >>said. She was jailed Sept. 10 on unrelated charges.
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Trying to beat Federal Drug Testing
> >>
> >>From: "TailGator"
> >>Newsgroups: alt.drugs.pot
> >>Subject: Medicinal Marijuana
> >>Lines: 33
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 18:03:13 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 65.32.220.35
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@rr.com
> >>X-Trace: twister.tampabay.rr.com 1047837793 65.32.220.35 (Sun, 16 Mar 2003
> >>13:03:13 EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 13:03:13 EST
> >>Organization: RoadRunner - Tampa Bay
> >>
> >>
> >>Hey people, found this newsgroup because I wanted to post and get some
> >>opinions.
> >>
> >>A guy I know used to play and tour with a neo-famous southern rock and roll
> >>band in the 70s & early 80s, traveled with folks like Lynyrd Skynyrd,
> >>Charlie Daniels, Marshall Tucker, etc, and he lived on the fast lane for a
> >>few years, did it all, became a junkie, cleaned up (several times) and did
> >>the 12-step thang, all that - and when the southern rock scene fizzled in
> >>the early 80s this boy had to clean up his act and get a real job. Welcome
> >>to Corporate America.
> >>
> >>Well, as a result of his dangerous habits, he has since developed diabetes
> >>(Type II) and was diagnosed with neuropathic damage to his sciatic nerve
> >>(neurapathy), the worst of his diabetes-related ailments - he went

> >>undiagnosed for a long time. Until recently, he hasn't smoked pot since
> >>1986. He now finds that smoking not only eases the discomfort, but also
> >>eases the nausea he feels after glucophage and other meds hit his stomach.
> >>He used to be a heavy toker:) but now he smokes when he feels the need,
> >>which is once or twice a day. He is strongly opinionated to the fact that it
> >>does have medicinal qualities - he's proven that it lowers blood sugar and
> >>it makes him feel better. He does it only in the privacy of his own home.
> >>It's his business.
> >>
> >>Unfortunately, he now works for a major corporation that randomly drug
> >>tests, and he knows his number is going to be up one of these times. I
> >>would like to hear from anyone in a similiar situation, or anyone with any
> >>advice on how to really beat the tests, live the way you want to in
> >>Corporate America. Any and all advice would be greatly appreciated, but
> >>please spare sarcasm and flames. No time for that - thanks!
> >>
> >>JD
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
....
> >>
> >>Attempting to buy and sell Weapons over the Internet
> >>
> >>From: TailGator
> >>Subject: FS: SS Ruger Mini-14
> >>Date: 1998/04/29
> >>Message-ID: <6i8n42$p3o@xring.cs.umd.edu>#1/1
> >>Approved: gun-control@cs.umd.edu
> >>Organization: Loozyana Bayou, Inc
> >>Newsgroups: rec.guns
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>Ruger Mini-14, almost NIB fired twice. Installed Choate flash hider and
> >>customized rubber butt pad. Mint condition.
> >>
> >>Make Offer plus shipping.
> >>
> >>John
> >>KF4ANC
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>From: "TailGator"
> >>Newsgroups: rec.knives
> >>Subject: Tac Folder Stag?
> >>Lines: 15
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Thu, 18 Dec 2003 15:04:44 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc01.gnilink.net 1071759884 4.4.58.104 (Thu, 18 Dec 2003 10:04:44
> >>EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 18 Dec 2003 10:04:44 EST
> >>
> >>
> >>I'm also looking for a small (4") LL folder with stag handles, replacing one
> >>I lost recently. I went to a knife maker here locally in St. Petersburg FL
> >>(Roger Gamble) who made me a custom folder with very handsome stag handles,
> >>but it's a bit too big and bulky for the pocket - made to be holstered and
> >>he included a very nice leather holster with it. Although I love this knife,
> >>its not somethng I can carry to work in my pocket. Prefer liner lock, one
> >>hand open, possible with pocket clip on it. Any ideas? Thanks
> >>
> >>The one I lost was called the Tactical Folder, but I'll be darned if I can
> >>remember the company name...bought it from a catalog called The Edge many
> >>years ago...they are no longer making the knife.
> >>
> >>TG
> >>
> >>
> >>From: "radiobuff"
> >>Newsgroups: rec.knives
> >>Subject: FS: Phrobis M-9 Buck
> >>Lines: 11
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Thu, 23 Oct 2003 19:24:59 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.59.1
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc01.gnilink.net 1066937099 4.4.59.1 (Thu, 23 Oct 2003 15:24:59
> >>EDT)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 23 Oct 2003 15:24:59 EDT
> >>
> >>
> >>Like new Buck Phrobis III military field knife/bayonet with scabbard and
> >>pouches as it was sold by Buck. Used once on a fishing trip and been in
> >>gunsafe since then. Asking $175 - interested parties can email me directily
> >>if you want to see a pic - great knife! Only selling it and other items
> >>because I am wanting to buy new ham radio. Offering it here for a few days,
> >>if no response you will see it on ebay. You will be very pleased with this
> >>knife...

> >>
> >>john
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>Good Luck.
> >>
> >>
> >>Regards,
> >>-Smith. Agent Smith
> >

Are you guys REALLY this stupid ???!!!

320. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:15:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bt9vpp$887@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85095

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040104155656.07961.00001037@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <j2ZJb.20300$lo3.4640@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "K&#65533;HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> And when the vanity rules changed, there was naturally a spike in
> >> application numbers - and 10 years later, a spike in expirations.
> >
> >We're about 30 months shy of even the leading edge of that spike.
> >
> Yep - and we don't know if it will be a spike, or a bump, or whatever. Or
even
> if it has much of an effect at all.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

You are the keeper of the "poll." I say that there will be no siginificant spike in application numbers. In fact, I think you'll see the number of applicants for new licenses go down (first-time entry to the ARS--or entry from long expiration).

By the way, what of the "poll" for when CW would be eliminated from the arena of testing?

Kim W5TIT

321. Re: JD HAVRY The Final Word "May Be Dangerous" JJ aka TailGator aka Radiobuff aka KF4ANC aka leeman aka John aka Kenny aka Brent aka JR aka BJ aka GH aka ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:24:34 UTC
From: Lord Floyd <nospam@biteme.invalid>
Message-ID: <Xns946688685DA05SMEGHEAD@199.45.49.11>
Source record: 85096
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

tanda@extremezone.com (czar) wrote in news:dda7bc89.0401041311.7795fbf9
@posting.google.com:

>> >>-Smith. Agent Smith
>> >
>
> Are you guys REALLY this stupid ???!!!
>

As to opposed to reposting the entire message for this gem....

--
You are a fluke of the Universe
You have no right to be here
And whether you can hear it or not,
the Universe is laughing behind your back

322. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:31:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bta0nd$6f9@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85097

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:cIYJb.38886$g77.8748095@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bt9gvk$2g5@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:jvVJb.33338$g77.7647916@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9HBJb.6361$6B.1548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:b7d1465c.0401030533.52e9f0da@posting.google.com...
> > > <Lets's save some bandwidth, snip!>
> > > > > I'm not talking about "knowing" the code, Bill. Very few people
> > > > > actually "know" the code from preparing for and passing Element 1.
> I'm
> > > > > addressing the self-discipline required to accept the challenge
and
> > > > > meet the requirements to upgrade one's privileges rather than
> complain
> > > > > about how one never plans on using it.
> > > >
> > > > Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> > > > Using your philosophy, the FCC should never change requirements...
> > > > even when a specific requirement no longer has justification.
> > >
> > > That's not it at all. The fact is that Morse code IS the second most
> > popular
> > > mode in use in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself is sufficient
> > > justification. Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm test, NOT 13 0r
> 20.
> > >
> >
> > Bert, if you're using popularity as a justification--and the test
> questions
> > may have changed to inlcude this since I entered ham radio--then why are
> > there no questions or demonstration required during testing for the
> *number
> > 1* most popular mode of operation?
>
> Because for 99.9% of ARO's, speach is a skill that's already in our
toolbox
> upon entry into the ARS.
>
```

Please excuse my indignation, but "speech," in and of itself, is a very minimal aspect of phone operation. There are procedures--long held traditional procedures, as well as R&R procedures set forth by the FCC--that make phone operation an acquired skill if one is to be effective in ham radio.

That belief is not defensively mentioned, I truly believe it. I have actually witnessed poorly executed phone operation that netted in nothing when signals and conditions were optimal; it was just that the operating was so poor that no one was even slightly interested in return on such poor operating. And, then there's net conditions. Some people, but very few, come by net operation smoothly and without incident. But, for the majority, operating in a net condition, especially on HF is truly an art--every bit as much as CW operation in my opinion.

> >
> > Not that I am arguing against your desire to see CW stay as a test
> > element--that is your desire and I have no problem with it at all. But,
> the
> > argument of popularity probably doesn't, in fact doesn't with me, hold
> water
> > for importance--and can be turned around to my question above: why not
> have
> > questions based on phone operation and also have the mode tested? A net
> > condition is easy to establish for testing, doesn't even really require
> > radio at all (it could be "pretended" in any room with more than one
> > person).
>
> I understand, Kim...and I agree. Whatever the questions or "requirements"
> are, bring 'em on. I'd be willing to make the effort to meet the
> requirements for the desired privies.
>

Exactly. And, I think anyone would--anyone who is serious about their desire, that is.

> > > >
> > > > No problem there and I don't oppose "knowledge" questions
> > > > about CW the mode. The issue is the stand alone skill test
> > > > for morse which is a separate pass fail element. NO other
> > > > mode is set on that pedestal.
> > >
> > > Is this really an issue at 5-wpm, Bill?
> > >
> >
> > For me, there is an issue at *any* speed for CW testing. It's validity
> has
> > waned.
>
> See the language post I pasted into my reply to Bill's post. I can
> communicate effectively with my Japanese counterpart without actually
> speaking Japanese. Let 'em try that on phone.

>

That is still not justification. If it were ability to send and receive,
then there are needed tests in many modes, not just CW. I don't need to
know a language with SSTV, either. In fact, I daresay I'd need less
language capability on SSTV than nearly any other mode.

> > > >
> > > > You are free to propose any changes you wish. Others already
> > > > have done so.
> > > >
> > > The changes I find acceptable are already in a RM proposal. I've sent
> > > multiple letters and/or e-mails to my elected representatives, the
> entire
> > > ARRL leadership, and the FCC. That'll suffice for now, thanks.
> > > >
> > >
> > heh heh...see...I haven't sent any, as the issue isn't that important to
> me
> > and I can live with it either way. I really never intend on upgrading,
> and
> > already 5 wpm. I leave the real meat of this issue to those who are
that
> > passionate about it. :)
>
> A reasonable stance.
>

I always try to be reasonable, at a minimum. ;)

> > > >
> > > > You'd rather we continue mandating a skill test for a mode that
> > > > is all but totally gone from the world of radio communications
> > > > except within amateur use? Again, per my comment above,
> > > > NO other mode has its own unique test. That's the point.
> > > >
> > > YEAH BABY!!! You are THE BEST, Bill...thank you, thank you, thank you!
> > Yes,
> > > I would very much "like to continue mandating a skill test for a mode
> that
> > > is all but gone from the world of radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
> > AMATEUR
> > > USE." Thats because it's a skill test for upgrading within, not entry
> > into,
> > > the ARS and the mode is the second most popular mode in use in the ARS
> > > today. Too easy, Bill.
> > > >
> > >
> > Again, I point out that it would probably not be a plus for the FCC to
> > continue facilitating a CW test, when it is nearly only the ARS that has
> it

> > in use today. I am not sure what costs are associated with
administering
> > the CW test, but one must inlcude any time spent/wasted (depending on
your
> > point of view) for the FCC, congresspersons, etc., to read and deal with
> the
> > issue.
>
> I agree that time and expenditure is at the heart of the FCC's support of
> ending code testing.
>

Yep. I think it's the majority of the issue for them, and believe it will
be the demise of CW testing *in spite of* whatever we or the ARRL has to
say.

> > > >
> > > > So let me get this straight. You wantis some undefined,
> > > > unmeasurable amount of effort that the FCC should be
> > > > trying to have in place for any license level?
> > >
> > > No Bill, I want a very defined (Element 1) very measurable (5-wpm)
> effort
> > > for two (Not any.) license levels.
> > >
> >
> > I think it's OK to have two license levels. But, rather than a CW test,
> I'd
> > support nearly anything else but a mode test--any mode. Written tests
> > suffice for any level of license.
>
> Mee too, just can the published Q&A pools.
>

Absolutely. And, mind you...had it not been for the style of testing in
operation when I got my license, I would not be a ham today. And I *still*
think the tests (written) should be tougher, and unpublished.

> > > >
> > > > Irrelavent. The point is NOT the effort, and the FCC has
> > > > already chimed in on the. The test must exist or go based
> > > > on a clear and understood need for the knowledge. EFFORT
> > > > is not now and never has been recognized as a valid test requirement
> > > > determinator.
> > >
> > > You mean the second most popular mode in use today doesn't rate as a
> valid
> > > test requirement determinator. Gee, we could have one for the first
most
> > > popular, SSB, but we already know how to talk. That's way the
> stand-alone,

> > > Bill. It's a learned skill that's an unknown coming in. (Unlike
speech.)
> > >
> >
> > Ruh roh...there you go again with the "second most popular mode." If
that
> > is justification, then the first most popular mode needs to be tested,
not
> > the second. :o
>
> Bring it on.
>
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Man, it took me nearly a year of listening...to all kinds of nets, before I felt confident enough to enter one and feel my presence would be seamless and without disruption. I was right, and felt at home once I keyed in and entered the net. And, not to give readers here the idea that nets are unfriendly--it was *me* that placed the demand upon myself not to be embarrassed the first few times, not a net or net control. Nets and good net controls are very patient and mentor wonderfully. To this day, the greatest fun I've ever had on HF was with MARS and being Net Control (even though that venue was more stressful to me than any other!)

Kim W5TIT

323. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:57:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104165704.15462.00005413@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85098

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401041006.1cf7cffd@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>> > > > Answer the question asked...The question is, for those that need
>> > > > clarity: IF someone became a General or Extra with NO
>> > > > code skills, and then decided to learn code on-the-air, what's
>> > > > the harm, danger, etc?
>
>So lets see here. If the new jet airliners will fly and land
>themselves, the persons that occupy the cockpit don't really need to
>learn to fly. Makes perfect sense. They don't need to learn to fly
>because the computer does it for them.

For that matter, why would you need people in the cockpit at all?

This isn't as far fetched as it sounds. More than 25 years ago, the BART (transit) system in the SF area was designed to run without drivers. A lot of basic things were (re)learned at great expense in the process....

Most of today's radio communication systems are designed to work without radio operators. That's why MF CW on ships was replaced with the GMDRSS (or whatever it's called) system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

324. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:57:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104165704.15462.00005414@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85099

In article <3FF77F3B.188B87D9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Trivia Quiz:
>>
>> There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?
>
>W1MK, I think located near Brainard Field, Hartford.

You are correct, sir! Heavily damaged in the flood of '36, as I recall.
>
>> There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?
>
>Memory fails...
>
W1INF

73 de Jim, N2EY

325. New Year's Eve Record Set

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 21:58:35 UTC
From: "M. Boker" <azk@mailburgnet.net>
Message-ID: <bta29qjra0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85100
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Initial assessments from monitoring groups and other observers indicates a record number of pirates, unlicensed broadcasters, & intruders took to the airwaves New Year's Eve and New Year's Day across the U.S.

Activity was observed on HF in the 6600-6900 khz range and 15 mhz band. Larger cities had four & five unlicensed Low Power FM stations going simultaneously. Some observers reported unlicensed activity even appearing in the AM broadcast band!

M. Boker

326. Re: JD HAVRY The Final Word "May Be Dangerous" JJ aka TailGator aka Radiobuff aka KF4ANC aka leeman aka John aka Kenny aka Brent aka JR aka BJ aka GH aka ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 22:14:21 UTC
From: vfr99_2001@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <524ee40f.0401041414.2585128c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

Nice work, i had most of the same as well but did'nt post.

I think u missed a couple, at least these were used in fabricated
emails to my address.

Alden wd4bsr wd4bsr@yahoo.com

Steve Vinsonnospam234@netcom.com

George gtgrandprix00@aol.com

327. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 22:23:06 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <en0Kb.1526$Ui2.403339@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85002

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0401041347.705f0f6b@posting.google.com...
> Steve will have to try them all on to prove me wrong. He should get
> the white ones so he can wear them to work.

Brian, IMHO, what Steve does for a living is one hell of a noble occupation. Discuss, debate, or argue about ARS related stuff all you want, but I'd cut the man some slack wrt mentioning his job in a disrespectful light while doing so.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

328. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 22:25:53 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401041425.54960966@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040104132050.986$Mn_-_@newsreader.com>...
> Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> > Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> > >Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> > >> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> > >> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> > >> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> > >> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> > >> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> > >> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> > >> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> > >> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> > >> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> > >> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> > >> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> > >> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> > >> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> > >> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> > >> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> > >> and harassment.
> > >>
> > >>You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the
> > >>man in the moon too, jackass.
> > >>
> > >>Be careful when accusing people, you putz.
> > >>Paybacks can be a real bitch.
> > >
> > Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> > these guys.> =-
> > Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> > Le : Sun Jan 4 18:16:46 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> > 532284301978]
> >
> I get along fine with Leland and Jerry, it's -YOU- that's the trouble
> maker, George Busch WA3MOJ. You make your bed, you have to sleep in it.

i wonder if he will be sleeping in his bed when someone takes a pic of
his house in allentown.????

329. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 22:27:52 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401041427.1d792058@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85005
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:<bt9ogjvts1@news.x-echo.com>...
> "Landshark" S3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote:
> >"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> >news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
> >> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> >> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
> >> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
> >> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
> >> and breaking fcc laws etc.
> >> The other one is Landshark
> >> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA
> >
> >But George, you said on the previous post I lived
> >in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
> >You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
> >Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
> >You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
> >WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC

> >again, among numerous others.
> >
> >> he had a ham license
> >> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
> >
> >Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
> >have a license, now I lost it for not following
> >the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
> >like you on the local ham bands, not because of
> >"following" rules.
> >
> >> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
> >> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
> >> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
> >> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
> >> McCampbell of Florida.
> >
> > Now George, you know I have nothing against
> >Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
> >nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj
> >who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
> >why he create these posts, then cross post them
> >to cause a flame fest.

>
> Look queersack how many times do I have to
> tell you you have no proof that WA3MOJ even posts
> in here just because you saw those letters and numbers
> at the bottom of someones post means nothing. Dont
> take my word for it take Brainbusters he said callsigns
> are meaningless in a CB newsgroup and they are just
> random letters and numbers could mean anything like
> kp82 tim nebo or scott unit 69 or what ever. There may
> be some trolls who want you to think I am wa3moj but
> they are laughing at you because you are so fucking
> stupid how could any one be so stupid.....Now go take
> a transexual up your ass.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Jan 4 20:11:15 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

damn shark you got georgie girl doing a major league tap
dance.....hmmm this hammie sounds guilty as charged.......

330. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 22:51:31 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040104175131.085$49@newsreader.com>
Source record: 85006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

gw@webhideout.com (gw) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040104132050.986$Mn_-_@newsreader.com>...
> > Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> > > Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> > > >Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote:
> > > >> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> > > >> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> > > >> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> > > >> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> > > >> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> > > >> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> > > >> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> > > >> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> > > >> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> > > >> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> > > >> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> > > >> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> > > >> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> > > >> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> > > >> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> > > >> and harassment.
> > > >>
> > > >You're a regular friggin Columbo, maybe it's the
> > > >man in the moon too, jackass.
> > > >
> > > >Be careful when accusing people, you putz.
> > > >Paybacks can be a real bitch.
> > >
> > > Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> > > these guys.> =-
> > > Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> > > Le : Sun Jan 4 18:16:46 2004 depuis l'IP : acd2e0ee.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> > > 532284301978]
> > >
> > I get along fine with Leland and Jerry, it's -YOU- that's the trouble
> > maker, George Busch WA3MOJ. You make your bed, you have to sleep in it.
>
> i wonder if he will be sleeping in his bed when someone takes a pic of
> his house in allentown.????
>
Think he has rubber sheets for crisco nancy?

331. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 23:57:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104185710.07961.00001043@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85008

In article <bt9vpp$887@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Yep - and we don't know if it will be a spike, or a bump, or whatever. Or
>> even if it has much of an effect at all.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>You are the keeper of the "poll." I say that there will be no siginificant
>spike in application numbers. In fact, I think you'll see the number of
>applicants for new licenses go down (first-time entry to the ARS--or entry
>from long expiration).

Quite possible.

By the way, what of the "poll" for when CW would be eliminated from the
arena of testing?

That was a pool, not a poll. I just updated it in its thread. So far four
predicted dates have passed.

You may just wind up being the winner of that one, Kim.

73 de Jim, N2EY

332. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 23:57:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104185710.07961.00001042@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85009

In article <6JWJb.7583$6B.3222@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Bert Craig" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) The fact is that Morse code IS
>> the second most popular mode in use
>> in the ARS today. IMHO, that in itself
>> is sufficient justification. (snip)
>
> And, in my humble opinion, it is not sufficient justification - no more
>than the fact that vacuum tubes or circular analog tuning dials were once
>popular justifies a requirement that they continue to be used.

There were never any test questions on circular analog tuning dials AFAIK. There used to be lots of test questions on tubes but they are almost all gone now - because most hams' rigs don't use tubes any more.

But the use of Morse Code in amateur radio is very popular. It's a big part of *today's* amateur radio, not just its past.

There are far more hams on the air today using Morse Code than hams using homebrew ham rigs. Yet we still test for theory knowledge even though most hams won't ever need to use most of it.

>Clearly,
>unless there is a valid reason otherwise, anyone should be free to use those
>if he or she wants, but there should be no government regulation mandating
>that. The same with Morse code.

Yet in order to get a ham license today, one must pass written tests containing many questions on solid-state electronics - even though there is no requirement to use that technology. A ham who wants to get on HF in the non-General parts of the bands using only vacuum-tube equipment still has to pass 3 tests full of questions on solid-state technologies, even though there is no mandate that s/he use those technologies.

>> Remember, we're talking about the 5-wpm
>> test, NOT 13 0r 20.

> If a person has no interest in code, the speed certainly isn't going to
> change that.

Apply that same logic to the written test...
>
>> (snip) Yes, I would very much "like to

>> continue mandating a skill test for a mode
>> that is all but gone from the world of
>> radio communications EXCEPT WITHIN
>> AMATEUR USE." Thats because it's a
>> skill test for upgrading within, not entry
>> into, the ARS (snip)
>
> The Amateur Radio Service does not exist in a vacuum, Bert. The FCC
>recently said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing
>requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."

The FCC also said that BPL was a step toward "broadband Nirvana". Heck, a
commissioner said that...

>They came to that conclusion after looking at modern communications systems
>outside Amateur Radio and the changes that have occurred in communications
>over the last fifty years.

Sure. Did anyone think they would contradict themselves?

>They noted that "no communication system has been
>designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability
>to receive messages in Morse code by ear."

Has any communication system been designed in many years that depends
on *any* special radio operator skills?

>And they said reducing the
>emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement would "allow
>the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined
>persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn
>and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs
>expertise."

But that hasn't happened. Didn't happen after 1991, nor again after 2000.
>
>> You mean the second most popular mode
>> in use today doesn't rate as a valid test
>> requirement determinator. (snip)

> If you're going to argue that to justify a test requirement for the second
>most popular mode, why not argue the same for the third, forth, or even
>fifth, most popular modes?

Because none of those modes require learning specific new skills.

> By the way, where did you get the idea that CW was the second most popular
>mode? I agree that SSB is probably the most popular. But, given the sheer
>numbers of Technicians today and the fact that not all others use CW on a
>regular basis, certainly far more people use FM than CW today.

On amateur HF/MF, it's the second most popular mode. And a code test is only
needed
for amateur HF/MF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

333. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-04 23:57:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104185711.07961.00001044@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85007

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008

If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.

73 de Jim, N2EY

334. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 00:27:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ac2Kb.20819$lo3.7240@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85010

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

Given that ARRL likely will lobby for continuing a code test for Amateur Extra (12-13WPM?) applicants, I predict that Morse testing will not be eliminated in this decade.

While it's a cop out, it's probably the only way they can get 15 politicians to sign up for a "New Amateur Radio Plan" without a palace revolt on their hands at the BoD meeting. They'll be able to go back to East Overshoe, Iowa and Resume Speed, Arizona and mumble platitudes to their membership about how "We've opened HF to non-Morse applicants, but where it really counts we actually increased the Morse requirement."

That's my story and I'm sticking to it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

335. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 00:33:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <9y2dnRjs28VSLWWiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 85011

While I wish it would be sooner, I'm going to guestimate
that we'll see a Report and Order in December, 2004.

Carl - wk3c

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040104185711.07961.00001044@mb-m03.aol.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

336. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 00:41:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Jo2Kb.20834$lo3.9817@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85012

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

Given that ARRL likely will lobby for continuing a code test for Amateur Extra (12-13WPM?) applicants, I predict that Morse testing will not be eliminated in this decade.

While it's a cop out, it's probably the only way they can get 15 politicians to sign up for a "New Amateur Radio Plan" without a palace revolt on their hands at the BoD meeting. They'll be able to go back to East Overshoe, Iowa and Resume Speed, Arizona and mumble platitudes to their membership about how "We've opened HF to non-Morse applicants, but where it really counts we actually increased the Morse requirement."

That's my story and I'm sticking to it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

337. Re: New Year's Eve Record Set

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 01:08:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FF8B915.5030902@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85013
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

M. Boker wrote:

>Initial assessments from monitoring groups and other observers
> indicates a record number of pirates, unlicensed broadcasters,
>& intruders took to the airwaves New Year's Eve and New Year's
>Day across the U.S.
>
>
Today with the Internet with the World Wide Web, it seems pointless to bother with pirate broadcasting. If I had a message I wanted heard (or read) I'd set up a web page. If I wanted people to hear my garage band's music, I could upload the mp3s to that web page. The web page would be available 24/7 world wide. A pirate station will only have a very limited
range and time period, and most people interested in your material would miss it.

Add the fact that the pirate station is rather illegal, the web page would be the media of choice.

338. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 01:10:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <IP2Kb.3251$uF6.1428489@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85017

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
>>eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
>
> Given that ARRL likely will lobby for continuing a code test for Amateur
> Extra (12-13WPM?) applicants, I predict that Morse testing will not be
> eliminated in this decade.

You mean they will increase the requirements from 5wpm?

- Mike KB3EIA -

339. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 01:18:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <UX2Kb.20736$P%1.19824241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85014

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040104185711.07961.00001044@mb-m03.aol.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Put me down for July 1, 2005.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

340. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 01:38:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btaf8u$fvc@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85015

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040104185710.07961.00001043@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <bt9vpp$887@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Yep - and we don't know if it will be a spike, or a bump, or whatever.
Or
> >> even if it has much of an effect at all.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >You are the keeper of the "poll." I say that there will be no
siginificant
> >spike in application numbers. In fact, I think you'll see the number of
> >applicants for new licenses go down (first-time entry to the ARS--or
entry
> >from long expiration).
>
> Quite possible.
>
> By the way, what of the "poll" for when CW would be eliminated from the
> arena of testing?
>
> That was a pool, not a poll. I just updated it in its thread. So far four
> predicted dates have passed.
>
> You may just wind up being the winner of that one, Kim.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Uh huh...and you *could* validate me as a ham by inserting my callsign on
the submission. :o

Kim W5TIT

341. Re: WA3MOJ does not post to this NG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 02:07:39 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0401041807.5cbd12e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Lancer <lancer@rock..com> wrote in message
news:<X1XJb.3741557$be.586472@news.easynews.com>...
> On Sun, 04 Jan 2004 09:01:39 -0600, William Wallace (Georgie-girl Busch)
> <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:
>
> >richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in
> >news:c5ecbb69.0401040613.3f921416@posting.google.com:
> >
> >> Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> >> news:<bt82im$tgl$1@news.x-echo.com>...
> >>> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> >>> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> >>> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> >>> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> >>> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> >>> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> >>> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> >>> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> >>> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> >>> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> >>> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> >>> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> >>> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> >>> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> >>> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> >>> and harassment.
> >>
> >> Sorry, Charlie (really Georgie-girl Busch WA3MOJ). It's hardly >
> >> random < for someone to choose your callsign since you are the biggest
> >> TROLL in the cb newsgroup. If they target > you < it's because you
> >> deserve it for making so many fag posts and personal attacks on people
> >> you don't even know.
> >>
> >>
> >Sorry assclown, you are really 1 clueless TROLL, do a search on dickiehed
> >cranium, and note his trolling ways. George busch does not post to this
> >NG, you have some serious serious mental problems.
> >>
>
> How do you know George Busch doesn't post to this NG? Either you are
> him or you have first hand knowledge of which groups he does post in.
```

Come to think about it, in a sort of perverted way he's correct:
Georgie-girl Busch doesn't dare post in this newsgroup > under his
real name <. But he hasn't stopped TROLLing or flaming under dozens of
phoney nics and fake email addys in the three years I've been reading
and posting here.

Either way, he is "really 1 clueless TROLL" and thinks he's sooooo
clever! LOL!

But why did he snip my post? Because I pointed out that he had forged
posts as N8WWM? Intelligent people want the truth, Georgie, and not
just the truth as you want them to know it.

342. Re: Why don't you like this cross posted to rec.radio.cb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 02:11:47 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0401041811.62603ccb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

DouGayisakeyclownz@yahoo.com (No No Not George) wrote in message news:<e7a52aa9.0401021623.3b2e51ec@posting.google.com>...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message news:<20040102082953.232$cK_-_@newsreader.com>...
> > Because most topics that are cross posted to this many groups
> > end up being worthless tripe.
>
> Look here is Steveo trolling ham groups again why am I not surprised.

Look here is DouGay Adair N8WWM trolling cb groups again why am I not surprised.

343. Re: JD HAVRY The Final Word "May Be Dangerous" JJ aka TailGator aka Radiobuff aka KF4ANC aka leeman aka John aka Kenny aka Brent aka JR aka BJ aka GH aka ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 03:01:38 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401041901.7499c4e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

WA3MOJ wrote in message news:...
> Why are you flaming JJ radiobuff now William Wallace? What did JJ ever do to
> you?
>
> In article , Ballen says...
> >
> >On Sat, 03 Jan 2004 22:32:24 GMT, th@t.other.george (Regards, Agent Smith)
> >wrote:
> >
> >
> >
> >Most excellent! I knew he was hiding something. Maybe they should put out an
> >AMBER
> >ALERT for him. Does anyone know what type of rig he has?
> >
> >
> >
> >>Terry,
> >>
> >>I did some research and I came up with some of the names he has used in the
> >>past. You can Google for any of them to find out more about his
> >>multiple personalities. This man may be capable of what you claim. He's armed
> >>and claims he has been busted for violent crimes including robbery. If I
> >>were you I'd contact the authorities and let them deal with it.
> >>
> >>
> >>Lou Cummings (Camelot@castlegate.net)
> >>Tailgator (Tailgator@ix.netcom.com)
> >>John (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>KF4ANC (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>JHaury (SkynyrdBook@cajun.zzn.com)
> >>TailGator (skynyrd_book@hotmail.com)
> >>leeman (skynyrd_book@hotmail.com)
> >>John & Karen (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>John TailGator (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>J Haury (BayouLaRue@ij.net)
> >>JJ (radiobuff@mailcity.net)
> >>JR (radiobuff@mailcity.net)
> >>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.net)
> >>JR (radiobuff0@mailcity.net)

> >>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)
> >>BJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
> >>JR (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
> >>GH (radiobuff0@mailcity.com)
> >>JJ (radiobuff@mailcity.com)
> >>JR (radiobuff@mailcity.com)
> >>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)
> >>TailGator (tailgator@prontomail.com)
> >>TailGator (nomail@privacy.net)
> >>Kenny (Militaria75@hotmail.com)
> >>Brent (brentsco9@yahoo.com)
> >>radiobuff (me@privacy.net)
> >>radiobuff (radiobuff@hotmail.com)
> >>JJ (planetj7@bellsouth.net)
> >>Radiobuff (nail3inch@yahoo.com)
> >>TailGator (kf4anc@yahoo.com)
> >>
> >>By his own admission the person posting as J Havry admits that he shot a man,
> >>robbed banks in the 80's and is a needle user. He has tried to buy and
> >>sell weapons over the internet, carries a gun and is an interstate trucker. He
> >>may also be a racist, involved in software piracy and homosexual. He is
> >>on his way to California already or soon.
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>Admits to carrying gun
> >>
> >>From: "radiobuff"
> >>Newsgroups: alt.guitar.bass
> >>References: <0Uhlb.92461$0Z5.72935@lakeread03>
> >>Subject: Re: What's in YOUR gig bag?
> >>Lines: 49
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Sun, 09 Nov 2003 20:03:24 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc02.gnilink.net 1068408204 4.4.58.104 (Sun, 09 Nov 2003 15:03:24
> >>EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 09 Nov 2003 15:03:24 EST
> >>
> >>
> >>kewl thread...my 2 cents
> >>
> >>extra strings
> >>towel
> >>string winder

> >>9v batteries
> >>extra cables
> >>Boss tuner
> >>spearmint gum
> >>Leatherman tool (pliers, wire cutters)
> >>BC Powder (YES!)
> >>duct tape
> >>ear plugs
> >>flashlight (mini-maglite)
> >>utility knife/lockblade
> >>set list
> >>digital camera
> >>water bottle/holster
> >>strap locks
> >>extra strap
> >>pony tail holders
> >>Beretta Compact 9mm Model L semi-automatic pistol (depends what part of town
> >>I am in:)
> >>extra mag of ammo
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Admits he shot a man in Louisiana, shot dope and robbed banks in the eighties.
> >>
> >>
> >>From: "leeman"
> >>Newsgroups: alt.music.southern-rock
> >>References:
> >>
> >>
> >>Subject: Re: The LIST
> >>Lines: 298
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 22:31:11 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc03.gnilink.net 1071527471 4.4.58.104 (Mon, 15 Dec 2003 17:31:11
> >>EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 17:31:11 EST
> >>
> >>
> >>one thing about the john lee walker band, those guys were true outlaws in
> >>the real world. one of those guys was featured in the skynyrd book "an oral
> >>history" jhis name was john haury. he was friends with ronnie and the band
> >>and they tore up a few bars together. I think he was even busted for

> >>shooting a man somewhere in Louisiana and robbing banks in the eighties.
> >>they were all pretty hardcore dopers and needle freaks but man could they
> >>jam. anybody know what ever happened to them? I saw them once with skynyrd
> >>in west va in 76 and they were awesome but very young and inexperienced,
> >>i've always wonmdered what became of them. heroin destroiyed a damn good
> >>band!!!!
> >>
> >>lee
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Showing interest in things homosexual.
> >>
> >>From: "radiobuff0@mailcity.moc"
> >>Subject: Gay Pride Picnic 2003 Recap
> >>Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc
> >>
> >>About 270 people, an all time record, came together to celebrate the
> >>11th annual Pride Erie Picnic at Presque Isle, Beach 11 on June 14,
> >>2003. Once again, we had hot dogs and hamburgers and folks brought a
> >>yummy assortment of dishes. There were about 225 people at last year's
> >>picnic, which was the previous record amount for attendance.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>Date: 28 Jun 2003 22:10:15 -0000
> >>Message-ID:
> >>From: "JJ"
> >>Subject: JJ exclusive N.J. GAY DUOS SUE TO MARRY You go girls
> >>Newsgroups: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc
> >>Lines: 29
> >>
> >>
> >>June 28, 2003 -- Seven same-sex couples began fighting yesterday for
> >>the right to get married in New Jersey — one day after the U.S. Supreme
> >>Court stamped out a Texas law that made gay sex a crime.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Looking to pirate some software
> >>
> >>From: Radiobuff
> >>Newsgroups: alt.2600.crackz

> >>Subject: adobe Premiere pro v7 expire info
> >>Reply-To: nospam.nail3inch@yahoo.com
> >>Message-ID:
> >>X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.8/32.548
> >>MIME-Version: 1.0
> >>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> >>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> >>Lines: 5
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 69.144.209.36
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@bresnan.net
> >>X-Trace: attbi_s52 1067905650 69.144.209.36 (Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT
> >>Organization: Bresnan Online
> >>Date: Tue, 04 Nov 2003 00:27:30 GMT
> >>
> >>
> >>Just woundering if there is a more curent copy of Adobe Premiere Pro
> >>v7 out there as the latest one expires March 1 2004 and its version #
> >>is c552 8/11/2003/r. If you dodnt believe it, turn your computer
> >>clock up to March 1 2004. The last copy I had expired Nov 1 2003. To
> >>note the 2 copy`s I put one I used the keygen to do a key.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Showing how classy and cultured he is
> >>
> >>From: JJ
> >>User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:1.4)
> >>Gecko/20030624 Netscape/7.1 (ax)
> >>X-Accept-Language: en-us, en
> >>MIME-Version: 1.0
> >>Newsgroups: ny.politics
> >>Subject: UNA's strike again
> >>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
> >>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> >>Lines: 15
> >>Message-ID:
> >>X-Trace:
> >>npbhgpngjbkmjfegdbdpiflmbcekedmfhojhikkbagflhcboadlfadgbofomnhcjonkedhnjbgmfaelbbgjghf
njpeanimkkhhkbhhlpijajakbmnmfcnpfeoeaakoimjplnlhhaibcdamclomlgcccebcdfdbbm
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 22:31:57 EDT
> >>Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 22:32:36 -0400
> >>
> >>
> >>Another UNA (Urban Nigger Ape) proves why some are that. Baboons with
> >>clothes.
> >>

> >>JACKSONVILLE, Florida (AP) -- A 2-year-old left alone for nearly three
> >>weeks while her mother was behind bars survived by eating mustard,
> >>ketchup, rice and raw pasta, police said.
> >>
> >>The toddler was watching cartoons when found by her father, police said
> >>Monday. She was suffering from malnutrition and was being treated at
> >>Wolfson Children's Hospital, police said.
> >>
> >>Dakeysha Lee, 22, was charged Monday with child abuse because she didn't
> >>let anyone know that her daughter was alone in her apartment, police
> >>said. She was jailed Sept. 10 on unrelated charges.
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
.....
> >>
> >>Trying to beat Federal Drug Testing
> >>
> >>From: "TailGator"
> >>Newsgroups: alt.drugs.pot
> >>Subject: Medicinal Marijuana
> >>Lines: 33
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 18:03:13 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 65.32.220.35
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@rr.com
> >>X-Trace: twister.tampabay.rr.com 1047837793 65.32.220.35 (Sun, 16 Mar 2003
> >>13:03:13 EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 13:03:13 EST
> >>Organization: RoadRunner - Tampa Bay
> >>
> >>
> >>Hey people, found this newsgroup because I wanted to post and get some
> >>opinions.
> >>
> >>A guy I know used to play and tour with a neo-famous southern rock and roll
> >>band in the 70s & early 80s, traveled with folks like Lynyrd Skynyrd,
> >>Charlie Daniels, Marshall Tucker, etc, and he lived on the fast lane for a
> >>few years, did it all, became a junkie, cleaned up (several times) and did
> >>the 12-step thang, all that - and when the southern rock scene fizzled in
> >>the early 80s this boy had to clean up his act and get a real job. Welcome
> >>to Corporate America.
> >>
> >>Well, as a result of his dangerous habits, he has since developed diabetes
> >>(Type II) and was diagnosed with neuropathic damage to his sciatic nerve
> >>(neurapathy), the worst of his diabetes-related ailments - he went

> >>undiagnosed for a long time. Until recently, he hasn't smoked pot since
> >>1986. He now finds that smoking not only eases the discomfort, but also
> >>eases the nausea he feels after glucophage and other meds hit his stomach.
> >>He used to be a heavy toker:) but now he smokes when he feels the need,
> >>which is once or twice a day. He is strongly opinionated to the fact that it
> >>does have medicinal qualities - he's proven that it lowers blood sugar and
> >>it makes him feel better. He does it only in the privacy of his own home.
> >>It's his business.
> >>
> >>Unfortunately, he now works for a major corporation that randomly drug
> >>tests, and he knows his number is going to be up one of these times. I
> >>would like to hear from anyone in a similiar situation, or anyone with any
> >>advice on how to really beat the tests, live the way you want to in
> >>Corporate America. Any and all advice would be greatly appreciated, but
> >>please spare sarcasm and flames. No time for that - thanks!
> >>
> >>JD
> >>
> >>
> >>.....
....
> >>
> >>Attempting to buy and sell Weapons over the Internet
> >>
> >>From: TailGator
> >>Subject: FS: SS Ruger Mini-14
> >>Date: 1998/04/29
> >>Message-ID: <6i8n42$p3o@xring.cs.umd.edu>#1/1
> >>Approved: gun-control@cs.umd.edu
> >>Organization: Loozyana Bayou, Inc
> >>Newsgroups: rec.guns
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>Ruger Mini-14, almost NIB fired twice. Installed Choate flash hider and
> >>customized rubber butt pad. Mint condition.
> >>
> >>Make Offer plus shipping.
> >>
> >>John
> >>KF4ANC
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>From: "TailGator"
> >>Newsgroups: rec.knives
> >>Subject: Tac Folder Stag?
> >>Lines: 15
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Thu, 18 Dec 2003 15:04:44 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.58.104
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc01.gnilink.net 1071759884 4.4.58.104 (Thu, 18 Dec 2003 10:04:44
> >>EST)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 18 Dec 2003 10:04:44 EST
> >>
> >>
> >>I'm also looking for a small (4") LL folder with stag handles, replacing one
> >>I lost recently. I went to a knife maker here locally in St. Petersburg FL
> >>(Roger Gamble) who made me a custom folder with very handsome stag handles,
> >>but it's a bit too big and bulky for the pocket - made to be holstered and
> >>he included a very nice leather holster with it. Although I love this knife,
> >>its not somethng I can carry to work in my pocket. Prefer liner lock, one
> >>hand open, possible with pocket clip on it. Any ideas? Thanks
> >>
> >>The one I lost was called the Tactical Folder, but I'll be darned if I can
> >>remember the company name...bought it from a catalog called The Edge many
> >>years ago...they are no longer making the knife.
> >>
> >>TG
> >>
> >>
> >>From: "radiobuff"
> >>Newsgroups: rec.knives
> >>Subject: FS: Phrobis M-9 Buck
> >>Lines: 11
> >>X-Priority: 3
> >>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> >>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
> >>Message-ID:
> >>Date: Thu, 23 Oct 2003 19:24:59 GMT
> >>NNTP-Posting-Host: 4.4.59.1
> >>X-Complaints-To: abuse@verizon.net
> >>X-Trace: nwrddc01.gnilink.net 1066937099 4.4.59.1 (Thu, 23 Oct 2003 15:24:59
> >>EDT)
> >>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 23 Oct 2003 15:24:59 EDT
> >>
> >>
> >>Like new Buck Phrobis III military field knife/bayonet with scabbard and
> >>pouches as it was sold by Buck. Used once on a fishing trip and been in
> >>gunsafe since then. Asking $175 - interested parties can email me directily
> >>if you want to see a pic - great knife! Only selling it and other items
> >>because I am wanting to buy new ham radio. Offering it here for a few days,
> >>if no response you will see it on ebay. You will be very pleased with this
> >>knife...

> >>
> >>john
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>Good Luck.
> >>
> >>
> >>Regards,
> >>-Smith. Agent Smith
> >

hey wa3moj, do you still play music on 75 meters????

344. Re: WA3MOJ does not post to this NG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 03:04:37 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401041904.2a3f0450@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Lancer <lancer@rock..com> wrote in message
news:<X1XJb.3741557$be.586472@news.easynews.com>...
> On Sun, 04 Jan 2004 09:01:39 -0600, William Wallace
> <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:
>
> >richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in
> >news:c5ecbb69.0401040613.3f921416@posting.google.com:
> >
> >> Bonnie Prince Charlie <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> >> news:<bt82im$tgl$1@news.x-echo.com>...
> >>> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> >>> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> >>> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> >>> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> >>> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> >>> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> >>> Beck of SF California. All these people have an axe to
> >>> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> >>> radio operation and notice please that none of them
> >>> have a license. They target hams and pick random
> >>> call signs like wa3moj or specific people in rrap that
> >>> they think might rat them out to the FCC etc or if you
> >>> have a record of supporting legal operation like Leland
> >>> Scott KC8LDO or even Jerry Oxendine. You may be next
> >>> these cb outlaws will stop at nothing including threats
> >>> and harassment.
> >>
> >> Sorry, Charlie (really Georgie-girl Busch WA3MOJ). It's hardly >
> >> random < for someone to choose your callsign since you are the biggest
> >> TROLL in the cb newsgroup. If they target > you < it's because you
> >> deserve it for making so many fag posts and personal attacks on people
> >> you don't even know.
> >>
> >>
> >Sorry assclown, you are really 1 clueless TROLL, do a search on dickiehed
> >cranium, and note his trolling ways. George busch does not post to this
> >NG, you have some serious serious mental problems.
> >>
>
> How do you know George Busch doesn't post to this NG? Either you are
> him or you have first hand knowledge of which groups he does post in.
```

its called damage control lancer...he does it everytime he feels threatened. think about it, it would be a extreme shock if he couldn't hang around here fooling around everyday..what else would a man of his enormous talents do with his time???

345. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 03:09:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040104220914.15462.00005421@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85021

In article <9y2dnRjs28VSLWWiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>I'm going to guestimate
>that we'll see a Report and Order in December, 2004.

Carl,

Need an exact date for the pool. Dec 1? Dec 15?

Let me know and I'll put you in.

73 de Jim, N2EY

346. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 03:15:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040104221548.07961.00001108@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85022

In article <gjj3vv4gacmt4ab1qd680q0hbn3daqba15@4ax.com>, Hole E. Ghost <kornform@aol.com> writes:

>For centuries the church could not decide on the proper date of the
>birth of JC (bible scholars are still debating if this person actually
>existed, or if he was just another concoction of the church to control
>the masses), according to Ruth Reichmann of the Max Kade
>German-American Center, IUPUI, "Pagans had traditionally decked their
>halls with boughs of holly, evergreens and mistletoe to symbolize
>winter's inability to prevent the renewal of life. Merrymaking came to
>have a share in Christmas observance through popular enthusiasm. The
>medieval secular celebrations lasted for a "season," extending from
>Christmas eve to Epiphany, and in some localities even from St.
>Thomas' Day, Dec. 21 (honoring the "doubting Thomas," disciple of
>Jesus) to Candlemas (February 2).
>There was some dispute about the proper date of the birth of Christ
>and not everyone agrees even to this day. It was not until A.D. 350,
>that December 25 was declared the official date for celebrating
>Christmas by Pope Julius I. When the fathers of the church decided to
>settle upon a date to celebrate the event, they wisely chose the day
>of the winter solstice, since it coincided with some rival religions'
>celebrations and the rebirth of the sun and approaching longer days,
>symbolized by bon-fires and yule logs. December 25 was a festival long
>before the conversion of the Germanic peoples to Christianity, it
>seemed fitting that the time of their winter festival would also be
>the time to celebrate the birth of Christ. The darkness that had
>frightened and threatened to defeat the ancient pagans, was forever
>defeated by the coming of Christ."

Holey:

Yada, yada, yada. We know all about that. Whatever the geneology of the holiday, the reason that it is celebrated in present times is to commemorate the birth of Jesus Christ, the Lord and Saviour of all Christian peoples. Nothing will change that, not even any irrelevant facts about how the holiday came about. So, please be my guest and continue to be outraged when us Christians say that "Jesus is the reason for the season."

May the Peace of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ be with you now and always.

73 de Larry, K3LT

347. Re: Ham Radio in The Information Age and Terrorism

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 03:51:05 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401050352330.731@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85023

On Tue, 30 Dec 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
> According to a story in the Washington Post, by Dan Eggen, on Tuesday, Dec.
> 30, 2003:
> An FBI intelligence bulletin sent to law enforcement agencies last week
> warned that "terrorist operatives may rely on almanacs to assist with target
> selection and pre-operational planning" because they include detailed
> information on bridges, tunnels and other U.S. landmarks, officials said.
>
> OK, fault me and sneer at me all you want but, isn't the above just going
> way too far? (the rest of the story can be read on the Washington Post
> website--just do a search on the word almanac and it should be around the
> second item in the list). I mean, I understand the fear, the tendency to
> jump to safety, but even if terrorists are using almanacs, do we want to be
> "caught" with one if we are thought to be acting "suspicious" as is
> mentioned in the article?
>
> Sheesh, what about ham radio?! One of the most widely used communication
> mediums in this country and maybe the world, right? What do we open
> ourselves up for by being on the air and "just talking?"

The NSA has amateur radio classified as an activity that could be abused by foreign nationals in espionage activities (prior to September 2001 - I'm not certain if this has been changed after that time).

348. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 04:23:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vF5Kb.21271$lo3.20124@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85024

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote

>
> You mean they will increase the requirements from 5wpm?
>

I don't know if FCC will or will not, but I expect ARRL to ask for an
increase.

73, de Hans, K0HB

349. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 04:39:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ST5Kb.24485$IM3.22321@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > [snip] The FCC recently said "the
> > emphasis on Morse code proficiency
> > as a licensing requirement does not
> > comport with the basis and purpose
> > of the service." They came to that
> > conclusion after looking at modern
> > communications systems outside
> > Amateur Radio and the changes that
> > have occurred in communications
> > over the last fifty years. They noted
> > that "no communication system has
> > been designed in many years that
> > depends on hand-keyed telegraphy
> > or the ability to receive messages in
> > Morse code by ear." And they said
> > reducing the emphasis on telegraphy
> > proficiency as a licensing requirement
> > would "allow the amateur service to,
> > as it has in the past, attract technically
> > inclined persons, particularly the
> > youth of our country, and encourage
> > them to learn and to prepare
> > themselves in the areas where the
> > United States needs expertise."
>
> That deemphasis has already occurred.
> The no-code tech was instituted in the
> late 1980s and the code for the higher
> classes was dropped to only 5wpm in
> 2000. There is no need for further
> deemphasis. (snip)

I disagree. The reasons stated for reducing code (changes over last 50 years, no system dependant on code in many years, and so on) could just as easily be used to argue against a code test of any kind. In other words, how are those facts changed by a 5 wpm test instead of a 13 wpm test?

> (snip) Morse code/CW is unique and
> cannot be covered by the written tests.
> Actually (snip)

It is unique only in the level of emphasis placed on it. Without that emphasis, there would be no unique test for it. Which brings us right back where I started, pointing to what the FCC has said - "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

350. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:01:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Dc6Kb.24502$IM3.7691@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> Nobody's forcing anybody to use it,
> just learn it...and only for HF privies.

Given another statement in your reply ("unique skill...decoded by the human brain"), that statement is rather illogical, isn't it? If the "skill" tested is the ability to decode code with the human brain, it would seem one would have to "use" that ability at some level just to pass the test.

> At 5-wpm, it's more a demonstration of
> discipline than proficiency. That is where
> the true crux lies.

The FCC doesn't have a mandate to test discipline. And, beyond the rules and good operating practices, we shouldn't expect it either. After all, we're not the military or a karate school.

> They've already reduced the emphasis by
> creating the no-code Technician ticket and
> further by reducing the required code
> speed for the General and Extra tickets.

As I told Dee, the reasons quoted in my earlier message for reducing code (changes over last 50 years, no system dependant on code in many years, and so on) could just as easily be used to argue against a code test of any kind. In other words, how are those facts changed by a 5 wpm test instead of a 13 wpm test?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

351. Illegal CBers forging hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:17:49 UTC
From: Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com>
Message-ID: <btas1tfao1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 85027
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

For your information.

Illegal CBers are targeting random ham callsigns
such as WA3MOJ and forging them on Usenet
newsgroups. WA3MOJ is not now or has not ever
posted on Usenet but the forgers have an axe to
grind against anyone who complains about illegal
radio operation so they post callsigns of people
who they think are against them.

You may be next these cb outlaws will stop at
nothing including threats and harassment.

Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
Beck of Fremont California. Also a person known only
as "GW" aka Randall of Texas is doing the forging. And
there leader Twistedhed aka Dave McCampbell of
Clearmwater Florida encourages them and gives them
instructions on harassment of hams including using
their call signs on "freeband".

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Mon Jan 5 06:17:47 2004 depuis l'IP : ac97f6fc.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

352. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:24:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <1y6Kb.24526$IM3.7582@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85028

"Bert Craig" wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > Bert, if you're using popularity as a
> > justification--and the test questions
> > may have changed to inlcude this
> > since I entered ham radio--then why
> > are there no questions or
> > demonstration required during testing
> > for the *number 1* most popular
> > mode of operation?
>
> Because for 99.9% of ARO's, speach
> is a skill that's already in our toolbox
> upon entry into the ARS.

I understand Kim's point. Lets try it from this perspective. If you're one of the millions of immigrants entering this country, the speech we use on the radio, and on the radio tests, in this country is not already in the "toolbox." And Spanish certainly isn't in the "toolbox" of many other Hams in this country. So, even if you ignore any skills needed for the voice modes (however minor), there is still some validity in Kim's argument. Spanish is use more often the CW in this country (more popular), so perhaps we should test all operators on the ability to speak Spanish like we test for CW now. Or, since English is more common (popular) in this country today than Spanish, perhaps we should test all on the ability to speak English like we test for CW now. In other words, as Kim says, popularity alone is not a justification for a code test unless it is equally so for voice.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

353. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:34:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <CH6Kb.24535$IM3.17809@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85029
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Dwight, how about giving us a good
> rational reason to continue testing at
> all. I can break every reason with
> either rationale or minor modifications
> to equipment.

The FCC itself has already effectively provided that answer when they said "the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service." Clearly, the written tests do comport with the basis and purpose of the service, and I doubt many of us, including you, would disagree.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

354. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:40:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6N6Kb.24540$IM3.20933@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85030

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Irrelevant, Dwight. The amateur
> community has specifed the criteria
> and goals of amateurism.
>
> First and foremost is morsemanship.
> (snip)

Because so many obviously agree, your sarcasm falls flat, Len.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

355. Amateur Radio Newsline☐ Report 1377 ☐ January 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:47:25 UTC
From: channel391@juno.com
Message-ID: <ae188f77.0401042147.35dba59f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Amateur Radio Newslineï¿½ Report 1377 ï¿½ January 2, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1377 with a release date of
Friday, January 2, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a QST. V-K hams welcome 2004 with new spectrum.
P-29 hams enter the new year with no-code and the FCC ends 2003
embracing smart radios. All this and more on Amateur Radio Newsline
report number 1377 for the first week of 2004 coming your way right
now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: EXCLUSIVE SPECTRUM DOWN UNDER

Hams in Australia start 2004 with an unexpected gift. Some exclusive
spectrum in the 75 meter band. From Brisbane here's Q-News Graham
Kemp, VK4BB, with the rest of the story:

--

As of January 1st amateur radio operators in Australia have gained
exclusive access to 24 kHz of HF spectrum at 3776-3800 kHz for high
frequency amateur radio communications between continents.

The new Australian spectrum allocation for the amateur service is made
under footnote AUS8 of the Australian Radiofrequency Spectrum Plan
2002 published by the ACA. It aligns well with international
arrangements, which means intercontinental communications for
Australian amateur radio operators will be improved at these
frequencies.

This domestic change has affected other spectrum users. More than 40
government bodies, community groups and commercial organizations were
previously licensed for HF communications within this 24 kHz of
spectrum, with amateur operators having lower priority access to 6
kHz.

For Q-News Australia, I'm Graham Kemp, VK4BB, for the Amateur Radio
Newsline.

--

A very nice way to start the year 2004. (Q-News)

**

RESTRUCTURING: P29Z CALLS GIVEN HF GIFT

Australia is not the only nation in the Southern hemisphere to have some ham radio rules changes with the new year. A report out of Papua New Guinea says that the tiny nations has welcomed 2004 by going no-code.

According to Rick Warnett, P29KFS, in Port Morsby, the nations telecommunications regulator PANGTEL has issued an opinion confirming that P-N-G hams holding a Limited Amateur Operator's Certificate of Proficiency now have access to all High Frequency bands granted by PANGTEL. As a result, from 0000 P-N-G time on December 31st hams assigned P29Z series calls have full High Frequency access in the ham bands from 165 KHz thru 28MHz in addition to their 430 MHz to the multi Ghz allocation. (Q-News)

**

RESCUE RADIO: IRELAND PREPARES FOR POWER OUTAGES

Meantime on the other side of the world, what amounts to a mini Field Day exercise took place in Ireland December 6th and 7th. This when that nations ham radio rescue service known as AREN took part in a twenty-four hour simulated test to help prepare members for a possible power failure such as those experienced recently in the US and in the United Kingdom.

The test had several goals. Among them was to establish that AREN members could operate without mains power and to have members ready for activation during a sustained standby period. Also important was maintaining discipline by politely and firmly holding control of a working frequency for the duration of the exercise.

According to assessment reports, the AREN members demonstrated a keen and effective will to efficiently operate such a service. They also held the primary exercise frequency of 3.660 MHz without incident for the duration of the watch period. (IRTS)

**

RADIO LAW: S.C. INDICTMENT IN BPL RELATED SCHEME

Back here at home, it looks as if the first scam associated with Broadband over Powerline technology has surfaced. Amateur Radio Newsline's Jim Davis, W2JKD, tells us the who, the what, the why and the where:

--

News reports say that two Texas businessmen have been indicted on wire fraud and money laundering charges. This in a scheme that defrauded a South Carolina electric utility out of $1 million.

Prosecutors in Columbia, South Carolina say that the two convinced the utility to invest the money in research they said would allow voice,

video and data to be sent to homes and businesses through power lines. According to the documents filed on Thursday, December 18th, the could not deliver on the promises they had made.

Jim Davis, W2JKD, reporting.

--

No trial date has been announced in this case. (Published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Southern California Amateur Transmitting Society serving West Covina California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE CHANGING OF THE GUARD: Joe Knight, W5PDY, - S.K.

Some truly sad news to report. One of the nicest people ever to hold a ham radio license, Joe Knight, W5PDY, the recently retired New Mexico ARRL Section Manager, died on December 28th. Knight was in declining health when he passed away in Albuquerque at age 76.

For those not aware, Joe Knight held the honor of the longest tenure of any Section Manager in history. He was elected to the post in the mid 1970's and only stepped down last July after his health began to fail. In all he served as New Mexico Section Manager close to 27 years. A record never before matched.

Knight was the subject and chief narrator of an article, "The Luckiest Man Alive," which appeared in the January 2003 issue of QST Magazine. In it, Knight said that Amateur Radio will exist as long as there are people who love the art and science of communicating by radio. The article also outlined the vast emergency communication resources that Knight and hundreds of other dedicated volunteers built up over the years in New Mexico.

John Stuart, AC5ZO, the president of the Albuquerque DX Association, visited Knight on December 22nd. At that time Stuart presented Knight with an honorary membership certificate in that group.

Survivors include his wife, Lois, KC5CXO, who often accompanied Knight on his hamfest and convention visits and was a tireless recruiter for new ARRL members. (ARRL, W7AS, N7US, others)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: Emmanuel G. Papandreas, W4SS, - S.K.

And former ARRL Southern Florida Section Emergency Coordinator, Emmanuel G. Papandreas, W4SS, of Lake Worth, passed away, Friday, December 26th at age 80. Manny as he was better was Southern Florida was SEC for 20 years. A record longer than any of his predecessors. And during his tenure, Papandreas oversaw the amateur emergency communications effort following Hurricane Andrew in 1992 including the staging area at the South Florida Fairgrounds in Palm Beach County.

W4SS was a life member of the West Palm Beach Amateur Radio Club and served numerous terms as President. He also taught amateur radio classes and was an ARRL Volunteer Examiner in Palm Beach county. And, over the years, W4SS was the recipient of many awards and honors from the South Florida agencies served by Amateur Radio. (WA4AW)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC OPENS SMART RADIO PROCEEDING

Turning to the regulatory scene, the FCC has adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order that sets out proposals and seeks comments on the uses and applications for "smart" radio systems. This, In light of the ever increasing demand for wireless transmitters.

Smart radios have the ability to adapt their use of spectrum to their environments. For example, a smart radio system could use geolocation and table lookups to determine whether certain frequencies are candidates for use in a particular area. Then, those frequencies could be scanned, idle spectrum identified, and the best frequencies and power levels selected for a particular link.

More is at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-242312A1.doc and http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-322A1.doc on the World-Wide-Web. (CGC, FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU CAN FLY BUT YOU CAN'T USE THAT RADIO

The FCC has asked more groups representing hang glider enthusiasts to tell their members to stay off the ham bands unless they hold Amateur Radio licenses. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, N-N-Zero-W, has more details:

--

Audio report only. Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

Hang gliding zealots who fail to heed the FCC warning could face some pretty severe penalties. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: COMPANY FINED $8,000 FOR FAILING TO PAINT TOWER CABLES

The FCC has issued an $8,000 fine against Tower Properties of Florida, Inc. for having unpainted cables attached to their tower structure. Cables that the regulatory agency says precluded good visibility of the orange and white aviation-painted structure.

Section 17.50 of the FCC's Rules provides that antenna structures such as this one that require painting will be cleaned or repainted as often as necessary to maintain good visibility. Further, as incorporated by reference, alternate bands of aviation orange and white are normally displayed on coaxial cable, conduits, and other cables attached to the face of a tower. (CGC, FCC)

**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW: JUDGE RULES ISP'S DO NOT HAVE TO PROVIDE INFO TO MUSIC INDUSTRY

Meantime, back here in the United States, a major setback for the music industry's anti-piracy campaign. This, a federal appeals rejects efforts by the music producers to compel the nation's Internet providers to identify subscribers accused of illegally distributing music on-line. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more:

--

It happened on Friday December 19th and it's being called a substantial setback for the entertainment industry. This, as a three-judge panel from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia overturned a ruling by the trial judge to enforce a copyright subpoena.

Earlier a trial judge had authorized the use of the subpoenas forcing Verizon Communications Inc. to turn over names and addresses for at least four Internet subscribers. Verizon complied but instructed its lawyers to challenges the ruling.

In its decision, the appeals court not only sided with Verizon. It went a step further. This, by declaring one of the crucial arguments used by the Recording Industry Association of America to obtain the original order as -- quote -- bordering upon the silly. The judges words-- not ours.

What does this mean to those artists and companies wanting to protect their intellectual copyright? It won't stop the entertainment industry from suing those who continue to swap music and video files peer to peer, but it will make them a lot harder for the industry lawyers to locate.

From the entertainment capitol of the world, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline

--

Its not known if the recording industry plans to appeal this latest decision against it to the U-S Supreme court. (Published news reports)

**

ON THE AIR: IOTA 40TH ANNIVERSARY AWARD

Turning to operating events, Don Field, G3XTT, wants to remind Islands on the Air Award enthusiasts and would-be enthusiasts that 2004 marks the 49th anniversary of this unique program. Don says that a set of files for downloading with lots more information are now available on the Chiltern DX Club website at www.cdxc.org.uk Just follow the IOTA 2004 links and remember this years award began on January 1st. (RSGB)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: HAMFAIR NY IN FEBRUARY

And a reminder that Sunday, February 29th is the annual Long Island Hamfair and Electronics Show Winterfest sponsored by the Long Island Mobile Amateur Radio Club. The doors open 9:00 AM for buyers. Admission is $6 with children 11 and under welcome through the gate for free.

The location is Levittown Hall in Hicksville, New York. Complete directions are available on the Long Island Mobile Amateur Radio Club website at www.limarc.org/fest.htm (LIMARC)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: AWARD NOMINATING PERIOD CLOSES JANUARY 31ST

And the planners of Hamvention 2004 want to remind everyone that the nominating period for the Radio Amateur of the Year, Technical Excellence and Special Achievement awards program closes on January 31st.

There are three awards that will be given this year. The Radio Amateur of the Year is described as that special person who has made a long term commitment to the advancement of amateur radio. He or she is a well rounded individual who has contributed most of his or her lifetime to our hobby in some very outstanding way.

A nominee for the Technical Excellence award should be a person who has made an outstanding technical advancement in the field of amateur radio. Something like a revolutionary new equipment design or mode of operation that has impacted positively on the day to day operation of many hams.

Last but by no means least, a nominee for the Hamvention's Special Achievement is the kind of special person who has made an outstanding contribution to the advancement of amateur radio. This award is usually given to a respected amateur who spearheaded a single significant project.

Documentation is required. Magazine articles, newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos, and the like will better inform the Awards Committee of your candidate's accomplishments.

The nomination deadline is January 31st, All materials become the property of the Hamvention and cannot be returned.

You can fill out the on-line form and attach documentation files at www.hamvention.org. Then click your mouse on the words award nominations. Printed nominations and documentation go to the Awards Committee, Hamvention 2004, PO Box 964, Dayton Ohio, 45401.

Again, the deadline for all nominations is Saturday, January 31st. (Hamvention)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ARISS UPDATE

According to ARISS International Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, the crew on board the International Space Station does not have time to read messages from the ham public and he advises against sending any. We have more in this report:

--

In letters posted to the SAREX remailer, Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, indicates that ham radio is lucky that the crew has been able to fire up the new Kenwood packet radio system that was recently delivered to the space outpost. He also says that its not a good idea for hams to send personal e-mails to the astro-hams indicating that they are really to busy to read and answer them.

As to the new radio itself, Bauer says that the unit is a Kenwood D700 that has been modified to support up to 25 watts maximum output. Normally, if the crew has the system configured with the default settings. This means about 10 watts out which is medium power on the 700.

Regarding the packet frequencies and why split channels rather than simplex is used, Bauer says this. 145.80 MHz is designated a human spaceflight downlink frequency. Right now it shares use on voice and packet for general operations and school group contacts. In the future it will be used at times for voice, packet, repeater capabilities, school group contacts and S-S-T-V. Because of this, the

ARISS team would like to keep the downlink frequency clear for all to hear and receive. Therefore, packet simplex is use not a good idea on this frequency.

I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

--

Meantime, Miles Man, WF1F, has posted some photos of the new station on his MAREX website. The URL is: http://www.marex.org/hardware.kenwood.html (SAREX BBS, WF1F)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: RADIO BRINGS FASTER FAST FOOD

On the emerging technology front, fast food has gotten even faster in southern California thanks to the magic of radio. This as five McDonald's restaurants sign a deal with a communications company to allow motorists to zip through the drive-through line without having to stop and pay cash for their food.

The trick is utilizing the same technology that permits motorists to skip stops on toll roads. A transponder will emit a signal to a receiver at the food giant that will automatically calculate the food the fee. The motorist is then billed. The process is said to cut 15 seconds off the normal 131 second-wait for delivery at the payment window. (Technology Corner)

**

INTERNATIONAL-ARGENTINA: ANDES MOUNTAIN LAND CROSSING

From the international page, Carlos Beviglia, LU1BCE, says that between January 4 and 15th, the Radio Club Argentino will participate in the 6th Andes Mountains Land Crossing. LU1BCE is the Secretary of the Radio Club Argentino. He tells the Ohio Penn D-X newsletter that this trek is made every year to honor General San Martin and his army's crossing to Chile. This, during the American Independence War in 1817.

The Radio Club Argentino will provide the communication for the event. The club will set up two High Frequency stations at every camp point throughout the journey. Operation will be mainly on SSB and C-W using the special event call LS4M. QSL via LU4AA, either direct or via the bureau. (OPDX)

**

INTERNATIONAL-CANADA: MEET THE NEW RAC EXEC COMMITTEE

Meantime, to the North, word that Daniel Lamoureux VE2KA, has been elected as president of the Executive Committee of Radio Amateurs of Canada. This, for a 2004 through 2005 term. Also elected to the committee are First Vice President Robert Nash, VE3KZ; Vice President

of Regulatory Affairs James Deann, VE3IQ; Vice President Field Services and International Affairs Pierre Mainville, VA3PM, and Noel Marcil, VE2BR, as Secretary. (RAC)

**

INTRUDER WATCH: THOSE INDONESIANS AGAIN

On the Intruder Watch scene, we have some bad news and some good news. First the bad. VK6XW reports hearing 53 non ham stations on the 14 MHz band operating SSB. He says that most appear to be from Indonesia.

The good news? Word that another group of Indonesians who had been using 14.335 MHz have vanished and have not been found again. The same is true for the bunch on 14.252 which have also disappeared from the Amateur spectrum leaving only the 14.144 gang which have gone LSB and moved up to 14.145 Mhz. (Q-News)

**

SPECIAL EVENT: 50 YEARS A HAM

And you might call this one celebrating a personal best. This as Fort Wayne Indiana's Jack Forbing, K9LSB, takes to the air from March 1st to the 14th as K9L in celebration of his 50 years as a licensed operator.

Jack and his friends in the Hoosierland Amateur Mobile Systems group will operate all bands and all modes from K9LSB's home QTH. Equipment for the event will be a Yaesu FT-1000MP Mark V and a Yaesu FTV-1000 6 meter transverter into an yaggi at 65 feet. All other bands will use dipoles antennas. All QSL's go to K9LSB at his Callbook address. And we wish Jack a hearty well done on reaching this milestone in his ham radio career. (Via e-mail)

**

DX

In DX, 9V1DX, is now active as 9V0A from Ellsworth Mountain in Antarctica. He was spotted in 40 and 30 meters CW. Watch 7.001 or 10.108 MHz between 01:30 and 03:00 UTC. (OPDX)

And W4WX, will be active as KG4DX from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, from January 13th to the 19th. He will operate the HF bands and 6 meters. QSL to his home call, direct with SASE. (OPDX)

Lastly, AP2JZB, was active recently from Pakistan on 17 and 12 meters SSB . Watch around 18.119 and 24.946 MHz between 13:30 and 15:00 U-T-C. QSL as directed on the air. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO HISTORY -- THE FIRST BIG REPEATER MEETING - PART I

And finally this week, many hams are not aware that back in the early 1970's repeater growth and continued experimentation in ham radio relay communication came to a screeching halt. This, as the result of overly restrictive regulations on the part of the FCC.

As most radio amateurs of that era knew, this was not a good time to be the owner of a repeater unless you also held an Electronics Engineering degree. Things had to change if F-M and repeaters were to grow again. In the end, one man risked it all to make it happen.

On January 24, 1974 then 73 Magazine publisher Wayne Green, W2NSD, brought a group of prominent "repeater people" before the FCC. He had arranged the meeting in an attempt to convince the Commissioners to roll back the restrictions put in place as a result of Docket 18803. Here's a sample of what that meeting sounded like:

--
Meeting audio sample
--

Want to hear more? Well, over the next several months you can take a trip back in time to join Wayne Green, W2NSD, former Colorado's Marshal Quiat, AG0X, New York's Howard Lester W2ODC and Dick McKay, K6VGP, from California. This, as they and others go to Washington D-C -- to -- quite literaly -- set repeaters free.

Part 1 of the audio of that meeting is on our website as a Newsline Extra. In it you will meet the hams who traveled to Washington to speak on behalf of the nations FM and repeater community. You will also hear some of the presentations made by them. Its on line now at our f-t-p site at www.arnewsline.org slash quincy.

This is literally a page out of ham radio's history. Its here -- right now for you -- exclusively -- on the Amateur Radio Newsline. (ARNewesline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying welcome to 2004, 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights

reserved.

356. SPECIAL ANNOUBCEMENT TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS FRM Hamvention® 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:57:12 UTC
From: channel391@juno.com
Message-ID: <ae188f77.0401042157.c2117fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SPECIAL ANNOUBCEMENT TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS FRM Hamventionï¿½ 2004

Press Release
(January 2, 2003)

For more information please send e-mail to: media@hamvention.org

Hamventionï¿½ Award Nominations Close January 31st

Do you know an outstanding amateur in your club, community, or from on-the-air contacts? Does this person appear to excel in some phase of amateur radio? Do you feel that he/she deserves national and world-wide recognition? If so, then the time is now for you to sit down and write a letter to nominate that special radio amateur for one of three Hamventionï¿½ 2004 awards.

There are three categories of awards being presented: The Radio Amateur of the Year, Technical Excellence and Special Achievement Award.

The Radio Amateur of the Year is described as that special person who has made a long term commitment to the advancement of amateur radio. A well-rounded individual who has contributed most of his or her lifetime to our hobby in some very outstanding way.

A nominee for the Technical Excellence award should be a person who has made an outstanding technical advancement in the field of amateur radio. Something like a revolutionary new equipment design or mode of operation that has impacted positively on the day to day operation of many hams.

Last but by no means least, a nominee for the Hamvention's Special Achievement award is the kind of special person who has made an outstanding contribution to the advancement of amateur radio. This award is usually given to a respected amateur who spearheaded a single significant project.

All amateurs are eligible - Novice through Extra. Recipients are decided by the Awards Committee, based partially upon the information received, not the number of nominations submitted. The decision of the judges is final.

Nominations must be received before midnight on January 31, 2004. Documentation is not only beneficial, but essential in determining viability of a candidate's achievement(s). Magazine articles,

newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos, etc. will better inform the Awards Committee of your candidate's accomplishments. All materials become the property of the Hamvention and cannot be returned. Submissions go by mail to: Awards Committee, Hamvention 2004, PO Box 964, Dayton Ohio, 45401.

(Note: You can also fill out the on-line "Nominating Form" found at the Hamventionï¿½ 2004 website (http://www.hamvention.org) by clicking your mouse on the words "Award Nominations," but you are still required to submit substantiating documentation to the address noted above before January 31, 2004)

Yahoo! Groups Links

To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

357. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 05:57:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <I17Kb.24551$IM3.21354@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85033

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > And, in my humble opinion, it is not
> > sufficient justification - no more than
> > the fact that vacuum tubes or circular
> > analog tuning dials were once popular
> > justifies a requirement that they
> > continue to be used.
>
> There were never any test questions on
> circular analog tuning dials AFAIK. There
> used to be lots of test questions on tubes
> but they are almost all gone now - because
> most hams' rigs don't use tubes any more.

The issue is a government requirement, not test questions.

> > If a person has no interest in code, the
> > speed certainly isn't going to change that.
>
> Apply that same logic to the written test...

Have already done so elsewhere (in a reply to Mike Coslo, I believe).

> > And they said reducing the emphasis on
> > telegraphy proficiency as a licensing
> > requirement would "allow the amateur
> > service to, as it has in the past, attract
> > technically inclined persons, particularly
> > the youth of our country, and encourage
> > them to learn and to prepare themselves
> > in the areas where the United States
> > needs expertise."
>
>
> But that hasn't happened. Didn't happen
> after 1991, nor again after 2000.

How do you know that to be a fact? With some training in electronics,
radio, computers, and so on, I consider myself somewhat technically inclined
and I probably would have never gotten a license if the code tests remained
for all licenses. Are you so very certain I'm the only one?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

358. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 06:33:15 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Ly7Kb.6589$wx1.5845@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:bta6ng$6rj$1@news.x-echo.com...
> Mark Beck the proven transexual and his butt buddies Steve Parks and GW
> Randall how can you live with your Hypocrisy? ....Now go to the mirror a
> nd practice spreading your ass cheeks.

Again George, do show everyone
how you act.

http://www.google.com/groups?q=+%22wa3moj%22&start=400&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&scoring=d&selm=Mgsu7.68301%245A3.25741449%40news1.rdc2.pa.home.com&rnum=440

http://www.google.com/groups?q=g:thl2482584805d&dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=20011023161351.17382.00001281%40mb-fo.aol.com

Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
14:07:26 -0500
X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw201648
for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

Hello,

This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy
department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings
sent from your SBCIS account.

It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet
newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
wa3moj@aol.com
Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.

Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
(http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
(http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to email
or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise objectionable
material.

If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it will be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.

Sincerely,
The SBCIS Policy Department

Landshark

--
Hard things are put in our way,
not to stop us, but to call out our
courage and strength.

359. Re: Mark Beck has proved that wa3moj issues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 06:33:15 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Ly7Kb.6586$wx1.3154@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:btak0v$p98$1@news.x-echo.com...
> >> Mark Beck the proven transexual and his butt
> >>buddies Steve Parks and GW Randall how can
> >>you live with your Hypocrisy? ....Now go to the
> >>mirror and practice spreading your ass cheeks.
> >
> >You have homosexual issues. Seek clinical help.
>
> I am just telling the TRUTH. Mark beck of Fremont CA let some guy dresse
> d as a girl pump his asshole full of semen and that has been proven.

LMAO!!! Now you forgot to cross
post this to the correct groups George Busch
wa3moj@aol.com
You see this is what has been trolling
RRCB for over three years now. It's not
that he is a ham, no that isn't the problem,
but a troll with a ham license extra class.

Landshark

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

360. Re: Illegal CBers forging hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 06:33:15 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Ly7Kb.6587$wx1.3764@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85036
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:btas1tfao1@news.x-echo.com...
> For your information.
>
> Illegal CBers are targeting random ham callsigns
> such as WA3MOJ and forging them on Usenet
> newsgroups. WA3MOJ is not now or has not ever
> posted on Usenet but the forgers have an axe to
> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> radio operation so they post callsigns of people
> who they think are against them.
>
> You may be next these cb outlaws will stop at
> nothing including threats and harassment.
>
> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> Beck of Fremont California. Also a person known only
> as "GW" aka Randall of Texas is doing the forging. And
> there leader Twistedhed aka Dave McCampbell of
> Clearmwater Florida encourages them and gives them
> instructions on harassment of hams including using
> their call signs on "freeband".
>

Yes, believe an extra class ham, that trolls
RRCB, use's vile vulgar language, harasses, forges,
changes nics to by pass kill file filters, out right lies.

http://www.google.com/groups?q=+%22wa3moj%22&start=400&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&scoring
=d&selm=Mgsu7.68301%245A3.25741449%40news1.rdc2.pa.home.com&rnum=440

http://www.google.com/groups?q=g:thl2482584805d&dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=20011
023161351.17382.00001281%40mb-fo.aol.com

Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
14:07:26 -0500
X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw201648

for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

Hello,

This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy
department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings
sent from your SBCIS account.

It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet
newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
wa3moj@aol.com
Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.

Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
(http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
(http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to email
or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise objectionable
material.

If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it will
be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.

Sincerely,
The SBCIS Policy Department

Yes, this is a stellar example of a human being
gone bad.

Landshark

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

361. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 06:33:15 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Ly7Kb.6588$wx1.5676@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85037
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:bt9uogkbi1@news.x-echo.com...
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com> wrote:
> >> "Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> >> news:bt9ogjvts1@news.x-echo.com...
> >> > "Landshark" S3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote:
> >> > >"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> >> > >news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
> >> > >> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> >> > >> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
> >> > >> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
> >> > >> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
> >> > >> and breaking fcc laws etc.
> >> > >> The other one is Landshark
> >> > >> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA
> >> > >
> >> > >But George, you said on the previous post I lived
> >> > >in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
> >> > >You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
> >> > >Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
> >> > >You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
> >> > >WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC
> >> > >again, among numerous others.
> >> > >
> >> > >> he had a ham license
> >> > >> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
> >> > >
> >> > >Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
> >> > >have a license, now I lost it for not following
> >> > >the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
> >> > >like you on the local ham bands, not because of
> >> > >"following" rules.
> >> > >
> >> > >> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
> >> > >> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
> >> > >> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
> >> > >> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
> >> > >> McCampbell of Florida.
> >> > >
> >> > > Now George, you know I have nothing against
> >> > >Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
> >> > >nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj

> >> > >who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
> >> > >why he create these posts, then cross post them
> >> > >to cause a flame fest.
> >> >
> >> > Look queersack how many times do I have to
> >> > tell you you have no proof that WA3MOJ even posts
> >> > in here just because you saw those letters and numbers
> >> > at the bottom of someones post means nothing. Dont
> >> > take my word for it take Brainbusters he said callsigns
> >> > are meaningless in a CB newsgroup and they are just
> >> > random letters and numbers could mean anything like
> >> > kp82 tim nebo or scott unit 69 or what ever. There may
> >> > be some trolls who want you to think I am wa3moj but
> >> > they are laughing at you because you are so fucking
> >> > stupid how could any one be so stupid.....Now go take
> >> > a transexual up your ass.
> >>
> >> Now of course it's you George, why else
> >> would I have gotten the warning letter about posting under your aol
> >> screen nic wa3moj@aol.com :
> >>
> >> Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
>
> >> 14:07:26 -0500
> >> X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
> >> Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
> >> by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw20164
> 8
> >> for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500
> >>
> >> Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
> >> Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
> >> To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net
> >>
> >> Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
> >> From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
> >> Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net
> >>
> >> Hello,
> >>
> >> This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Polic
> y
> >> department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/post
> ings
> >> sent from your SBCIS account.
> >>
> >> It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the inte
> rnet
> >> newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
> >> wa3moj@aol.com

> >> Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.
> >>
> >> Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
> >> (http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
> >> (http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to
>
> >> email or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise
> >> objectionable material.
> >>
> >> If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account,
> it
> >> will be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.
> >>
> >> Sincerely,
> >> The SBCIS Policy Department
> >>
> >> Now I did that to prove you were really
> >> posting on RRCB and that you did have an
> >> AOL account, but you still show your trolling
> >> ways by the response to the previous posts.
> >> Why else would you be so vehemently denying
> >> that you are George Busch wa3moj trolling
> >> RRCB.
> >> >
> >> Landshark
> >>
> >> Now do what is expected and make a denial
> >> from you're Comcast account now.
> >>
> >It's him, he's WA3MOJ the rec.radio.cb leg humper,
> >bagged and tagged.
> >
> >Notice how the loser trys to drag Leland and Jerry into
> >his pissing contest? Like those guys are going to defend >george, riiii
> ght! lol
>
> Hey asscrack I am not George, I am not WA3MOJ and I do
> not have Comcast and further more if Landfag Mark beck
> got a warning letter from his ISP it means the real WA3MOJ
> sent it not me. did you ever stop to think there is a
> real George Busch who does not post in this NG and who
> has no idea you fags are forging him and accusing
> him of everything including made up lies. Someone ought
> to let him know what is going on maybe he will get the FCC
> involved who knows. Now go ahead Mark....lube up your
> anus again ready for penetration by bear type TS.

Um George, you forgot to cross post this so that your
peers can see how an extra class ham acts when they go bad
and start acting like a troll.

Landshark

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

362. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 06:45:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FF907F3.8060103@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85038
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Robert, have you ever run into someone that you felt you just didn't like
>very well, but you couldn't identify a good reason for that feeling. You've
>just given me my good reason. You're an asshole, and you're damned good at
>it.
>
>
>
There's people in the group rec.audio.tubes that do a much better job at
that than I
ever can do. Compared to them, I'm a pretender. :-)

BTW, I didn't say "all", only said "many". Rarely run across such in baby
boomers or later.

>
>
>
>
>
>

363. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 09:57:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105045701.12631.00003983@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85039

In article <Dc6Kb.24502$IM3.7691@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>The FCC doesn't have a mandate to test discipline.

Yes, they do. That's what the "character" stuff in the rules is about.

There's a local ham around here who has generated so much trouble on various repeaters and earned himself so many warning letters that FCC is considering not renewing his license for "character" reasons. IOW he simply doesn't have the necessary self-discipline to be a ham.

>And, beyond the rules
>and good operating practices, we shouldn't expect it either.

Agreed. But those things do constitute "discipline".

73 de Jim, N2EY

364. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 09:57:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105045703.12631.00003984@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85040

In article <l17Kb.24551$IM3.21354@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > And, in my humble opinion, it is not
>> > sufficient justification - no more than
>> > the fact that vacuum tubes or circular
>> > analog tuning dials were once popular
>> > justifies a requirement that they
>> > continue to be used.
>>
>> There were never any test questions on
>> circular analog tuning dials AFAIK. There
>> used to be lots of test questions on tubes
>> but they are almost all gone now - because
>> most hams' rigs don't use tubes any more.
>
>
> The issue is a government requirement, not test questions.

The written tests which are made from those questions are a govenrment requirement.

>> > If a person has no interest in code, the
>> > speed certainly isn't going to change that.
>>
>> Apply that same logic to the written test...
>
> Have already done so elsewhere (in a reply to Mike Coslo, I believe).
>
>> > And they said reducing the emphasis on
>> > telegraphy proficiency as a licensing
>> > requirement would "allow the amateur
>> > service to, as it has in the past, attract
>> > technically inclined persons, particularly
>> > the youth of our country, and encourage
>> > them to learn and to prepare themselves
>> > in the areas where the United States
>> > needs expertise."
>>
>> But that hasn't happened. Didn't happen
>> after 1991, nor again after 2000.
>

> How do you know that to be a fact?

Because we have not seen any significant changes
to the technology used by hams in all that time that
came from hams who aren't code tested.

>With some training in electronics,
>radio, computers, and so on, I consider myself somewhat technically inclined
>and I probably would have never gotten a license if the code tests remained
>for all licenses. Are you so very certain I'm the only one?

Not at all.

But with all due respect, Dwight - how "technically inclined" are you?
Build any homebrew rigs? Any new modes or technologies? Any
technical articles in amateur radio publications?

Please understand, there's no requirement that you or any ham do any of those
things. But what difference does it make how "technically inclined" a ham is if

they don't do any of them?

73 de Jim, N2EY

365. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline☐ Report 1377 ☐ January 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 10:13:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401051013440.1214@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85041

On Mon, 4 Jan 2004, Dave Welby wrote:
> Amateur Radio Newsline☐ Report 1377 ☐ January 2, 2004

Ah! A new spammer address for Pasternak's drivel surfaces.

366. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 12:57:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105075701.11891.00003445@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85042

In article <5ee63311.0401031432.2d46227d@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040102235644.11891.00003364@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> In article <8jiJb.16109$lo3.14854@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>> >
>> >> Suppose FCC enacted your proposal as you submitted it. Why would a
>> >> person with the entry-level license be qualified for that license for
>> >> ten years but then be unqualified for it after ten years? Particularly
>> >> if they were willing to retest for the same license?
>> >>
>> >
>> >It's a learners permit, NOT a license.
>>
>> What's the difference?
>
>It's provisional, intended to assist in gaining full qualification for
>an amateur license.

Just like the Tech and General class licenses are today...
>>
>> Here in PA, a person with a learner's permit for driving cannot drive
>> alone.
>> Could your learner's permit hams operate their own rigs all by themselves?
>> If so, it's a license.
>>
Well? Could the holder of your learners permit ham license operate a ham rig
alone?

>> >If they couldn't/didn't learn enough
>> >in 10 years to pass the examination for a license, then they are obviously
>> >not qualified for a license.
>>
>> But they're qualified to have a learner's permit for 10 years.
>
>Do you have aproblem with 10 years? Should we make it 10 weeks?

I have a problem with the idea that someone who can pass the test for the
learner's permit and who has a clean record is pushed off the amateur bands
because he/she can't or won't pass the exam for the full-privileges license. I
can see making the LP nonrenewable and requiring a retest to get another one,

but not being banned for life as your plan would do.
>
>> Can you name any other license where, if you don't upgrade within a
>> specified time, you lose the license you have?
>
>There are no such amateur licenses extant, but for the majority of
>it's availability the Novice license was exactly like that.

Actually just about half its existence.

But that feature ended almost 30 years ago. I've been told I'm "clinging to the past" because I think code tests are a good idea...

Are there any licenses or learner's permits of *any* kind currently issued by the US Govt. that are one-time-only, upgrade-or-you're-out?

>That was
>probably the most effective method ever devised of introducing
>non-amateurs to ham radio with a "sample sized" operating permit.
>Easy to get, with limited power so you didn't trash the
>RF-neighborhood too badly, and of a duration long enough to decide if
>you wanted to become a ham and to gain experience for the
>qualification tests.

And they limited it to a few slices of a few bands. And for most of its existence it was CW only. ;-)

> Then they spoiled it by making it renewable.

Which was done because of the perception that too many newcomers were dropping out.

There's another option. Make it nonrenewable but "retakeable", just like other LP's. If someone reached the end of their 10 years and wanted to remain a ham, but couldn't pass the full-privs test, they could take the then-current LP test and get another LP. Just like for a driver's license. That way, no one who was interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would be incentive to get a full-privs renewable license. And FCC would not have to maintain a database of folks banned from ever getting an LP.

73 de Jim, N2EY

367. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 12:57:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105075702.11891.00003446@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85043

In article <9gXJb.23310$IM3.8552@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040103141922.29660.00002352@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <1_AIb.16878$IM3.13697@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >The point is that no other licensing (federal or state) takes such a
>> >position....i.e. where the additional privileges are not otherwise
>> >a function of additional knowledge required for the license.
>>
>> What other licensing includes things like a Basis and Purpose that the
>> licensees are expected to fulfill? Drivers sure don't have such.
>> >
>> >> >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
>> >> >> For that matter what about the General?
>> >> >
>> >> > If we adopt the philosophy, it could be done. Insane, but stranger
>> >> >things have happened.
>> >
>> >There are, as we have discussed, valid privileges which could be
>> >tied to the increased license knowledge. Power would be a good
>> >example (IMHO). Most of us have agreed that it makes almost
>> >no sense to have the entry level license (technician) allowed to
>> >run 1500 watts based on a knowledge base of so little technical
>> >and theory.
>>
>> Agreed! But FCC doesn't see it that way - yet.
>>
>> Bill, your argument simply points down the path of getting rid of the
>> Extra, even if you don't intend it that way.
>
>Not at all. I'd make the Extra the only license allowed 1500 watts.

Then you have the unenviable task of convincing FCC that the current General
and Tech exams don't adequately test for the knowledge required to safely
operate 1500 watt amateur transmitters.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

368. Re: SPECIAL ANNOUBCEMENT TO ALL RAD IO AMATEURS FRM Hamvention® 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 13:15:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401050515.704e0a33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85044
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I nominate Hans, not because he's a good guy (he's not), but because
he's got a good idea.

channel391@juno.com (Dave Welby) wrote in message
news:<ae188f77.0401042157.c2117fc@posting.google.com>...
> SPECIAL ANNOUBCEMENT TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS FRM Hamventionï¿½ 2004
>
> Press Release
> (January 2, 2003)
>
> For more information please send e-mail to: media@hamvention.org
>
> Hamventionï¿½ Award Nominations Close January 31st
>
> Do you know an outstanding amateur in your club, community, or from
> on-the-air contacts? Does this person appear to excel in some phase
> of amateur radio? Do you feel that he/she deserves national and
> world-wide recognition? If so, then the time is now for you to sit
> down and write a letter to nominate that special radio amateur for
> one of three Hamventionï¿½ 2004 awards.
>
> There are three categories of awards being presented: The Radio
> Amateur of the Year, Technical Excellence and Special Achievement
> Award.
>
> The Radio Amateur of the Year is described as that special person who
> has made a long term commitment to the advancement of amateur radio.
> A well-rounded individual who has contributed most of his or her
> lifetime to our hobby in some very outstanding way.
>
> A nominee for the Technical Excellence award should be a person who
> has made an outstanding technical advancement in the field of amateur
> radio. Something like a revolutionary new equipment design or mode
> of operation that has impacted positively on the day to day operation
> of many hams.
>
> Last but by no means least, a nominee for the Hamvention's Special
> Achievement award is the kind of special person who has made an
> outstanding contribution to the advancement of amateur radio. This
> award is usually given to a respected amateur who spearheaded a
> single significant project.
>

> All amateurs are eligible - Novice through Extra. Recipients are
> decided by the Awards Committee, based partially upon the information
> received, not the number of nominations submitted. The decision of
> the judges is final.
>
> Nominations must be received before midnight on January 31, 2004.
> Documentation is not only beneficial, but essential in determining
> viability of a candidate's achievement(s). Magazine articles,
> newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos, etc. will better inform the
> Awards Committee of your candidate's accomplishments. All materials
> become the property of the Hamvention and cannot be returned.
> Submissions go by mail to: Awards Committee, Hamvention 2004, PO Box
> 964, Dayton Ohio, 45401.
>
> (Note: You can also fill out the on-line "Nominating Form" found at
> the Hamventionï¿½ 2004 website (http://www.hamvention.org) by clicking
> your mouse on the words "Award Nominations," but you are still
> required to submit substantiating documentation to the address noted
> above before January 31, 2004)
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Yahoo! Groups Links
>
> To visit your group on the web, go to:
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/
>
> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
> arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com
>
> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
> http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

369. Re: Ham Radio in The Information Age and Terrorism

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 13:18:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401050518.3ca2553e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85045

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.58.0401050352330.731@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...
> On Tue, 30 Dec 2003, Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > According to a story in the Washington Post, by Dan Eggen, on Tuesday, Dec.
> > 30, 2003:
> > An FBI intelligence bulletin sent to law enforcement agencies last week
> > warned that "terrorist operatives may rely on almanacs to assist with target
> > selection and pre-operational planning" because they include detailed
> > information on bridges, tunnels and other U.S. landmarks, officials said.
> >
> > OK, fault me and sneer at me all you want but, isn't the above just going
> > way too far? (the rest of the story can be read on the Washington Post
> > website--just do a search on the word almanac and it should be around the
> > second item in the list). I mean, I understand the fear, the tendency to
> > jump to safety, but even if terrorists are using almanacs, do we want to be
> > "caught" with one if we are thought to be acting "suspicious" as is
> > mentioned in the article?
> >
> > Sheesh, what about ham radio?! One of the most widely used communication
> > mediums in this country and maybe the world, right? What do we open
> > ourselves up for by being on the air and "just talking?"
>
> The NSA has amateur radio classified as an activity that could be abused by
> foreign nationals in espionage activities (prior to September 2001 - I'm not
> certain if this has been changed after that time).

So did the Koreans. At least when I was there, no MOBILE hamming allowed.

370. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 13:23:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401050523.4b13f90b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85046

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<MWUJb.20521$P%1.19646882@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<20031225180555.09599.00001473@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 12/25/03 5:01 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312251501.133978ef@posting.google.com>
>
> > > >Sounds like what we've inherited today. Let's do something rational
> instead.
> > >
> > > It will be interesting to see what YOU call "rational".
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Steve, you never pay attention, do you?
> >
> > I've said it many, many times. One amateur radio service, one amateur
> > radio license. And maybe a learners permit as Hans suggests.
> >
> > How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> > really want?
>
> You will of course expect the licensing exam to be equivalent to the sum of
> knowledge required for Tech, General and Extra for this single full
> privilege license.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Jim does. His proposal.

371. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 14:20:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ooeKb.26038$IM3.17015@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85047

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > The FCC doesn't have a mandate
> > to test discipline.
>
> Yes, they do. That's what the "character"
> stuff in the rules is about.

I've read the rules many times, but must have missed the part or parts about character testing.

> There's a local ham around here who
> has generated so much trouble on
> various repeaters and earned himself
> so many warning letters that FCC is
> considering not renewing his license
> for "character" reasons. IOW he
> simply doesn't have the necessary
> self-discipline to be a ham.

First, what does that have to do with testing? Second, there is nothing in the rules about refusing a renewal based on character, so I seriously doubt that would be the FCC's explination for any action like this (a pattern of rule violations, yes).

> Agreed. But those things do constitute
> "discipline".

Only if you stretch the word to mean something beyond common usage.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

372. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 14:24:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <8LadnRjNmYJN7mSiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 85048

Dec. 30, 2004

Carl - wk3c

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040104220914.15462.00005421@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <9y2dnRjs28VSLWWiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >I'm going to guestimate
> >that we'll see a Report and Order in December, 2004.
>
> Carl,
>
> Need an exact date for the pool. Dec 1? Dec 15?
>
> Let me know and I'll put you in.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

373. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 15:02:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <M%eKb.26187$IM3.1064@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85049

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> The written tests which are made from
> those questions are a govenrment
> requirement.

However, we were discussing the government requirement, not test
questions.

> Because we have not seen any significant
> changes to the technology used by hams
> in all that time that came from hams who
> aren't code tested.

Of course not. Radio is a mature technology, so you're not likely to see
"significant" changes in the future. But that doesn't suggest for a moment
that there are no contributions at all being made. With several hundred
thousand hams out there, neither of us are likely to know what contributions
are being made.

> But with all due respect, Dwight - how
> "technically inclined" are you? Build any
> homebrew rigs? Any new modes or
> technologies? Any technical articles in
> amateur radio publications?

Are these what determines who is technically inclined? If so, I doubt 99%
of the operators today, in any license class, could be described that way. I
use modern radio equipment, far beyond what could be built easily at home.
New modes were rare even before any changes to the code tests and may be
even more rare in the future. And new technologies will obviously be small
in a mature industry. As for my own activities, I'll refrain beyond saying
I've built some lessor equipment at home, written some articles, and helped
to establish policies for the use of amateur equipment within a national
organization.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

374. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 15:50:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>
Source record: 85050

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040103085646.07961.00000982@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
>>In article <dcrJb.2350$uF6.916899@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>The question kind of states it. I suppose that the BW might be wider as
>>>the speed increases.
>>
>>Mike,
>>
>>The bandwidth of a Morse signal is determined by the rise and fall times
>
> of the
>
>>leading and trailing edges of each dit or dah, and the shape of the rise
>
> and
>
>>fall.
>>
>>
>>>The reason I ask is that on 3580 tonight, we're all sitting there fat,
>>>dumb, and happy, when W1AW starts it's CW broadcast.
>>
>>Who is "we", Mike?
>>
>>
>>>And it's some 700
>>>kHz wide!!!
>>
>>How did you determine the bandwidth?
>>
>>
>>>And now I'd swear it's almost 3kHz wide. That's like SSB!!!
>>
>>Yep. Such a bandwidth would require extremely "hard" keying, though. Or a
>>modulated carrier.
>>
>>>Needless to say, their strong signal was pretty tough on all us 5 and
>>>ten watters. you could get most of a message through, but it took a lt
>>>of the fun out of it.

>>
>>Was the AGC on?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> Part of the equation here is the receiver, as Jim N2EY was bringing up. A
> lot of folks don't understand that actual bandwidth and apparant bandwith as
> determined by a receiver are not the same in most cases.
>
> Also I really don't see the problem, why did you just sit there? Were you
> all rock bound or what?
>
> Move frequency, were not channelized, yet.

That isn't my point, Dan. That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood. Usually PSK
and OOK Morse get along just fine.

My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing what
so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too bad
for the rest of you.

That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.

- Mike KB3EIA -

375. Re: BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 15:53:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FF9888E.7090108@psu.edu>
Source record: 85102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

cb and shortwave groups trimmed

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message

<some snippage>

>>As I figured, the BPL internet access concept is going down fast.
>>

>
> A test of BPL was run in Alabama. A engineer friend of mine told me it was
> not coming up to what was advertised in Birmingham. Repeaters were needed
> way too often, thus jacking up the expense.
>
> Unless the FCC is totally braindead I think BPL, as proposed will die by
> itself. However what they want is INCREASE the power of BPL over and above
> what is presently allowed under part 15.
>
> They may take that route. We shall see.

I think they should be told that "Ya can't polish a Turd!"

- Mike KB3EIA -

376. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 15:54:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85101

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> That way, no one who was
> interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would
be
> incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.

If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely to be sufficient to become qualified.

I can't imagine "one who was interested" would fail to qualify in 10 years, but if they didn't, well I guess there are other hobbies like finger painting which might be less challenging and not require a federal license to pursue. The liberals will whine and wring their hands in dismay, but life's a bitch sometimes.

73, de Hans, K0HB

377. Re: IllegAL CBERS forge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 16:12:24 UTC
From: Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <r33jvv8gp8egk7ps3uc673nojrchtllac2@4ax.com>
Source record: 85103
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 05 Jan 2004 08:22:24 -0600, Illegal Cbers will stoop to
anything <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:

>"Landshark" <S3buell@sbcglobal.net> wrote in
>news:Ly7Kb.6589$wx1.5845@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com:
>
>>
>> "Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
>> news:bta6ng$6rj$1@news.x-echo.com...
>>> Mark Beck the proven transexual and his butt buddies Steve Parks and
>>> GW Randall how can you live with your Hypocrisy? ....Now go to the
>>> mirror a nd practice spreading your ass cheeks.
>>
>> Again George, do show everyone
>> how you act.
>
>
>If any hams out here know george busch please contact him and let him know
>Illegal cbers are running him up and down and making false and baseless
>accusations. And a few Illegal Cbers are making threats against him
>telling others to drive by his home etc. If anything happens to him the
>names of the likely culprits are available to law enforcemnt

That would put you at the top of that culprits list. You did post
that you were WA3MOJ, you started this whole WA3MOJ thing.

378. Re: IllegAL CBERS forge Legal Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 16:15:46 UTC
From: Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <v93jvv0f0q5dh21log3ffm3jk89mlrjjvq@4ax.com>
Source record: 85104
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 05 Jan 2004 15:52:01 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
wrote:

>NotGeorge <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20040105103310.790
>> $vg@newsreader.com:
>>
>> > Legal <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:
>> >> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
>> >> news:20040105093448.923$RO@newsreader.com:
>> >>
>> >> > Squirm squirm.. squirm squirm.. squirming..
>> >>
>> >> hey steve you always brag how much money you have should be a cinch to
>> >> prove who I am right.
>> >>
>> > Show me where I'm bragging about money, George.
>>
>> Squirm squirm.. squirm squirm.. squirming..
>>
>> Show me where I am George
>>
> -YOU- showed everyone you were WA3MOJ when you made this post:
>--
>
>
>From: "No Fear" <nofear@home.comm>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
>References: <3327-3BB7D3C2-92@storefull-146.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
><9pbgml$gsuhm$1@ID-26551.news.dfncis.de>
><Vzhu7.67536$5A3.25250972@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
><9pci75$fq242$1@ID-26551.news.dfncis.de> Subject: Re: predator 10k site url
>Lines: 60
>Organization: AKC
>X-Priority: 3
>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
>Message-ID: <Mgsu7.68301$5A3.25741449@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
>Date: Tue, 02 Oct 2001 23:41:32 GMT
>NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.180.184.171
>X-Complaints-To: abuse@home.net
>X-Trace: news1.rdc2.pa.home.com 1002066092 24.180.184.171 (Tue, 02 Oct 2001

> 16:41:32 PDT)
>NNTP-Posting-Date: Tue, 02 Oct 2001 16:41:32 PDT
>
>Oh thats funny a few months back you said you sold everything I guess your
>just a part timer now?
>
>WA3MOJ
>--
>
>You've been Squirm squirm.. squirm squirm.. squirming.. ever since.

Too Bad, if he's not WA3MOJ and something does happen, he will be the
first one they talk to. Then he whines about others forging WA3MOJ
posts.

379. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 16:21:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <CagKb.21609$lo3.2172@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85105

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Could the holder of your learners permit ham license operate a ham rig
> alone?

Of course, just like the previous learners permit, aka "Novice".

> not being banned for life as your plan would do.

They wouldn't be 'banned for life'. They could take the standard
qualification test at any time.

> Are there any licenses or learner's permits of *any* kind currently issued
by
> the US Govt. that are one-time-only, upgrade-or-you're-out?

None that I'm aware are currently extant, but precedent exists.

73, de Hans, K0HB

380. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 18:00:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401051000.4df1740b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85106

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<mznJb.5529$6B.2830@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:DCZIb.29483$Pg1.3348@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > > Only on a one-time basis.
> >
> > If N2EY's latest post under "ARS License Numbers" is accurate,

It is.

> > and if the
> > "fix" was instituted today, the number of Amateur Extra licensees would
> > increase by 213% and the vast majority (69%) of this enlarged "Extra
> > Class"
> > would not qualify for the license under yesterdays rules or tomorrows
> rules.
> >
> > > > Given that sad state of affairs, now any NEW amateur hopefuls can
> > > >reasonably > plead that any examination more comprehensive
> > > > than the current General discriminates against new applicants.
> > >
> > > They can plead all they want...doesn't make it so. The FCC could
> > > certainly counter argue the upgrades were a one-time need to
> > > simplify the overall license structure.

But why is there such a need? Retaining closed-off license classes
like the Advanced and Novice simply requires that a certain field in
the FCC database have more alternatives and the retention of a few
paragraphs of Part 97 listing privs of those licenses.

Back in the days before electronic data, FCC kept the closed-off
Advanced class as a separate entity for more than a decade even though
it carried no additional privileges.
> >
> > Their counter argument would utterly fail, because they'd first need to
> > prove that the "one-time need" over-rides the harm of a massive influx of
> > underqualified (by their own rules) individuals into the top class of
> > amateur operators. Judges rule on logic, not administrative convenience.
>
> So how come when the Generals "lost" privileges in 1968 they didn't
> win that same argument...i.e. you can't take privileges
> from me because the new requirements aren't justified
> since I already had those privileges via a lower class

> license?

Two reasons:

1) The 1968 situation involved existing hams *losing* privs, not getting a free upgrade.

2) What is proposed, if I read it correctly, is a one-time giveaway, not a rules change.

The closest thing to it historically isn't 1968 but instead it's the Great Giveaway of 1953, when FCC completely reversed its restructuring of 1951 and opened all privs to all hams except Novices and Techs.

And I'll ask again - why is there a need to eliminate the closed-off license classes? Tech Plus will disappear automatically no later than 6 years, 3 months and 10 days from now. Novice is down by about a third and Advanced is slowly decreasing as well. What harm do these old classes do?

73 de Jim, N2EY

381. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 18:35:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401051035.28aca0b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85107

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>...
>
> That isn't my point, Dan. That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
> out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood. Usually PSK
> and OOK Morse get along just fine.
>
> My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing what
> so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too bad
> for the rest of you.
>
> That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, Mike, my boy, you just don't understand.

The ARRL is kind of like that "Home on the Range" song... where never
is heard a discouraging word, and the skies are not cloudy all day.

Don't be sayin nuttin bad bout the ARRL, nor their flagship broadcast
station W1AW. You'll get the wrath of the Old Man himself when you
get up to the Pearly Gates.

382. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 18:38:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401051038.6687f69b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85108

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040104145919.15462.00005409@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0401040700.31209cba@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> >> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >>
> >> >
> >> > Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
> >> > inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
> >> >
> >>
> >> I knew you'd agree with me.
> >>
> >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >I just happen to agree with Hans' plan. Allow the amateur to
> >distinguish him or herself through actions rather than an FCC forced
> >march.
>
> While I agree on the generality of that, such is impossible under
> the present-day Class Distinction Rules of US amateur radio.
>
> ALL perceived expertise is judged by the "amateur community"
> as demonstrated by the fancy-bordered license (suitable for
> framing) from the federal government.
>
> The Amateur Extra is the epitome of excellence. Once achieved,
> nothing else need be learned. Education ends. You have been
> told by his Most High Excellency, the Dill Instructor.
>
> All learning comes through having tiers and tiers of classes, of
> distinctions (enforced by law) right along with the social need of
> call letters written behind the name to signify a "title" all may see
> (and admire, respect) as if it is a dukedom, barony, or other
> noble rank. That is VERY IMPORTANT. Do not criticize any
> statements of the ruling classes of the "community."
>
> US amateur radio seems to have ceased being a hobby, an
> avocational activity done for personal recreation. It has become a
> LIFESTYLE...a True Belief.
>

> <cut to stock shot of Rod Serling and signpost up ahead, voice
> sign-off by Rod...up theme and take black...>
>
> LHA

And poor Mike is getting beat up for saying the W1AW signal was too wide.

383. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 18:46:01 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <JhiKb.46924$m83.10369@fed1read01>
Source record: 85109

> > Someone wrote;
> > That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.

From the ARRL License Manual 1976:

CW Bandwidth = wpm X 4
"With proper shaping, the necessary keying bandwidth is equal to 4
times the speed in words per minute for International Morse Code;
e.g. at 25 words per minute, the bandwidth is approximately 100 cycles.
e.g., 40 WPM = approximately 160 Hz"

--
73 From The Wilderness Keyboard

384. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 20:52:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FF9CE89.4060506@psu.edu>
Source record: 85111

Leo wrote:
> Very insightful, Mike! Especially the use of digital voice, and the
> transmission of images on 144 MHz repeaters. That does make sense!
> I'm surprised that digital voice in particular is not being played
> with much today on HF - that may well be the future of radio right
> there, based on the direction the commercial broadcasters are headed.

I thought I replied to this post, but maybe not. I think that Digital voice takes up more BW than SSB, so there will probably be a wait for future developments.

> I would also expect to see much more emphasis on the convergence of
> the Internet with amateur radio - IRLP, e-mail servers, wireless
> messaging and similar concepts, for example. Handheld radios would
> probably have many cellular-like features - text messaging and
> built-in cameras, for example.

Probably. Ham/Internet functions would probably be a lot better than what they are now, and people like me, that don't think that the Internat is Ham radio would not have time to form their biases.

> I am positive that CW would be rediscovered and resurrected by those
> who wished to experiment with a historic signalling method used in the
> golden days of long distance communication. Special interest groups
> would spring up, as they would for RTTY, SITOR and other interesting
> though antiquated protocols.

I agree about the CW. That would probably come about as a minimalist thing, kind of like QRP is now, but with extremely simple equipment.

I don't think that RTTY would come about. I think amateurs got started on RTTY after getting surplus writers. There probably wouldn't be many of them left today. And the encoding scheme wouldn't likely be adopted

However, truly outmoded forms of
> communication common today would not exist at all, such as the
> repeater phone patch (in an era of cheap cellphones, who would even
> think up this one?) For emergency use, a similar interface to the
> public network would be provided, perhaps directly to a PSTN operator.
> No more personal phone calls, though!).

Agreed.

> Without the legacy of all of the current AM, CW, SSB, RTTY etc.
> equipment from years gone by, the requirement to fully support these
> modes on the new bands would not exist. What modes would be popular
> in equipment produced to meet the demands of the amateur service? In

> addition to standalone radios (at least for handheld service anyway),
> would we see black boxes designed to interface to PC and antenna, with
> software to run all manner of digital communication (high speed modem,
> digital voice, image transmission, low-res full motion video, etc.)?
>
> I would also anticipate that, in the interest of ensuring compliance
> with regulations, that each commercial radio may be designed to
> automatically transmit a unique identifier over the air, which would
> allow authorities to trace back faulty, out-of-band or malicious
> operation to a particular unit. This feature could be coupled with a
> built-in GPS receiver, to further aid in localizing the radio if and
> when necessary. This may well raise privacy concerns, but it could be
> mandated as part of the operating licence, just as mandatory
> transmission of the operators' call sign at intervals is today. And,
> as we are assuming a brand new service, it would be relatively easy to
> do - with no older units to retrofit. What would happen with
> homebuilt equipment, though?

hmmmm. not sure if I like that!

> With respect to testing, I would anticipate that the regulatory and
> operating etiquette sections would continue to exist in virtually
> their present form. Along with the addition of more Digital questions
> to the theoretical portion of the tests, we may well see questions on
> interconnection to the Internet, firewalling and network security.
>
> There may be a new test section on emergency traffic handling, radio
> net and message relay operations - this being the most likely premise
> that we would be able to convince anyone to hand over all of this
> valuable radio spectrum to us in the first place! And given the
> priority of national security in our post-9/11 world, there may be a
> mandate for the amateur service to link very closely with the various
> emergency management agencies, upon governmental request?
>
> I would envision a requirement for perhaps two different licence
> levels, though - one for the basic equipment operator, limited to
> perhaps 100 or 200 watts, commercially built and type-approved
> transmitting equipment only, not permitted to act as control operator
> of repeaters. A higher level licence would be granted upon passing
> more stringent testing on RF safety and high power operation, repeater
> commissioning, internetworking and advanced electronic theory, which
> would remove these restrictions.
>
> Either licence level would have full access to all bands and modes,
> with no restrictions other than those listed above. The licence
> levels are not intended to be incentive based, but to ensure
> competence and safety (both personal and public) when installing and
> operating multi-user automated-access, internetworked or high RF power
> output equipment.
>
> Of course, there is the remote possibility that a Usenet group

> dedicated to the endless (and animated!) discussion of whether RTTY
> testing should be discontinued might crop up - hopefully very remote
> :)

HAR!!

- mike KB3EIA -

385. Re: Illegal CBers forging hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 20:53:38 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0401051253.32e7a9c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85110
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert The Bruce <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
news:<btas1tfao1@news.x-echo.com>...
> For your information.
>
> Illegal CBers are targeting random ham callsigns
> such as WA3MOJ and forging them on Usenet
> newsgroups. WA3MOJ is not now or has not ever
> posted on Usenet but the forgers have an axe to
> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> radio operation so they post callsigns of people
> who they think are against them.
>
> You may be next these cb outlaws will stop at
> nothing including threats and harassment.
>
> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> Beck of Fremont California. Also a person known only
> as "GW" aka Randall of Texas is doing the forging. And
> there leader Twistedhed aka Dave McCampbell of
> Clearmwater Florida encourages them and gives them
> instructions on harassment of hams including using
> their call signs on "freeband".
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Mon Jan 5 06:17:47 2004 depuis l'IP : ac97f6fc.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

you misspelled 'their' numbnutts.....geez, why don't you get
spellcheck if you can't spell for crying out loud.....

386. Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 21:23:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6BkKb.21854$lo3.19299@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85112
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Several years ago ARRL marketed a WIN3.xx software package called "Radio Designer" which was a 'lite' copy of a commercial RF design program. Unfortunately the program does not run under 16- and 32-bit Windows environments, and the OEM is not interested in entering into further arrangements with ARRL.

Does anyone know of a similar program in a price range (under $500) attractive to hams?

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

387. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 21:54:05 UTC
From: W3JDR <joe@roccis.com>
Message-ID: <12lKb.1373$_o1.804@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 85113
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

The company that made ARRL Designer (Compact Software) was bought by Ansoft.
They have greatly enhanced the capability, and the current offering is
available as a free student version here:
http://www.ansoft.com/ansoftdesignersv/
There are also many other evaluation & student packages available on the net
for free. Check out this site as a starter:
http://www.rfengineer.cc/rftools.htm

Also, if you do an internet search on "RF circuit analysis software" or
something similar, you'll get lots of hits.

BTW, I run ARRL Designer under Win98SE and it's fine. What OS are you trying
to use it with?

Joe
W3JDR

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:6BkKb.21854$lo3.19299@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Several years ago ARRL marketed a WIN3.xx software package called "Radio
> Designer" which was a 'lite' copy of a commercial RF design program.
> Unfortunately the program does not run under 16- and 32-bit Windows
> environments, and the OEM is not interested in entering into further
> arrangements with ARRL.
>
> Does anyone know of a similar program in a price range (under $500)
> attractive to hams?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> --
> http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
>
>
>

388. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 22:12:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3jlKb.21898$lo3.3675@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85114
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"W3JDR" <joe@roccis.com> wrote

>
> BTW, I run ARRL Designer under Win98SE and it's fine. What OS are you
trying
> to use it with?
>

Joe,

Thanks for all the resources. At my house ARRL Designer pukes and dies on
both WIN98 (500MHz P2) and WIN-XP (2.5GHz P-4) machines.

73, Hans, K0HB

389. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 22:32:35 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <75ojvvgjnn2j2555th54v0dn242hjfq1qa@4ax.com>
Source record: 85115
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hans,

ARRL's Radio Designer Version 1.5 (copyrighted 1998) claims that it runs on both Windows 9x amd NT systems, and I can confirm empirically that it operates on Win XP Pro as well - an excerpt from the included Help file is below:

" ARRL Radio Designer 1.5, a Windows (3.1, 3.11, 95 and NT)-based computer program, lets you create computerized models of audio, radio and electronic circuits so you can see how they work--and make them work better--without actually building them....."

IIRC correctly, the last version sold by the ARRL was 1.51. If you are using an older version, perhaps you can find a copy of this one somewhere? Was originally $150, should be a copy at a fraction of that out there now that it is discontinued.......

73, Leo

On Mon, 05 Jan 2004 21:23:14 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:

> Several years ago ARRL marketed a WIN3.xx software package called "Radio
>Designer" which was a 'lite' copy of a commercial RF design program.
>Unfortunately the program does not run under 16- and 32-bit Windows
>environments, and the OEM is not interested in entering into further
>arrangements with ARRL.
>
> Does anyone know of a similar program in a price range (under $500)
>attractive to hams?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> --
> http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
>
>

390. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 23:00:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <7jpjvvo7nmk7tom461orhf0roro1glr8gp@4ax.com>
Source record: 85116

Mike,

Thanks for your comments - mine are below:

On Mon, 05 Jan 2004 15:52:25 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>> Very insightful, Mike! Especially the use of digital voice, and the
>> transmission of images on 144 MHz repeaters. That does make sense!
>> I'm surprised that digital voice in particular is not being played
>> with much today on HF - that may well be the future of radio right
>> there, based on the direction the commercial broadcasters are headed.
>
>I thought I replied to this post, but maybe not. I think that Digital
>voice takes up more BW than SSB, so there will probably be a wait for
>future developments.
>
True, but maybe one of the roles of the 'new' amateur service would be
to serve as a testbed for new technologies like this one. With all of
the new licensees concentrating on playing around with it, and no old
low-tech stuff to impede them :), improvements may come more quickly
than in our current scenario.

>
>> I would also expect to see much more emphasis on the convergence of
>> the Internet with amateur radio - IRLP, e-mail servers, wireless
>> messaging and similar concepts, for example. Handheld radios would
>> probably have many cellular-like features - text messaging and
>> built-in cameras, for example.
>
>Probably. Ham/Internet functions would probably be a lot better than
>what they are now, and people like me, that don't think that the
>Internat is Ham radio would not have time to form their biases.

Make that one 'us' - I don't consider any Internet-linked radio system
to be a 'real' radio - more like a telephone, at best. But, you are
absolutely correct, this bias of ours would not exist at all! Folks
who grew up in the age of the 'Net may see the new Radio service as an
extension of it.
>
>> I am positive that CW would be rediscovered and resurrected by those
>> who wished to experiment with a historic signalling method used in the
>> golden days of long distance communication. Special interest groups
>> would spring up, as they would for RTTY, SITOR and other interesting

>> though antiquated protocols.
>
> I agree about the CW. That would probably come about as a minimalist
>thing, kind of like QRP is now, but with extremely simple equipment.
>
> I don't think that RTTY would come about. I think amateurs got started
>on RTTY after getting surplus writers. There probably wouldn't be many
>of them left today. And the encoding scheme wouldn't likely be adopted

I was thinking more of those folks who had been monitoring some of the
commercial RTTY utility broadcasts (like the Canadian Army's aviation
forecasts out of Halifax, NS at a blistering 75 Baud, for example),
and who would want to try it out for themselves. With a PC, encoding
schemes are relatively simple to create and play around with - maybe
some nut would do it just to see if they could? (Maybe even this
nut..... :))

>
>
> However, truly outmoded forms of
>> communication common today would not exist at all, such as the
>> repeater phone patch (in an era of cheap cellphones, who would even
>> think up this one?) For emergency use, a similar interface to the
>> public network would be provided, perhaps directly to a PSTN operator.
>> No more personal phone calls, though!).
>
> Agreed.
>
>> Without the legacy of all of the current AM, CW, SSB, RTTY etc.
>> equipment from years gone by, the requirement to fully support these
>> modes on the new bands would not exist. What modes would be popular
>> in equipment produced to meet the demands of the amateur service? In
>> addition to standalone radios (at least for handheld service anyway),
>> would we see black boxes designed to interface to PC and antenna, with
>> software to run all manner of digital communication (high speed modem,
>> digital voice, image transmission, low-res full motion video, etc.)?
>>
>> I would also anticipate that, in the interest of ensuring compliance
>> with regulations, that each commercial radio may be designed to
>> automatically transmit a unique identifier over the air, which would
>> allow authorities to trace back faulty, out-of-band or malicious
>> operation to a particular unit. This feature could be coupled with a
>> built-in GPS receiver, to further aid in localizing the radio if and
>> when necessary. This may well raise privacy concerns, but it could be
>> mandated as part of the operating licence, just as mandatory
>> transmission of the operators' call sign at intervals is today. And,
>> as we are assuming a brand new service, it would be relatively easy to
>> do - with no older units to retrofit. What would happen with
>> homebuilt equipment, though?
>
>hmmmm. not sure if I like that!

Me either - concepts like this scare the heck out of me. But, the
potential for some unsavoury character or terrorist to acquire a radio
with the capability to communicate globally (and stealthily - pretty
hard to find one, especially if it transmits on a random schedule!!)
and use it for whatever nefarious purpose may prompt the government
who created the 'new' amateur service to build this in right from the
start. It's very technically possible, and cheap and practical if
done en masse right from the beginning. (after all, who ever thought
that an innocuous little computer in your car could be used to produce
data to nail you in court over an accident?? Hmmmm. That wasn't in the
Owners Manual....)

Included as a discussion point......we'll see if anyone else shares
this view / concern.
>
>
>> With respect to testing, I would anticipate that the regulatory and
>> operating etiquette sections would continue to exist in virtually
>> their present form. Along with the addition of more Digital questions
>> to the theoretical portion of the tests, we may well see questions on
>> interconnection to the Internet, firewalling and network security.
>>
>> There may be a new test section on emergency traffic handling, radio
>> net and message relay operations - this being the most likely premise
>> that we would be able to convince anyone to hand over all of this
>> valuable radio spectrum to us in the first place! And given the
>> priority of national security in our post-9/11 world, there may be a
>> mandate for the amateur service to link very closely with the various
>> emergency management agencies, upon governmental request?
>>
>> I would envision a requirement for perhaps two different licence
>> levels, though - one for the basic equipment operator, limited to
>> perhaps 100 or 200 watts, commercially built and type-approved
>> transmitting equipment only, not permitted to act as control operator
>> of repeaters. A higher level licence would be granted upon passing
>> more stringent testing on RF safety and high power operation, repeater
>> commissioning, internetworking and advanced electronic theory, which
>> would remove these restrictions.
>>
>> Either licence level would have full access to all bands and modes,
>> with no restrictions other than those listed above. The licence
>> levels are not intended to be incentive based, but to ensure
>> competence and safety (both personal and public) when installing and
>> operating multi-user automated-access, internetworked or high RF power
>> output equipment.
>>
>> Of course, there is the remote possibility that a Usenet group
>> dedicated to the endless (and animated!) discussion of whether RTTY
>> testing should be discontinued might crop up - hopefully very remote
>> :)
>

>
> HAR!!

Yup - the seeds are already sown for "NORTTY International".....I can
hear 'em growing from here! :)

> - mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

391. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-05 23:33:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <NumKb.21943$lo3.13497@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote

> Hans,

>

> ARRL's Radio Designer Version 1.5 (copyrighted 1998) claims that it

> runs on both Windows 9x amd NT systems, and I can confirm empirically

> that it operates on Win XP Pro as well - an excerpt from the included

> Help file is below:

Thanks Leo,

Mine is the original version 1.0 and it doesn't run in Win98 or Win-XP Pro
or Win-XP Home.

I'll see if I can root out a copy of 1.5.

73, Hans, K0HB

392. Re: WA3MOJ forger

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 01:15:27 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0401051715.32a690a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Landshark" <S3buell@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<Ly7Kb.6588$wx1.5676@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> news:bt9uogkbi1@news.x-echo.com...
> > Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> > >"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com> wrote:
> > >> "Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:bt9ogjvts1@news.x-echo.com...
> > >> > "Landshark" S3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote:
> > >> > >"Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> > >> > >news:bt9hpu$592$1@news.x-echo.com...
> > >> > >> Now see here is a perfect example of the threats from
> > >> > >> these guys. For those who do not know moparholic
> > >> > >> he is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio and unlicensed
> > >> > >> bootlegger who brags using ham gear on hf bands.
> > >> > >> and breaking fcc laws etc.
> > >> > >> The other one is Landshark
> > >> > >> aka Mark beck of Fremont CA
> > >> > >
> > >> > >But George, you said on the previous post I lived
> > >> > >in SF Ca., now I live in Fremont ca.? which is it?
> > >> > >You have also posted that I live in Modesto Ca.,
> > >> > >Stockton Ca., Waterford Ca, among other places.
> > >> > >You have claimed that I have these ISP's Netcom,
> > >> > >WebTv, Mindspring, Earthlink, AOL, PacBell, SBC
> > >> > >again, among numerous others.
> > >> > >
> > >> > >> he had a ham license
> > >> > >> but let it drop because he could not follow the rules
> > >> > >
> > >> > >Again, on the previous post you claimed I didn't
> > >> > >have a license, now I lost it for not following
> > >> > >the rules? LMAO!!!! I let it expire because of trolls
> > >> > >like you on the local ham bands, not because of
> > >> > >"following" rules.
> > >> > >
> > >> > >> so you see what kind of people these are confirmed
> > >> > >> outlaws. And FYI they have been after Lee Scott KC8LDO
> > >> > >> for years because he was brave enough to stand up
> > >> > >> to them and there leader Twistedhed aka Dave
> > >> > >> McCampbell of Florida.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Now George, you know I have nothing against

> > >> > >Leland or Jerry as with most other people I have
> > >> > >nothing against them either. George Busch wa3moj
> > >> > >who trolls RRCB has a problem about trolling, that's
> > >> > >why he create these posts, then cross post them
> > >> > >to cause a flame fest.
> > >> >
> > >> > Look queersack how many times do I have to
> > >> > tell you you have no proof that WA3MOJ even posts
> > >> > in here just because you saw those letters and numbers
> > >> > at the bottom of someones post means nothing. Dont
> > >> > take my word for it take Brainbusters he said callsigns
> > >> > are meaningless in a CB newsgroup and they are just
> > >> > random letters and numbers could mean anything like
> > >> > kp82 tim nebo or scott unit 69 or what ever. There may
> > >> > be some trolls who want you to think I am wa3moj but
> > >> > they are laughing at you because you are so fucking
> > >> > stupid how could any one be so stupid.....Now go take
> > >> > a transexual up your ass.
> > >>
> > >> Now of course it's you George, why else
> > >> would I have gotten the warning letter about posting under your aol
> > >> screen nic wa3moj@aol.com :
> > >>
> > >> Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
>
> > >> 14:07:26 -0500
> > >> X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
> > >> Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
> > >> by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw20164
> 8
> > >> for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500
> > >>
> > >> Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
> > >> Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
> > >> To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net
> > >>
> > >> Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
> > >> From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
> > >> Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net
> > >>
> > >> Hello,
> > >>
> > >> This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Polic
> y
> > >> department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/post
> ings
> > >> sent from your SBCIS account.
> > >>
> > >> It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the inte
> rnet

> > >> newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
> > >> wa3moj@aol.com
> > >> Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.
> > >>
> > >> Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
> > >> (http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
> > >> (http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to
>
> > >> email or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise
> > >> objectionable material.
> > >>
> > >> If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account,
> it
> > >> will be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.
> > >>
> > >> Sincerely,
> > >> The SBCIS Policy Department
> > >>
> > >> Now I did that to prove you were really
> > >> posting on RRCB and that you did have an
> > >> AOL account, but you still show your trolling
> > >> ways by the response to the previous posts.
> > >> Why else would you be so vehemently denying
> > >> that you are George Busch wa3moj trolling
> > >> RRCB.
> > >> >
> > >> Landshark
> > >>
> > >> Now do what is expected and make a denial
> > >> from you're Comcast account now.
> > >>
> > >It's him, he's WA3MOJ the rec.radio.cb leg humper,
> > >bagged and tagged.
> > >
> > >Notice how the loser trys to drag Leland and Jerry into
> > >his pissing contest? Like those guys are going to defend >george, riiii
> > ght! lol
> >
> > Hey asscrack I am not George, I am not WA3MOJ and I do
> > not have Comcast and further more if Landfag Mark beck
> > got a warning letter from his ISP it means the real WA3MOJ
> > sent it not me. did you ever stop to think there is a
> > real George Busch who does not post in this NG and who
> > has no idea you fags are forging him and accusing
> > him of everything including made up lies. Someone ought
> > to let him know what is going on maybe he will get the FCC
> > involved who knows. Now go ahead Mark....lube up your
> > anus again ready for penetration by bear type TS.
>
> Um George, you forgot to cross post this so that your

> peers can see how an extra class ham acts when they go bad
> and start acting like a troll.
>
> Landshark

Start? Georgie-girl Busch has been doing this crap for years!

393. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 01:27:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401051727.73c9dc02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85119

"Keyboard In The Wilderness" <KIYW@zilch.net> wrote in message
news:<JhiKb.46924$m83.10369@fed1read01>...
> > > Someone wrote;
> > > That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.
> ------------------------
>
> From the ARRL License Manual 1976:
>
> CW Bandwidth = wpm X 4
> "With proper shaping, the necessary keying bandwidth is equal to 4
> times the speed in words per minute for International Morse Code;
> e.g. at 25 words per minute, the bandwidth is approximately 100 cycles.
> e.g., 40 WPM = approximately 160 Hz"

Does the ARRL License Manual of 1976 address Farnsworth code and bandwidth?

394. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:11:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6PoKb.22155$lo3.9984@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85120
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

More info....

http://www.caves.org/grotto/nag/html/harness.html

395. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211924.25517.00003314@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85127

In article <6N6Kb.24540$IM3.20933@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Irrelevant, Dwight. The amateur
>> community has specifed the criteria
>> and goals of amateurism.
>>
>> First and foremost is morsemanship.
>> (snip)
>
> Because so many obviously agree, your sarcasm falls flat, Len.

Irrelevant. Morse code is the entire foundation for amateur radio.

Morse code is cutting-edge technology, an advancement necessary to use the HF spectrum for communications.

Morse code gets through when nothing else will, thus proving that morse code modes do away with electrical power requirements.

All who are "interested in radio" are required to learn morse code and be licensed in the amateur radio service. Non-morse modes do not count as "interest." Non-amateur work does not count as "interest." Professional work in radio does not count as "interest."

Learning morse code shows the self-discipline, dedication, and commitment to the amateur community and the League.

I have been told this. I repeat it to you for the betterment of all.

LHA

396. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211925.25517.00003315@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85123

In article <3A_Jb.20587$P%1.19721133@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:xvYJb.20223$lo3.11388@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>> > You will of course expect the licensing exam to be equivalent to the sum
>> of
>> > knowledge required for Tech, General and Extra for this single full
>> > privilege license.
>>
>> Yes. Good plan. (Toss in Novice and Advanced while we're on the topic.)
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Well of course but that's already been done. The current Tech pool now
>covers the old Novice material and the current Extra pool now covers the old
>Advanced material.

Sorry, the entirety of the Tech is totally irrelevant and irreverent...they are not tested for morse code proficiency.

Morse code is the living heart of amateur radio. Only "real" hams have been code-tested.

Without morse code testing, all new amateur licenses are Given Away!

LHA

397. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211926.25517.00003316@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85121

In article <f45722ac.0401051038.6687f69b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040104145919.15462.00005409@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0401040700.31209cba@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> >> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
>> >> > inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> I knew you'd agree with me.
>> >>
>> >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> >
>> >I just happen to agree with Hans' plan. Allow the amateur to
>> >distinguish him or herself through actions rather than an FCC forced
>> >march.
>>
>> While I agree on the generality of that, such is impossible under
>> the present-day Class Distinction Rules of US amateur radio.
>>
>> ALL perceived expertise is judged by the "amateur community"
>> as demonstrated by the fancy-bordered license (suitable for
>> framing) from the federal government.
>>
>> The Amateur Extra is the epitome of excellence. Once achieved,
>> nothing else need be learned. Education ends. You have been
>> told by his Most High Excellency, the Dill Instructor.
>>
>> All learning comes through having tiers and tiers of classes, of
>> distinctions (enforced by law) right along with the social need of
>> call letters written behind the name to signify a "title" all may see
>> (and admire, respect) as if it is a dukedom, barony, or other
>> noble rank. That is VERY IMPORTANT. Do not criticize any
>> statements of the ruling classes of the "community."
>>
>> US amateur radio seems to have ceased being a hobby, an

>> avocational activity done for personal recreation. It has become a
>> LIFESTYLE...a True Belief.
>>
>> <cut to stock shot of Rod Serling and signpost up ahead, voice
>> sign-off by Rod...up theme and take black...>
>>
>> LHA
>
>And poor Mike is getting beat up for saying the W1AW signal was too wide.

Newsgroup rules. Make ONE mistake and absolutely everything
else the mistaker posts is "incorrect, faulty, irrelevant!" :-)

ARRL can do no wrong. Ergo, W1AW's signal is perfect. No problem.

LHA

398. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211927.25517.00003317@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85125

In article <f45722ac.0401050535.7d4263b4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040104145909.15462.00005404@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0401030854.650893e6@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040102175148.08626.00002451@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20031224102156.12501.00004836@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> (N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >In article <20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>,
>> lenover21@aol.com
>> >> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >> >> There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE.
>> >> >
>> >> >Says who?
>> >>
>> >> The Field First Sergeant of your SERVICE company when you
>> >> fall out for roll call at 0530.
>> >>
>> >> Answer "here" as your name is called...sound off like you got a
>> >> pair...
>> >>
>> >> Hup, too, tree, foah...
>> >>
>> >> LHA
>> >
>> >He's still out there, somewhere, marching and calling cadence all by
>hisself.
>>
>> Yes...I can hear him even now...<beat of 120 per minute>
>>
>> "I don't know but I've been told...morse code mode is solid gold!"
>>
>> :-)
>>
>> LHA
>
>We should put a GPS on him so we can keep track of his progress. And

>a webcam on his helmut.

No problem on location. He's HERE almost every day, spending a great deal of time being the revered guru of the newsgroupies, tantalizing all with trivia of the past.

GPS doesn't work in the past.

LHA

399. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211928.25517.00003318@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85124

In article <f45722ac.0401050531.3b60fc06@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:<en0Kb.1526$Ui2.403339@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
>> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:f45722ac.0401041347.705f0f6b@posting.google.com...
>> > Steve will have to try them all on to prove me wrong. He should get
>> > the white ones so he can wear them to work.
>>
>> Brian, IMHO, what Steve does for a living is one hell of a noble
>occupation.
>> Discuss, debate, or argue about ARS related stuff all you want, but I'd cut
>> the man some slack wrt mentioning his job in a disrespectful light while
>> doing so.
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>
>Reciprocity. Steve does not respect my endeavors.

There's no such thing as "reciprocity" in here, Brian, only
recedetive retribution spouted from the drool-dribbled hot keyboards
of the mad-as-hell-because-all-the-others-don't-mind-talking-back-to
a high-level ex-NCO who is an amateur extra.

Anyone not getting along with mighty Stebe will - guaranteed - be
treated to a mighty melange of vitriol and personal insults...about
their life, their wife, their occupation, their accomplishments, plus
defamatory remarks of their choices, abilities, and for just existing.

But, in Egbert's view, all that is part of the hamgame? All must
condone the actions of a macho psycho extra who once passed
a 20 WPM code test and answered enough questions correctly to
receive a federal merit badge (suitable for framing). So, all extras
have absolutely carte blanche permission to act as assholes off
the radio and never be able to play well with others.

Yes, all must "cut him slack." Nursing is a heroic occupation and,
like W1AW, none can do wrong ever, anyplace. Just like an Efren
Salizar and another (recently) in the east.

Cut him "slack?" No. That makes all who do slackers.

LHA

400. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211928.25517.00003319@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85126

In article <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> That way, no one who was
>> interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would be
>> incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.
>
>If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they
>can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely to
>be sufficient to become qualified.
>
>I can't imagine "one who was interested" would fail to qualify in 10 years,
>but if they didn't, well I guess there are other hobbies like finger
>painting which might be less challenging and not require a federal license
>to pursue. The liberals will whine and wring their hands in dismay, but
>life's a bitch sometimes.

Those who are "interested in radio" might very well go into the
electronics industry and find out the whole of the radio world...
and earn a comfortable living while they are at it.

LHA

401. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211929.25517.00003320@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85122

In article <f45722ac.0401051035.28aca0b9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>...
>>
>> That isn't my point, Dan. That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
>> out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood. Usually PSK
>> and OOK Morse get along just fine.
>>
>> My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing what

>> so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too bad
>> for the rest of you.
>>
>> That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>Mike, Mike, my boy, you just don't understand.
>
>The ARRL is kind of like that "Home on the Range" song... where never
>is heard a discouraging word, and the skies are not cloudy all day.
>
>Don't be sayin nuttin bad bout the ARRL, nor their flagship broadcast
>station W1AW. You'll get the wrath of the Old Man himself when you
>get up to the Pearly Gates.

If any individual hears "bad signals" on W1AW frequency, it is
obviously a fault of the individual's receiver/antenna/ears/imagination.
W1AW and ARRL can do no wrong.

LHA

402. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:19:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105211930.25517.00003321@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 85128

In article <6BkKb.21854$lo3.19299@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

> Several years ago ARRL marketed a WIN3.xx software package called "Radio >Designer" which was a 'lite' copy of a commercial RF design program. >Unfortunately the program does not run under 16- and 32-bit Windows >environments, and the OEM is not interested in entering into further >arrangements with ARRL.
>
> Does anyone know of a similar program in a price range (under $500) >attractive to hams?

Zero cost ought to be attractive? :-)

Linear Technology Corporation has a free download version of their

LTspice / SwitcherCAD III at

http://www.linear.com

This is a standard SPICE plus the addition of switching power supply section (using Linear's PSU ICs of course). The SPICE part runs the same as everyone else's SPICE which has been optimized for speed of execution.

Mine runs fine on a Windows 98 platform...as well as the Windows XP on my wife's H-P machine.

The SPICE core is total freeware and that was Pedersen's request at Berkeley. Other folks have taken the free core and established their own Windows menus, pop-downs, and output formatting; that part is individually copyrighted...like copyrighting fancy wrapping paper for a present. :-)

"Radio Designer" has a SPICE core.

There are several SPICE "lite" versions available for free as demos, all with "limited" component count, number of nodes, etc., etc. Those limitations do not hinder a complex several-transistor plus several standard IC circuit combination analysis. You can even get freebie CDs in the mail on request of these demo versions. I have such as well as the SPICE core source code in both C and FORTRAN.

If you are only interested in frequency-domain circuit analysis and want an on-screen simulation circuit control (add, delete, insert, modify values) along with some macromodels within, I can send you my (formerly) shareware version of LINEA. LINEA is DOS-level, looks monochrome, is not attractive in looks but the answers are

on-the-money out to double precision. At DOS level operation, it is relatively immune to Windows versions' differences; LINEA was originally written on a Spectra 70 mainframe and eventually ported to a PC running Windows 3.1 at DOS level. LINEA is very small as program packages go, roughly 150 K...pretty cosmetics take up many megabytes.

LHA

403. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:25:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105212538.23171.00003179@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85129

In article <f45722ac.0401051737.7dc98b0c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401030809.48d3f418@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040102175148.08626.00002450@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> > In article <c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com>,
>N2EY@AOL.COM
>> > (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> > >I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
>> > >I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
>> > >inconsistencies in the written testing....
>> >
>> > [nobody can realistically expect you to "shut up," jimmie...:-)]
>>
>> Nor can we expect you, Leonard H. Andserson, to heed your own
>> advice, ie not using belittling endearments when addressing others.
>>
>> Scumbags rarely do. And you ARE a scumbag.
>
>OK, little Stevie, you appear to be using belittling endearments when
>addressing others. Again.

Stebe once passed a 20 WPM code test, answered enough questions
correct on an exam, received his federal merit badge certification
(suitable for framing) and became an amateur extra.

That gives him absolute permission to behave as an asshole off the
radio. No problem. :-)

LHA

404. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:47:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105214712.23307.00005702@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85130

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

405. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:47:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105214713.23307.00005703@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85131

In article <CagKb.21609$lo3.2172@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Could the holder of your learners permit ham license operate a ham rig
>> alone?
>
>Of course, just like the previous learners permit, aka "Novice".

Then it's a license.
>
>> not being banned for life as your plan would do.
>
>They wouldn't be 'banned for life'. They could take the standard
>qualification test at any time.

Sorry if I wasn't clear. They'd be "banned for life" from getting another learner's permit...err, Class B license. FCC or somebody would have to keep a database of everyone who had held one and let it expire without upgrading, to insure that someone wouldn't retest and get a second one.

>> Are there any licenses or learner's permits of *any* kind currently issued
>> by the US Govt. that are one-time-only, upgrade-or-you're-out?
>
>None that I'm aware are currently extant, but precedent exists.

Sure - a precedent that ended almost 30 years ago. Maybe FCC will go for that idea but I doubt it.

btw, the old nonrenewable nonretakeable Novice had one more limitation back in those days: it was for newbies only. Anyone who had *ever* held any class of amateur license, even one that had long since expired, could not get a Novice. It had to be a person's first ham license.

Of course back then FCC trusted that when someone checked the box on the Form 610 that said they' never had a ham license before, they weren't fibbing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

406. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:47:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105214714.23307.00005704@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85133

In article <ooeKb.26038$IM3.17015@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > The FCC doesn't have a mandate
>> > to test discipline.
>>
>> Yes, they do. That's what the "character"
>> stuff in the rules is about.
>
> I've read the rules many times, but must have missed the part or parts
>about character testing.

FCC reserves the right to deny a license to someone who has passed the tests *if* FCC determines that said person cannot be trusted to follow the rules. In practice this means that someone convicted of a crime (usually a felony) can be denied a ham license, particularly if the crime was a violation of the Communications Act.

For example, some years back a ham went to jail for hacking into computers (he wrote a book about it in prison, btw). Ham radio had nothing to do with his crimes
but FCC did some serious consideration of not renewing his license. I think he finally convinced them that he was rehabilitated and trustworthy enough to have a license.

>> There's a local ham around here who
>> has generated so much trouble on
>> various repeaters and earned himself
>> so many warning letters that FCC is
>> considering not renewing his license
>> for "character" reasons. IOW he
>> simply doesn't have the necessary
>> self-discipline to be a ham.
>
> First, what does that have to do with testing?

It has to do with discipline and responsibility. Even though this guy could pass the tests again, his renewal may be denied.

>Second, there is nothing in
>the rules about refusing a renewal based on character, so I seriously doubt
>that would be the FCC's explination for any action like this (a pattern of
>rule violations, yes).

We discussed the "character" issue in its own thread some time back. K2ASP gave some good insights. A person who can't seem to follow the rules *can* be denied a renewal based on what FCC calls "character".

Don't take my word for it - ask Phil and/or google up the old thread. I recall the C-word was in the thread title.
>
>> Agreed. But those things do constitute
>> "discipline".
>
> Only if you stretch the word to mean something beyond common usage.
>
Then use the word "responsibility" or the words "responsible behavior".

73 de Jim, N2EY
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

407. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 02:47:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040105214715.23307.00005705@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85132

In article <3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
>out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood.

Are you sure the W1AW signal was dirty? An overloaded receiver or soundcard
will do exaclty what you describe.

That doesn't mean it's impossible that W1AW had a problem, just that all things
need to be checked out. Have you listened to W1AW since then?

>Usually PSK and OOK Morse get along just fine.

Depends on who's doing what. 3579 used to be a popular "glowbug" frequency for
Morse folks using simple rigs and a colorburst crystal. Then the freq was taken
over by PSK-31 due to the popularity of the "Warbler".
>
> My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing
> what so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too bad
>for the rest of you.

W1AW transmits bulletins and code practice on a published schedule, and is on
every HF amateur band simultaneously. Been doing that for almost 70 years now.
However, the signal should be clean.

Didja email them? Even that "professional" Harris stuff can go wacko.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.
>

408. Re: New Year's Eve Record Set

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:17:25 UTC
From: Roooty <when@roootycoms.net>
Message-ID: <btd9c6$11g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85134
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sure, what you say makes perfect logic for all the rich little white
kids whose mommy & daddy buy them the latest hottest
computer. For the kids in the ghetto who have only boom
boxes, the pirate-unlicensed station with a DJ who speaks their
language, IS their world. In fact, a good portion of unlicensed
FM is found in the inner cities.

Roooty Slip Ice Two

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FF8B915.5030902@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> Today with the Internet with the World Wide Web, it seems pointless to
> bother with pirate broadcasting. If I had a message I wanted heard (or
> read) I'd set up a web page. If I wanted people to hear my garage band's
> music, I could upload the mp3s to that web page. The web page would
> be available 24/7 world wide. A pirate station will only have a very
> limited
> range and time period, and most people interested in your material would
> miss it.
>
> Add the fact that the pirate station is rather illegal, the web page would
> be the media of choice.
>

409. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:24:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mTpKb.21197$P%1.20390361@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85135

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0401051727.73c9dc02@posting.google.com...
> "Keyboard In The Wilderness" <KIYW@zilch.net> wrote in message
news:<JhiKb.46924$m83.10369@fed1read01>...
> > > > Someone wrote;
> > > > That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first
place.
> > ------------------------
> >
> > From the ARRL License Manual 1976:
> >
> > CW Bandwidth = wpm X 4
> > "With proper shaping, the necessary keying bandwidth is equal to 4
> > times the speed in words per minute for International Morse Code;
> > e.g. at 25 words per minute, the bandwidth is approximately 100 cycles.
> > e.g., 40 WPM = approximately 160 Hz"
>
> Does the ARRL License Manual of 1976 address Farnsworth code and
bandwidth?

The Farnsworth approach isn't even used for faster code speeds like 40wpm so it is a moot point. However the calculation method would be to use the character speed as the parameter in the calculation not the "effective word speed" that is created by increasing the space between characters.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

410. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:24:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TTpKb.5809$uF6.1764415@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85153

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>...
>
>> That isn't my point, Dan. That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
>>out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood. Usually PSK
>>and OOK Morse get along just fine.
>>
>> My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing what
>>so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too bad
>>for the rest of you.
>>
>> That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Mike, Mike, my boy, you just don't understand.
>
> The ARRL is kind of like that "Home on the Range" song... where never
> is heard a discouraging word, and the skies are not cloudy all day.
>
> Don't be sayin nuttin bad bout the ARRL, nor their flagship broadcast
> station W1AW. You'll get the wrath of the Old Man himself when you
> get up to the Pearly Gates.

I'll carry a Wouff Hong wit' me for protection!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

411. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:28:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7XpKb.22233$lo3.12529@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85136

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> FCC or somebody would have to keep a
> database of everyone who had held one and let it expire without upgrading,
to
> insure that someone wouldn't retest and get a second one.
>

No more than FCC or somebody kept a similar database to prevent ex-licensees from glomming onto a Novice permit back in the 1950's. A false application today is just as unlikely as a false application 50 years ago, and I suspect the penalties are similar.

And why bother --- after 10 years of experience, the standard exam would be a laugher.

73, CU in NAQP,

de Hans, K0HB

412. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:28:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mXpKb.21200$P%1.20392234@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85137

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040105214715.23307.00005705@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
> >out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood.
>
> Are you sure the W1AW signal was dirty? An overloaded receiver or
soundcard
> will do exaclty what you describe.
>
> That doesn't mean it's impossible that W1AW had a problem, just that all
things
> need to be checked out. Have you listened to W1AW since then?
>
> >Usually PSK and OOK Morse get along just fine.
>
> Depends on who's doing what. 3579 used to be a popular "glowbug" frequency
for
> Morse folks using simple rigs and a colorburst crystal. Then the freq was
taken
> over by PSK-31 due to the popularity of the "Warbler".
> >
> > My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing
> > what so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too
bad
> >for the rest of you.
>
> W1AW transmits bulletins and code practice on a published schedule, and is
on
> every HF amateur band simultaneously. Been doing that for almost 70 years
now.
> However, the signal should be clean.
>
> Didja email them? Even that "professional" Harris stuff can go wacko.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >

I agree with Jim. If their signal had a problem, I'm sure that they would
want to know so email them about it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

413. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:50:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5gqKb.5818$uF6.1770739@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85152

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
>>out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood.
>
>
> Are you sure the W1AW signal was dirty? An overloaded receiver or soundcard
> will do exaclty what you describe.

I'll never say never, but I don't think it was too likely. I tried a
number of things with the RTTY party last weekend, and even though there
were lots of strong, wide signals, the few psk signals on at the same
time were no problem to copy. And the other people on the air had to be
suffering the same malfunction I might have been.

> That doesn't mean it's impossible that W1AW had a problem, just that all things
> need to be checked out. Have you listened to W1AW since then?
>
>
>>Usually PSK and OOK Morse get along just fine.
>
>
> Depends on who's doing what. 3579 used to be a popular "glowbug" frequency for
> Morse folks using simple rigs and a colorburst crystal. Then the freq was taken
> over by PSK-31 due to the popularity of the "Warbler".
>
>> My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing
>>what so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too bad
>>for the rest of you.
>
>
> W1AW transmits bulletins and code practice on a published schedule, and is on
> every HF amateur band simultaneously. Been doing that for almost 70 years now.
> However, the signal should be clean.
>
> Didja email them? Even that "professional" Harris stuff can go wacko.

Well, I thought about it, but after the reaction of a number of people
here that I think know more about the suject than I do, I would imagine
they would write it off to pilot error.

- Mike KB3EIA -

414. Re: Illegal CBers forging hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:55:24 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <MkqKb.245$Io7.162@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Illegal Cbers Go Nuts" <wil@wall.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94676036462211234567890@216.196.97.136...
> >
> > "Robert The Bruce" <nevergeorge@kornet.com> wrote in message
> > news:btas1tfao1@news.x-echo.com...
> >> For your information.
> >>
> >> Illegal CBers are targeting random ham callsigns
> >> such as WA3MOJ and forging them on Usenet
> >> newsgroups. WA3MOJ is not now or has not ever
> >> posted on Usenet but the forgers have an axe to
> >> grind against anyone who complains about illegal
> >> radio operation so they post callsigns of people
> >> who they think are against them.
> >>
> >> You may be next these cb outlaws will stop at
> >> nothing including threats and harassment.
> >>
> >> Attention All: the person posting as WA3MOJ@aol.com
> >> is not wa3moj. Who is doing it is most likely tim nebo
> >> aka Tim Nebout, a drug dealer and freebander from
> >> LaMarque Texas who bootlegs on the 6 mhz aircraft
> >> comm band and also on ham bands without a license.
> >> If it is not Tim it is Steve Parks of Medina Ohio or Mark
> >> Beck of Fremont California. Also a person known only
> >> as "GW" aka Randall of Texas is doing the forging. And
> >> there leader Twistedhed aka Dave McCampbell of
> >> Clearmwater Florida encourages them and gives them
> >> instructions on harassment of hams including using
> >> their call signs on "freeband".
> >>
> >
> > Yes, believe an extra class ham, that trolls
> > RRCB, use's vile vulgar language, harasses, forges,
> > changes nics to by pass kill file filters, out right lies.
>
> YES THAT IS A PERFECT DESCRIPTION OF YOU MARK BECK a confirmed liar,
> foul language, forgery, posting under different accounts in an effort to
> harass those against Illegal CB, and last but not least a know proven
> transexual. yes a good look at Landshark's posting history which goes way
> back to the mid 90's will reveal just how this guy operates.

Oh Christ George, be a man and admit it, you
put you're foot in your mouth one to many times.

I got this email from SBC after using the screen
nic of wa3moj@aol.com now you might be able
to convince the pet dog, but most people now
are on top your trolling ways.

Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
14:07:26 -0500
X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw201648
for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

Hello,

This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy
department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings
sent from your SBCIS account.

It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet
newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
wa3moj@aol.com
Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.

Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service
(http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy
(http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to email
or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise objectionable
material.

If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it will
be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.

Sincerely,
The SBCIS Policy Department

Ramble on, but everyone has seen through your
BS trolling.

Here are some of the screen nics used for only a
little over a couple of months and the amount of posts
made to just RRCB.

Crab trap 12

Prozac 70

Pro@Zac.com 11

World Wide Prozac 28

Reptile 43

Whiskey 55

The Chosen one 54

Capn jack 21

Badabing 210

Crybaby 18

Deepbluesea 8

Helmet sweeny 16

Voobie Brutha 28

Mugabi 12

China grove 20

Smooth criminal 10

3 stooges 5

Chocolate Thunder 16

Crap Shooter 8

Davemade1 10

Gay wad in sf 13

Green Hornet 11

Green Mamba 11

Hymen Liqur 2

KiloWatt Kid 55

Humphrey 13

LandsharkSuxs 4

Man child 12

Mother Load 12

New world order 5

No Fear 12

Old Man in Pa 28

One of Three 14

Piggly wiggly 3

Popeye 48

Proffesor smokes 6

Przacholic 48

Read em 16

Rotec 7

The Black Dragon 19

Uncle fester 90

Warlord 9

3-500zees 99

Beer Bottle 67

Riddler 2

Hans Von Gruber 18

Pipedream

shrimbiskit

Some 1061 posts

415. Re: WA3MOJ squirms and fails again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 03:55:24 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <MkqKb.247$Io7.110@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85139
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040105174841.405$X1@newsreader.com...
> William Wallace <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> > news:20040105171931.699$dw_-_@newsreader.com:
> >
> > > William Wallace <wilum@wallace.com> wrote:
> > >> Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web> wrote in
> > >> > That would put you at the top of that culprits list. You did post
> > >> > that you were WA3MOJ, you started this whole WA3MOJ thing.
> > >>
> > >> No I am sorry I never did, you guys told me who I was, is it my fault
> > >> you are complete buffons.
> > >>
> > > Bullshit you name changing freak, there has been at least two posts
> > > from you that show WA3MOJ, re-posted here today.
> > >
> > > Read em and weep, loser.
> >
> > Ok I am waiting to read them where are they?
> >
> They've been posted several times, WA3MOJ.

I'll help you here Steveo:

http://www.google.com/groups?q=+%22wa3moj%22&start=400&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&scoring
=d&selm=Mgsu7.68301%245A3.25741449%40news1.rdc2.pa.home.com&rnum=440

http://www.google.com/groups?q=g:thl2482584805d&dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=20011
023161351.17382.00001281%40mb-fo.aol.com

Received: from vmn-ext.prodigy.net by vmk with SMTP; Mon, 1 Dec 2003
14:07:26 -0500
X-Originating-IP: [209.184.203.4]
Received: from sbcsmtp2.sbc.com (sbcsmtp2.sbc.com [209.184.203.4])
by vmn-ext.prodigy.net (8.12.10/8.12.10) with ESMTP id hB1J6vcw201648
for <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>; Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:07:19 -0500

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:04:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <200312011904.hB1J4OnR014439@abuse-int.prodigy.net>
To: s3buell@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Warning - Posting to Newsgroups
From: Prodigy Abuse Department <abuse@prodigy.net>
Reply-To: donotreply@prodigy.net

Hello,

This is a WARNING NOTICE from the SBC Internet Services (SBCIS) Policy department, regarding abusive, offensive and/or harassing emails/postings sent from your SBCIS account.

It has been brought to our attention that you are posting on the internet newsgroups with a known AOL user as you're account information RE:
wa3moj@aol.com
Said individual has forwarded a complaint concerning these posts.

Be advised it is a violation of our Terms of Service (http://sbc.yahoo.com/terms/)and Acceptable Use Policy (http://support.sbcglobal.net/legal/aup.shtml) to use our service to email or post, threatening, abusive, obscene, hateful, or otherwise objectionable material.

If additional complaints are received concerning your SBCIS account, it will be TERMINATED, and you may incur an early termination fee.

Sincerely,
The SBCIS Policy Department

Enjoy!
Landshark

--
Hard things are put in our way,
not to stop us, but to call out our
courage and strength.

416. Re: Antenna builders --- a caution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 04:01:28 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn-nospam-@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <sqqKb.252$4v7.121@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85140
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> More info....
>
> http://www.caves.org/grotto/nag/html/harness.html

Thanks, I'll be sure to never build or erect any of my antennas inside a cave... :>)

73 de W6DKN

417. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 04:18:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <CGqKb.5827$uF6.1776714@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85151

N2EY wrote:

>>Do you have aproblem with 10 years? Should we make it 10 weeks?
>
>
> I have a problem with the idea that someone who can pass the test for the
> learner's permit and who has a clean record is pushed off the amateur bands
> because he/she can't or won't pass the exam for the full-privileges license. I
> can see making the LP nonrenewable and requiring a retest to get another one,
> but not being banned for life as your plan would do.

There lise the BIG problem with this peoposal. There will be some
people that will test the principle, that's for sure.

- Mike KB3EIA -

418. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 05:56:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <V5sKb.11520$6B.7577@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85141

"Brian" wrote:
>
> We've had many characters testing.
>
> One of the more memorable ones
> has been CB Bruce/WA8ULX, who
> tested on a lark, scored 100% w/o
> studying, did so in less than 8 minutes,
> and collected $250 from two
> CB-Plussers.

LOL. Yep, if the goal is indeed to test character, there is something clearly wrong with the process.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

419. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 06:15:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fosKb.11547$6B.2565@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85142

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >> > The FCC doesn't have a mandate
> >> > to test discipline.
> >>
> >> Yes, they do. That's what the "character"
> >> stuff in the rules is about.
> >
> > I've read the rules many times, but must
> > have missed the part or parts about
> > character testing.
>
> FCC reserves the right to deny a license to
> someone who has passed the tests *if*
> FCC determines that said person cannot be
> trusted to follow the rules. In practice this
> means that someone convicted of a crime
> (usually a felony) can be denied a ham
> license, particularly if the crime was a
> violation of the Communications Act.

Good grief, Jim. Again, what does this have to do with code testing? This
has no relationship to anything being discussed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

420. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 06:26:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <aysKb.11563$6B.3285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85143

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) Morse code is cutting-edge
> technology, an advancement necessary
> to use the HF spectrum for
> communications. (snip)
>
> (snip) Learning morse code shows the
> self-discipline, dedication, and
> commitment to the amateur community
> and the League.
>
> I have been told this. I repeat it to
> you for the betterment of all.

I've heard it all before, and remain a doubting heathen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

421. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 06:38:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gJsKb.11587$6B.5675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85144

"Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
> I understand Kim's point. Lets try
> it from this perspective. If you're one
> of the millions of immigrants entering
> this country, the speech we use on
> the radio, and on the radio tests, in
> this country is not already in the
> "toolbox." And Spanish certainly isn't
> in the "toolbox" of many other Hams
> in this country. So, even if you ignore
> any skills needed for the voice modes
> (however minor), there is still some
> validity in Kim's argument. Spanish is
> use more often the CW in this (snip)

Wow! See what happens when you edit a sentence without checking it afterwards. That last sentence should read "Spanish is used" and "more often than CW."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

422. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 08:21:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060021.1168256f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85145

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401030841.6b5c4de5@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401020211.3ac8aafa@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > >I've built HF and VHF antennas,
> > > >some from a box, some from a reel of wire and bamboo poles. And I've
> > > >operated on HF from Nebraska, ROK, Guam, Illinois, Somalia, Florida,
> > > >and Ohio, in that order.
> > >
> > > Who is puffing out his chest now?
> >
> > BAM!
> >
> > The hammer on THAT nail HAD to hurt!
>
> Stebe, put your rubber mallet away. You might hurt yourself.

I wasn't the one doing the hammering, Brain, just enjoying the
show.

> > > But you can't seem to tell us anything about the /T5 operation.
> > > >
> > > >Just don't be so jealous.
> > >
> > > I'm not.
> >
> > ...Jealous of what? Fantasizing?
>
> You do live in a fantasy world.

It's a fantasy world in that I ever expect you to come clean on
the assertions you've made, Brain.

Silly me.

> > > >Besides, I don't see your name behind "Invented SSTV."
> > >
> > > Nor yours besides "invented anything".
> >
> > BAM AGAIN!
> >

> > The hammer falls again and accurately so!
>
> But, but, but... you Extras are the ones in the hot-seat for pushing
> the ARS into the future.
>
> You have all of the Merit Badges.

Nope. Not me. I was never a Scout. Never claimed any badges,
either.

That's Lennie's schtick.

> > No, we wouldn't. Regardless of how many times we re-invent the
> > wheel, those of us currently licensed will never have gone through the
> > same "drill" to get where we are.
>
> Ahhh. There's that Merit Badge puffing out on your chest again.

I repeat, since you seem to have an attention defict problem,
Brain...

"It Ain't Braggin' If You've Done It"

Besides, I dare you to DISprove the statement. It says "...those
of us currently licensed...", which includes you, me, and everyone
from the newest NCT to "career Novices".

Steve, K4YZ

Steve, K4YZ

423. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 08:26:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060026.20390fbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85146

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401050531.3b60fc06@posting.google.com>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<en0Kb.1526$Ui2.403339@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0401041347.705f0f6b@posting.google.com...
> > > Steve will have to try them all on to prove me wrong. He should get
> > > the white ones so he can wear them to work.
> >
> > Brian, IMHO, what Steve does for a living is one hell of a noble occupation.
> > Discuss, debate, or argue about ARS related stuff all you want, but I'd cut
> > the man some slack wrt mentioning his job in a disrespectful light while
> > doing so.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Reciprocity. Steve does not respect my endeavors.

On Contraire, Brain...I have never "dissed" your occupation.

I HAVE "dissed" your numerous assertions of accomplishments that
you've refused to back up with any evidence. That is your fault.

I HAVE thanked you for your service in the Armed Forces. Several
times.

In fact, I don't even know what you do for a current career.
Whatever it is, I am sure you do it well.

Steve, K4YZ

424. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 08:34:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060034.175ca229@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85147

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040105211928.25517.00003318@mb-m15.aol.com>...

> There's no such thing as "reciprocity" in here, Brian, only
> recedetive retribution spouted from the drool-dribbled hot keyboards
> of the mad-as-hell-because-all-the-others-don't-mind-talking-back-to
> a high-level ex-NCO who is an amateur extra.

My "mad as hell" attitude resounds from nopt tolerating abusive
pathological liars, such as yourself, who have no reservations about
making up antagonistic rants as they go.

You have proven this true for years. It is the reason you have
no respect in here.

> Anyone not getting along with mighty Stebe will - guaranteed - be
> treated to a mighty melange of vitriol and personal insults...about
> their life, their wife, their occupation, their accomplishments, plus
> defamatory remarks of their choices, abilities, and for just existing.

And YOU are innocent of such conduct...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHA

Only in the mind of the paranoid, Lennie...which pretty much sums up your behaviour.

Like I said...Sucks to be you...

Steve, K4YZ

425. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 08:35:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060035.4249077@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85148

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<en0Kb.1526$Ui2.403339@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0401041347.705f0f6b@posting.google.com...
> > Steve will have to try them all on to prove me wrong. He should get
> > the white ones so he can wear them to work.
>
> Brian, IMHO, what Steve does for a living is one hell of a noble occupation.
> Discuss, debate, or argue about ARS related stuff all you want, but I'd cut
> the man some slack wrt mentioning his job in a disrespectful light while
> doing so.

Thanks, Bert. As HE said, though...Lennie's his mentor, and what
could we expect from THAT bloodline?

73

Steve, K4YZ

426. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 08:39:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060039.689eecf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85149

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401051737.7dc98b0c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401030809.48d3f418@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040102175148.08626.00002450@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> > > In article <c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > > (N2EY) writes:
>
> > > >I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
> > > >I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
> > > >inconsistencies in the written testing....
> > >
> > > [nobody can realistically expect you to "shut up," jimmie...:-)]
> >
> > Nor can we expect you, Leonard H. Andserson, to heed your own
> > advice, ie not using belittling endearments when addressing others.
> >
> > Scumbags rarely do. And you ARE a scumbag.
>
> OK, little Stevie, you appear to be using belittling endearments when
> addressing others. Again.

It's not a belittling endearment, Brain, when it's the truth.

Steve, K4YZ

427. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 08:40:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060040.6f3583e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85150

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040105212538.23171.00003179@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> That gives him absolute permission to behave as an asshole off the
> radio. No problem.

Again with the profanities, Lennie?

Unable to express yourself effectively without them?

Some "professional", I'd say...Learn that in English 101 in your
14 years of night school?

Steve, K4YZ

428. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 10:20:29 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401060220.32bf7c0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85154
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

SNIP___SNIP

> Those should be drummed out of the corps, banished to the nether
> world of VHF and higher. All must show commitment and dedication
> to the amateur community by maintaining a pool of trained morsemen
> ready and waiting to save the world from alien invasion.
>
> Everything good in US amateur radio is about morse code skill.
>
> Self-discipline, dedication, committing to the olde-tyme hamme
> traditions. Showing all one's hard work and efforts.
>
> Words to live by in the amateur lifestyle, the belief system that is
> the bastion of amateurism. Amen.
>
> LHA

Very true. You have hit the nail on the head this time. Everything
that was good about amateur radio was morse code and the trained pool
of not only morsemen as you like to put it but also technically
trained people too. Amateur Radio as a service is gone. It is only
self serving now. Not a service but a high priced hobby. After all, it
is called the Amateur Radio Service. We do not have a right to our
allocated frequencies. We only use them by the grace of the FCC. So
LHA, your tounge in cheek comments ring very true indeed.
JEP

429. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 10:43:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bte3p6$9ba@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85156

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ooeKb.26038$IM3.17015@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > The FCC doesn't have a mandate
> > > to test discipline.
> >
> > Yes, they do. That's what the "character"
> > stuff in the rules is about.
>
> I've read the rules many times, but must have missed the part or parts
> about character testing.
>
> > There's a local ham around here who
> > has generated so much trouble on
> > various repeaters and earned himself
> > so many warning letters that FCC is
> > considering not renewing his license
> > for "character" reasons. IOW he
> > simply doesn't have the necessary
> > self-discipline to be a ham.
>
> First, what does that have to do with testing? Second, there is nothing
in
> the rules about refusing a renewal based on character, so I seriously
doubt
> that would be the FCC's explination for any action like this (a pattern of
> rule violations, yes).
>
> > Agreed. But those things do constitute
> > "discipline".
>
> Only if you stretch the word to mean something beyond common usage.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Unfortunately, I believe I have heard the story of which Jim speaks...or at
least one exactly like it. In fact, it seems to me that it was related to
the renewal of....hmmm, was it that Herb Schoen...something-or-other down in
the Carribean somewhere? Whatever license renewal denial it was, it was due
to character and that was the words of the FCC.

I think that's most unfortunate and don't agree with the practice at all. Bust someone for R&R, etc., but the FCC--nor anyone and certainly not a government--should be able to deny something because of "character."

Kim W5TIT

430. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 10:46:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bte3p7$9ba@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85155

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040105214712.23307.00005702@mb-m29.aol.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

431. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 12:42:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <C2yKb.28238$IM3.28074@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85157

"JEP" wrote:
>
> (snip) Amateur Radio as a service is
> gone. It is only self serving now. Not
> a service but a high priced hobby.
> After all, it is called the Amateur
> Radio Service.

First, you're obviously confused about the word "service." In FCC terminology, "service" refers to a group of frequencies meant to serve a particular purpose for the users of those frequencies, not anything done by the users of those frequencies. As a result, we have the Amateur Radio Service, Radio Broadcast Services, Cable TV Relay Service, Maritime Service, Personal Radio Services, Citizens Band Radio Service, Fixed Microwave Services, and so on through a long list of other radio services. In other words, the word "service" in Amateur Radio Service does not refer to any "service" we might provide to others.

Second, you're completely wrong about "service" being gone within the Amateur Radio community. Based on what I've seen, I'd estimate as much as 75% of the current operators are involved in some form of public service related activity in any given year. Of course, the need for our help is high, meaning even more should become involved, but that hardly suggests the idea of service is gone today.

The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were deleted from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

432. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 13:12:29 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <1vyKb.35094$Qr5.3877@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 85158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

>
> That deemphasis has already occurred. The no-code tech was instituted in
> the late 1980s and the code for the higher classes was dropped to only
5wpm
> in 2000. There is no need for further deemphasis. Particularly when the
> stated reason was attract technically inclined people. That hasn't
happened
> so the reason for deemphasis has been proven to be invalid.
>

Get the foul mouthed red necked yahoos off of HF and I'll consider wasting
my time to learn CW to meet and exceed your criteria.

433. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 13:12:30 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <2vyKb.35095$Qr5.13866@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 85159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> At 5-wpm, it's more a demonstration of discipline than proficiency. That
is
> where the true crux lies.
>

A better demonstration of discipline would be if CW trained amateurs would
stop using HF like it was 11 meters.

434. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 13:15:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85160

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> Stebe thinks that the "majority" of U.S. amateur radio activity
> is above HF. That must mean that he never listens below 30
> MHz. Probably true since all he can do is transmit over-
> modulated shouting and hollering about close-order drill below
> 30 MHz. Hup too tree foah, ya lie, ya lie, ya lie.

Uhhhhh....nope.

And unfortunately for you, your lies ARE archived in this very
forum.

Sucks to be you, Leonard.

> The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham
> license and be proficient in morse code...(SNIP)

Oh geeze...Here we go again.

Lennie, we're STILL waiting on you to cite the quotes wherein
you've established this opinion.

It's certainly not true in MY case, and just one more example of
how you feel free to take liberties with the truth.

> ....with extra gold stars
> if one was once a member of da murine corpse. Doesn't hurt if
> one was a purchasing agent for a small modem and set-top box
> company in the "south" for a few months...that counts as "being
> in radio engineering!"

And still more silliness.

I never claimed to be an engineer...But I did provide numerous
references from that job that proved you WRONG on numerous occassions.
I guess that had to hurt, knowing a "non-engineer" had access to
references that took a bite out of your rants...

> Amateur radio FUN is only "ancilliary" to the U.S. amateur radio
> SERVICE. Ham radio is all about wearing a Lifestyle mental
> uniform, marching in ranks to the morse drumbeat of the 1930s,
> and being ready, willing, able to "take over communications" when
> all the commercial/professional infrastructure FAILS in an
> emergency? That's the thoughts I see expressed in here.

Again with the "1930's" rant, Lennie?

And in any case your sleight's against Amateur Radio's PROVEN
track record of being able to provide the very emergency services you
claim as "ineffectual" or "irrelevent" are DISproven over and ovr,
even in the 21st Century.

> There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE. It is all about duty,
> dedication, close-order drill on the proper and correct jargon and
> prosigns. [why the name "prosigns" when there is so much
> hatred of the pros?] Hupp, too, tree, foah! Beep, beep, beep!

There's no "hatred" of the "pros", Lennie. Only PROlific liars
such as yourself. That you claim to have been a "radio" professional
is unfortuante.

> It's a wonderful life.

Yes, it is. Too bad you'll die having not known exactly HOW
wonderful it is.

> Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, Brian, all the best to you
> and your family.

At least there was ONE person in this forum for you to exchange
greetings with. Good for you. No one should be alone for the
holidays. Even creeps like you, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

435. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 13:22:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFAB68C.6090505@psu.edu>
Source record: 85161

N2EY wrote:
> In article <9gXJb.23310$IM3.8552@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>>Not at all. I'd make the Extra the only license allowed 1500 watts.
>
>
> Then you have the unenviable task of convincing FCC that the current General
> and Tech exams don't adequately test for the knowledge required to safely
> operate 1500 watt amateur transmitters.

First we can trot out all that data on how many Technicians have been
hurt by high power.

- Mike KB3EIA -

436. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 14:00:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFABF85.2080305@psu.edu>
Source record: 85163

```
Brian wrote:
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040104145919.15462.00005409@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <f45722ac.0401040700.31209cba@posting.google.com>,
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>news:<WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
>>>>> inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I knew you'd agree with me.
>>>>
>>>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>>
>>>I just happen to agree with Hans' plan. Allow the amateur to
>>>distinguish him or herself through actions rather than an FCC forced
>>>march.
>>
>> While I agree on the generality of that, such is impossible under
>> the present-day Class Distinction Rules of US amateur radio.
>>
>> ALL perceived expertise is judged by the "amateur community"
>> as demonstrated by the fancy-bordered license (suitable for
>> framing) from the federal government.
>>
>> The Amateur Extra is the epitome of excellence. Once achieved,
>> nothing else need be learned. Education ends. You have been
>> told by his Most High Excellency, the Dill Instructor.
>>
>> All learning comes through having tiers and tiers of classes, of
>> distinctions (enforced by law) right along with the social need of
>> call letters written behind the name to signify a "title" all may see
>> (and admire, respect) as if it is a dukedom, barony, or other
>> noble rank. That is VERY IMPORTANT. Do not criticize any
>> statements of the ruling classes of the "community."
>>
```

>> US amateur radio seems to have ceased being a hobby, an
>> avocational activity done for personal recreation. It has become a
>> LIFESTYLE...a True Belief.
>>
>> <cut to stock shot of Rod Serling and signpost up ahead, voice
>> sign-off by Rod...up theme and take black...>
>>
>> LHA
>
>
> And poor Mike is getting beat up for saying the W1AW signal was too wide.

It has to be me! 8^)

I've done enough post testing on this to be pretty sure that it isn't
me though.

The Waterfall screen in Digipan functions pretty nicely as a poor man's
analyzer. The signal was putting "crap" all over the place.

I wasn't the only person who noticed the problem.

I was not able to duplicate anything like the problem with the RTTY
contest, which had many strong signals, and should have been worse if my
reciever was overloading. I'm impressed with how nicely the old 745
performs.

The problem - whatever it was - was in the W1AW signal.

- Mike KB3EIA -

437. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 14:01:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFABFBF.4000303@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85162

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Not at all. I'd make the Extra the only license allowed 1500 watts.
>
>
>
A major reason that the FCC doesn't restrict power level per license level
(other than novice) is that it is hard to enforce. Unless you visit and
inspect
the ham's station, how do you tell if that strong signal is due to excessive
power, or is it a beam pointed in your direction? Privilages based on
frequency is easy to enforce, all the FCC needs to do is listen to your
signal and note the frequency you're found on. Not that it takes extra
knowledge to operate on 14.160 vs 14.318 MHz.

>
>

438. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 14:20:47 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94685F0D8C893elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85164

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in news:bte3p7
$9ba@library2.airnews.net:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040105214712.23307.00005702@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
>> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>>
>> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>> N2EY: April 15, 2004
>> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>> K3LT: September 15, 2004
>> WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>> W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>
>> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>

I see we have 14 on the list and 3 are already out of the running. What do
we get if we win?

N3KIP

439. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 14:24:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFAC501.4030405@psu.edu>
Source record: 85165

Alun wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in news:bte3p7
> $9ba@library2.airnews.net:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040105214712.23307.00005702@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>>>Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
>>>eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>>>
>>>WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>>>KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>>>KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>>>K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>>>K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>>>AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>>>N2EY: April 15, 2004
>>>N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>>>KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>>>K3LT: September 15, 2004
>>>WK3C: December 30, 2004
>>>N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>>>KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>>>W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>>
>>>Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>
>
> I see we have 14 on the list and 3 are already out of the running. What do
> we get if we win?

Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^)

Maybe a J-38 key?

- Mike KB3EIA -

440. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 15:09:25 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9468674C12B6Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85166

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3FFAC501.4030405@psu.edu:

> Alun wrote:
>> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in news:bte3p7
>> $9ba@library2.airnews.net:
>>
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20040105214712.23307.00005702@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will
>>>>be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the
>>>>past.
>>>>
>>>>WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>>>>KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>>>>KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>>>>K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>>>>K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>>>>AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>>>>N2EY: April 15, 2004
>>>>N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>>>>KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>>>>K3LT: September 15, 2004
>>>>WK3C: December 30, 2004
>>>>N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>>>>KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement
>>>>drop") W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>>>
>>>>Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>> I see we have 14 on the list and 3 are already out of the running.
>> What do we get if we win?
>
>
> Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^)
>
> Maybe a J-38 key?
>

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

LOL! A Morse key might be a very ironic prize, depending on who won. I suppose if I won a key I would have to have my first CW QSO, after 24 years QRV!

Alun, N3KIP (G8VUK)

441. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 15:33:27 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <bzAKb.47544$m83.16584@fed1read01>
Source record: 85167

I suspect that for Farnsworth - just use the character speed - not the overall speed with extended spacing.

--
73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message news:f45722ac.0401051727.73c9dc02@posting.google.com...
> "Keyboard In The Wilderness" <KIYW@zilch.net> wrote in message news:<JhiKb.46924$m83.10369@fed1read01>...
> > > > Someone wrote;
> > > > That and wondering what a CW signal Bandwidth was in the first place.
> > ------------------------
> >
> > From the ARRL License Manual 1976:
> >
> > CW Bandwidth = wpm X 4
> > "With proper shaping, the necessary keying bandwidth is equal to 4
> > times the speed in words per minute for International Morse Code;
> > e.g. at 25 words per minute, the bandwidth is approximately 100 cycles.
> > e.g., 40 WPM = approximately 160 Hz"
>
> Does the ARRL License Manual of 1976 address Farnsworth code and bandwidth?

442. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 16:28:25 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <uunlvvgjktbtdhgjf25v0pm4irqvi7ou16@4ax.com>
Source record: 85168

Mike,

It seems to me that the bandwidth calculations given for CW are based
on 'true' CW - that is, carrier on / off operation.

I wonder if W1AW pre-records their CW material in audio format, then
broadcasts it as a modulated SSB signal - would that not stretch the
signal bandwidth out considerably?

Anyone know if this might be the case?

73, Leo

On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 09:00:37 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>snip
>
> It has to be me! 8^)
>
> I've done enough post testing on this to be pretty sure that it isn't
>me though.
>
> The Waterfall screen in Digipan functions pretty nicely as a poor man's
>analyzer. The signal was putting "crap" all over the place.
>
> I wasn't the only person who noticed the problem.
>
> I was not able to duplicate anything like the problem with the RTTY
>contest, which had many strong signals, and should have been worse if my
>reciever was overloading. I'm impressed with how nicely the old 745
>performs.
>
> The problem - whatever it was - was in the W1AW signal.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

443. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 16:58:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <JOBKb.39942$Pg1.20181@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85169

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Zero cost ought to be attractive? :-)
>

Yup!

I downloaded Ansoft "Designer SV" which Joe recommended. (At 77.0 MB!)

Looks a lot like the old ARRL package, but 10 years newer.

Thanks for your recommendations. (Filed away for a look if the Ansoft
package isn't a fit.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

444. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 17:10:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401060910.45308a4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85170

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bte3p6$9ba@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:ooeKb.26038$IM3.17015@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > > The FCC doesn't have a mandate
> > > > to test discipline.
> > >
> > > Yes, they do. That's what the "character"
> > > stuff in the rules is about.
> >
> > I've read the rules many times, but must have missed the part or parts
> > about character testing.
> >
> > > There's a local ham around here who
> > > has generated so much trouble on
> > > various repeaters and earned himself
> > > so many warning letters that FCC is
> > > considering not renewing his license
> > > for "character" reasons. IOW he
> > > simply doesn't have the necessary
> > > self-discipline to be a ham.
> >
> > First, what does that have to do with testing? Second, there is nothing
> in
> > the rules about refusing a renewal based on character, so I seriously
> doubt
> > that would be the FCC's explination for any action like this (a pattern of
> > rule violations, yes).
> >
> > > Agreed. But those things do constitute
> > > "discipline".
> >
> > Only if you stretch the word to mean something beyond common usage.
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> Unfortunately, I believe I have heard the story of which Jim speaks...or at
> least one exactly like it.

There was a whole thread devoted to the issue. Would you believe it
was almost 4 years ago?

Here's a link to a post by K2ASP that explains it much better than I
can:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=cuvyxnarpbzzynjpragrepbz.fuiqyo4.pminews%40ca.news.ve
rio.net&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

> In fact, it seems to me that it was related to
> the renewal of....hmmm, was it that Herb Schoen...something-or-other down in
> the Carribean somewhere?

The issues surrounding
He-Whose-Name-Or-Call-Must-Not-Be-Mentioned-Lest-You-Be-Spammed is
dealt with in that post.

> Whatever license renewal denial it was, it was due
> to character and that was the words of the FCC.

They are *required* to use certain words because that's how the law
works. Here's the relevant part of the Communications Act:

"Comm Act Sect. 308(b)
All applications for station licenses, or
modifications or renewals thereof, shall set
forth such facts as the Commission by regulation
may prescribe as to the citizenship, character,
and financial, technical and other qualifications
of the applicant to operate the station;....

The Commission, at any time after the filing of
such original application and during the term of
any such license, may require from an applicant or
licensee further written statements of fact to
enable it to determine whether such original
application should be granted or denied or such
license revoked. Such application and/or such
statement of fact shall be signed by the applicant
and/or licensee in any manner or form, including
by electronic means, as the Commission may
prescribe by regulation."
>
> I think that's most unfortunate and don't agree with the practice at all.
> Bust someone for R&R, etc., but the FCC--nor anyone and certainly not a
> government--should be able to deny something because of "character."

Then get Congress to change the Communications Act. FCC is *required*
to
do it. Your definition of "character" is probably quite different from
FCC's, but when you're in front of The Judge, guess which definition
will
get used?

One principle that some hams seem to not understand is that we are required to comply with *all* of the Communications Act, not just Part 97 rules. *Any* violation of the Communications Act can have ham license consequences. IOW, just because something isn't specifically prohibited by Part 97 doesn't mean it's OK for hams to do.
A violation of the Communications Act is, by definition, a violation of
FCC R&R.

In fact it goes even farther. The Congress has specifically prohibited people in arrears of child support from getting *any* Federal benefit. That includes licenses. While I don't know of any actual enforcement actions, a law does exist to revoke a 'deadbeat' parent's ham license.

If you don't like it, Kim, get The Congress to change it. Good luck ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

445. Re: Illegal CBers forging hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 17:13:28 UTC
From: Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <jvqlvv404vmqg16efdm4a5sbccodkf9r4t@4ax.com>
Source record: 85171
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 03:55:24 GMT, "Landshark" <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
wrote:

>
> Here are some of the screen nics used for only a
>little over a couple of months and the amount of posts
>made to just RRCB.
>
>Crab trap 12
>
>Prozac 70
>
>Pro@Zac.com 11
>
>World Wide Prozac 28
>
>Reptile 43
>
>Whiskey 55
>
>The Chosen one 54
>
>Capn jack 21
>
>Badabing 210
>
>Crybaby 18
>
>Deepbluesea 8
>
>Helmet sweeny 16
>
>Voobie Brutha 28
>
>Mugabi 12
>
>China grove 20
>
>Smooth criminal 10
>
>3 stooges 5
>
>Chocolate Thunder 16

>
>Crap Shooter 8
>
>Davemade1 10
>
>Gay wad in sf 13
>
>Green Hornet 11
>
>Green Mamba 11
>
>Hymen Liqur 2
>
>KiloWatt Kid 55
>
>Humphrey 13
>
>LandsharkSuxs 4
>
>Man child 12
>
>Mother Load 12
>
>New world order 5
>
>No Fear 12
>
>Old Man in Pa 28
>
>One of Three 14
>
>Piggly wiggly 3
>
>Popeye 48
>
>Proffesor smokes 6
>
>Przacholic 48
>
>Read em 16
>
>Rotec 7
>
>The Black Dragon 19
>
>Uncle fester 90
>
>Warlord 9
>
>3-500zees 99

>
>Beer Bottle 67
>
>Riddler 2
>
>Hans Von Gruber 18
>
>Pipedream
>
>shrimbiskit
>
>
>
>
>
>Some 1061 posts
>

What kind of nut case has to change his nic so many times?

Maybe you better double up on your schizo medicine George.

446. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 17:45:00 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wuCKb.27989$Cs3.2933767@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85172

```
"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401060910.45308a4c@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bte3p6$9ba@library2.airnews.net>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:ooeKb.26038$IM3.17015@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > > > The FCC doesn't have a mandate
> > > > > to test discipline.
> > > >
> > > > Yes, they do. That's what the "character"
> > > > stuff in the rules is about.
> > >
> > > I've read the rules many times, but must have missed the part or
parts
> > > about character testing.
> > >
> > > > There's a local ham around here who
> > > > has generated so much trouble on
> > > > various repeaters and earned himself
> > > > so many warning letters that FCC is
> > > > considering not renewing his license
> > > > for "character" reasons. IOW he
> > > > simply doesn't have the necessary
> > > > self-discipline to be a ham.
> > >
> > > First, what does that have to do with testing? Second, there is
nothing
> > in
> > > the rules about refusing a renewal based on character, so I seriously
> > doubt
> > > that would be the FCC's explination for any action like this (a
pattern of
> > > rule violations, yes).
> > >
> > > > Agreed. But those things do constitute
> > > > "discipline".
> > >
> > > Only if you stretch the word to mean something beyond common usage.
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
```

> > >
> >
> > Unfortunately, I believe I have heard the story of which Jim speaks...or
at
> > least one exactly like it.
>
> There was a whole thread devoted to the issue. Would you believe it
> was almost 4 years ago?
>
> Here's a link to a post by K2ASP that explains it much better than I
> can:
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=cuvyxnarpbzzynjpragrepbz.fuiqyo4.pminews%40ca.news.ve
rio.net&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain
>
>
> > In fact, it seems to me that it was related to
> > the renewal of....hmmm, was it that Herb Schoen...something-or-other
down in
> > the Carribean somewhere?
>
> The issues surrounding
> He-Whose-Name-Or-Call-Must-Not-Be-Mentioned-Lest-You-Be-Spammed is
> dealt with in that post.
>
> > Whatever license renewal denial it was, it was due
> > to character and that was the words of the FCC.
>
> They are *required* to use certain words because that's how the law
> works. Here's the relevant part of the Communications Act:
>
> "Comm Act Sect. 308(b)
> All applications for station licenses, or
> modifications or renewals thereof, shall set
> forth such facts as the Commission by regulation
> may prescribe as to the citizenship, character,
> and financial, technical and other qualifications
> of the applicant to operate the station;....
>
> The Commission, at any time after the filing of
> such original application and during the term of
> any such license, may require from an applicant or
> licensee further written statements of fact to
> enable it to determine whether such original
> application should be granted or denied or such
> license revoked. Such application and/or such
> statement of fact shall be signed by the applicant
> and/or licensee in any manner or form, including
> by electronic means, as the Commission may

> prescribe by regulation."
> >
> > I think that's most unfortunate and don't agree with the practice at
all.
> > Bust someone for R&R, etc., but the FCC--nor anyone and certainly not a
> > government--should be able to deny something because of "character."
>
> Then get Congress to change the Communications Act. FCC is *required*
> to
> do it. Your definition of "character" is probably quite different from
> FCC's, but when you're in front of The Judge, guess which definition
> will
> get used?
>
> One principle that some hams seem to not understand is that we are
> required to comply with *all* of the Communications Act, not just
> Part 97 rules. *Any* violation of the Communications Act can have
> ham license consequences. IOW, just because something isn't
> specifically prohibited by Part 97 doesn't mean it's OK for hams to
> do.
> A violation of the Communications Act is, by definition, a violation
> of
> FCC R&R.
>
> In fact it goes even farther. The Congress has specifically prohibited
> people in arrears of child support from getting *any* Federal benefit.
> That includes licenses. While I don't know of any actual enforcement
> actions, a law does exist to revoke a 'deadbeat' parent's ham license.
>
> If you don't like it, Kim, get The Congress to change it. Good luck
> ;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I hate to say it, Jim, but this is one of those intangibles that fall under
the catagory of "if you don't get it, I can't explain it to you."

Kim's got it, but doesn't like it. I can respect that. Bill's got it too,
but doesn't appear to want to let on that he's got it. (Broken record mode:
But the FCC..., but the FCC..., but the FCC...) Dwight? No comment.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

447. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 17:53:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401060953.3b762ba4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85173

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7XpKb.22233$lo3.12529@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > FCC or somebody would have to keep a
> > database of everyone who had held one and let it expire without upgrading,
> > to insure that someone wouldn't retest and get a second one.
>
> No more than FCC or somebody kept a similar database to prevent ex-licensees
> from glomming onto a Novice permit back in the 1950's.

I think people had more respect for the FCC and its R&R back then,
Hans. Just IMHO.

And i'm not "insisting" on it, just pointing out some of the possible
problems. I think the best solution might be to have it nonrenewable,
but if someone *really* wants another one, they can take the exam
again after the first one expires. Just a thought.

> A false application
> today is just as unlikely as a false application 50 years ago, and I suspect
> the penalties are similar.
>
I hope you're right.

> And why bother --- after 10 years of experience, the standard exam would be
> a laugher.
>
That's what I thought back in 1968. I was amazed that there was so
much
moaning and groaning and complaining from *experienced* hams about
having to take another license test......

73 de Jim, N2EY

448. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 18:05:44 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401061005.17b37199@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85174
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<C2yKb.28238$IM3.28074@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "JEP" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Amateur Radio as a service is
> > gone. It is only self serving now. Not
> > a service but a high priced hobby.
> > After all, it is called the Amateur
> > Radio Service.
>
>
> First, you're obviously confused about the word "service." In FCC
> terminology, "service" refers to a group of frequencies meant to serve a
> particular purpose for the users of those frequencies, not anything done by
> the users of those frequencies. As a result, we have the Amateur Radio
> Service, Radio Broadcast Services, Cable TV Relay Service, Maritime Service,
> Personal Radio Services, Citizens Band Radio Service, Fixed Microwave
> Services, and so on through a long list of other radio services. In other
> words, the word "service" in Amateur Radio Service does not refer to any
> "service" we might provide to others.
>
> Second, you're completely wrong about "service" being gone within the
> Amateur Radio community. Based on what I've seen, I'd estimate as much as
> 75% of the current operators are involved in some form of public service
> related activity in any given year. Of course, the need for our help is
> high, meaning even more should become involved, but that hardly suggests the
> idea of service is gone today.
>
> The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were deleted from
> this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Service means just that. Broadcasters have to do public service to
keep broadcastings. Why do you think they do PSA's. No money involved,
they do it free. Amateur operators operate uder the same subset of
rules. If they don't provide a public service when called they have no
reason for being. You also would have to prove that 75% of the
amareurs provide a public service. Lets see, chasing DX, rag chewing
with Barny down the road and checking the weather outside. Yep, thats

sure public service-----NOT!

449. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 18:26:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFAFDC9.6010101@psu.edu>
Source record: 85175

N2EY wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7XpKb.22233$lo3.12529@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>FCC or somebody would have to keep a
>>>database of everyone who had held one and let it expire without upgrading,
>>>to insure that someone wouldn't retest and get a second one.
>>
>>No more than FCC or somebody kept a similar database to prevent ex-licensees
>>from glomming onto a Novice permit back in the 1950's.
>
>
> I think people had more respect for the FCC and its R&R back then,
> Hans. Just IMHO.
>
> And i'm not "insisting" on it, just pointing out some of the possible
> problems. I think the best solution might be to have it nonrenewable,
> but if someone *really* wants another one, they can take the exam
> again after the first one expires. Just a thought.
>
>
>>A false application
>>today is just as unlikely as a false application 50 years ago, and I suspect
>>the penalties are similar.
>>
>
> I hope you're right.
>
>
>>And why bother --- after 10 years of experience, the standard exam would be
>>a laugher.
>>
>
> That's what I thought back in 1968. I was amazed that there was so
> much
> moaning and groaning and complaining from *experienced* hams about
> having to take another license test......

Some might object to having to take and pay for another test. esp if
they are qrp operators.

- Mike KB3EIA -

450. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 18:46:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8oDKb.40048$Pg1.22923@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85176

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> Some might object to having to take and pay for another test. esp if
> they are qrp operators.
>

Yes, I can see where that would be an almost insurmountable problem among
cheapskate hams. After all, it works out to
$0.00273972602739726027397260273972602739726 per day for the term of the license.
That's a HUGE number!

73, de Hans, K0HB

451. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 19:45:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5fEKb.40105$Pg1.9712@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85177

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote

>
> Well, I thought about it, but after the reaction of a number of people
> here that I think know more about the suject than I do, I would imagine
> they would write it off to pilot error.
>

Not a chance that you'd have been blown off! The crew at W1AW takes their responsibility very seriously. You should have sent a quick email to w1aw@arrl.org

73, de Hans, K0HB

452. Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 19:59:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85178

I'm in love.....

http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm

....or maybe in lust.

453. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 20:01:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hr2uam6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 85180
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 05 Jan 2004 22:12:15 GMT, K&#65533;HB wrote:

>Thanks for all the resources. At my house ARRL Designer pukes and dies on
>both WIN98 (500MHz P2) and WIN-XP (2.5GHz P-4) machines.

I hear you. I have several older (DOS) comm programs which puke on
faster machines - good ol' PCPLUS for one. That's why my 24/7 packet
circuit (for the local ARES/RACES group) runs on a separate (166
P1) machine - it slows down my Athlon XP 2000 and my P2 machines.

I'm trying to find a DOS emulator for Linux to see if I can run two
circuits at once now...,..

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

454. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 20:01:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hr2uy87.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 85179

On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 09:24:01 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:

>> What do we get if we win?>
>
> Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^) Maybe a J-38 key?

I already have a gen-u-wine J-38 with the Lionel "L" on it.

I'll settle for the K2... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

"Where nothing is heard but discouraging words,
and the skies are all cloudy all day...."
(snowing on and off all week)

455. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 20:13:16 UTC
From: dplatt@radagast.org
Message-ID: <vvm5mst9jslfe6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 85181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> I hear you. I have several older (DOS) comm programs which puke on
> faster machines - good ol' PCPLUS for one. That's why my 24/7 packet
> circuit (for the local ARES/RACES group) runs on a separate (166
> P1) machine - it slows down my Athlon XP 2000 and my P2 machines.
>
> I'm trying to find a DOS emulator for Linux to see if I can run two
> circuits at once now...,..

A version of F6FBB is available which runs native on Linux, using the
Linux AX.25 networking support code. There ought to be no problem
running multiple TNCs (either real ones in KISS mode on serial ports,
or soundmodem versions), doing digipeating, etc. on Linux.

--
Dave Platt <dplatt@radagast.org> AE6EO
Hosting the Jade Warrior home page: http://www.radagast.org/jade-warrior
I do _not_ wish to receive unsolicited commercial email, and I will
boycott any company which has the gall to send me such ads!

456. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 20:55:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFB20BC.4070302@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85182

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>
>>You mean they will increase the requirements from 5wpm?
>>
>>
>>
>
>I don't know if FCC will or will not, but I expect ARRL to ask for an
>increase.
>
>
>
It seems unlikely that the FCC would increase the requirement for code. The medical wavier issue would pop up again, and they don't want to be bothered. Also, what of all those "extra lites" issued since restructuring day? At this point, it's a sure bet that the FCC will never increase the code speed.

457. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 21:04:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFB22E1.9060802@psu.edu>
Source record: 85184

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>Some might object to having to take and pay for another test. esp if
>>they are qrp operators.
>>
>
>
> Yes, I can see where that would be an almost insurmountable problem among
> cheapskate hams. After all, it works out to
> $0.00273972602739726027397260273972602739726 per day for the term of the license.
> That's a HUGE number!

Some might have to take off from work to take the test. Some may have to drive long distances to take it. I drove 70 miles each way for my Tech license, and 150 each way for my General, I took the Element 1 in my home town, and my Extra in a town 50 miles away, because they were on dates that I could get away.

- Mike KB3EIA -

458. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 21:07:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFB23A3.1060201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85183

>
>
>>-
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>LOL! A Morse key might be a very ironic prize, depending on who won. I
>suppose if I won a key I would have to have my first CW QSO, after 24 years
>QRV!
>
>Alun, N3KIP (G8VUK)
>
>
That's about as long ago since I did a CW QSO. :-)

Let's see, several petitions were submitted a few months ago, and the
comment
periods are now closed. So it's probably sitting on some brearucrat's
desk right
now. Or at the bottom of the pile on one or more commissioners' desks,
to be
looked at when there's nothing better to do. And they'll spend a few
minutes
looking at the restructuring R&O, find the part about code kept only because
of the treaty, note that the teaty has changed, delete the code
requirement, and
publish it in the federal register. Then it takes force 4 months later.
So it cannot
take place before May 2004 (date it takes force, "when Morse code
testing will
be eliminated in the US"). Add a few more months for the brearucracy, so
I say "August 1, 2004"

73 de WA2ISE

459. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 21:07:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFB23AC.90300@psu.edu>
Source record: 85185

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> I'm in love.....
>
> http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
>
> ....or maybe in lust.

a Homeresque: mmmmmmmmm....ICOM......drool...

What a beautiful piece of equipment!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

460. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 21:11:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFB246B.9050700@psu.edu>
Source record: 85186

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 09:24:01 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>>What do we get if we win?>
>>
>> Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^) Maybe a J-38 key?
>
>
> I already have a gen-u-wine J-38 with the Lionel "L" on it.
>
> I'll settle for the K2... <ggg>

Though that Icom 7800 Hans told us about might be a good prize too.

That Jim is a really generous guy, ya'know?

- Mike KB3EIA -

461. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 21:56:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <daGKb.40256$Pg1.3045@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85187

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> Some might have to take off from work to take the test. Some may have
> to drive long distances to take it. I drove 70 miles each way for my
> Tech license, and 150 each way for my General, I took the Element 1 in
> my home town, and my Extra in a town 50 miles away, because they were on
> dates that I could get away.
>

Life's a bitch and then you die and they give your callsign away.

73, de Hans, K0HB

462. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 22:48:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401061448.5d618918@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85188

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> I'm in love.....
>
> http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
>
> ....or maybe in lust.

Wowee!

I Like Ike(com)!

463. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-06 23:27:20 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a65549830e79d44989683@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85189

In article <f45722ac.0401061448.5d618918@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com says...
> "KØHB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > I'm in love.....
> >
> > http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
> >
> > ....or maybe in lust.
>
> Wowee!
>
> I Like Ike(com)!
>

And a Wowee price $9995.00 (discounted) KJI Electronics

464. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 00:00:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <T_HKb.35318$wU7.17575@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 85190
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil,

Don't know if it will help, but how about this:
http://www.dosemu.org/
I have no idea if it will help or not; I'm thinking of putting Linux in one of the boxes. A Google search of 'DOS emulators for Linux' yielded a ton of hits, but you've likely already researched them.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hr2uam6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 05 Jan 2004 22:12:15 GMT, K&#65533;HB wrote:
>
> >Thanks for all the resources. At my house ARRL Designer pukes and dies
on
> >both WIN98 (500MHz P2) and WIN-XP (2.5GHz P-4) machines.
>
> I hear you. I have several older (DOS) comm programs which puke on
> faster machines - good ol' PCPLUS for one. That's why my 24/7 packet
> circuit (for the local ARES/RACES group) runs on a separate (166
> P1) machine - it slows down my Athlon XP 2000 and my P2 machines.
>
> I'm trying to find a DOS emulator for Linux to see if I can run two
> circuits at once now...,..
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.558 / Virus Database: 350 - Release Date: 1/2/04

465. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211821.23171.00003207@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85197

In article <1vyKb.35094$Qr5.3877@news01.roc.ny>, "Steve Stone"
<spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>> That deemphasis has already occurred. The no-code tech was instituted in
>> the late 1980s and the code for the higher classes was dropped to only
>5wpm
>> in 2000. There is no need for further deemphasis. Particularly when the
>> stated reason was attract technically inclined people. That hasn't
>happened
>> so the reason for deemphasis has been proven to be invalid.
>>
>
>Get the foul mouthed red necked yahoos off of HF and I'll consider wasting
>my time to learn CW to meet and exceed your criteria.
>
What mode are those "foul mouthed yahoos" using? It isn't CW.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

466. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211822.23171.00003208@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85193

In article <uunlvvgjktbtdhgjf25v0pm4irqvi7ou16@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>I wonder if W1AW pre-records their CW material in audio format, then
>broadcasts it as a modulated SSB signal - would that not stretch the
>signal bandwidth out considerably?

Yes, but that's not how it's done.
>
>Anyone know if this might be the case?

Here's how it was when I visited in 1993:

The W1AW main transmitters are Harris transceivers and amplifiers, all computer
controlled from a master console in the little building out in front of Hq.
Bulletin and code practice texts are sent over the network from the
headquarters building and the local computer keys all the rigs simultaneously.
(Text-to-Morse conversion is done in the local computer).

Of course a faulty command from the computer, a bad cable or problem in one of
the "professional grade" rigs could wreak all kinds of havoc.

But they don't feed audio into the rigs for Morse or RTTY.

73 de Jim, N2EY

467. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211822.23171.00003209@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85196

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

468. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211823.23171.00003210@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85194

In article <3FFB23A3.1060201@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Let's see, several petitions were submitted a few months ago, and the
>comment periods are now closed. So it's probably sitting on some
>brearucrat's desk right now. Or at the bottom of the pile on one or more
>commissioners' desks, looked at when there's nothing better to do.

I doubt very much that the Commissioners read individual comments on
ham radio issues like that. If my guess is right, one or two staffers have
to read all of them and come up with what they think is the best solution
for all concerned.

>And they'll spend a few minutes
>looking at the restructuring R&O, find the part about code kept only because
>of the treaty, note that the t[r]eaty has changed, delete the code
>requirement, and
>publish it in the federal register.

Maybe. They could also change their minds based on any number of factors.
Or simply use the petitions to formulate an NPRM.

> Then it takes force 4 months later.

Unless we go through a whole NPRM cycle.

> So it cannot
>take place before May 2004 (date it takes force, "when Morse code
>testing will
>be eliminated in the US"). Add a few more months for the brearucracy, so
>I say "August 1, 2004"

I'll put you on the list..

73 de Jim, N2EY

469. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211824.23171.00003211@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85191

In article <3FFB246B.9050700@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>> On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 09:24:01 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>>>What do we get if we win?>
>>>
>>> Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^) Maybe a J-38 key?
>>
>>
>> I already have a gen-u-wine J-38 with the Lionel "L" on it.
>>
>> I'll settle for the K2... <ggg>
>
>
>Though that Icom 7800 Hans told us about might be a good prize too.
>
>That Jim is a really generous guy, ya'know?
>
Not that generous.

73 de Jim, N2EY

470. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211824.23171.00003212@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85192

In article <3FFAC501.4030405@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^)

No.
>
> Maybe a J-38 key?

Don't have one.

The prize is braggin' rights...

73 de Jim, N2EY

471. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 02:18:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040106211825.23171.00003213@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85195

In article <5gqKb.5818$uF6.1770739@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3FF987C9.9070307@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>That wasn't a good signal W1AW was putting
>>>out, and it was making a mess out of the local neighborhood.

>> Are you sure the W1AW signal was dirty? An overloaded receiver or
>> soundcard will do exaclty what you describe.
>
> I'll never say never, but I don't think it was too likely.

OK.

>I tried a
>number of things with the RTTY party last weekend, and even though there
>were lots of strong, wide signals, the few psk signals on at the same
>time were no problem to copy. And the other people on the air had to be
>suffering the same malfunction I might have been.

Certainly possible.
>
>> That doesn't mean it's impossible that W1AW had a problem, just that all
>> things
>> need to be checked out. Have you listened to W1AW since then?

The reason I ask is that if it only happened that once it was likely their problem.

>>>Usually PSK and OOK Morse get along just fine.

>> Depends on who's doing what. 3579 used to be a popular "glowbug" >>
frequency for
>> Morse folks using simple rigs and a colorburst crystal. Then the freq was
>> taken over by PSK-31 due to the popularity of the "Warbler".
>>
>>> My point is that by coming out with a ratty signal, W1AW was doing
>>>what so many hams were complaining about K1MAN does. Fire it up, and too
>>>bad for the rest of you.
>
>> W1AW transmits bulletins and code practice on a published schedule, and is
>> on
>> every HF amateur band simultaneously. Been doing that for almost 70 years
>> now.
>> However, the signal should be clean.

>>
>> Didja email them? Even that "professional" Harris stuff can go wacko.
>
> Well, I thought about it, but after the reaction of a number of people
>here that I think know more about the suject than I do, I would imagine
>they would write it off to pilot error.
>
As Hans said, I doubt that very much! At the very least they'd have someone a few miles away listen in.

And they have a spare rig for just such situations, too.

I wouldn't be surprised if someone *did* let them know, and it got fixed right away.

73 de Jim, N2EY

472. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 03:39:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TbLKb.7551$uF6.2085268@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85198

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3FFB246B.9050700@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>>On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 09:24:01 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>What do we get if we win?>
>>>>
>>>>Wasn't Jim going to give the winner his K2? 8^) Maybe a J-38 key?
>>>
>>>
>>> I already have a gen-u-wine J-38 with the Lionel "L" on it.
>>>
>>> I'll settle for the K2... <ggg>
>>
>>
>>Though that Icom 7800 Hans told us about might be a good prize too.
>>
>>That Jim is a really generous guy, ya'know?
>>
>
> Not that generous.

Well, I tried! I don't blame you though.

- Mike KB3EIA -

473. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 03:59:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8uLKb.7560$uF6.2089524@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85199

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>Some might have to take off from work to take the test. Some may have
>>to drive long distances to take it. I drove 70 miles each way for my
>>Tech license, and 150 each way for my General, I took the Element 1 in
>>my home town, and my Extra in a town 50 miles away, because they were on
>>dates that I could get away.
>>
>
>
> Life's a bitch and then you die and they give your callsign away.

Sure enough! But.... Lenover21 is right about one thing.

From Lenover21:
>>> Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
>>>inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.

Back to me:

If I were a qrp'er, I would surely be peeved under the circumstances.
Heck if I were to be happy with 50 Watts power, I probably wouldn't be
too happy about the situation, having to retest or lose my license.

Perhaps it would be better if everyone were to just tell you that the
plan was the best thing they ever saw?

- Mike KB3EIA -

474. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 04:02:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lxLKb.7563$uF6.2090103@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85200

N2EY wrote:

> In article <1vyKb.35094$Qr5.3877@news01.roc.ny>, "Steve Stone"
> <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:
>
>
>>>That deemphasis has already occurred. The no-code tech was instituted in
>>>the late 1980s and the code for the higher classes was dropped to only
>>
>>5wpm
>>
>>>in 2000. There is no need for further deemphasis. Particularly when the
>>>stated reason was attract technically inclined people. That hasn't
>>
>>happened
>>
>>>so the reason for deemphasis has been proven to be invalid.
>>>
>>
>>Get the foul mouthed red necked yahoos off of HF and I'll consider wasting
>>my time to learn CW to meet and exceed your criteria.
>>
>
> What mode are those "foul mouthed yahoos" using? It isn't CW.....

That I believe, would be foul fisted. 8^)

I'm having trouble grasping the logic that says to effect: "I don't like
the way people talk, so I won't communicate with the people that don't
use voice"

- Mike KB3EIA -

475. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 04:13:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btg117$itb@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85201

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040106211822.23171.00003209@mb-m05.aol.com...
Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
W5TIT: June 1, 2008

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

476. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 04:28:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFB8AE9.9BAA862E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85202

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0401061448.5d618918@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com says...
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > > I'm in love.....
> > >
> > > http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
> > >
> > > ....or maybe in lust.
> >
> > Wowee!
> >
> > I Like Ike(com)!
> >
>
> And a Wowee price $9995.00 (discounted) KJI Electronics

I'll just keep slogging along with my ancient Orion. For the price of a
'7800, I could own three Orions.

Dave K8MN

477. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 04:32:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFB8BC9.9CB4C0DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85203

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040106211822.23171.00003209@mb-m05.aol.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Kim,

Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
indication that you're changing them? That kind of thing could further
reflect on your character.

Dave K8MN

478. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 05:07:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <juMKb.41220$Pg1.29657@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85204

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> What mode are those "foul mouthed yahoos" using? It isn't CW.....

Jim obviously isn't a DX'er, or he'd know about the infamous "pileup police"
shenanigans regularly heard around 14.023 +/-. I could send you some .wav
files that aren't even fit to air on rrap.

73, de Hans, K0HB

479. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 05:13:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8AMKb.41252$Pg1.40795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85205

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote

>
> Perhaps it would be better if everyone were to just tell you that the
> plan was the best thing they ever saw?
>

A lot of people have told me exactly that, but I'm sure there are some who
share your view that I'm out to lunch. Life's a bitch, and then I'll die
and they'll give my call sign away.

73, de Hans "He's not a nice man", K0HB

480. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 06:02:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OhNKb.29706$IM3.3803@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85206

"N2EY" wrote:
> > (snip)
> > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> > Kim: June 1, 2008

> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > (snip)
> > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> > W5TIT: June 1, 2008

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> Kim,
> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
> and re-posting with no indication that you're
> changing them? That kind of thing could
> further reflect on your character.

I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim obviously has some issue with her callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has done with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the FCC and, if Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the FCC. Regardless, until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is legitimate and should be treated as such by all within the Ham radio community - just as any ham operator, including Jim, would expect his or her own callsign to be treated.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

481. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 06:25:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <RDNKb.29808$IM3.12043@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85207

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Unfortunately, I believe I have heard
> the story of which Jim speaks...or at
> least one exactly like it. (snip)

Okay, I'll try one more time. Please read back over what I've said. Nothing was said by me about a denial of license based on other grounds. We were talking about license testing and everything I said had to do with license testing. What does Jim's story have to do with license testing? Instead, not able to respond to the actual question raised (character testing within the license tests), Jim has deceitfully, but clearly successfully, introduced another subject (denial of license) to undermine my earlier statements about license testing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

482. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 06:40:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hRNKb.29850$IM3.13607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85208

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> I hate to say it, Jim, but this is one
> of those intangibles that fall under
> the catagory of "if you don't get it,
> I can't explain it to you."
>
> Kim's got it, but doesn't like it. I
> can respect that. Bill's got it too,
> but doesn't appear to want to let
> on that he's got it. (Broken record
> mode: But the FCC..., but the
> FCC..., but the FCC...) Dwight?
> No comment.

Excuse me, Bert. Before you continue discussing whether I "get" something or not, read back over what I've actually said and notice that absolutely none of it had anything whatsoever to do with the separate issue raised by Jim. We were talking about license testing. My comments had to do with license testing. Jim changed the subject to license denial based on other grounds. I've made no comments on that subject.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

483. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 06:57:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <35OKb.29913$IM3.10132@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85209

"JEP" wrote:
>
> Service means just that. Broadcasters
> have to do public service to keep
> broadcastings. Why do you think they
> do PSA's. No money involved, they
> do it free. (snip)

Nonsense. What public service is performed by those in the Citizens Band Radio Service? Or the Family Radio Service? Or what public service, especially free public service, is provided by the radio services used by business, commerce, or industry?

> (snip) You also would have to prove
> that 75% of the amareurs provide a
> public service. Lets see, chasing DX,
> rag chewing with Barny down the
> road and checking the weather
> outside. Yep, thats sure public
> service-----NOT!

After reading that, it is obvious you have no intent to honestly discuss the issue. And, since I have no desire to provide you with an opportunity to spread misinformation, I will refrain from further comment.

The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were again deleted from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

484. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:02:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401070302.34078e22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85210

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<OhNKb.29706$IM3.3803@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > > (snip)
> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> > > Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > (snip)
> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> > > W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Kim,
> > Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
> > and re-posting with no indication that you're
> > changing them? That kind of thing could
> > further reflect on your character.
>
>
> I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim obviously has some issue with her
> callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has done
> with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the FCC and, if
> Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the FCC. Regardless,
> until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is legitimate and should be
> treated as such by all within the Ham radio community - just as any ham
> operator, including Jim, would expect his or her own callsign to be treated.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim has been doing some squirelly stuff lately.

485. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:06:54 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401070306.1996ea74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85211

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<35OKb.29913$IM3.10132@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "JEP" wrote:
> >
> > Service means just that. Broadcasters
> > have to do public service to keep
> > broadcastings. Why do you think they
> > do PSA's. No money involved, they
> > do it free. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense. What public service is performed by those in the Citizens Band
> Radio Service? Or the Family Radio Service? Or what public service,
> especially free public service, is provided by the radio services used by
> business, commerce, or industry?
>
>
> > (snip) You also would have to prove
> > that 75% of the amareurs provide a
> > public service. Lets see, chasing DX,
> > rag chewing with Barny down the
> > road and checking the weather
> > outside. Yep, thats sure public
> > service-----NOT!
>
>
> After reading that, it is obvious you have no intent to honestly discuss
> the issue. And, since I have no desire to provide you with an opportunity to
> spread misinformation, I will refrain from further comment.
>
> The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were again deleted
> from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Well sir, you perhaps need to do a little research so you can discuss
this subject. I do see you are well educated but the comments from you
are not entirely correct. The 3 above mentioned groups PAY for their
priviledge. Check the rules. Broadcasters have to do public service as
do hams when called. My last comment on this subject as you will
believe what you will. Kinda figures. A fairly new TECH class ham with

all the answers. Come back 30 years from now and we will talk then. Of course you will still have that TECH that came out of a corn flakes box. Not a real Amateur ticket.

486. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:26:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401070326.7f60037c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85212

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401061457.60c78d6@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401060040.6f3583e4@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040105212538.23171.00003179@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >
> > > That gives him absolute permission to behave as an asshole off the
> > > radio. No problem.
> >
> > Again with the profanities, Lennie?
>
> Len, what's going on here?
>
> There were no outrages when Hans just called someone an a-hole.

Hans is not the one professing to be the ex-professional author
and "radio professional", Brain.

If you're going to "brag" on some personal characteristic or past
achievement of your life, you should be ready to stand behind it.

Your "mentor" has made a point of insisting on what a
"professional" he is in both electronics and publishing. I think his
conduct herein belies his real character.

Clear enough for you?

Steve, K4YZ

487. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:30:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107063018.23307.00005730@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85217

In article <RDNKb.29808$IM3.12043@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>What does Jim's story have to do with license testing?

Simple.

It shows that the FCC has very wide authority to set license test criteria, including
such concepts as "character" and "discipline". Merely passing the tests is not the only requirement for a license grant.

Normally the FCC assumes that all applicants for a ham license are "of good character" unless there is a reason to suspect differently.

I think FCC could indeed legally implement Hans' one-shot learner license with its upgrade-or-out provision. Their argument would be that someone who was a ham for 10 years and yet c/wouldn't pass the full-privs test simply didn't have the required "character" or "discipline" to stay in the ARS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

488. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:30:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107063021.23307.00005732@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85213

In article <5qidnRU6lMEXomWiRVn-hg@comcast.com>, "Herbert Khaury"
<Herbert@tiptoe.tp> writes:

>Good evening, mister dang-her. Rocky Roccoco, at your cervix.
>
>... how does he make his voice do that?
>
>:-)
>

Must come from all that time spent driving on the Antelope Freeway in a car
from Ralph Spoilsport Motors ("factory air-conditioned air from our airt
conditioned factory")

73 de Jim "I wonder where Ruth is?" N2EY

489. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:30:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107063021.23307.00005731@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85218

In article <juMKb.41220$Pg1.29657@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> What mode are those "foul mouthed yahoos" using? It isn't CW.....
>
>Jim obviously isn't a DX'er,

That's right. Never claimed to be.

>or he'd know about the infamous "pileup police"
>shenanigans regularly heard around 14.023 +/-. I could send you some .wav
>files that aren't even fit to air on rrap.

Sad. Very sad. Guess I'll not be a DX'er, either.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

490. Re: Look for the Union Label (was: The 14 Petitions)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:30:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107063022.23307.00005733@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85216

In article <JoGdnc4IrMtw12qiRVn-uw@comcast.com>, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> writes:

>The problem in this country is not a lack of
>unions, but the value system we have. For example
>where else can you find somebody with nothing more
>than a high school education, if that, making
>millions of dollars a year playing a kids game,
>basketball. Same goes for other sports like
>football, hockey, and baseball.
>Then there are
>those who make fortunes in the music industry
>because of their voice, or in the movies.

Actually, all of the above are in the same line of work: show business.
"Professional" athletes are in show business, same as movie stars or
singers or TV personalities.

While I don't agree with their enormous paychecks, such things are the
inevitable result of any system that is even close to a free market.

>None of
>these people contribute to the general well being
>of society on a day to day basis like the
>engineers, technicians etc. who design and repair
>the products that are taken for granted.

It's all in the perception of the people who pay the bills. Lots of people
enjoy movies, sports events, etc., and are willing to pay for it.

Next time you're in Best Buy or wherever, take a look at music CD prices
and realize that the actual cost of manufacturing the CD is a dollar or less.
>
>I find it really a twisted sense of value when a
>highly skilled technical person has to give up
>doing technical work if they want to have any hope
>of advancing their pay and career. Businesses
>value the marketing types, and the MBA's, above
>those who actually design the products.

Look at CEO salaries in some companies. Same deal - it's
what the market will bear.

>Very few
>forward looking companies have realized this and
>have done something about it. Those that have now
>implement a dual track system, one in to

>management for those who want it, the other keeps
>those interested in the technical area doing what
>they like, and both allows for greater advancement
>in salary and career.
>
Supply and demand.

73 de Jim, N2EY

491. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:30:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107063023.23307.00005735@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85214

In article <PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>I'm in love.....
>
> http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
>
>....or maybe in lust.

"Anything worth doing is worth overdoing...."

73 de Jim, N2EY

492. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:30:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107063023.23307.00005734@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85215

In article <daGKb.40256$Pg1.3045@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Life's a bitch and then you die and they give your callsign away.
>
Not if your license never expires!

"Life sucks. Get a helmet!" - Denis Leary aka Edgar Friendly

73 de Jim, N2EY

493. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:33:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401070333.132ac7ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85219

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401060937.1655f67f@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401060026.20390fbf@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401050531.3b60fc06@posting.google.com>...

> > > Reciprocity. Steve does not respect my endeavors.
> >
> > On Contraire, Brain...I have never "dissed" your occupation.
>
> Oh? So what of your comments of the "1957C This is the Air Force."

What about them, Brain? I pointed out that your "duties" were
in an MOS that was well known as far back as 1957.

I never said anything disrespectful about the character of your
service in the USAF or your duties.

Perhaps you can produce the quote wherein I did?

> I really can't believe anything you say.

No, you WON'T believe anything I say since it would disprove your
rants.

Steve, K4YZ

494. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:35:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401070335.27945f51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85220

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401060937.1655f67f@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401060026.20390fbf@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401050531.3b60fc06@posting.google.com>...

> > > Reciprocity. Steve does not respect my endeavors.
> >
> > On Contraire, Brain...I have never "dissed" your occupation.
>
> Oh? So what of your comments of the "1957C This is the Air Force."

PS: This STILL does not relate to your occupation NOW,
Brain...NOT your service in the Armed Forces.

I once again state, WITHOUT fear of contradiction, that I have
NEVER "dissed" your occupation.

Steve, K4YZ

495. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:50:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401070350.55d6c442@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85221

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<35OKb.29913$IM3.10132@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "JEP" wrote:
> >
> > Service means just that. Broadcasters
> > have to do public service to keep
> > broadcastings. Why do you think they
> > do PSA's. No money involved, they
> > do it free. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense. What public service is performed by those in the Citizens Band
> Radio Service? Or the Family Radio Service? Or what public service,
> especially free public service, is provided by the radio services used by
> business, commerce, or industry?

I'll play a bit of "Devil's Advocate" here, Dwight...There are
some very well respected REACT teams utilizing GMRS which is,
unfortunately, "Citizen's Band". (ie: Crest REACT in SoCal)

They are far and few between, however, and many of the more
functional REACT Teams have blended Amateur Radio into their teams.

> > (snip) You also would have to prove
> > that 75% of the amareurs provide a
> > public service. Lets see, chasing DX,
> > rag chewing with Barny down the
> > road and checking the weather
> > outside. Yep, thats sure public
> > service-----NOT!
>
> After reading that, it is obvious you have no intent to honestly discuss
> the issue. And, since I have no desire to provide you with an opportunity to
> spread misinformation, I will refrain from further comment.

He is, at the very least, predisposed to trying to disparge the
Amateur Service.

Facts undermine his attack, however.

73

Steve, K4YZ

496. Lennie Finally Comes To Senses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 11:59:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401070359.113e4f6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85222

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040104145912.15462.00005406@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Morse code skill is the epitome of amateur radio.
>
> The morse code test should never, ever be removed from US amateur
> radio law.
>
> If fact, the morse code test word rate should be increased to HIGHER
> than 20 WPM.
>
> This will inspire even greater self-discipline, dedication, and commitment
> to the amateur comunity's goals and standards.
>
> Morse code modes SHOULD be First, not second.
>
> Morsemanship is vital and important.
>
> That morse code modes are merely second shows a definite lack of
> self-discipline, dedication, and commitment to the goals of
> amateurism.

Bravo, Leonard. You've finally posted something quotable and sensible.

Now, try that "Extra Lite" test...It's not that hard!

Steve, K4YZ

497. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 12:28:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFBFB6A.66EFCC26@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85223

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > > (snip)
> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> > > Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > (snip)
> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> > > W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Kim,
> > Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
> > and re-posting with no indication that you're
> > changing them? That kind of thing could
> > further reflect on your character.
>
> I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim obviously has some issue with her
> callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has done
> with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the FCC and, if
> Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the FCC. Regardless,
> until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is legitimate and should be
> treated as such by all within the Ham radio community - just as any ham
> operator, including Jim, would expect his or her own callsign to be treated.

Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and politically correct.

I'm certain that Jim has an issue with Kim's call. Quite a number of us
have issues with Kim's call. Even Riley Hollingsworth has issues with
Kim's call. For you to attempt the equation of Kim's tacky choice of
vanity call with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.

You'll note that I used "further reflect on your character". The
touching up of another's post is one issue. The choice of calls is
another.

Dave K8MN

498. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 14:04:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401070604.20f68202@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85224

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FF65476.C695DAAD@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > It should be obvious, Bill. US ham radio is all about "working
> > DX on HF with CW."
>
> Same old song, huh? You wrote it and you're the only one singing it.
> HF amateur radio is many things to many people, but you aren't one of
> them.

Thank God for small favors ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

499. Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 14:20:56 UTC
From: Burp <belch@pukeburp.org>
Message-ID: <bth4k4tno0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Whoppers heard at the amateur radio club meeting last
night:

"I got my DXCC the honest way."

"It's in mint condition, I used it for only a few hours."

"I'll sell it to you for what I paid for it."

Burp

500. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 15:06:03 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946966B8E7D97elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85226

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3FFBFB6A.66EFCC26@earthlink.net:

> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>> > > (snip)
>> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
>> > > Kim: June 1, 2008
>>
>> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
>> > > (snip)
>> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
>> > > W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>
>> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>> > Kim,
>> > Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
>> > and re-posting with no indication that you're
>> > changing them? That kind of thing could further reflect on your
>> > character.
>>
>> I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim obviously has some issue with
>> her
>> callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has
>> done with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the
>> FCC and, if Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the
>> FCC. Regardless, until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
>> legitimate and should be treated as such by all within the Ham radio
>> community - just as any ham operator, including Jim, would expect his
>> or her own callsign to be treated.
>
> Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and politically correct.
>
> I'm certain that Jim has an issue with Kim's call. Quite a number of
> us have issues with Kim's call. Even Riley Hollingsworth has issues
> with Kim's call. For you to attempt the equation of Kim's tacky choice
> of vanity call with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.
>
> You'll note that I used "further reflect on your character". The

> touching up of another's post is one issue. The choice of calls is
> another.
>
> Dave K8MN

I don't think you can really separate them in this instance. We all know why Jim doesn't want to use her call, but at the same time I doubt if any of us would be pleased to appear on a list where everyone else had their call listed but we didn't. The obvious implication is that the person with no call is not a ham, even though we know that's not what Jim meant.

You might not choose to have a call like Kim's, but can you honestly say you wouldn't correct someone's post if they did this to you? As for the lack of an accompanying comment, have you considered that she might not be able to think of anything that wouldn't actually be worse than no comment? If she can't think of anything good to say, she may be being polite by saying nothing.

Alun, N3KIP

501. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 15:20:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <NsVKb.42856$Pg1.32031@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85227

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> I think FCC could indeed legally implement Hans' one-shot learner license
with
> its upgrade-or-out provision. Their argument would be that someone who was
a
> ham for 10 years and yet c/wouldn't pass the full-privs test simply didn't
have
> the required "character" or "discipline" to stay in the ARS.
>

Nice try, Jim, but that wouldn't be their argument at all.

Their argument would be that the individual had not yet demonstrated knowledge of the technical qualifications for a standard license by passing the required written examination, and their learners permit had expired. It has nothing to do with "character" or "discipline".

73, de Hans, K0HB

502. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 15:20:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ltVKb.31037$IM3.7669@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85228

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> It shows that the FCC has very wide
> authority to set license test criteria,
> including such concepts as
> "character" and "discipline". (snip)

Nonsense. It would be virtually impossible to test character or discipline in a radio license test. The FCC hasn't done it and probably wouldn't ever attempt to do so. Nice talking to you, Jim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

503. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 15:38:06 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <yJVKb.60755$Cs3.7207730@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85229

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:hRNKb.29850$IM3.13607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> >
> > I hate to say it, Jim, but this is one
> > of those intangibles that fall under
> > the catagory of "if you don't get it,
> > I can't explain it to you."
> >
> > Kim's got it, but doesn't like it. I
> > can respect that. Bill's got it too,
> > but doesn't appear to want to let
> > on that he's got it. (Broken record
> > mode: But the FCC..., but the
> > FCC..., but the FCC...) Dwight?
> > No comment.
>
>
> Excuse me, Bert. Before you continue discussing whether I "get"
something
> or not, read back over what I've actually said and notice that absolutely
> none of it had anything whatsoever to do with the separate issue raised by
> Jim. We were talking about license testing. My comments had to do with
> license testing. Jim changed the subject to license denial based on other
> grounds. I've made no comments on that subject.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

No Dwight, I will not excuse you. The discussion I was engaged in w/Bill,
K2UNK, concerned the "character" aspect of Morse code testing. (i.e.
demonstrating self-discipline by studying for and passing Element 1 for
increased privileges, regardless whether one plans on actually using CW OTA
or not.)

As for discussing whether or not you "get it," again...no comment. No
comment means no comment. You were only included because you were one of
three that commented re. the subject. I do notice that this is not the first
(or tenth, for that matter) time you've joined into a thread, (or a branch
thereof) pulled the subject in a different direction, and then whined about
a response by claiming that what you said had nothing to do with a
"separate" issue. Well Dwight, the above is the issue that Bill, JEP, Kim,
Jim, and I were discussing. Get it yet?

73 de Bert'
WA2SI

504. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 15:46:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <4RVKb.60915$Cs3.7230567@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85230

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:35OKb.29913$IM3.10132@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "JEP" wrote:
> >
> > Service means just that. Broadcasters
> > have to do public service to keep
> > broadcastings. Why do you think they
> > do PSA's. No money involved, they
> > do it free. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense.

I just love how you so cavalierly proclaim other's opinions and/or
statements as "nonsense." Kim was right on target re. same.

> What public service is performed by those in the Citizens Band
> Radio Service?

Gee, the Office of Homeland Security disagrees with you, Dwight. Should your
statement be labeled as "nonsense" or just plain "ignorant?"

> The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were again
deleted
> from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).

Good call.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

505. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 16:21:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rmWKb.31268$IM3.24127@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85231

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
>
> I'll play a bit of "Devil's Advocate"
> here, Dwight... There are some very
> well respected REACT teams utilizing
> GMRS which is, unfortunately,
> "Citizen's Band". (ie: Crest REACT
> in SoCal) (snip)

And the efforts of REACT and its members are commendable. However, any public service performed is informal in nature, not the result of any regulatory stipulation imposed by the FCC or federal government. There is nothing in part 95 that mandates public service like that found in part 97.

> He is, at the very least, predisposed to
> trying to disparge the Amateur Service.
>
> Facts undermine his attack, however.

But he obviously has no desire to listen to, or accept, facts. Therefore, an ongoing exchange simply isn't worthwhile, and may be counterproductive if it provides him with a medium to rant against this radio service. Instead, I'll wait for something worthwhile to respond to, such as an argument that may be taken seriously by others.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

506. Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 16:23:23 UTC
From: Burp <belch@pukeburp.org>
Message-ID: <bthbpmfgd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Two guys eating at Waffle House, one is a ham and the
other a nonham.

Nonham: "Geeeze, I love the smell of that waitress's perfume."

Ham: "Yeah, I love the smell of generator fumes, it reminds
me of field day next month."

Burp

507. Re: Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 16:26:01 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <uqWKb.49108$m83.20653@fed1read01>
Source record: 85233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ah good ones -- some more "Great Ham Whoppers"
I only own one radio!!
Ur 599 (ur call again please).
Your QSL is in the Mail
I'll Never Build Another Kit Project

I bought my mint TS-950SDX for $300.00.
I worked em on the first call.
I never worked DX on a net!!

After a long boring QSO:
XYL says dinner is ready.
Just got the ____ call.
We're losing propagation (wiggle the RF Pwr control)
QRM Now -- Better Sign while we can!
OOpps -- there's the doorbell
Gotta land line OM -- 73
OOppss Rover!!! Gotta run and empty the dog!!
Oh shoot, lightning in the area, gota shut down!
XYL says time to take my pills. Gota go!
Time for the local repeater net, Gota go!

I am just running a few watts, opps there goes the circuit breaker.
I usually copy code around 40 wpm but have an ear infection so using phone
now.
Love code but had my Vibroplex stolen so have to use phone.

--
73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
"Burp" <belch@pukeburp.org> wrote in message
news:bth4k4tno0@pita.alt.net...
> Whoppers heard at the amateur radio club meeting last
> night:
>
>
> "I got my DXCC the honest way."
>
> "It's in mint condition, I used it for only a few hours."
>
> "I'll sell it to you for what I paid for it."
>
>
> Burp
>

>
>
>
>

508. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 17:05:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <I%WKb.31368$IM3.1238@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85234

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim
> > obviously has some issue with her
> > callsign. Without saying why, he refuses
> > to use her callsign as he has done with
> > everyone else on his list. That callsign
> > was issued by the FCC and, if Jim has
> > an issue with that, he should take it up
> > with the FCC. Regardless, until the
> > FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
> > legitimate and should be treated as
> > such by all within the Ham radio
> > community - just as any ham operator,
> > including Jim, would expect his or her
> > own callsign to be treated.
>
>
> Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and
> politically correct.

No, just civil, polite, manners, Dave. My mother wasn't thinking of political correctness when she taught me to try to respect others, even if they may not deserve it. Sadly, too many people today consider polite manners to be an unwelcomed human attribute, now described as political correctness by those people.

> I'm certain that Jim has an issue with
> Kim's call. Quite a number of us have
> issues with Kim's call. Even Riley
> Hollingsworth has issues with Kim's
> call. For you to attempt the equation
> of Kim's tacky choice of vanity call
> with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.

Regardless, the agency that Hollingsworth works for, and that issued the other callsigns on Jim's list, does equate the validity of Kim's callsign to Jim's. Some may wish to dismiss that, but doing so perhaps says a lot about their own character.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

509. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 17:12:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <E5XKb.42951$Pg1.27045@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85235

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> Facts undermine his attack, however.
>

The facts are this: If amateur radio had to justify it's frequency allocations based only on public service communications (Part 97, SubPart E), then we'd be QRT on most of our frequencies by midnight tonight.

The amateur radio service, the citizens (band) radio service, the GMRS, the FRS, the broadcast radio service, and etc., all exist and are allocated frequencies so long as PICON says they do. PICON is a lot more than just "public service", and further it is dynamic so any given services "favor" under PICON is subject to spectrum market forces, and is influenced most strongly by the "I" and "N" in PICON. As a hypothetical example, if Tom Ridge decided he needs ("N") some HF spectrum to communicate with air marshalls, 50KHz each of 75, 40, 30, and 20 meters could disappear from 97.301 in the blink of an eye.

Thus endeth the lesson.

73, de Hans, K0HB

510. Re: Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 17:17:52 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <4bXKb.244616$8y1.1127909@attbi_s52>
Source record: 85250
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Good ones ..... how about ....

Hey I just got my ticket ....your VEC group testing time didn't fit into my schedule so I drove 300 miles and "passed"

To the person above .....you can borrow my key since you learned 5 WPM overnight .... naa don't have time for CW .....

The band is always "open" here .....

I can't pass the code test because of my hearing .....

My wife says I can put up that 100 foot tower but ....

Boy I'd love to help you guys but I have something going on this weekend ....

Nobody wants to do anything for this club ....meanwhile this joker has done crap for years save bitch about everything ....

Gee I'd really like to have that ----as I have been looking for one of those for years ...meanwhile your "good buddy" has cut a deal with a fellow cross town who wants one but doesn't want to miss out on a "score".

To the widow ..... Ya know Mrs. RF your husband was such a good guy and he told me that you should only talk to me about getting rid of the "shack". Don't laugh '''this HAS happened at funeral homes ......

To the grieving widow ..... Ya know Mrs. RF that you can't get parts for that old stuff any more ... I'll give you a few bucks and then give the radios to the scouts they can take them apart for a merit badge project ....

It only "cuts out" now and then ....

AND NOW FOR THE GRANDDADDY OF WHOPPERS .... drum roll .....

CW always gets through ....

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

511. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 17:25:54 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <CiXKb.81669$I07.407777@attbi_s53>
Source record: 85251

Wait a second Dave ....you don't understand ... that 7800's display is in color and the Orion is in 50's BW I believe .... That in it self explains the price difference.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa..

> I'll just keep slogging along with my ancient Orion. For the price of a
> '7800, I could own three Orions.
>
> Dave K8MN

512. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 17:56:51 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0401070956.374c7a40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85236

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> Sad. Very sad. Guess I'll not be a DX'er, either.
>

Boo hoo.

513. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 18:14:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85237

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

>
> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
> indication that you're changing them?
>

Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond that.

Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which he and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.

Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.

Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my right.

YMMV. That's your right.

73, de Hans, K0HB

514. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85244

In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
>> Stebe thinks that the "majority" of U.S. amateur radio activity
>> is above HF. That must mean that he never listens below 30
>> MHz. Probably true since all he can do is transmit over-
>> modulated shouting and hollering about close-order drill below
>> 30 MHz. Hup too tree foah, ya lie, ya lie, ya lie.
>
> Uhhhhh....nope.
>
> And unfortunately for you, your lies ARE archived in this very
>forum.

No "lies."

> Sucks to be you, Leonard.

Only when I turn on the ShopVac.

>> The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham
>> license and be proficient in morse code...(SNIP)
>
> Oh geeze...Here we go again.

A 1x2 has stated the Word on that: The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham license and be a morseman.

That's the Official Word.

> Lennie, we're STILL waiting on you to cite the quotes wherein
>you've established this opinion.

Observation of the human condition for over a half century.

What's your excuse?

> It's certainly not true in MY case, and just one more example of
>how you feel free to take liberties with the truth.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...role-playing in a fantasy land is not "reality" nor is it "truth."

>> ....with extra gold stars
>> if one was once a member of da murine corpse. Doesn't hurt if

>> one was a purchasing agent for a small modem and set-top box
>> company in the "south" for a few months...that counts as "being
>> in radio engineering!"
>
> And still more silliness.
>
> I never claimed to be an engineer...But I did provide numerous
>references from that job that proved you WRONG on numerous occassions.

Never once did you "prove" anything. Your imagination tells only
you that you were "right." Your imagination is WRONG.

> I guess that had to hurt, knowing a "non-engineer" had access to
>references that took a bite out of your rants...

"Hurt?" Only my sides from laughing. "References" from a weekly
newspaper from Podunk Hollow, TN, hardly counts for anything...

>
>> Amateur radio FUN is only "ancilliary" to the U.S. amateur radio
>> SERVICE. Ham radio is all about wearing a Lifestyle mental
>> uniform, marching in ranks to the morse drumbeat of the 1930s,
>> and being ready, willing, able to "take over communications" when
>> all the commercial/professional infrastructure FAILS in an
>> emergency? That's the thoughts I see expressed in here.
>
> Again with the "1930's" rant, Lennie?

Call it "transistorized 1930s," Stebe.

Standards and Practices remain the same as 70 years ago.
Imagination of Public Service and self-serving glory are still the
same. If ARRL writes it, all MUST believe, for their words are
sacred.

> And in any case your sleight's against Amateur Radio's PROVEN
>track record of being able to provide the very emergency services you
>claim as "ineffectual" or "irrelevent" are DISproven over and ovr,
>even in the 21st Century.

Of course (he said, humoring the mentally ill)...when any disaster
strikes, all the communications infrastructure fails but amateurs can
jump in and save the day. Using morse code, of course.

[try "slight" and "over"...]

> There's no "hatred" of the "pros", Lennie. Only PROlific liars
>such as yourself. That you claim to have been a "radio" professional
>is unfortuante.

Not a "claim," an actual fact...provable through several third-party
sources. You keep trying to say I never worked in the electronics
industry at all. I did. In aerospace since 1956. Got paid for it.

Try to get used to the FACT that I was employed on a regular basis with several electronic corporations in southern California and did retire from regular hours' work. Try to get used to the FACT that my single patent grant is on radio. Try to get used to the FACT that I was doing big-leagues HF radio communication before you were born. Try to get used to the FACT that HF communications has hardly changed in the last half century. Try to get used to the FACT that I have far more technical knowledge of radio and electronics in general than you have now.

Or, reject all the facts, ignore reality, and say everything I've written is "lies." That doesn't make your statement "true." It never will.

>> It's a wonderful life.
>
> Yes, it is. Too bad you'll die having not known exactly HOW
>wonderful it is.

Perhaps. I'm not complaining. Why are you complaining?

I had to sit with the family gathering again to watch "It's A Wonderful Life." :-) After seeing it so many times, it's still a good motion picture even if very dated.

>> Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, Brian, all the best to you
>> and your family.
>
> At least there was ONE person in this forum for you to exchange
>greetings with. Good for you. No one should be alone for the
>holidays. Even creeps like you, Lennie.

Hardly "alone" during the Holidays. Wasn't even here (physically). An inconvenience to access another's computer to check e-mail, even if a close relative.

Why do you insist on painting all those imaginary scenarios, trying to denigrate others?

I don't live in newsgroups nor do I look to the computer to give me either acceptance or love or respect. Never thought that way since getting on BBSs the first time 19 years ago. Computer-modem communications are just another form of communications...just like radio. You haven't reached that point in understanding this medium yet...you can holler incessantly that I "lie" and vomit all sorts of bad names but none of that is "true" anywhere but in your head.

So far you've not been able to "force" me to do anything, not even with vague "threats" of some sort of veiled physical harm. Acting the bully in here only demonstrates what bullies do. This isn't a "personal battleground" that must be totally occupied by your personal perceived slights/insults/whatever...yet you keep on with that sort of thing. Ho hum. Boring to most readers. Doesn't work, can never work...except in the fantasyland withing your head.

Try to remember that you are NOT some high-rank NCO and that
this is NOT some kind of military service. Playing the Dill Sergeant
won't get you out of any pickle you make by your own words.

LHA

515. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140053.21642.00003531@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85239

In article <NsVKb.42856$Pg1.32031@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I think FCC could indeed legally implement Hans' one-shot learner license
>with
>> its upgrade-or-out provision. Their argument would be that someone who was
>a
>> ham for 10 years and yet c/wouldn't pass the full-privs test simply didn't
>have
>> the required "character" or "discipline" to stay in the ARS.
>
>Nice try, Jim, but that wouldn't be their argument at all.
>
>Their argument would be that the individual had not yet demonstrated
>knowledge of the technical qualifications for a standard license by passing
>the required written examination, and their learners permit had expired. It
>has nothing to do with "character" or "discipline".

On the contrary, passing a morse test indicates strength of character
and determination, dedication, perseverence to the AMATEUR
COMMUNITY. All amateurs are resolute, noble of character, honest,
and are committed to one another in bonds of liberte', fraternite', and
egalite'. The AMATEUR COMMUNITY. Ignore the FCC.

LHA

516. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140053.21642.00003530@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85242

In article <3FFABF85.2080305@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Brian wrote:
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040104145919.15462.00005409@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>>>In article <f45722ac.0401040700.31209cba@posting.google.com>,
>>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:<WkoJb.16698$lo3.2335@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>>>
>>>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Anything said against YOUR PLAN is worthless, illogical,
>>>>>> inconsequential, irresponsible, irrelevant, etc., etc., etc.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I knew you'd agree with me.
>>>>>
>>>>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>>>
>>>>I just happen to agree with Hans' plan. Allow the amateur to
>>>>distinguish him or herself through actions rather than an FCC forced
>>>>march.
>>>
>>> While I agree on the generality of that, such is impossible under
>>> the present-day Class Distinction Rules of US amateur radio.
>>>
>>> ALL perceived expertise is judged by the "amateur community"
>>> as demonstrated by the fancy-bordered license (suitable for
>>> framing) from the federal government.
>>>
>>> The Amateur Extra is the epitome of excellence. Once achieved,
>>> nothing else need be learned. Education ends. You have been
>>> told by his Most High Excellency, the Dill Instructor.
>>>
>>> All learning comes through having tiers and tiers of classes, of
>>> distinctions (enforced by law) right along with the social need of
>>> call letters written behind the name to signify a "title" all may see
>>> (and admire, respect) as if it is a dukedom, barony, or other
>>> noble rank. That is VERY IMPORTANT. Do not criticize any

>>> statements of the ruling classes of the "community."
>>>
>>> US amateur radio seems to have ceased being a hobby, an
>>> avocational activity done for personal recreation. It has become a
>>> LIFESTYLE...a True Belief.
>>>
>>> <cut to stock shot of Rod Serling and signpost up ahead, voice
>>> sign-off by Rod...up theme and take black...>
>>>
>>> LHA
>>
>>
>> And poor Mike is getting beat up for saying the W1AW signal was too wide.
>
> It has to be me! 8^)
>
> I've done enough post testing on this to be pretty sure that it isn't
>me though.
>
> The Waterfall screen in Digipan functions pretty nicely as a poor man's

>analyzer. The signal was putting "crap" all over the place.
>
> I wasn't the only person who noticed the problem.
>
> I was not able to duplicate anything like the problem with the RTTY
>contest, which had many strong signals, and should have been worse if my
>reciever was overloading. I'm impressed with how nicely the old 745
>performs.
>
> The problem - whatever it was - was in the W1AW signal.

It's extremely hard to believe that W1AW could ever foul up. They are
so Perfect!

You must have been out of the shack, watching Reality shows too
much!

LHA

517. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140055.21642.00003533@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85238

In article <RDNKb.29808$IM3.12043@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>> Unfortunately, I believe I have heard
>> the story of which Jim speaks...or at
>> least one exactly like it. (snip)
>
> Okay, I'll try one more time. Please read back over what I've said.
>Nothing was said by me about a denial of license based on other grounds. We
>were talking about license testing and everything I said had to do with
>license testing. What does Jim's story have to do with license testing?
>Instead, not able to respond to the actual question raised (character
>testing within the license tests), Jim has deceitfully, but clearly
>successfully, introduced another subject (denial of license) to undermine my
>earlier statements about license testing.

No one in this newsgroup is allowed to maintain a civil debate.

It should be a fact of life in this venue that morse code testing is a vital necessity to show the strength of character to the Amateur Community. Has nothing to do with federal regulations. It is all about mindset and flights of fantasy.

LHA

518. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140055.21642.00003532@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85240

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401070306.1996ea74@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<35OKb.29913$IM3.10132@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "JEP" wrote:
>> >
>> > Service means just that. Broadcasters
>> > have to do public service to keep
>> > broadcastings. Why do you think they
>> > do PSA's. No money involved, they
>> > do it free. (snip)
>>
>>
>> Nonsense. What public service is performed by those in the Citizens Band
>> Radio Service? Or the Family Radio Service? Or what public service,
>> especially free public service, is provided by the radio services used by
>> business, commerce, or industry?
>>
>>
>> > (snip) You also would have to prove
>> > that 75% of the amareurs provide a
>> > public service. Lets see, chasing DX,
>> > rag chewing with Barny down the
>> > road and checking the weather
>> > outside. Yep, thats sure public
>> > service-----NOT!
>>
>>
>> After reading that, it is obvious you have no intent to honestly discuss
>> the issue. And, since I have no desire to provide you with an opportunity
>to
>> spread misinformation, I will refrain from further comment.
>>
>> The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were again
>deleted
>> from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>Well sir, you perhaps need to do a little research so you can discuss

>this subject.

You FAR more than Dwight!

>I do see you are well educated but the comments from you
>are not entirely correct.

Not only are you incorrect but also (still) anonymous.

>The 3 above mentioned groups PAY for their
>priviledge. Check the rules.

Which three groups? Broadcasters do NOT "pay for any priviledge [sic]."
Broadcasters exist by selling air time for profit.

Amateur radio, by definition, is a radio activity NOT engaged in for
pecuniary reasons.

>Broadcasters have to do public service as
>do hams when called.

Nope. The regulations are quite different.

>My last comment on this subject as you will
>believe what you will. Kinda figures. A fairly new TECH class ham with
>all the answers. Come back 30 years from now and we will talk then.

Oh, my, the "experienced" olde-tyme hamme...who remains
anonymous.

I was first licensed 47 years ago...in commercial radio. I was in
military radio (big leagues, not piddly mobile things) over 50
years ago. Do you have the entire 5-volume set of Title 47 C.F.R.
at your disposal? Do you have bookshelves to put them on?
Does your bookshelf have protection from the rain (like having a
real roof overhead)?

>Of
>course you will still have that TECH that came out of a corn flakes
>box. Not a real Amateur ticket.

Oh, no...don't say it...you got Extra on a whim because two CBers
dared you and paid you $250 if you passed, right? :-)

We will call you Broose Two.

LHA

519. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140057.21642.00003534@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85243

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401061005.17b37199@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (somebody anonymous) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<C2yKb.28238$IM3.28074@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "JEP" wrote:
>> >
>> > (snip) Amateur Radio as a service is
>> > gone. It is only self serving now. Not
>> > a service but a high priced hobby.
>> > After all, it is called the Amateur
>> > Radio Service.
>>
>>
>> First, you're obviously confused about the word "service." In FCC
>> terminology, "service" refers to a group of frequencies meant to serve a
>> particular purpose for the users of those frequencies, not anything done by
>> the users of those frequencies. As a result, we have the Amateur Radio
>> Service, Radio Broadcast Services, Cable TV Relay Service, Maritime
>Service,
>> Personal Radio Services, Citizens Band Radio Service, Fixed Microwave
>> Services, and so on through a long list of other radio services. In other
>> words, the word "service" in Amateur Radio Service does not refer to any
>> "service" we might provide to others.
>>
>> Second, you're completely wrong about "service" being gone within the
>> Amateur Radio community. Based on what I've seen, I'd estimate as much as
>> 75% of the current operators are involved in some form of public service
>> related activity in any given year. Of course, the need for our help is
>> high, meaning even more should become involved, but that hardly suggests
>the
>> idea of service is gone today.
>>
>> The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were deleted from
>> this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>Service means just that.

No. All throughout Title 47 C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory
term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

>Broadcasters have to do public service to
>keep broadcastings.

It's the law.

>Why do you think they do PSA's. No money involved,
>they do it free.

Yes, in the wee small hours when their air rates are absolutely lowest.

>Amateur operators operate uder the same subset of
>rules.

Incorrect. Contact the FCC and have them explain the different radio services and which Parts are applicable to their radio service. Copies of all Parts are available free for download from the US Government Printing Office website (through a link at the FCC webpage).

>If they don't provide a public service when called they have no
>reason for being.

Look up the Radio Control Radio Service in Part 95, Title 47 C.F.R.

Absolutely NO "public service" required there...yet the R-Cers lobbied for and got a whole band of frequencies just for them.

>You also would have to prove that 75% of the
>amareurs provide a public service.

They do by maintaining a national pool of trained radio operators, aka Morsemen. This is a vital, necessary public service to save the world when aliens invade from outer space, disasters incapacitate all the emergency service infrastructure (only CW can work under such conditions), and when time machines are invented to transport all morsemen back to 1917 or 1943 and win foreign wars.

LHA

520. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:00:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107140058.21642.00003535@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85241

In article <f45722ac.0401061457.60c78d6@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401060040.6f3583e4@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040105212538.23171.00003179@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>>
>> > That gives him absolute permission to behave as an asshole off the
>> > radio. No problem.
>>
>> Again with the profanities, Lennie?
>
>Len, what's going on here?
>
>There were no outrages when Hans just called someone an a-hole.

It's "noblesse oblige" oriented, Brian. The "upper classes" and
royalty get to swear, vomit profanities, demean and denigrate the
lower classes because they all passed 20 WPM code tests.

It's the blue blood of the ruling amateurs. If you don't admire and
love and cherish their noble accomplishments, they turn blue and
use blue language. None others may do the same to them.

Maybe not blue, it's more like they are inviolate.

Stebe gets all red in the face and insists all are green with envy
for not being able to "radiate RF at great power" somehow
allowed to him alone. He's not yellow, doesn't shirk from trying
(vainly) to defend himself when he pales on thinking he's been
insulted.

Of course, any former E-5 or higher that thinks "asshole" is a
terribly profane word must be of the sissy pink coloring.

It's a gray area...

LHA

521. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:38:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFC601E.5060905@psu.edu>
Source record: 85246

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>> (snip)
>>>WK3C: December 30, 2004
>>>N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>>>KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
>>>Kim: June 1, 2008
>>
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>> (snip)
>>>WK3C: December 30, 2004
>>>N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>>>KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
>>>W5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>>Kim,
>>Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
>>and re-posting with no indication that you're
>>changing them? That kind of thing could
>>further reflect on your character.
>
>
>
> I think Kim's complaint is valid.

If Jim does not want to use Kim's callsign, he doesn't have to.I don't have a problem with it, but some people do. Even so, if she wishes to change the post, she should not put it in as if Jim posted it.

> Jim obviously has some issue with her
> callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has done
> with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the FCC and, if
> Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the FCC. Regardless,
> until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is legitimate and should be
> treated as such by all within the Ham radio community - just as any ham
> operator, including Jim, would expect his or her own callsign to be treated.

If I were in this situation, I would post a polite note with my callsign, and not post it as if Jim did the posting. I know until I

looked back up at the from area on the screen, I though it was from Jim.

I dobt any of us wants our posts altered. We could eventually get like the crazies thaat post here from tim to time.

- Mike KB3EIA -

522. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:39:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401071139.3fb53272@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85245

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FFB8AE9.9BAA862E@earthlink.net>...
> "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0401061448.5d618918@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com says...
> > > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > > > I'm in love.....
> > > >
> > > > http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
> > > >
> > > > ....or maybe in lust.
> > >
> > > Wowee!
> > >
> > > I Like Ike(com)!
> > >
> >
> > And a Wowee price $9995.00 (discounted) KJI Electronics
>
> I'll just keep slogging along with my ancient Orion. For the price of a
> '7800, I could own three Orions.
>
> Dave K8MN

But with the IC7800 you can save on forklift rental fees.

523. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:42:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFC612F.6080808@psu.edu>
Source record: 85247

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>> I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim
>>>obviously has some issue with her
>>>callsign. Without saying why, he refuses
>>>to use her callsign as he has done with
>>>everyone else on his list. That callsign
>>>was issued by the FCC and, if Jim has
>>>an issue with that, he should take it up
>>>with the FCC. Regardless, until the
>>>FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
>>>legitimate and should be treated as
>>>such by all within the Ham radio
>>>community - just as any ham operator,
>>>including Jim, would expect his or her
>>>own callsign to be treated.
>>
>>
>>Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and
>>politically correct.
>
>
>
> No, just civil, polite, manners, Dave. My mother wasn't thinking of
> political correctness when she taught me to try to respect others, even if
> they may not deserve it. Sadly, too many people today consider polite
> manners to be an unwelcomed human attribute, now described as political
> correctness by those people.
>
>
>
>>I'm certain that Jim has an issue with
>>Kim's call. Quite a number of us have
>>issues with Kim's call. Even Riley
>>Hollingsworth has issues with Kim's
>>call. For you to attempt the equation
>>of Kim's tacky choice of vanity call
>>with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.
>
>
>

> Regardless, the agency that Hollingsworth works for, and that issued the
> other callsigns on Jim's list, does equate the validity of Kim's callsign to
> Jim's. Some may wish to dismiss that, but doing so perhaps says a lot about
> their own character.

Regardless of the reasoning, do you concur with altering peoples posts
to reflect your own wishes?

- Mike KB3EIA

524. Re: Why you keep insisting on renewing 10-year learner permits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 19:55:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFC643A.2030601@psu.edu>
Source record: 85248

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>Perhaps it would be better if everyone were to just tell you that the
>>plan was the best thing they ever saw?
>>
>
>
> A lot of people have told me exactly that, but I'm sure there are some who
> share your view that I'm out to lunch. Life's a bitch, and then I'll die
> and they'll give my call sign away.

Do you really think I ever said you were out to lunch?. If I disagree with portions of you plan, that's a big part of why we're here; I've pointed out what I don't like (and even some parts I thought were okay).....Wow, I'm a thoroughgoing bastard, eh!

Your responses have been belittling and insulting for the most part. If statements like "lifes a bitch..." and "that's a novel idea" as a synonym for stupid and definition games are the best supporting arguments you can make for your proposal, it isn't going to go too far.

Sobeit!

- Mike KB3EIA -

525. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 20:01:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFC6590.4090907@psu.edu>
Source record: 85249

N2EY wrote:
> In article <RDNKb.29808$IM3.12043@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>>What does Jim's story have to do with license testing?
>
>
> Simple.
>
> It shows that the FCC has very wide authority to set license test criteria,
> including
> such concepts as "character" and "discipline". Merely passing the tests is not
> the only requirement for a license grant.
>
> Normally the FCC assumes that all applicants for a ham license are "of good
> character" unless there is a reason to suspect differently.
>
> I think FCC could indeed legally implement Hans' one-shot learner license with
> its upgrade-or-out provision. Their argument would be that someone who was a
> ham for 10 years and yet c/wouldn't pass the full-privs test simply didn't have
> the required "character" or "discipline" to stay in the ARS.

Hoo, I wonder how that would stand up in the courts! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

526. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 23:31:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFC96D7.5DFC6E04@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85252

Alun wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3FFBFB6A.66EFCC26@earthlink.net:
>
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >> "N2EY" wrote:
> >> > > (snip)
> >> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> >> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> >> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> >> > > Kim: June 1, 2008
> >>
> >> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >> > > (snip)
> >> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> >> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> >> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> >> > > W5TIT: June 1, 2008
> >>
> >> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >> > Kim,
> >> > Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
> >> > and re-posting with no indication that you're
> >> > changing them? That kind of thing could further reflect on your
> >> > character.
> >>
> >> I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim obviously has some issue with
> >> her
> >> callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has
> >> done with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the
> >> FCC and, if Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the
> >> FCC. Regardless, until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
> >> legitimate and should be treated as such by all within the Ham radio
> >> community - just as any ham operator, including Jim, would expect his
> >> or her own callsign to be treated.
> >
> > Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and politically correct.
> >
> > I'm certain that Jim has an issue with Kim's call. Quite a number of
> > us have issues with Kim's call. Even Riley Hollingsworth has issues
> > with Kim's call. For you to attempt the equation of Kim's tacky choice
> > of vanity call with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.

> >
> > You'll note that I used "further reflect on your character". The
> > touching up of another's post is one issue. The choice of calls is
> > another.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I don't think you can really separate them in this instance. We all know
> why Jim doesn't want to use her call, but at the same time I doubt if any
> of us would be pleased to appear on a list where everyone else had their
> call listed but we didn't. The obvious implication is that the person with
> no call is not a ham, even though we know that's not what Jim meant.
>
> You might not choose to have a call like Kim's, but can you honestly say
> you wouldn't correct someone's post if they did this to you?

I might not have chosen a call like Kim's? I flat out didn't choose a
call like Kim's. I can honestly say that I would not change the post of
another to make it appear that the original poster had written something
different than what was originally posted.

> As for the
> lack of an accompanying comment, have you considered that she might not > be able to
think of anything that wouldn't actually be worse than no
> comment?

I have no doubt at all that anything Kim would have written would have
been worse than no comment.

> If she can't think of anything good to say, she may be being polite by
> saying nothing.

I've not known Kim to be bound by politeness.

Dave K8MN

527. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 23:41:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85253

garigue wrote:
>
> Wait a second Dave ....you don't understand ... that 7800's display is in
> color and the Orion is in 50's BW I believe .... That in it self explains
> the price difference.

Well, Tom, there you go. Don't forget those two additional 32-bit processors too. Color and the 2 additional processors cost an additional six grand. But wait a minute--Icom's soon-to-come-lately 7800 has fewer roofing filters and one less band stacking register per band. I also like my real analog meter better than a digital simulation.

Drop by sometime. I'm only 35 miles west of Waynesburg.

Dave K8MN

> God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa..
>
> > I'll just keep slogging along with my ancient Orion. For the price of a
> > '7800, I could own three Orions.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

528. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 23:49:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFC9AFB.7B333C69@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85254

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
> > indication that you're changing them?
> >
>
> Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond that.

Changing it is one thing. Changing it and making appear that Jim wrote
are two quite different things.

> Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which he > and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.

It certainly is.

> Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.

Not by making the material look as if it is a quote of what Jim wrote,
it isn't.

> Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think > that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my right.

Under no circumstances could Kim remind me of the "Church Lady". As to
the sanctimonious twit reference: Is it your week to do the Walter
Matthau "Grumpy Old Men" role?

Dave K8MN

529. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-07 23:52:45 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.01.07.23.52.45.278790@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 85255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 11:23:23 -0500, Burp wrote:

> Two guys eating at Waffle House, one is a ham and the other a nonham.
>
>
> Nonham: "Geeeze, I love the smell of that waitress's perfume."
>
> Ham: "Yeah, I love the smell of generator fumes, it reminds
> me of field day next month."
>
>
> Burp

better yet.... the smell of a soldering station warming up as compared to
that of steak and eggs cooking. :)

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

530. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 00:02:48 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <I61Lb.67962$Cs3.8765987@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85256

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FFB8AE9.9BAA862E@earthlink.net...
> "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0401061448.5d618918@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com says...
> > > "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > > > I'm in love.....
> > > >
> > > > http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
> > > >
> > > > ....or maybe in lust.
> > >
> > > Wowee!
> > >
> > > I Like Ike(com)!
> > >
> >
> > And a Wowee price $9995.00 (discounted) KJI Electronics
>
> I'll just keep slogging along with my ancient Orion. For the price of a
> '7800, I could own three Orions.
>
> Dave K8MN

I believe that's the beauty of the Orion, it's never "ancient." The latest upgrade is just a download away. I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800 Pro or Pro II comes out.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

531. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 00:02:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <N61Lb.44004$Pg1.8318@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85257

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> As to the sanctimonious twit reference: Is it
> your week to do the Walter
> Matthau "Grumpy Old Men" role?

Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.

73, de Hans, K0HB

532. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 00:05:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401071605.582fed24@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85258

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<NsVKb.42856$Pg1.32031@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > I think FCC could indeed legally implement Hans' one-shot learner license
> > with
> > its upgrade-or-out provision. Their argument would be that someone who was
> > a
> > ham for 10 years and yet c/wouldn't pass the full-privs test simply didn't
> > have the required "character" or "discipline" to stay in the ARS.
>
> Nice try, Jim, but that wouldn't be their argument at all.

Maybe not.
>
> Their argument would be that the individual had not yet demonstrated
> knowledge of the technical qualifications for a standard license by passing
> the required written examination, and their learners permit had expired.

Perhaps.

Or maybe they'd use both arguments.

But said individual *had* demonstrated knowledge of the technical
qualifications for the privileges of the "learner's" license by
passing
the required examination, yet those privileges are revoked if the
learner doesn't learn fast enough.

While there is a precedent from over a quarter century ago, I think it
would be a hard sell to FCC. But perhaps I'm mistaken about that.

Even though I don't agree with every detail, I really do think you
should write it up and send it to FCC as a proposal (rather than a
comment) like those other 14 petitioners.

--

Back in the days of the one-shot Novice, a prospective ham could go
straight to Technician, General or Conditional. After 1967, the first
step
could be all the way to Advanced. And a certain number of new hams did
just
that, getting full privileges "right out of the box", as it were. Your
plan
would not allow that - every new ham would have to go the 'learner
license' route for at least two years. Some 'liberals' might wail and

wring
their hands about "hazing rituals" and "underclass", etc.

As you so succintly wrote in another post: "Boo hoo".

> It has nothing to do with "character" or "discipline".

Sure it does. With your plan, if someone doesn't have the "character"
or "discipline" to upgrade within the 8 year window, they're out of
the ARS until they do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

533. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 00:19:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjbl6$4o7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85279

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FFB8BC9.9CB4C0DF@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040106211822.23171.00003209@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> > eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
> >
> > WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> > KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> > KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> > K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> > K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> > AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> > N2EY: April 15, 2004
> > N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> > KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> > WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> > K3LT: September 15, 2004
> > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> > W5TIT: June 1, 2008
> >
> > Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Kim,
>
> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
> indication that you're changing them? That kind of thing could further
> reflect on your character.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Dave: First, phuck you and what you think "character" is all about. You are nothing short of a self-serving, high-nosed, snobbish, educated idiot--and nothing more; and some of those are even questionable. Second: on character, like I care.

And, if I've made a post I'VE OBVIOUSLY CHANGED IT OR AM JUST PLAIN REPOSTING IT. What is so hard about that? Jim refuses to put my callsign

associated with my prediction. I will add it whenever I feel (yeah, one of those "feeling" things you know nothing about) like it.

Kim W5TIT

534. Re: Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 00:38:09 UTC
From: Tim B <tim4accasla@accala.com>
Message-ID: <b645b$3ffca6c0$d1cc58f3$22369@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 85259
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:4bXKb.244616$8y1.1127909@attbi_s52...
> Good ones ..... how about ....

yes good ones indeed, but you forgot one of the big ones:

"But I always run legal power during contests!"

535. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 00:57:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <QV1Lb.22090$P%1.21313103@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85260

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:rmWKb.31268$IM3.24127@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
> And the efforts of REACT and its members are commendable. However, any
> public service performed is informal in nature, not the result of any
> regulatory stipulation imposed by the FCC or federal government. There is
> nothing in part 95 that mandates public service like that found in part
97.
>

OK, Dwight quote paragraph and section that states that amateurs MUST do
public service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

536. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 01:05:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <L12Lb.44234$Pg1.5183@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85261

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

> I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks
> down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800
> Pro or Pro II comes out.

First of all, I don't think he'd be poor, and why are you calling me a slob?

I'm placing my order.

73, de Hans, K0HB

537. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 01:13:37 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <592Lb.69024$Cs3.9139608@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85262

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:L12Lb.44234$Pg1.5183@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> > I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks
> > down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800
> > Pro or Pro II comes out.
>
> First of all, I don't think he'd be poor, and why are you calling me a
slob?
>
> I'm placing my order.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

I stand corrected, Hans...and still lol. ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

538. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 02:26:11 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401071826.6eaa42c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85263
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:<pan.2004.01.07.23.52.45.278790@127.0.0.1>...
> On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 11:23:23 -0500, Burp wrote:
>
> > Two guys eating at Waffle House, one is a ham and the other a nonham.
> >
> >
> > Nonham: "Geeeze, I love the smell of that waitress's perfume."
> >
> > Ham: "Yeah, I love the smell of generator fumes, it reminds
> > me of field day next month."
> >
> >
> > Burp
> better yet.... the smell of a soldering station warming up as compared to
> that of steak and eggs cooking. :)
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Phoenix, Arizona

Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny
of first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very
large belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in
years.

539. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 02:56:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107215625.12501.00005335@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85264

In article <N61Lb.44004$Pg1.8318@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.

How about Ann Margret? Or Diane Keaton?

73 de Jim, N2EY

540. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 02:56:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040107215626.12501.00005336@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85265

In article <ltVKb.31037$IM3.7669@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> It shows that the FCC has very wide
>> authority to set license test criteria,
>> including such concepts as
>> "character" and "discipline". (snip)
>
> Nonsense. It would be virtually impossible to test character or discipline
>in a radio license test. The FCC hasn't done it and probably wouldn't ever
>attempt to do so.

Point is, FCC has a wide latitude as far as testing and license requirements goes. You may not like the concept but The Congress does.

Didja know that in 1940 FCC required all US hams to either sign a loyalty oath or turn in their licenses? While not exactly a "character test", you can bet that some hams' backgrounds were checked.

Such things seemed far-fetched a few years ago. Not any more.

> Nice talking to you, Jim.
>
You too, Dwight.

73 de Jim, N2EY

541. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 03:28:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <x74Lb.7928$uF6.2395440@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85266

N2EY wrote:
> In article <N61Lb.44004$Pg1.8318@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.
>
>
> How about Ann Margret? Or Diane Keaton?

Is that the Grumpy old Man list?

- Mike KB3EIA -

542. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 04:57:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFCE328.1733823E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85267

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FFB8AE9.9BAA862E@earthlink.net...
> > "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0401061448.5d618918@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com says...
> > > > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<PsEKb.40121$Pg1.21943@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > > > > I'm in love.....
> > > > >
> > > > > http://www.icom.co.jp/world/products/amateur/7800/index.htm
> > > > >
> > > > > ....or maybe in lust.
> > > > >
> > > > Wowee!
> > > >
> > > > I Like Ike(com)!
> > > >
> > >
> > > And a Wowee price $9995.00 (discounted) KJI Electronics
> >
> > I'll just keep slogging along with my ancient Orion. For the price of a
> > '7800, I could own three Orions.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I believe that's the beauty of the Orion, it's never "ancient." The latest
> upgrade is just a download away. I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks
> down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800 Pro or Pro II comes out.

TT just keeps making it better and better. The rig is now about eight
months old and I've downloaded about ten firmware releases in that time.

Dave K8MN

543. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 04:59:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFCE3BD.A809BC92@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85268

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > As to the sanctimonious twit reference: Is it
> > your week to do the Walter
> > Matthau "Grumpy Old Men" role?
>
> Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.

See if you can break your contract. In "Grumpiest Old Men", you'll be
starring opposite Kim Walker.

Dave K8MN

544. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 05:03:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFCE48F.8441C52A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85269

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401070604.20f68202@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FF65476.C695DAAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > > It should be obvious, Bill. US ham radio is all about "working
> > > > DX on HF with CW."
> > >
> > > Same old song, huh? You wrote it and you're the only one singing it.
> > > HF amateur radio is many things to many people, but you aren't one of
> > > them.
> >
> > Thank God for small favors ! ! ! !
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> So you think God is keeping Len out of the amateur radio service?

It may well be, Brian. After all, the man has declared a several
decades old interest in amateur radio but he can't bring himself to act
upon the interest. Our modern "Moses" may not be able to enter the
promised land.

Dave K8MN

545. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 05:06:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FFCE556.62C5BE00@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85270

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> > I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks
> > down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800
> > Pro or Pro II comes out.
>
> First of all, I don't think he'd be poor, and why are you calling me a slob?
>
> I'm placing my order.

Free Advice

No strings attached

Absolutely FREE

Call Ten-Tec and have 'em ship you an Orion. If you don't fall in love
with it within the first thirty days, return it for a full refund (less
shipping charges). You can buy a fancy new four-wheeler with the extra
change you'd spend on the '7800.

Dave K8MN

546. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 05:26:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <JR5Lb.44577$Pg1.28826@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85271

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> > > As to the sanctimonious twit reference: Is it
> > > your week to do the Walter
> > > Matthau "Grumpy Old Men" role?
> >
> > Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.
>
> See if you can break your contract. In "Grumpiest Old Men", you'll be
> starring opposite Kim Walker.
>

I ain't that grumpy. In fact I feel a spell of downright warm fuzzy friendliness coming on, and genuine concern and empathy for the opinions and feelings of those who have lost their clues and don't know where to find them.

73, de Hans "He isn't a nice man" K0HB

547. Re: shut your mouth, transhark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 05:48:32 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Qa6Lb.8179$wD3.1271@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85272
Cross-posted to: es.rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

"Sir Francis Drake" <georgeonthebrain@baron.net> wrote in message
news:btiqh4$787$1@news.x-echo.com...
> You know nothing you can prove nothing
> and you have no hope of proving nothing.
> How dare you use Dick N0BK to further
> your gay anti legal CB agenda. What the
> fuck is wrong with you oh I know
> too much tubesteak in your diet rotflmao
> ..now go stick a hose up your ass and have
> Steveo suck on it.

YAWN!!!!! Is the anyway for an
extra class ham to act George Busch wa3moj?
You have been troll RRCB for over three
years now, thousands of screen nics to by pass
kill files, tens of thousands of posts using foul
language, harassing, accusatory just plain
trolling..... This from a person over
fifty years of age.

Landshark

548. Re: Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 06:42:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFCFBD0.8010106@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>Whoppers heard at the amateur radio club meeting last
>night:
>
>
>"I got my DXCC the honest way."
>
>"It's in mint condition, I used it for only a few hours."
>
>"I'll sell it to you for what I paid for it."
>
>
>
>
Was that meeting held at a Burger King? :-)

>
>
>
>
>

549. Re: Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 06:46:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFCFCCA.6020104@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
>
>
>
>AND NOW FOR THE GRANDDADDY OF WHOPPERS ....... drum roll .....
>
>CW always gets through .......
>
>
>
Well, that's better than "CB always gets through... on my TV set,
stereo, etc
because the neighbor is running his "lyneyr"...."
```

550. Re: How wide is a Moirse CW pulse?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 08:10:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401080010.7e383e26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85275

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040104072950.29660.00002360@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <7ZMJb.36054$Pg1.12973@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> There was an ARRL HQ station before W1AW. What was its callsign?
> >
> > -----> W1MK
>
> You are correct, sir! And before that, it was 1MK
>
> >> There's a second callsign for the ARRL lab. What is/was it?
> >
> > -----> W1INF
> >
> "It's Never Finished" - again correct.
>
> >More trivia: There is an IARU HQ call sign. What is it?
>
> That's easy: NU1AW
>
> >While it may
> >have a certain familiarity about it, especially the suffix, what is the
> >significance of the prefix?
>
> The original system for licensed amateur calls was a number and two or three
> letters. Maxim held 1AW, for example. This worked fine until amateur began
> working internationally and there was no way to tell what country a ham was
> in. When the first shortwave QSO was made by in November of 1925, the stations
> involved were 1QP, 1MO and 8AB - the last one being in France.
>
> So amateurs invented the idea of unofficial prefixes. "NU" meant "North
> america, United states". So while Maxim's call was shown on the license as 1AW,
> on the air he would use NU1AW to indicate where he was. Other countries had
> different prefixes, all according to the unoffficial system
>
> To emphasize that the prefixes were unofficial, they were usually written lower
> case: nu1AW

They had a shift key on their paddles or what??

> The situation was finally sorted out at one of the radio conferences of the
> '20s (1927, I think) and the USA decided that American ham calls would all

> start with W (in CONUS) and K (outside CONUS).
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

551. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 09:38:15 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.01.08.09.38.12.18482@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 85276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 18:26:11 -0800, JEP wrote:

>
> Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny of
> first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very large
> belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in years.
hmmmm. you must have run into a few of the rednecks because a lot of us
aren't this way at all.

Me, I wear blue jeans, button down shirts (many styles and colors to
choose from) and sneakers or boots most of the time.

I was a bit overweight for a while (bad diet) but that is going away to
the tune of 10 lbs. a month (thank you Dr. Atkins!). Regular exercise
doesn't hurt either.

now... about your opinion. perhaps you should relegate it to a much
narrower forum? its an over-generalization that makes you look foolish.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

552. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 09:41:51 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <zB9Lb.78125$Cs3.10990912@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85277

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FFCE556.62C5BE00@earthlink.net...
> "K�HB" wrote:
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
> >
> > > I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks
> > > down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800
> > > Pro or Pro II comes out.
> >
> > First of all, I don't think he'd be poor, and why are you calling me a
slob?
> >
> > I'm placing my order.
>
> *Free Advice*
>
> *No strings attached*
>
> *Absolutely FREE*
>
> Call Ten-Tec and have 'em ship you an Orion. If you don't fall in love
> with it within the first thirty days, return it for a full refund (less
> shipping charges). You can buy a fancy new four-wheeler with the extra
> change you'd spend on the '7800.
>
> Dave K8MN

Not to mention, support a product made in the USA.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

553. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 10:11:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108051149.23171.00003296@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85278

In article <x74Lb.7928$uF6.2395440@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <N61Lb.44004$Pg1.8318@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.
>>
>>
>> How about Ann Margret? Or Diane Keaton?
>
>Is that the Grumpy old Man list?
>
Who could be grumpy in their presence?

And at the very top of the list: Jan Smithers, best known as "Bailey Quarters" (turns 55 this year).

73 de Jim, N2EY

554. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 10:47:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjcdd$685@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85280

Mike, how in the Hell is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear like someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that actually sent it? The "art" of making it look like someone else had sent it would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had also changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.

That Dave Heil is so damned bored with life that he has to concoct things from thin air is usual and status quo for him. Don't be so quick to jump on a Dave Heil bandwagon...because those wagons don't travel far at all.

For anyone with computer sense, it is unreasonable to even consider that a post could be issued under the guise of someone else--contrary to the opinion that it can be done. And, when I resubmit "The Pool" list with my callsign attributed to my prediction date, it is certainly weak, at best, to display anger and make it seem as though I was doing *anything* else but resubmitting a post an attributing my callsign to my prediction.

However, if you or anyone else, is so desperate to reach for the stars in some display of dislike for me--then go for it.

Kim W5TIT

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FFC612F.6080808@psu.edu...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> >>Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >>> I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim
> >>>obviously has some issue with her
> >>>callsign. Without saying why, he refuses
> >>>to use her callsign as he has done with
> >>>everyone else on his list. That callsign
> >>>was issued by the FCC and, if Jim has
> >>>an issue with that, he should take it up
> >>>with the FCC. Regardless, until the
> >>>FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
> >>>legitimate and should be treated as
> >>>such by all within the Ham radio
> >>>community - just as any ham operator,
> >>>including Jim, would expect his or her
> >>>own callsign to be treated.
> >>

> >>
> >>Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and
> >>politically correct.
> >
> >
> >
> > No, just civil, polite, manners, Dave. My mother wasn't thinking of
> > political correctness when she taught me to try to respect others, even
if
> > they may not deserve it. Sadly, too many people today consider polite
> > manners to be an unwelcomed human attribute, now described as political
> > correctness by those people.
> >
> >
> >
> >>I'm certain that Jim has an issue with
> >>Kim's call. Quite a number of us have
> >>issues with Kim's call. Even Riley
> >>Hollingsworth has issues with Kim's
> >>call. For you to attempt the equation
> >>of Kim's tacky choice of vanity call
> >>with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.
> >
> >
> >
> > Regardless, the agency that Hollingsworth works for, and that issued
the
> > other callsigns on Jim's list, does equate the validity of Kim's
callsign to
> > Jim's. Some may wish to dismiss that, but doing so perhaps says a lot
about
> > their own character.
>
>
> Regardless of the reasoning, do you concur with altering peoples posts
> to reflect your own wishes?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA
>

555. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 10:49:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjcga$62n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85281

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FFC601E.5060905@psu.edu...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> >>> (snip)
> >>>WK3C: December 30, 2004
> >>>N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> >>>KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> >>>Kim: June 1, 2008
> >>
> >
> >>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>> (snip)
> >>>WK3C: December 30, 2004
> >>>N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> >>>KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> >>>W5TIT: June 1, 2008
> >>
> >
> > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> >>Kim,
> >>Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts
> >>and re-posting with no indication that you're
> >>changing them? That kind of thing could
> >>further reflect on your character.
> >
> >
> >
> > I think Kim's complaint is valid.
>
> If Jim does not want to use Kim's callsign, he doesn't have to.I don't
> have a problem with it, but some people do. Even so, if she wishes to
> change the post, she should not put it in as if Jim posted it.
>
>
>
> > Jim obviously has some issue with her
> > callsign. Without saying why, he refuses to use her callsign as he has
done
> > with everyone else on his list. That callsign was issued by the FCC and,
if

> > Jim has an issue with that, he should take it up with the FCC.
Regardless,
> > until the FCC says otherwise, that callsign is legitimate and should be
> > treated as such by all within the Ham radio community - just as any ham
> > operator, including Jim, would expect his or her own callsign to be
treated.
>
> If I were in this situation, I would post a polite note with my
> callsign, and not post it as if Jim did the posting. I know until I
> looked back up at the from area on the screen, I though it was from Jim.
>
> I dobt any of us wants our posts altered. We could eventually get like
> the crazies thaat post here from tim to time.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Oh, yeah, Mike. And God forbid that you think that Jim posted my prediction with MY callsign next to it, rather than my name!!! Oh, that would be just awful...

Sheesh,

Kim W5TIT

556. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 10:51:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjcjk$6iv@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85282

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:l%WKb.31368$IM3.1238@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim
> > > obviously has some issue with her
> > > callsign. Without saying why, he refuses
> > > to use her callsign as he has done with
> > > everyone else on his list. That callsign
> > > was issued by the FCC and, if Jim has
> > > an issue with that, he should take it up
> > > with the FCC. Regardless, until the
> > > FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
> > > legitimate and should be treated as
> > > such by all within the Ham radio
> > > community - just as any ham operator,
> > > including Jim, would expect his or her
> > > own callsign to be treated.
> >
> >
> > Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and
> > politically correct.
>
>
> No, just civil, polite, manners, Dave. My mother wasn't thinking of
> political correctness when she taught me to try to respect others, even if
> they may not deserve it. Sadly, too many people today consider polite
> manners to be an unwelcomed human attribute, now described as political
> correctness by those people.
>

Ahem...at least he hasn't said he's going to "pray for you" yet. I love it
when someone says that to me with that certain "tone of voice" LOL

>
> > I'm certain that Jim has an issue with
> > Kim's call. Quite a number of us have
> > issues with Kim's call. Even Riley
> > Hollingsworth has issues with Kim's
> > call. For you to attempt the equation
> > of Kim's tacky choice of vanity call
> > with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.
>
>

> Regardless, the agency that Hollingsworth works for, and that issued the
> other callsigns on Jim's list, does equate the validity of Kim's callsign
to
> Jim's. Some may wish to dismiss that, but doing so perhaps says a lot
about
> their own character.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Kim W5TIT

557. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 10:59:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjd42$7du@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85283

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:btg117$itb@library2.airnews.net...
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040106211822.23171.00003209@mb-m05.aol.com...
Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
W5TIT: June 1, 2008

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

WAIT...oh, I was going to change this to show that it is posted from Kim
Walker but, oh my gosh look! It says "From Kim Walker" in the list and,
gosh, let me check now--yep, that pesky little Header has my Yahoo email
address *just like always* and, why just look at that, it even has the same
routing information as always.

It's obvious up front, surely, to anyone not *searching* for the sake of
disagreement and dislike, that this is from anyone but Jim/N2EY. And, it's
obvious, since *I posted to him once and asked him to include my callsign,*
that I am simply adding my callsign to the list. And, of course it's
obvious, right up front from the "From" line, then by further investigation
(if some stupido really needed to go further) into the Header, that this was
sent by someone other than Jim/N2EY.

So, I guess I will no longer have to even bother with those who can't see
the obvious.

Oh, yeah: Kim W5TIT

558. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:00:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjd5u$7kc@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85284

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:juMKb.41220$Pg1.29657@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > What mode are those "foul mouthed yahoos" using? It isn't CW.....
>
> Jim obviously isn't a DX'er, or he'd know about the infamous "pileup
police"
> shenanigans regularly heard around 14.023 +/-. I could send you some .wav
> files that aren't even fit to air on rrap.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

You actually spend time recording it, huh? Wow, I am not so show I would look forward to retirement.

Kim W5TIT

559. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:02:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjd8p$797@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85285

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:RDNKb.29808$IM3.12043@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Unfortunately, I believe I have heard
> > the story of which Jim speaks...or at
> > least one exactly like it. (snip)
>
>
> Okay, I'll try one more time. Please read back over what I've said.
> Nothing was said by me about a denial of license based on other grounds.
We
> were talking about license testing and everything I said had to do with
> license testing. What does Jim's story have to do with license testing?
> Instead, not able to respond to the actual question raised (character
> testing within the license tests), Jim has deceitfully, but clearly
> successfully, introduced another subject (denial of license) to undermine
my
> earlier statements about license testing.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I thought he'd been responding to your analogy that "character" is not
something to be tested for (paraphrasing there). Sorry...

Kim W5TIT

560. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:03:18 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401080303.58223c87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85286

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<gJsKb.11587$6B.5675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > I understand Kim's point. Lets try
> > it from this perspective. If you're one
> > of the millions of immigrants entering
> > this country, the speech we use on
> > the radio, and on the radio tests, in
> > this country is not already in the
> > "toolbox." And Spanish certainly isn't
> > in the "toolbox" of many other Hams
> > in this country. So, even if you ignore
> > any skills needed for the voice modes
> > (however minor), there is still some
> > validity in Kim's argument. Spanish is
> > use more often the CW in this (snip)
>
>
> Wow! See what happens when you edit a sentence without checking it
> afterwards. That last sentence should read "Spanish is used" and "more often
> than CW."
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

No sweat, Dwight. Only the very petty folks will nitpick about minor
spelling errors or grammatical misuses on USENET. (Usually in an
attempt to compensate for the invalidity of their own statements.)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

561. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:04:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjdcl$7v5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85287

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:hRNKb.29850$IM3.13607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> >
> > I hate to say it, Jim, but this is one
> > of those intangibles that fall under
> > the catagory of "if you don't get it,
> > I can't explain it to you."
> >
> > Kim's got it, but doesn't like it. I
> > can respect that. Bill's got it too,
> > but doesn't appear to want to let
> > on that he's got it. (Broken record
> > mode: But the FCC..., but the
> > FCC..., but the FCC...) Dwight?
> > No comment.
>

Bert: I just noticed this. I cannot believe you said that. I cannot believe you are acting like that. I *GET* that you like CW testing and you should *GET* that I don't. THAT is all there is to *GET*. It's that simple.

Kim W5TIT

>
> Excuse me, Bert. Before you continue discussing whether I "get"
something
> or not, read back over what I've actually said and notice that absolutely
> none of it had anything whatsoever to do with the separate issue raised by
> Jim. We were talking about license testing. My comments had to do with
> license testing. Jim changed the subject to license denial based on other
> grounds. I've made no comments on that subject.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

562. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:07:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjdj4$89v@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85288

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:4RVKb.60915$Cs3.7230567@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:35OKb.29913$IM3.10132@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "JEP" wrote:
> > >
> > > Service means just that. Broadcasters
> > > have to do public service to keep
> > > broadcastings. Why do you think they
> > > do PSA's. No money involved, they
> > > do it free. (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > Nonsense.
>
> I just love how you so cavalierly proclaim other's opinions and/or
> statements as "nonsense." Kim was right on target re. same.
>
> > What public service is performed by those in the Citizens Band
> > Radio Service?
>
> Gee, the Office of Homeland Security disagrees with you, Dwight. Should
your
> statement be labeled as "nonsense" or just plain "ignorant?"
>
> > The newsgroups "rec.radio.shortwave" and "rec.radio.cb" were again
> deleted
> > from this reply (off-topic in those newsgroups).
>
> Good call.
>
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

BERT. I still can't believe I am seeing this!! YOU are getting way too
upset...LOL

Kim W5TIT

563. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:10:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btjdp0$8mu@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85289

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401080303.58223c87@posting.google.com...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<gJsKb.11587$6B.5675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > >
> > > I understand Kim's point. Lets try
> > > it from this perspective. If you're one
> > > of the millions of immigrants entering
> > > this country, the speech we use on
> > > the radio, and on the radio tests, in
> > > this country is not already in the
> > > "toolbox." And Spanish certainly isn't
> > > in the "toolbox" of many other Hams
> > > in this country. So, even if you ignore
> > > any skills needed for the voice modes
> > > (however minor), there is still some
> > > validity in Kim's argument. Spanish is
> > > use more often the CW in this (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > Wow! See what happens when you edit a sentence without checking it
> > afterwards. That last sentence should read "Spanish is used" and "more
often
> > than CW."
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> No sweat, Dwight. Only the very petty folks will nitpick about minor
> spelling errors or grammatical misuses on USENET. (Usually in an
> attempt to compensate for the invalidity of their own statements.)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

OK, I see...you're getting up early, too. ;) ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

564. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 11:57:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108065728.11022.00003283@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85290

<kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>Mike, how in the

[expletive deleted]

>is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear like
>someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that
>actually sent it?

The problem is that you *didn't* alter the number
of > symbols at the beginning of the line, so it
looks like I wrote something that I didn't. That's why there's
no > in front of the "[expletive deleted]" part that I wrote above.

>The "art" of making it look like someone else had sent it
>would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had also
>changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.

Simply going in and changing what someone else wrote without
changing the > symbols is misattribution and one of the very few
things that are almost universally condemned on Usenet. Headers
simply tell what the number of > symbols means.

Of course it was all probably just a small mistake but I thought you'd
want to know.

73 de Jim, N2EY

565. Re: Laptops FS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 12:14:15 UTC
From: joe <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <_ObLb.6$bf7.0@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85291
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

He looks like he could be gay as well with those faggot chaps...

joe@joe.net wrote:
> I am N4CND and I am stoned. Got it?
>
> Roger wrote:
>
>> "Lloyd" <lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
>> news:F87017833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
>> On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 19:51:32 -0500, joe@joe.net <joe@joe.net> wrote:
>>
>>> What the hell does this have to do with ham radio dumbass?
>>
>>
>>
>> Why do you top-post and include 70 lines just to type one sentence
>> dumbass?
>> You ever been around the net before dumbass?
>>
>> He's been around jolly Wogie Wussman too long. Birds of a feather and all
>> that, old chap.
>>
>>
>
> ---
>

566. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 12:45:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <uhcLb.32947$IM3.30486@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85292

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> (snip) The discussion I was engaged
> in w/Bill, K2UNK, concerned the
> "character" aspect of Morse code
> testing. (snip)
>
> (snip) Well Dwight, the above is the
> issue that Bill, JEP, Kim, Jim, and I
> were discussing. Get it yet?

However, I wasn't discussing anything with Bill, Jep, Kim, or you. I responded to something Jim had said and we had exchanged several messages on that subject (with the subject clearly stated).

> I do notice that this is not the first
> (or tenth, for that matter) time you've
> joined into a thread, (or a branch
> thereof) pulled the subject in a
> different direction, and then whined
> about a response by claiming that
> what you said had nothing to do
> with a "separate" issue.

In case you haven't noticed, the subject you're discussing isn't the subject listed in the subject line of this thread. The subject you're discussing spun off from that original discussion, as the subject Jim and I were discussing spun off from yours. That's fairly typical of newsgroup discussions. Therefore, I think it's fairly important to know what is being discussed before making comments, especially comments about the participants (not the subject, but the participants - you said, "Kim's got it, (snip) Bill's got it too, (snip) Dwight No comment."). Enough said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

567. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 13:03:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%ycLb.32963$IM3.14861@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85293

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > (snip)
>
> I just love how you so cavalierly
> proclaim other's opinions and/or
> statements as "nonsense." Kim
> was right on target re. same.

It's a matter of opinion, Bert. From my perspective, it is nonsense. Of course, it doesn't become so just because I say it. Others, including you, are obviously free to have a different opinion.

> > What public service is performed by
> > those in the Citizens Band Radio
> > Service?
>
> Gee, the Office of Homeland Security
> disagrees with you, Dwight. (snip)

I ask a question and you respond by saying DHS disagrees.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

568. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 13:20:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WOcLb.32978$IM3.28342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85294

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > And the efforts of REACT and its
> > members are commendable. However,
> > any public service performed is informal
> > in nature, not the result of any regulatory
> > stipulation imposed by the FCC or
> > federal government. There is nothing in
> > part 95 that mandates public service like
> > that found in part 97.
>
> OK, Dwight quote paragraph and section
> that states that amateurs MUST do public
> service.

Okay, Dee, show me where I said Amateurs "must" do public service. Part 97 offers that as one purpose of the ARS and gives us the mandate (authority) to do so (ARES and so on), but it certainly isn't required.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

569. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 13:55:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <EjdLb.33011$IM3.27487@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85295

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Regardless of the reasoning, do you
> concur with altering peoples posts
> to reflect your own wishes?

Of course not. But do you concur with attempts to alter the perception of a person's status as a Ham by blatantly omitting that person's callsign in a list containing only the callsigns of others? Jim is aware of what he's doing. Kim had already asked him to include her callsign (a request which should have been unnecessary).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

570. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 14:04:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401080604.67c810d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85296

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401071646.2c556261@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401070604.20f68202@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FF65476.C695DAAD@earthlink.net>...

> > Thank God for small favors ! ! ! !
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> So you think God is keeping Len out of the amateur radio service?

I hope so. Nothing that good could have happened by accident, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

571. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 15:04:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <MjeLb.404$Pg.327@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85297

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> You actually spend time recording it, huh?
>

Common practice when working weak signals in DXpedition mode. (Didn't you
often wonder why some DSP rigs have that little 'snippet catcher' in them?)

73, de Hans, K0HB

572. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 15:17:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%veLb.406$Pg.224@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85298

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

>
> Not to mention, support a product made in the USA.
>

Ya mean like an AMC Gremlin, or an MFJ (anything they make), or Budweiser beer?

I'll do my part for the hillbilly economy and support Jack Daniels. You and Dave can support TenTec.

73, de Hans, K0HB

573. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 15:47:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401080747.1bb17b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85299

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040107140058.21642.00003535@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> It's "noblesse oblige" oriented, Brian. The "upper classes" and
> royalty get to swear, vomit profanities, demean and denigrate the
> lower classes because they all passed 20 WPM code tests.

Nope.

It's the standard YOU have tried to set, Scummy. YOU are the one
stating "we" (the Amateur community) don't respect
"professionals"...yet here you are spewing antgonisms, profanities and
boldface lies.

So, there you go.

> Stebe gets all red in the face and insists all are green with envy
> for not being able to "radiate RF at great power" somehow
> allowed to him alone. He's not yellow, doesn't shirk from trying
> (vainly) to defend himself when he pales on thinking he's been
> insulted.

On contraire again, Lennie...I get to radiate more than adequate
"great power". I hardly ever use more than 200 watts on ANY band,
however, since it's not necessary to use it.

Of course, unlike YOU, I have a station license that allows me to
establish a radio station wherein I can use it.

> Of course, any former E-5 or higher that thinks "asshole" is a
> terribly profane word must be of the sissy pink coloring.

Blatant evidence that you are not in touch with the "new"
professional Armed Forces, Lennie. That kind of language, although
rampant in your day, can get a prefessional soldier busted or fined.

Of course WE knew that, since all of your references to the Armed
Forces start off "Back in 1953 at ADA..."...

> It's a gray area...

Nothing "gray" about it, Lennie. YOU keep trying to foist
yourself off as a professional, both as an author and as an engineer,
but YOUR conduct and YOUR language lend a different example.

Sucks to be you, I'd say...

Steve, K4YZ

574. Pirate SSTV on 6925

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 16:21:32 UTC
From: Bigali <bigali@hotfreqnews.net>
Message-ID: <btk026$s7f$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"No Name" <noname@nohost.com> wrote in message
news:vvpiqv2sk3ff9f@news.supernews.com...
> Check out 6925usb in the evenings for Pirate SSTV.
>
>

That guy has been broadcasting some interesting stuff for quite
a while. Says he's located in the Ozark Mountains.

Bigali

575. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 16:32:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85301

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > And unfortunately for you, your lies ARE archived in this very
> >forum.
>
> No "lies."

"I am going to get my Extra Lite out of the box".

"The ARRL is dishonest".

Do you really want your nose rubbed in ALL of them, Lennie?

> > Sucks to be you, Leonard.
>
> Only when I turn on the ShopVac.

I guess that's the ONLY suction in your house, Lennie...Which
means it REALLY sucks to be you...

> >> The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham
> >> license and be proficient in morse code...(SNIP)
> >
> > Oh geeze...Here we go again.
>
> A 1x2 has stated the Word on that: The ONLY way one can be
> "interested in radio" is to get a ham license and be a morseman.
>
> That's the Official Word.

Quotes, Lennie...Cite the message thread, please (I have learned
to not trust ANYthing you say unless I can cross-reference it to a
third party source)

> > Lennie, we're STILL waiting on you to cite the quotes wherein
> >you've established this opinion.
>
> Observation of the human condition for over a half century.
>
> What's your excuse?

Once again you avoid the request to prove your assertions with
some sort of facts.

And so far, your "observations" are just bitter rants against
just about anything that you can't/weren't able to understand or
master yourself.

That's not "proof", unless just being a loser is your goal, in
which case I'd say you have excelled.

> > It's certainly not true in MY case, and just one more example of
> >how you feel free to take liberties with the truth.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...role-playing in a fantasy land is not "reality" nor
> is it "truth."

There's only one "role-player" here, Lennie. Almost everyone
else here HAS an Amateur Radio license and PARTICIPATES in teh "Real
McCoy".

YOU are the outsider here.

> > I never claimed to be an engineer...But I did provide numerous
> >references from that job that proved you WRONG on numerous occassions.
>
> Never once did you "prove" anything. Your imagination tells only
> you that you were "right." Your imagination is WRONG.

Sure I did. Starting with simple assertions about the
"engineering community"...You said that there was "no such thing" and
I provided you with an immediate quote from one of the periodicals
that cited that very concept.

And you further went on to say "real engineers" didn't need/use
Amateur Radio...I gave you the callsigns of not only 13 engineers, but
three of them were PhD's.

> > I guess that had to hurt, knowing a "non-engineer" had access to
> >references that took a bite out of your rants...
>
> "Hurt?" Only my sides from laughing. "References" from a weekly
> newspaper from Podunk Hollow, TN, hardly counts for anything...

They were hardly from "Podunk Hollow", Lennie. They were
professional journals and periodicals.

(Squirm a bit harder, Scummy...)

> > Again with the "1930's" rant, Lennie?
>
> Call it "transistorized 1930s," Stebe.

I call it your "1930's rant", Lennie...It's not truthful, nor
even representitive of anything associated with MODERN Amateur Radio.

> Standards and Practices remain the same as 70 years ago.
> Imagination of Public Service and self-serving glory are still the
> same. If ARRL writes it, all MUST believe, for their words are

> sacred.

No, they don't.

But if you NEED to believe that in order to sleep well at night,
please, be my guest...

> > And in any case your sleight's against Amateur Radio's PROVEN
> >track record of being able to provide the very emergency services you
> >claim as "ineffectual" or "irrelevent" are DISproven over and ovr,
> >even in the 21st Century.
>
> Of course (he said, humoring the mentally ill)...when any disaster
> strikes, all the communications infrastructure fails but amateurs can
> jump in and save the day. Using morse code, of course.
>
> [try "slight" and "over"...]

Try "sleight" and excuse me for dropping the "e".

> > There's no "hatred" of the "pros", Lennie. Only PROlific liars
> >such as yourself. That you claim to have been a "radio" professional
> >is unfortuante.
>
> Not a "claim," an actual fact...provable through several third-party
> sources. You keep trying to say I never worked in the electronics
> industry at all. I did. In aerospace since 1956. Got paid for it.

I never said you "never" worked in electronics, Your Lyingness.

>>I<< said you never amounted to anything more than a very
determined bench technician. I have complimented your cut-and-paste
skills, however.

> Or, reject all the facts, ignore reality, and say everything I've written
> is "lies." That doesn't make your statement "true." It never will.

Long list of "FACTS" snipped.

The FACT is that I have spoken with people who KNEW you and wee
not impressed.

The FACT is that YOU refuse to accept that your "professional"
and military "experience" is NOT Amateur Radio.

This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.

You have yet to demonstrate an even rudimentary understanding of
what it is, let alone have participated in it.

The FACT is that YOU have been caught in NUMEROUS fabrications or
misrepresentations of truth and "called" on them over and over.

YOU have no credibility herein as a result of that, Sir Putzy.

And (I've said this before) it's just peachy with me that you
know more about electronics than I do or ever did, Lennie...Being able
to quote Shannon's Law in your sleep is irrelevent here.

> >> It's a wonderful life.
> >
> > Yes, it is. Too bad you'll die having not known exactly HOW
> >wonderful it is.
>
> Perhaps. I'm not complaining. Why are you complaining?

I only complain about having to tolerate compulsive liars and
antagonists such as yourslef.

> I had to sit with the family gathering again to watch "It's A Wonderful
> Life." :-) After seeing it so many times, it's still a good motion
> picture even if very dated.

"Family gathering"...?!?! You, Mrs Lennie and the cat?

> >> Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, Brian, all the best to you
> >> and your family.
> >
> > At least there was ONE person in this forum for you to exchange
> >greetings with. Good for you. No one should be alone for the
> >holidays. Even creeps like you, Lennie.
>
> Hardly "alone" during the Holidays. Wasn't even here (physically).
> An inconvenience to access another's computer to check e-mail,
> even if a close relative.

I imagine the "inconvienience" was hoping they didn't see where
you "hang out" and then follow behind you to see how you act in
public.

> Why do you insist on painting all those imaginary scenarios, trying
> to denigrate others?

Because those are the "scenarios" that your conduct engenders.

> I don't live in newsgroups...(SNIP)

Sure you do.

> (UNSNIP)...nor do I look to the computer to give me
> either acceptance or love or respect.

Good for you. The computer is an inanimate object.

However the people you hope to snowjob with your wisdom and wit
aren't, and unfortuantely for you, you've completely ruined your
credibility, regardless of how "smart" you may really be.

> Never thought that way since
> getting on BBSs the first time 19 years ago. Computer-modem
> communications are just another form of communications...just like

> radio. You haven't reached that point in understanding this medium
> yet...you can holler incessantly that I "lie" and vomit all sorts of bad
> names but none of that is "true" anywhere but in your head.

Sorry Lennie. Repeat that over and over if you care to, but the
facts are that there are still thousands of pages of archived RRAP
fodder wherein you've been caught with your britches down over and
over.

> So far you've not been able to "force" me to do anything, not even
> with vague "threats" of some sort of veiled physical harm. Acting
> the bully in here only demonstrates what bullies do. This isn't a
> "personal battleground" that must be totally occupied by your
> personal perceived slights/insults/whatever...yet you keep on with
> that sort of thing. Ho hum. Boring to most readers. Doesn't work,
> can never work...except in the fantasyland withing your head.

That you're responding to this lays waste to THAT argument,
Lennie.

That it's "boring" to "most" readers is irrelevent. These words
are directed to one person...that they can or may be read by others is
incidental to the medium in which they are offered.

As for "keeping on" with insults, etc, you should read some of
your own postings. Why do you chastise me for doing that which you
ahve made a career?

And "force" you to do anything...?!?! If by humiliating your
over and over that you "resist" actually becomming a licensed Amateur
just to "spite" me, then yes, Your Putziness, I "forced" you to not be
a Ham.

> Try to remember that you are NOT some high-rank NCO and that
> this is NOT some kind of military service. Playing the Dill Sergeant
> won't get you out of any pickle you make by your own words.

I'm not the one with the lies to overcome, Lennie.

As for being a bully, etc, that's your cowardly way of trying to
duck out of the "fight" YOU started. Most bullies ARE cowards,
Lennie, and I'd say you've done a fair job of "proving" that, too.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

576. Croatia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 17:16:30 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946A7CDDFB124elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85302

Another domino falls.

No more code testing in 9A now.

They are now also the first country in Region 1 to get 7100-7200 kHz, not otherwise due until next year, I think. I'll be looking for 9A1A in 7150-7200 in the next contest.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

577. Re: Pirate SSTV on 6925

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 17:21:04 UTC
From: Z1 <z1@zappo.com>
Message-ID: <KigLb.73092$BA6.1483316@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 85304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What type of software do you need to see this? Can you download any from the Internet?

Z1
"Bigali" <bigali@hotfreqnews.net> wrote in message
news:btk026$s7f$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "No Name" <noname@nohost.com> wrote in message
> news:vvpiqv2sk3ff9f@news.supernews.com...
> > Check out 6925usb in the evenings for Pirate SSTV.
> >
> >
>
> That guy has been broadcasting some interesting stuff for quite
> a while. Says he's located in the Ozark Mountains.
>
> Bigali
>
>
>

578. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 17:48:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401080948.4a286fab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85303

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> simulation.
>
My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.

Also Made In USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

579. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 18:46:19 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401081046.6f636ae9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85305

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<btjdcl$7v5@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:hRNKb.29850$IM3.13607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Bert Craig" wrote:
> > >
> > > I hate to say it, Jim, but this is one
> > > of those intangibles that fall under
> > > the catagory of "if you don't get it,
> > > I can't explain it to you."
> > >
> > > Kim's got it, but doesn't like it. I
> > > can respect that. Bill's got it too,
> > > but doesn't appear to want to let
> > > on that he's got it. (Broken record
> > > mode: But the FCC..., but the
> > > FCC..., but the FCC...) Dwight?
> > > No comment.
> > >
>
> Bert: I just noticed this. I cannot believe you said that. I cannot
> believe you are acting like that.

Why sure I said itï¿½and I'm not even "acting." (As in pretending, get
it? That was a jokeï¿½a little levity.)

> I *GET* that you like CW testing and you should *GET* that I don't.

I fine with that and stated as such. To clarify, you can substitute
"Kim's got it, (it being my opinion) but doesn't agree with it."

> THAT is all there is to *GET*. It's that simple.

Not in my opinion. IMNSHO, folks are a tad too quick to remove the
character aspect from many daily activities, both professional and
personal. How many times have you heard "It's just business, nothing
personal" or "It's unfortunate, but it's the bottom line that
matters." Usually when you hear these words, it's in conjunction with
actions that are going to adversely affect somebody's life. I've seen
folks that have put in twenty plus loyal years of some seriously hard
work for a company and get released just so the bottom line showed a
ten percent profit margin as opposed to nine. (IOW, double instead of
single digit growth.) While there are many valid "business" reasons
that can be quoted to defend this, there are some moral or "character"
issues involved here. I know it wasn't always like this and at some
point in history loyalty was rewarded with loyalty at many companies.

That's a professional example.

At 5-wpm, I don't believe for one nanosecond that Element 1 is about forcing people to become "proficient" in a mode, whether they plan on using it OTA or not. Perhaps 13 or 20, but certainly not 5-wpm. The FCC actually has some references to character, Jim, N2EY has provided an example. I personally believe that *one of* the valid cases in favor of retaining Element 1 is that it requires an individual to demonstrate a certain level of self-discipline that is not achieved by cramming a published Q&A pool.

Furthermore, I think that many of the folks want to do away with the character aspect solely to remove a valid argument against the removal of Element 1. ("But the FCCï¿½, but the FCCï¿½, but the FCCï¿½") Just like the professional who don't want to feel bad about "making the unpopular decision" or following "good business practice" while legitimately shafting good employees. So now we have a whole generation of young folks that are prepared to enter the workplace, possibly "earn" their way into a position where they can do some harm, but won't care because they were taught that it's ok to step on and use others as long as it fits a prescribed business plan. What'll it be like in another sixty or seventy years?

It ain't so simple, Kimï¿½at least not to this observer. Character means somethingï¿½in all of life's aspect. A hobby and/or service called Amateur Radio is just one of them.

> Kim W5TIT

73 de Bert
WA2SI

580. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 19:11:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFDAB65.1080407@psu.edu>
Source record: 85306

N2EY wrote:
> In article <x74Lb.7928$uF6.2395440@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <N61Lb.44004$Pg1.8318@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Only if my 'co-star' is Sophia Loren.
>>>
>>>
>>>How about Ann Margret? Or Diane Keaton?
>>
>>Is that the Grumpy old Man list?
>>
>
> Who could be grumpy in their presence?
>
> And at the very top of the list: Jan Smithers, best known as "Bailey Quarters"
> (turns 55 this year).

One of the great mysteries of the Universe is how Jan got so little
attention compared to Loni Anderson, who has to be one of the scariest
wimmin this lad has ever seen.

- Mike KB3EIA -

581. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 20:30:03 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401081230.2dd56484@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85307

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<uhcLb.32947$IM3.30486@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> Enough said.

Agreed...por fin!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

582. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 20:38:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFDBFC7.5050406@psu.edu>
Source record: 85308

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> Mike, how in the Hell is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear like
> someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that
> actually sent it? The "art" of making it look like someone else had sent it
> would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had also
> changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.

You could always past it as a quote.

> That Dave Heil is so damned bored with life that he has to concoct things
> from thin air is usual and status quo for him. Don't be so quick to jump on
> a Dave Heil bandwagon...because those wagons don't travel far at all.

I'm not on any Dave Heil bandwagon. That I agree with him in this case
means only that I agree with him in this case.

> For anyone with computer sense, it is unreasonable to even consider that a
> post could be issued under the guise of someone else--contrary to the
> opinion that it can be done.

I would have submitted the post as a quote, and perhaps with a "ahem -
My callsign is W5TIT in case you forgot, Jim!" You would have made your
point most eloquently in that case.

> And, when I resubmit "The Pool" list with my
> callsign attributed to my prediction date, it is certainly weak, at best, to
> display anger and make it seem as though I was doing *anything* else but
> resubmitting a post an attributing my callsign to my prediction.

Who's angry? Jim has the right to be skittish about your callsign. You
have the right to call him on it. I'm not going to presume to tell you
how to make your posts, but I'll tell you how I would have reacted in
the same circumstances.

> However, if you or anyone else, is so desperate to reach for the stars in
> some display of dislike for me--then go for it.

Who dislikes you? Not me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

583. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 20:44:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFDC111.3000907@psu.edu>
Source record: 85310

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Regardless of the reasoning, do you
>>concur with altering peoples posts
>>to reflect your own wishes?
>
>
>
> Of course not. But do you concur with attempts to alter the perception of
> a person's status as a Ham by blatantly omitting that person's callsign in a
> list containing only the callsigns of others? Jim is aware of what he's
> doing. Kim had already asked him to include her callsign (a request which
> should have been unnecessary).

If Kim is uncomfortable with Kim's callsign, that is within his rights. Standard email would have left no doubts about the message. Message quoted, and "this" should be changed.

I don't know about everyone's mailreaders, but on the ones I used, it takes an extra effort to reply to a message and take the quotes out.

I noticed it immediately. What is the point of doing it otherwise?

- Mike KB3EIA -

584. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 20:44:24 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401081244.7430e526@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85309

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<btjdp0$8mu@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0401080303.58223c87@posting.google.com...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:<gJsKb.11587$6B.5675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I understand Kim's point. Lets try
> > > > it from this perspective. If you're one
> > > > of the millions of immigrants entering
> > > > this country, the speech we use on
> > > > the radio, and on the radio tests, in
> > > > this country is not already in the
> > > > "toolbox." And Spanish certainly isn't
> > > > in the "toolbox" of many other Hams
> > > > in this country. So, even if you ignore
> > > > any skills needed for the voice modes
> > > > (however minor), there is still some
> > > > validity in Kim's argument. Spanish is
> > > > use more often the CW in this (snip)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Wow! See what happens when you edit a sentence without checking it
> > > afterwards. That last sentence should read "Spanish is used" and "more
> often
> > > than CW."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > No sweat, Dwight. Only the very petty folks will nitpick about minor
> > spelling errors or grammatical misuses on USENET. (Usually in an
> > attempt to compensate for the invalidity of their own statements.)
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
>
> OK, I see...you're getting up early, too. ;) ROFLMAO...
>
> Kim W5TIT

I got up to go to work, had one foot out the door and...the machine
just called to me to check. <ggg>

73 de Bert
WA2SI

585. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 20:51:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFDC2E2.7010800@psu.edu>
Source record: 85311

Dave Heil wrote:

> Under no circumstances could Kim remind me of the "Church Lady". As to
> the sanctimonious twit reference: Is it your week to do the Walter
> Matthau "Grumpy Old Men" role?

WEEK??? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

586. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 21:15:08 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <wLjLb.82$8H.2603@attbi_s03>
Source record: 85312

"Zonedout" <im-not-no-spam@home.com> wrote in message
news:YXNoY2FrZQ==.1852c3257a93750eec72742446c8deb6@1073588356.cotse.net...
> JEP wrote:
>
> >...and very large belly. So large in fact....
>
> I became a ham at age 15. Now I'm almost 50 and weigh the
> same and have the same waist size I had in high school.
> 5'11" and 160 lbs., 33-inch waist.
> Wonder if you can make the same claim JEP? :P

Wow-wee .....

It used to be guys on this group talked about CW, callsigns, degeneration of ham radio service, obtuse ham calls, on air manners, testing, classes etc.etc.etc. Now the group discussion has been elevated to waist sizes and the ability on one to visualize one's anatomy ....

Maybe we can incorperate this into testing or better yet a contest .... lets see a special multiplier maybe or maybe a weekend contest .... preferably after the holidays ...

Wastebands measurements phone sprint seems like a good name. The major problem I see is that we need to have a formula for the DX guys as the metric system would give them an unfair advantage.

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

587. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 21:43:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <T9kLb.697$Pg.151@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85313

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote

> I personally believe that *one of* the valid cases in
> favor of retaining Element 1 is that it requires an individual to
> demonstrate a certain level of self-discipline that is not achieved by
> cramming a published Q&A pool.

I looked and looked and looked and looked and nowhere in 97.501, 97.503 nor anywhere in S25 did I find any regulatory requirement to "demonstrate a certain level of self-discipline" as part of the qualification procedures. Is this another of those "test of worthiness" things that occasionally floats to the surface around rrap?

Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write something like:

" A really tough written test would surely separate those who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..

" Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's dedication to the service.", or..

" I think it is effective at minimizing the undesirables.", or..

" ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is making it something to work for.", or..
.
"My opinion is that any obstacle you put in the way to any achievement guarantees that only those with dedication and strong interest will get there."

All of the above quotations, gathered from rrap threads, were made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the best for the Amateur Radio Service.

All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in that they suggest that the examination process is the key to ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are "worthy") become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong kind of people" get filtered out.

First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a "graduation" exam.

Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" might be hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other

measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefore it is not the function of the examination process to determine (even if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine if he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement that the examination process screens out applicants who lack "commitment".

Don't get me wrong here, folks. I believe that the examination process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash the bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the spectrum. I am not even suggesting that Morse testing is a "good thing" or a "poor idea". But I have no expectation that ANY examination can filter out "unworthy" applicants who lack the proper dedication or motivation.

Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of "worthy"?

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://www.W0AA.org

588. Re: Pirate SSTV on 6925

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 23:13:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iulLb.16765$6B.14049@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Z1" <z1@zappo.com> wrote in message
news:KigLb.73092$BA6.1483316@news20.bellglobal.com...
> What type of software do you need to see this? Can you download any from
the
> Internet?
>
>
> Z1
> "Bigali" <bigali@hotfreqnews.net> wrote in message
> news:btk026$s7f$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "No Name" <noname@nohost.com> wrote in message
> > news:vvpiqv2sk3ff9f@news.supernews.com...
> > > Check out 6925usb in the evenings for Pirate SSTV.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > That guy has been broadcasting some interesting stuff for quite
> > a while. Says he's located in the Ozark Mountains.
> >
> > Bigali
> >
> >
> >
>
>

This is the one you need. Scroll down the page. Use with your soundcard.

http://www.qsl.net/mmhamsoft/

Dan/W4NTI

589. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-08 23:16:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xxlLb.22847$P%1.21765796@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85315

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:WOcLb.32978$IM3.28342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > >
> > > And the efforts of REACT and its
> > > members are commendable. However,
> > > any public service performed is informal
> > > in nature, not the result of any regulatory
> > > stipulation imposed by the FCC or
> > > federal government. There is nothing in
> > > part 95 that mandates public service like
> > > that found in part 97.
> >
> > OK, Dwight quote paragraph and section
> > that states that amateurs MUST do public
> > service.
>
>
> Okay, Dee, show me where I said Amateurs "must" do public service. Part
97
> offers that as one purpose of the ARS and gives us the mandate (authority)
> to do so (ARES and so on), but it certainly isn't required.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

your words were:

"...There is nothing in part 95 that mandates public service like that found
in part 97."

tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates
1. To assign (a colony or territory) to a specified nation under a mandate.
2. To make mandatory, as by law; decree or require: mandated desegregation
of public schools.

The way you have used the word conforms to usage number 2. Therefore, you
have stated that public service is required even though that may not be what
you meant to say.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

590. Re: Pirate SSTV on 6925

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 00:47:30 UTC
From: haf47@juno.com
Message-ID: <f03bf94f.0401081647.3436fdb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85316
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Z1" <z1@zappo.com> wrote in message
news:<KigLb.73092$BA6.1483316@news20.bellglobal.com>...
> What type of software do you need to see this? Can you download any from the
> Internet?
>
>
> Z1
> "Bigali" <bigali@hotfreqnews.net> wrote in message
> news:btk026$s7f$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "No Name" <noname@nohost.com> wrote in message
> > news:vvpiqv2sk3ff9f@news.supernews.com...
> > > Check out 6925usb in the evenings for Pirate SSTV.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > That guy has been broadcasting some interesting stuff for quite
> > a while. Says he's located in the Ozark Mountains.
> >
> > Bigali
> >
> >
> >

You can receive just about any mode of slow scan tv ever used with the
software called MMSSTV available at the following site:

http://www.qsl.net/mmhamsoft/

Scroll down the screen 'til you see the link. This is incredible
software made even better due to the fact that it is true freeware as
long as it is being used for non-commercial use. No nags, no time
limits, just a really fine program in use by hams all over the world.

It's really easy to use, but that being said, you'll get more out of
the program if you read the help file.

To receive pictures all you need is a cable from the "speaker out" on
your receiver, to the soundcard "Line In" jack on your computer...no
other interface is required. Works super.

Good luck and enjoy....

73 de WA2AFD

591. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 01:10:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <icnLb.9643$uF6.2716564@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85317

N2EY wrote:
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>
>>Mike, how in the
>
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
>
>>is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear like
>>someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that
>>actually sent it?
>
>
> The problem is that you *didn't* alter the number
> of > symbols at the beginning of the line, so it
> looks like I wrote something that I didn't. That's why there's
> no > in front of the "[expletive deleted]" part that I wrote above.
>
>
>>The "art" of making it look like someone else had sent it
>>would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had also
>>changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.
>
>
> Simply going in and changing what someone else wrote without
> changing the > symbols is misattribution and one of the very few
> things that are almost universally condemned on Usenet. Headers
> simply tell what the number of > symbols means.

Kind of like:

In Unix style commenting, a ">" is placed before each line of quoted
text. Add your new text below the relevant quote.

from http://www.magicpub.com/netprimer/netiquette.html

> Of course it was all probably just a small mistake but I thought you'd
> want to know.

- Mike KB3EIA -

592. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 01:36:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108203614.21642.00003578@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85318

In article <20040104221548.07961.00001108@mb-m03.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <gjj3vv4gacmt4ab1qd680q0hbn3daqba15@4ax.com>, Hole E. Ghost
><kornform@aol.com> writes:
>
>>For centuries the church could not decide on the proper date of the
>>birth of JC (bible scholars are still debating if this person actually
>>existed, or if he was just another concoction of the church to control
>>the masses), according to Ruth Reichmann of the Max Kade
>>German-American Center, IUPUI, "Pagans had traditionally decked their
>>halls with boughs of holly, evergreens and mistletoe to symbolize
>>winter's inability to prevent the renewal of life. Merrymaking came to
>>have a share in Christmas observance through popular enthusiasm. The
>>medieval secular celebrations lasted for a "season," extending from
>>Christmas eve to Epiphany, and in some localities even from St.
>>Thomas' Day, Dec. 21 (honoring the "doubting Thomas," disciple of
>>Jesus) to Candlemas (February 2).
>>There was some dispute about the proper date of the birth of Christ
>>and not everyone agrees even to this day. It was not until A.D. 350,
>>that December 25 was declared the official date for celebrating
>>Christmas by Pope Julius I. When the fathers of the church decided to
>>settle upon a date to celebrate the event, they wisely chose the day
>>of the winter solstice, since it coincided with some rival religions'
>>celebrations and the rebirth of the sun and approaching longer days,
>>symbolized by bon-fires and yule logs. December 25 was a festival long
>>before the conversion of the Germanic peoples to Christianity, it
>>seemed fitting that the time of their winter festival would also be
>>the time to celebrate the birth of Christ. The darkness that had
>>frightened and threatened to defeat the ancient pagans, was forever
>>defeated by the coming of Christ."
>
>Holey:
>
>Yada, yada, yada. We know all about that. Whatever the geneology of
>the holiday, the reason that it is celebrated in present times is to
>commemorate the birth of Jesus Christ, the Lord and Saviour of all
>Christian peoples.

Yep. Except that some Christians celebrate it on a different day in early January.

>Nothing will change that, not even any irrelevant
>facts about how the holiday came about.

They're not irrelevant at all. They show how the pagans were searching for the Light, and recognized the importance of the Light.

The celebration of Hanukkah has similar connections with Light. Its date is determined not just by sunlight but also moonlight.

I don't think those non-Christian origins detract from the meaning of the holiday at all. They simply show the universal nature of the search.

73 de Jim, N2EY

btw, you might want to look up the origin of the word "Easter"...

593. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 01:52:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btl1nd$e9o@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85320

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:MjeLb.404$Pg.327@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > You actually spend time recording it, huh?
> >
>
> Common practice when working weak signals in DXpedition mode. (Didn't you
> often wonder why some DSP rigs have that little 'snippet catcher' in
them?)
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Never seen anything but a YAESU 890AT, my husband's. Well, OK, I've "seen"
others but haven't "looked" at them...

Kim W5TIT

594. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 01:55:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btl1ne$e9o@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85321

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FFDC111.3000907@psu.edu...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> >>Regardless of the reasoning, do you
> >>concur with altering peoples posts
> >>to reflect your own wishes?
> >
> >
> >
> > Of course not. But do you concur with attempts to alter the perception
of
> > a person's status as a Ham by blatantly omitting that person's callsign
in a
> > list containing only the callsigns of others? Jim is aware of what he's
> > doing. Kim had already asked him to include her callsign (a request
which
> > should have been unnecessary).
>
> If Kim is uncomfortable with Kim's callsign, that is within his rights.
> Standard email would have left no doubts about the message. Message
> quoted, and "this" should be changed.
>

Uh, OK. The J and K keys are right next to each other... ;)

Kim W5TIT

595. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 01:56:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btl1nf$e9o@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85319

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401081244.7430e526@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<btjdp0$8mu@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0401080303.58223c87@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:<gJsKb.11587$6B.5675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I understand Kim's point. Lets try
> > > > > it from this perspective. If you're one
> > > > > of the millions of immigrants entering
> > > > > this country, the speech we use on
> > > > > the radio, and on the radio tests, in
> > > > > this country is not already in the
> > > > > "toolbox." And Spanish certainly isn't
> > > > > in the "toolbox" of many other Hams
> > > > > in this country. So, even if you ignore
> > > > > any skills needed for the voice modes
> > > > > (however minor), there is still some
> > > > > validity in Kim's argument. Spanish is
> > > > > use more often the CW in this (snip)
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Wow! See what happens when you edit a sentence without checking it
> > > > afterwards. That last sentence should read "Spanish is used" and
"more
> > often
> > > > than CW."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > >
> > > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > > No sweat, Dwight. Only the very petty folks will nitpick about minor
> > > spelling errors or grammatical misuses on USENET. (Usually in an
> > > attempt to compensate for the invalidity of their own statements.)
> > >
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> >
```

> > OK, I see...you're getting up early, too. ;) ROFLMAO...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I got up to go to work, had one foot out the door and...the machine
> just called to me to check. <ggg>
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

Yep. Been getting up at 4AM for so long that when I start regular work hours again, it'll seem like vacation!

Kim W5TIT

596. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 02:53:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108215302.12631.00004065@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85323

In article <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> That way, no one who was
>> interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would
>be
>> incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.
>
>If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they
>can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely to
>be sufficient to become qualified.

That may well be the case, Hans. And since some Morse Code skill is obviously part of being a qualified full-privileges radio amateur, it makes sense that the standard license would include a Morse Code test.

>I can't imagine "one who was interested" would fail to qualify in 10 years,
>but if they didn't, well I guess there are other hobbies like finger
>painting which might be less challenging and not require a federal license
>to pursue.

Exactly.

So when you gonna send that proposal to the FCC?

73 de Jim, N2EY

The liberals will whine and wring their hands in dismay, but
>life's a bitch sometimes.
>

597. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 02:53:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108215304.12631.00004066@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85322

In article <3FFDAB65.1080407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>One of the great mysteries of the Universe is how Jan

[Smithers]

>got so little
>attention compared to Loni Anderson, who has to be one of the scariest
>wimmin this lad has ever seen.

It was part of the subtly subversive nature of the show, Mike. All of the characters were true originals and stereotype-busters.

Part of the subtext was that the more attractive "Bailey" was overlooked because of people's assumptions rather than the reality. The viewers saw it, of course. Same for the fact that "Jennifer" was actually in charge and very intelligent, "Johnny Fever" had an encyclopedic knowledge of rock and roll, "Venus" had a hidden past that no one suspected, etc. Appearances were intentionally deceiving.

Remember episodes like the one where Jennifer moves to a new house? Or the ones with the "Red Wigglers" and "Ferryman Funeral Homes" singing commercials? When Venus explained the atom in two minutes? Johnny Fever's reaction time after several drinks? Save The Flim? The list goes on and on..

And truly great music was part of the show, yet never slowed it down.

Yet the show was cancelled even though it was #6 overall in the ratings. The *overall* ratings. Can you imagine a #6 show that cost almost nothing to make being cancelled today?

"WKRP" and "Barney Miller" essentially invented the workplace ensemble sitcom that has no central character.. Before those two shows, almost all sitcoms were reinventions of the nuclear-family-plus-sidekick based 'The Honeymooners" and/or "I Love Lucy", (which are quite alike in many respects, except that the gender roles are reversed in "Lucy"). Most sitcoms today are simply variations on
Alice, Ralph, Trixie and Ed, or Lucy, Ricky, Ethel and Fred.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"as God is my witness, I thought turkeys could fly..."

598. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 02:58:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040108215839.07961.00001270@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85324

In article <20040101193920.25815.00005591@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Of course hams tip.
>
>All you have to do to get a ham to tip
>is to apply sufficient lateral force
>above the ham's center of gravity.
>
>This result is, of course, completely
>and accurately predicted by
>Fudd's First Law of Opposition:
>
>"If you push something hard enough, it will fall over."
>
>73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

I'm a ham, and here's a tip: There are tens of thousands of comedians out of work. You're giving it away for free doesn't help the situation.

BTW I'm on Day 5 of In Flew Enza. Haven't been to work yet this year. Hopefully Thursday. I'm on some good antibiotics now, wish me luck.

73 de Larry, K3LT

599. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 03:10:48 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a682c0cd4a3c05989685@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85325

In article <20040108215839.07961.00001270@mb-m03.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
> In article <20040101193920.25815.00005591@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Of course hams tip.
> >
> >All you have to do to get a ham to tip
> >is to apply sufficient lateral force
> >above the ham's center of gravity.
> >
> >This result is, of course, completely
> >and accurately predicted by
> >Fudd's First Law of Opposition:
> >
> >"If you push something hard enough, it will fall over."
> >
> >73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY
>

If it goes in, it must come out

Testlacurs deviant to Fuds 1st Law

The future is fun,
the future is fair,
you may already have won,
you may already be there

Back to the shadows again

600. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 03:42:50 UTC
From: hamradioman2000@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e95066a4.0401081942.27bc97fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

34474@yahoo.com (JEP) wrote in message
news:<5a5fcb7b.0401071826.6eaa42c0@posting.google.com>...
> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:<pan.2004.01.07.23.52.45.278790@127.0.0.1>...
> > On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 11:23:23 -0500, Burp wrote:
> >
> > > Two guys eating at Waffle House, one is a ham and the other a nonham.
> > >
> > >
> > > Nonham: "Geeeze, I love the smell of that waitress's perfume."
> > >
> > > Ham: "Yeah, I love the smell of generator fumes, it reminds
> > > me of field day next month."
> > >
> > >
> > > Burp
> > better yet.... the smell of a soldering station warming up as compared to
> > that of steak and eggs cooking. :)
> >
> > DE N7ZZT
> > Phoenix, Arizona
>
> Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny
> of first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very
> large belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in
> years.

WHO CARES!! (as you said to me) you lack a sense of humor, and you
need help spelling pekker, pecker.

WHO CARES!!

601. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 03:49:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <OwpLb.2493$8H.15153@attbi_s03>
Source record: 85327

>
> BTW I'm on Day 5 of In Flew Enza. Haven't been to work yet this year.
> Hopefully Thursday. I'm on some good antibiotics now, wish me luck.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Whiskey and plenty of it ...take care Larry

73 KI3R Tom

602. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 03:57:26 UTC
From: Tracy Fort <beerbarrel@cox.net>
Message-ID: <nj9svvcu4kv6slk0qkr2atkdhc8tg91qfs@4ax.com>
Source record: 85328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey! Where is my Pekker? Oh there it is! In your mouth!

Tracy

On 7 Jan 2004 18:26:11 -0800, no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) wrote:

>"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:<pan.2004.01.07.23.52.45.278790@127.0.0.1>...
>> On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 11:23:23 -0500, Burp wrote:
>>
>> > Two guys eating at Waffle House, one is a ham and the other a nonham.
>> >
>> >
>> > Nonham: "Geeeze, I love the smell of that waitress's perfume."
>> >
>> > Ham: "Yeah, I love the smell of generator fumes, it reminds
>> > me of field day next month."
>> >
>> >
>> > Burp
>> better yet.... the smell of a soldering station warming up as compared to
>> that of steak and eggs cooking. :)
>>
>> DE N7ZZT
>> Phoenix, Arizona
>
>Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny
>of first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very
>large belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in
>years.

603. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 04:00:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108230019.06226.00002325@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85330

In article <b7d1465c.0401081046.6f636ae9@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>Not in my opinion. IMNSHO, folks are a tad too quick to remove the
>character aspect from many daily activities, both professional and
>personal. How many times have you heard "It's just business, nothing
>personal" or "It's unfortunate, but it's the bottom line that
>matters." Usually when you hear these words, it's in conjunction with
>actions that are going to adversely affect somebody's life. I've seen
>folks that have put in twenty plus loyal years of some seriously hard
>work for a company and get released just so the bottom line showed a
>ten percent profit margin as opposed to nine. (IOW, double instead of
>single digit growth.) While there are many valid "business" reasons
>that can be quoted to defend this, there are some moral or "character"
>issues involved here. I know it wasn't always like this and at some
>point in history loyalty was rewarded with loyalty at many companies.
>That's a professional example.

This sort of thing is also why CC&Rs have proliferated, and are actually *supported* by many people. It comes from the bitter experience of having neighbors who do not have shared community values to take reasonable care of their properties. But ordinances and CC&Rs cannot replace the spirit of being a good neighbor.

>
>At 5-wpm, I don't believe for one nanosecond that Element 1 is about
>forcing people to become "proficient" in a mode, whether they plan on
>using it OTA or not. Perhaps 13 or 20, but certainly not 5-wpm. The
>FCC actually has some references to character, Jim, N2EY has provided
>an example. I personally believe that *one of* the valid cases in
>favor of retaining Element 1 is that it requires an individual to
>demonstrate a certain level of self-discipline that is not achieved by
>cramming a published Q&A pool.
>
That's one way to look at it. Here's another: There are very few prospective hams who already know enough Morse Code to pass the test. And it cannot be learned (in most cases, anyway) by reading a book or watching a video or doing a bit of this and that here and there. So it takes a bit of "personal investment" by the prospective ham, and the result is a skill specific to amateur radio. I think that specificity is what bothers some folks.

>Furthermore, I think that many of the folks want to do away with the
>character aspect solely to remove a valid argument against the removal
>of Element 1. ("But the FCC…, but the FCC…, but the FCC…")

FCC allows all sorts of things that are not in the best interest of the ARS. In part this is due to lack of resources.

Does anyone think that BPL can't be bad for amateur radio because FCC is allowing it?

Was it a good thing that FCC didn't go after that pop star or the network for saying the F-word on broadcast TV?

>Just like
>the professional who don't want to feel bad about "making the
>unpopular decision" or following "good business practice" while
>legitimately shafting good employees. So now we have a whole
>generation of young folks that are prepared to enter the workplace,
>possibly "earn" their way into a position where they can do some harm,
>but won't care because they were taught that it's ok to step on and
>use others as long as it fits a prescribed business plan. What'll it
>be like in another sixty or seventy years?

What's it like now? Remember Michael Milliken - "Greed is good"? Or how about Enron, WorldCom, etc.? Those are just the folks who got caught.
>
>It ain't so simple, Kim…at least not to this observer. Character means
>something…in all of life's aspect. A hobby and/or service called
>Amateur Radio is just one of them.
>
Exactly.

And to those who say "Who is to be the arbiter?" the answer is simple: Anyone who proposes requirements - or the removal of them - is being the arbiter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

604. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 04:00:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040108230021.06226.00002326@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85329

In article <MPG.1a682c0cd4a3c05989685@news.west.earthlink.net>, Steven R. Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:

>If it goes in, it must come out
>
>Testlacurs deviant to Fuds 1st Law

I think you mean "Teslacle's Deviant" ;-)

At least that's how Porgy Tirebiter explained it to me.
>
>The future is fun,
>the future is fair,
>you may already have won,
>you may already be there
>
"Would you like to squeeze the wheeze? People like to."
>
>Back to the shadows again
Out where a friend is a friend
Where the vegetables are green
And you can...

You know the rest.
>
"This is Worker speaking"

73 de Jim "I think we're *all* Bozos on this bus" N2EY

"I suppose you think that's very funny, Harold....."

605. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 04:51:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0rqLb.9750$uF6.2758949@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85331

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3FFDAB65.1080407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>One of the great mysteries of the Universe is how Jan
>
>
> [Smithers]
>
>
>>got so little
>>attention compared to Loni Anderson, who has to be one of the scariest
>>wimmin this lad has ever seen.
>
>
> It was part of the subtly subversive nature of the show, Mike. All of the
> characters were true originals and stereotype-busters.
>
> Part of the subtext was that the more attractive "Bailey" was overlooked
> because of people's assumptions rather than the reality. The viewers
> saw it, of course. Same for the fact that "Jennifer" was actually in
> charge and very intelligent, "Johnny Fever" had an encyclopedic knowledge of
> rock and roll, "Venus" had a hidden past that no one suspected, etc.
> Appearances were intentionally deceiving.
>
> Remember episodes like the one where Jennifer moves to a new house? Or the ones
> with the "Red Wigglers" and "Ferryman Funeral Homes" singing commercials? When
> Venus explained the atom in two minutes? Johnny Fever's reaction time after
> several drinks? Save The Flim? The list goes on and on..
>
> And truly great music was part of the show, yet never slowed it down.
>
> Yet the show was cancelled even though it was #6 overall in the ratings. The
> *overall* ratings. Can you imagine a #6 show that cost almost nothing to make
> being cancelled today?
>
> "WKRP" and "Barney Miller" essentially invented the workplace ensemble sitcom
> that has no central character.. Before those two shows, almost all sitcoms were
> reinventions of the nuclear-family-plus-sidekick based 'The Honeymooners"
> and/or "I Love Lucy", (which are quite alike in many respects, except that the
> gender roles are reversed in "Lucy"). Most sitcoms today are simply variations
> on
> Alice, Ralph, Trixie and Ed, or Lucy, Ricky, Ethel and Fred.

Don't forget the "babe" and the fat ugly guy... oh wait, that was the alice and Ralph thing wasn't it. Television sucks now. The only things I watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a while, and the History channel.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> "as God is my witness, I thought turkeys could fly..."

Ahh, my favortite episode! Gaw, I laughed till I cried, and then some.

- Mike KB3EIA -

606. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 04:55:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <uvqLb.9752$uF6.2759456@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85332

N2EY wrote:
> In article <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>That way, no one who was
>>>interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would
>>
>>be
>>
>>>incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.
>>
>>If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they
>>can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely to
>>be sufficient to become qualified.
>
>
> That may well be the case, Hans. And since some Morse Code skill is
> obviously part of being a qualified full-privileges radio amateur, it makes
> sense that the standard license would include a Morse Code test.
>
>>I can't imagine "one who was interested" would fail to qualify in 10 years,
>>but if they didn't, well I guess there are other hobbies like finger
>>painting which might be less challenging and not require a federal license
>>to pursue.

> Exactly.

I can't imagein "one who was interested" not taking the time to learn
Morse code either, but if they didn't want to I gues there are other
things like wait around until it goes away, which might be less challenging!

> So when you gonna send that proposal to the FCC?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> The liberals will whine and wring their hands in dismay, but
>
>>life's a bitch sometimes.

607. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 05:19:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9RqLb.1231$Pg.336@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85333

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> So when you gonna send that proposal to the FCC?
>

I already did (as you knew perfectly well).

73, de Hans, K0HB

608. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 06:27:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFE49E1.4070406@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85334

>
>
>
>btw, you might want to look up the origin of the word "Easter"...
>
>

And what connection the resurection of Jesus Christ has with rabbits hiding colored chicken eggs has.

And why no holiday for "Wester", "Norther", and "Souther" :-)

And why kids get dressed up in costumes and ask neighbors for candy on Halloween. A Chinese friend once asked me about that, all I could say was that it was an ancient tradition that nobody knows where it came from or why it was done.

Santa Claus actually has a religious tie in with Christmas. Santa is a modified version of St Nick, who, a few hundred years ago somewheres in Europe, would give the kids in his town small gifts to celebrate the birth of Christ.

Up next: Q sign for Martin Luther King day: QMK

609. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 06:32:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFE4AF3.8080208@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85335
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny
>of first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very
>large belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in
>years.
>
>
Same can be said about anyone who has a hobby activity like model
railroads,
astronomy, bird watching, model planes, basically anything that is not
full time
drinking and chasing women and watching sports on TV....

610. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 10:42:58 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401090242.36d45f3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85336

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<xxlLb.22847$P%1.21765796@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:WOcLb.32978$IM3.28342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > And the efforts of REACT and its
> > > > members are commendable. However,
> > > > any public service performed is informal
> > > > in nature, not the result of any regulatory
> > > > stipulation imposed by the FCC or
> > > > federal government. There is nothing in
> > > > part 95 that mandates public service like
> > > > that found in part 97.
> > >
> > > OK, Dwight quote paragraph and section
> > > that states that amateurs MUST do public
> > > service.
> > >
> > >
> > Okay, Dee, show me where I said Amateurs "must" do public service. Part
> 97
> > offers that as one purpose of the ARS and gives us the mandate (authority)
> > to do so (ARES and so on), but it certainly isn't required.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> your words were:
>
> "...There is nothing in part 95 that mandates public service like that found
> in part 97."
>
> tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates
> 1. To assign (a colony or territory) to a specified nation under a mandate.
> 2. To make mandatory, as by law; decree or require: mandated desegregation
> of public schools.
>
> The way you have used the word conforms to usage number 2. Therefore, you
```

> have stated that public service is required even though that may not be what
> you meant to say.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Here you go, Dee.

From: "ARRL Letter"
Date: Wed, 26 Nov 2003 19:02:59 -0500
Subject: The ARRL Letter, Vol 22, No 47

==========
==>FCC REORGANIZES WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS BUREAU

The FCC has announced a reorganization of its Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (WTB) "to more effectively support the FCC's strategic goals--broadband, competition, spectrum, media, homeland security and modernizing the FCC." The WTB administers the Amateur Radio Service (Part 97) and amateur licensing, but the changes are expected to be transparent to the amateur community. The Amateur Service now will be administered by the newly named Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division. D'wana Terry, formerly chief of the Public Safety and Private Wireless Division, will head the new division.

"The bureau's portfolios have been redistributed along the lines of strategic goals, consolidating similar functions to focus resources better," the FCC said in a November 24 public notice. As a result of the reorganization, which the FCC approved November 13, WTB expands from five to six divisions: Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure, Spectrum Management Resources and Technologies, Auctions and Spectrum Access, Spectrum and Competition Policy, Mobility, and Broadband.

In addition to the Amateur Service, the Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division will oversee Part 95, Marine, Aviation, Intelligent Transportation Systems, Public Safety Fixed Microwave, Public Safety and Private Land Mobile services and E911, among other areas. Responsibilities moved elsewhere include Fixed Microwave (Part 101), Instructional Television Fixed Service, the Multipoint Distribution Service, and the Multichannel Video Distribution and Data Service.

The action reduces the scope and size of WTB's larger divisions and eliminates separate branches below the division level, while retaining their current functions. One of those was the Licensing and Technical Analysis Branch, headquartered in the FCC's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, office. Among other tasks, that branch has handled the granting and issuance of Amateur Radio licenses and the vanity call sign program. Another was the Policy and Rules Branch at FCC Headquarters, which has been the home of Bill Cross, W3TN, an FCC figure well-known within the amateur community. Among other tasks, that branch has handled Amateur Radio rule making petitions and Part 97 rules interpretations.

A potential plus of the new arrangement is that Cross now will work under another amateur licensee, Mike Wilhelm, WS6BR, who will report to Terry.

The FCC said eliminating branches would promote greater management flexibility in deploying resources and lead to a flatter, more flexible organization without altering the bureau's overall mission. The Commission said it was able to carry out the reorganization by redeploying existing positions.

WTB Chief John Muleta said the reorganization will result in "a mission-driven team that will be innovative in its approach to regulatory policies and customer service."

==========

Required 'claimer:
Material from The ARRL Letter may be republished or reproduced in whole or in part in any form without additional permission. Credit must be given to The ARRL Letter and The American Radio Relay League.

"In addition to the Amateur Service, the Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division will oversee Part 95" Hello.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

611. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 11:01:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040109060102.11022.00003328@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85337

In article <9RqLb.1231$Pg.336@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> So when you gonna send that proposal to the FCC?
>
>I already did (as you knew perfectly well).
>
But only as a comment to another's proposal, not as a stand-alone petition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

btw, what's the promised delivery date for the '7800?

612. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 12:37:32 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <ggxLb.48139$rV4.5058@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 85338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Same can be said about anyone who has a hobby activity like model
> railroads, astronomy, bird watching, model planes, basically anything that
is not
> full time drinking and chasing women and watching sports on TV....
>

And has a season ticket to local WWF events.....

613. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 12:55:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040109075552.25815.00005807@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 85341

In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
>> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>> indication that you're changing them?
>
>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond that.

Do you think it's her right to misattribute?

Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication of having done so?

Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical signature?
>
>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which he and
>many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.

To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is inappropriate for the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's evaluation of it. But I have tried not
to make a big deal about the issue.

I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can* control what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases are edited out by me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet and email standards. I try to always be clear what words were written by the original author and what words were not.

I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's choice of callsign wrote many, many postings containing that callsign, therefore giving it
far more visibility than it would otherwise get.

>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.

Do you think it's her right to misattribute?

Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication of having done so?

Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical signature?

>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think that
>they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my right.

"Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>
>YMMV. That's your right.
>
It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far less comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In fact, I've been omitting it for many months and no one has noticed until now.

Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who would *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her status as anything else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise patronized by me. Or by anyone else.

I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to change. Deal with it.

But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it clear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

614. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 12:55:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040109075553.25815.00005808@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 85339

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008
K0HB: January 1, 2011 (first date not in "this decade")

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

615. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 12:55:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040109075554.25815.00005809@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 85340

In article <Jo2Kb.20834$lo3.9817@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
>> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
>Given that ARRL likely will lobby for continuing a code test for Amateur
>Extra (12-13WPM?) applicants, I predict that Morse testing will not be
>eliminated in this decade.

I'll put you on the list for January 1, 2011, assuming by "this decade" you meant the ten years from January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2010

73 de Jim, N2EY

616. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 13:11:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401090511.6d5bc9aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85342

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401080948.4a286fab@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> > simulation.
> >
> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>
> Also Made In USA.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Now digital is not as good as analog? digital is a mere simulation?

617. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 13:12:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFEA8B9.7060305@psu.edu>
Source record: 85343

N2EY wrote:
> In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>>>indication that you're changing them?
>>
>>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond that.
>
>
> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>
> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication of having
> done so?
>
> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
> signature?
>
>>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which he and
>>many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
>
>
> To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is inappropriate for
> the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's evaluation of it. But I have
> tried not
> to make a big deal about the issue.
>
> I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can* control
> what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases are edited out by
> me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet and email standards. I try to
> always be clear what words were written by the original author and what words
> were not.
>
> I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's choice of
> callsign wrote many, many postings containing that callsign, therefore giving
> it
> far more visibility than it would otherwise get.
>
>
>>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.

>
>
> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?

Nope

> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication of having
> done so?

Nope

> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
> signature?

Nope

>
>>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think that
>>they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my right.
>
>
> "Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>
>>YMMV. That's your right.
>>
>
> It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far less
> comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In fact, I've been
> omitting it for many months and no one has noticed until now.

I did, but saw no need to comment until the mis-attribute letter came along.

> Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who would
> *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her status as anything
> else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise patronized by me. Or by
> anyone else.
>
> I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to change. Deal
> with it.
>
> But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it clear.

Most of her posts have the correct attributes (or is that
attributification) 8^) How this message became "different" is a mystery.
Maybe it was an accident, maybe it was not. Heck if I did that, I'd send
out an "oops" at least.

- Mike KB3EIA -

618. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 13:15:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFEA977.4000804@psu.edu>
Source record: 85344
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny
>> of first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very
>> large belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in
>> years.
>>
>>
> Same can be said about anyone who has a hobby activity like model railroads,
> astronomy, bird watching, model planes, basically anything that is not
> full time
> drinking and chasing women and watching sports on TV....
>

Oh, you mean what Kewwwl people do?

- Mike KB3EIA -

619. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 13:42:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFEAFDF.9090505@psu.edu>
Source record: 85345

N2EY wrote:
> In article <9RqLb.1231$Pg.336@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>So when you gonna send that proposal to the FCC?
>>
>>I already did (as you knew perfectly well).
>>
>
> But only as a comment to another's proposal, not as a stand-alone petition.

Hopefully Hans has a ready supply of replies for the FCC to use when
people comment on his petition. It just won't seem right to comment on
it there without being called stupid...oops, I mean novel! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

620. RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 14:36:00 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <5edtvvc3044frc6je9mtdgh5f0ce23qf83@4ax.com>
Source record: 85346

Mike,

It looks like no one else is interested in continuing this thread....in fact, other than the Teletubbies-esque new rule set that Hans proposed, nothing else has been posted other than our starter discussion points. Time to take it off of life support?

(sigh)...Oh well - back to the endless Morse code testing discussion!

73, Leo

"The best way to predict the future is to create it."
-Thomas Edison

On Sun, 04 Jan 2004 05:45:52 GMT, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Hey Leo, Good to see you on my screen again! Tell you what. I'll start
>with what I think would happen, and if you like, you can join in. Maybe
>we can P**s off someone that they might comment.....;^)

621. Ham Radio Automobiles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 15:00:40 UTC
From: Honest Ed's Used Cars <Ed@honestcarorg.org>
Message-ID: <btmfme$o7u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85347
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ham goes to car dealer to buy new car and trade in his
old one.

"How much my old one worth"?

$1,700

"The blue book say it's worth twice that."

"Yeah, that was before you drilled holes in the roof, drilled
holes through the fire wall, tore up the center cosole & dash
board, tore up the carpeting, and put prolong excessive
stress on the electrical system."

Honest Ed's Car Lot

622. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 15:28:27 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946B6A8898F4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85348

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040109075552.25815.00005807@mb-m07.aol.com:

> In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>>
>>> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>>> indication that you're changing them?
>>
>>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond
>>that.
>
> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>
> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
> of having done so?
>
> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
> signature?
>>
>>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which
>>he and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
>
> To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is
> inappropriate for the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's
> evaluation of it. But I have tried not
> to make a big deal about the issue.
>
> I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can*
> control what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases are
> edited out by me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet and
> email standards. I try to always be clear what words were written by
> the original author and what words were not.
>
> I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's
> choice of callsign wrote many, many postings containing that callsign,
> therefore giving it
> far more visibility than it would otherwise get.
>
>>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.
>

> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>
> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
> of having done so?
>
> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
> signature?
>
>>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think
>>that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my
>>right.
>
> "Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>>
>>YMMV. That's your right.
>>
> It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far
> less comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In
> fact, I've been omitting it for many months and no one has noticed
> until now.
>

You're kidding, right? Just because we didn't say anything doesn't mean we
didn't notice.

Personally, I think you should use her call if you are going to use
everyone else's. But I'm not an Internet cop.

My reaction to Kim's post was initially "why did she post without adding
anything". If I see something in quotes I don't even read it. In fact I can
skip over it by clicking on a particular symbol, and usually do, unless I
need to go back and get the context. And the name of the actual sender is
very prominently displayed to me.

So, if this was misattribution it wasn't very successful, as I saw it was
from Kim immediately and just thought she hit 'send' by mistake. Granted
different people don't see the same screen, as they are using different
newsreaders, but that's how it appears to me using XNews.

> Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who
> would *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her status
> as anything else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise
> patronized by me. Or by anyone else.
>
> I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to
> change. Deal with it.
>
> But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it clear.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

623. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 16:23:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8AALb.465$zj7.113@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85349

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008
>> K0HB: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

624. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 17:31:00 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401090931.49192edf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85350

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401080948.4a286fab@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> > simulation.
> >
> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>
> Also Made In USA.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I feel likewise, there's just something about an analog meter.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

625. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 17:48:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401090948.f5566bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85401

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<0rqLb.9750$uF6.2758949@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <3FFDAB65.1080407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> > >
> > >
> > > Most sitcoms today are simply variations
> > > on
> > > Alice, Ralph, Trixie and Ed, or Lucy, Ricky, Ethel and Fred.
> >
> > Don't forget the "babe" and the fat ugly guy... oh wait, that was the
> > alice and Ralph thing wasn't it.

And the Ed and Trixie thing, to an extent.

Audrey Meadows was about 18 when she auditioned for the part of Alice.
The casting people didn't want to give her a chance because they
thought she was way too young and way too beautiful for the role, and
would not stand up to Jackie Gleason's bombastic style. She showed up
with her hair pretty much as it is in the show, no makeup, very dowdy
clothes, and came out on stage talking in her Alice voice. Gleason
took it all in, stood up, pointed and said "That's Alice".

Note that no matter how much Ralph yells, throws his arms about and
carries on, Alice never flinches. Not even an eyelash.

Often imitated, never equaled.

Today we have "According to Jim" with Jim Belushi and Courtney
Thorne-Smith. Like THAT would ever happen...Before that, "Home
Improvement" was essentially the same show. All the way back to "Dick
Van Dyke", (Everyman nuclear family with scenes at both work and home)
which is still funnier than almost all of its imitators.

(Hall closet full of walnuts? Morey Amsterdam's constant wisecracks
about Mel's hair?)

> Television sucks now. The only things I
> watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a while,
> and the History channel.
>
I think there's as much good programming today as at any time in the
past. The problem is that there is so much more programming today, so
almost anything can get on the air. Most of which is JUNK.

Here in Philly during the '50s and '60s there were three stations (one
for each network, 3, 6, 10) and they were on the air about 18 hours a

day. Then what is now the PBS station (12) came on the air. Great stuff - but usually there was nothing worth watching.

Then in the late '60s came three UHF stations (17, 29, 48). Then cable, which caught on even in places where you could SEE the Roxborough antenna farm on a clear day. Today, with a cheap TV and a pair of rabbit ears I can see 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 23, 29, 35, 48, 52, 65. But there's usually nothing worth watching.

We remember the good shows and forget the bad ones. One of the reasons the original "Star Trek" made such an impression was that it was so different from the rest of the bad, bad, bad TV of the time. Such as "Lost In Space", which recycled the same B-movie robot...

> > "as God is my witness, I thought turkeys could fly..."
>
> Ahh, my favortite episode!

Almost everyone's. I have it on tape. Watch it every Thanksgiving. "They're hitting the ground like sacks of wet cement! oh, the humanity!"

> Gaw, I laughed till I cried, and then some.
>
"Then the turkeys mounted a counterattack. It was as if they were...organized!"

Then there's the one where the unscrupulous photographer secretly takes pictures of Jennifer getting changed, and the gang has to get them back. The scene where Johnny and Bailey impersonate a magazine editor and centerfold model (respectively) for a nonexistent magazine and con the bad guy is priceless.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Now identify the source of this quote:

"Do you....enjoy.....knives?"

626. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 18:53:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFEF8B6.1000706@psu.edu>
Source record: 85402

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

Egbert: September 13, 2003
Jeff: September 29, 2003
Leroy: December 31, 2003
Bill: January 1, 2004
Phil: March 15, 2004
Jim H: April 1, 2004
Jim M: April 15, 2004
Alun: May 1, 2004
Ryan: July 1, 2004
Robert: August 1, 2004
Larry: September 15, 2004
Charles: December 30, 2004
Dee: July 1, 2005
Mike: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008

Hans: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

Howzat?

- Mike KB3EIA -

627. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 18:54:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFEF8E6.6040008@psu.edu>
Source record: 85403

Leo wrote:
> Mike,
>
> It looks like no one else is interested in continuing this
> thread....in fact, other than the Teletubbies-esque new rule set that
> Hans proposed, nothing else has been posted other than our starter
> discussion points. Time to take it off of life support?
>
> (sigh)...Oh well - back to the endless Morse code testing discussion!

Well, no one can say we didn't give them the chance. Too bad too, since it allows us to form some new ideas. Not every idea is practical, but one comes along every once in a while that gives you a Eureka moment.

If we don't want to talk about the Morse code test, maybe Kim's callsign? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

628. Re: Difference Between Hams & Nonhams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 19:12:14 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401091112.3ac8a3dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tracy Fort <beerbarrel@cox.net> wrote in message
news:<nj9svvcu4kv6slk0qkr2atkdhc8tg91qfs@4ax.com>...

Come on Tracy. You are giving away your sexual preference. Now we know.

> Hey! Where is my Pekker? Oh there it is! In your mouth!
>
> Tracy
>
> On 7 Jan 2004 18:26:11 -0800, no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) wrote:
>
> >"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:<pan.2004.01.07.23.52.45.278790@127.0.0.1>...
> >> On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 11:23:23 -0500, Burp wrote:
> >>
> >> > Two guys eating at Waffle House, one is a ham and the other a nonham.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Nonham: "Geeeze, I love the smell of that waitress's perfume."
> >> >
> >> > Ham: "Yeah, I love the smell of generator fumes, it reminds
> >> > me of field day next month."
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Burp
> >> better yet.... the smell of a soldering station warming up as compared to
> >> that of steak and eggs cooking. :)
> >>
> >> DE N7ZZT
> >> Phoenix, Arizona
> >
> >Most Amateur radio operators act and behave as if they are the progeny
> >of first cousins. Pocket protector, HT strapped to their belt and very
> >large belly. So large in fact that they haven't seen their pekker in
> >years.

629. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 19:57:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FFF07B4.1090408@psu.edu>
Source record: 85405

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<0rqLb.9750$uF6.2758949@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <3FFDAB65.1080407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>Most sitcoms today are simply variations
>>>on
>>>Alice, Ralph, Trixie and Ed, or Lucy, Ricky, Ethel and Fred.
>>
>> Don't forget the "babe" and the fat ugly guy... oh wait, that was the
>>alice and Ralph thing wasn't it.
>
>
> And the Ed and Trixie thing, to an extent.
>
> Audrey Meadows was about 18 when she auditioned for the part of Alice.
> The casting people didn't want to give her a chance because they
> thought she was way too young and way too beautiful for the role, and
> would not stand up to Jackie Gleason's bombastic style. She showed up
> with her hair pretty much as it is in the show, no makeup, very dowdy
> clothes, and came out on stage talking in her Alice voice. Gleason
> took it all in, stood up, pointed and said "That's Alice".
>
> Note that no matter how much Ralph yells, throws his arms about and
> carries on, Alice never flinches. Not even an eyelash.
>
> Often imitated, never equaled.
>
> Today we have "According to Jim" with Jim Belushi and Courtney
> Thorne-Smith. Like THAT would ever happen...Before that, "Home
> Improvement" was essentially the same show. All the way back to "Dick
> Van Dyke", (Everyman nuclear family with scenes at both work and home)
> which is still funnier than almost all of its imitators.

Now there's a flashback moment! my first crush when I was a kid was MTM.
Now if I see a rerun I'm immediately reminded why. BTW, Mary should get
some consideration on this list. I think she is a classy lady, and still
looks fine.

Then comes my next crush, Barbara Eden. But boy was that show ever Stupid!

> (Hall closet full of walnuts? Morey Amsterdam's constant wisecracks
> about Mel's hair?)
>
>
>>Television sucks now. The only things I
>>watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a while,
>>and the History channel.
>>
>
> I think there's as much good programming today as at any time in the
> past. The problem is that there is so much more programming today, so
> almost anything can get on the air. Most of which is JUNK.

Ahh, the dilution effect. Quite like diamond mining.

> Here in Philly during the '50s and '60s there were three stations (one
> for each network, 3, 6, 10) and they were on the air about 18 hours a
> day. Then what is now the PBS station (12) came on the air. Great
> stuff - but usually there was nothing worth watching.
>
> Then in the late '60s came three UHF stations (17, 29, 48). Then
> cable, which caught on even in places where you could SEE the
> Roxborough antenna farm on a clear day. Today, with a cheap TV and a
> pair of rabbit ears I can see 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 23, 29, 35, 48, 52,
> 65. But there's usually nothing worth watching.
>
> We remember the good shows and forget the bad ones. One of the reasons
> the original "Star Trek" made such an impression was that it was so
> different from the rest of the bad, bad, bad TV of the time. Such as
> "Lost In Space", which recycled the same B-movie robot...

What would you class Green Acres as? (be careful, I think it is
television's pinnacle, disguised as an idiotic farce)

>
>>>"as God is my witness, I thought turkeys could fly..."
>>
>> Ahh, my favortite episode!
>
>
> Almost everyone's. I have it on tape. Watch it every Thanksgiving.
> "They're hitting the ground like sacks of wet cement! oh, the
> humanity!"
>
>
>>Gaw, I laughed till I cried, and then some.
>>
>
> "Then the turkeys mounted a counterattack. It was as if they
> were...organized!"
>
> Then there's the one where the unscrupulous photographer secretly

> takes pictures of Jennifer getting changed, and the gang has to get
> them back. The scene where Johnny and Bailey impersonate a magazine
> editor and centerfold model (respectively) for a nonexistent magazine
> and con the bad guy is priceless.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Now identify the source of this quote:
>
> "Do you....enjoy.....knives?"

Got me there! Anyone?

- Mike KB3EIA -

630. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 20:39:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FFF117D.4050209@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85406

>
>
>>>
>>>Most sitcoms today are simply variations
>>>on
>>>Alice, Ralph, Trixie and Ed, or Lucy, Ricky, Ethel and Fred.
>>>
>>>
>> Don't forget the "babe" and the fat ugly guy... oh wait, that was the
>>alice and Ralph thing wasn't it.
>>
>>
>
>And the Ed and Trixie thing, to an extent.
>
>
"As they say in the sewer, here's mud in your eye!"

>
>Today we have "According to Jim" with Jim Belushi and Courtney
>Thorne-Smith. Like THAT would ever happen...Before that, "Home
>Improvement" was essentially the same show. All the way back to "Dick
>Van Dyke", (Everyman nuclear family
>
My family ran on fossil fuel. Less radioactivity... :-)

>with scenes at both work and home)
>which is still funnier than almost all of its imitators.
>
>(Hall closet full of walnuts? Morey Amsterdam's constant wisecracks
>about Mel's hair?)
>
>
>
>>Television sucks now. The only things I
>>watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a while,
>>and the History channel.
>>
>>
>>
>I think there's as much good programming today as at any time in the
>past. The problem is that there is so much more programming today, so
>almost anything can get on the air. Most of which is JUNK.
>
Some of the stuff I liked as a kid I found to suck today. "Couragous

Cat and
Minute Mouse" sucks when you're an adult. But "Rocky and Bullwinkle" got
better when viewed as an adult.

"My Mother the Car" had to be the worst TV show ever done. "Lost in Space"
was decent for the first 2 episodes, then rapidly bit the big one
thereafter.

I rarely watch anything that is not the news or sports on TV anymore.

>
>Here in Philly during the '50s and '60s there were three stations (one
>for each network, 3, 6, 10) and they were on the air about 18 hours a
>day. Then what is now the PBS station (12) came on the air. Great
>stuff - but usually there was nothing worth watching.
>
>Then in the late '60s came three UHF stations (17, 29, 48). Then
>cable, which caught on even in places where you could SEE the
>Roxborough antenna farm on a clear day. Today, with a cheap TV and a
>pair of rabbit ears I can see 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 23, 29, 35, 48, 52,
>65. But there's usually nothing worth watching.
>
>We remember the good shows and forget the bad ones. One of the reasons
>the original "Star Trek" made such an impression was that it was so
>different from the rest of the bad, bad, bad TV of the time. Such as
>"Lost In Space", which recycled the same B-movie robot...
>
>
>
>>>"as God is my witness, I thought turkeys could fly..."
>>>
>>>
>> Ahh, my favortite episode!
>>
>>
>
>Almost everyone's. I have it on tape. Watch it every Thanksgiving.
>"They're hitting the ground like sacks of wet cement! oh, the
>humanity!"
>
>
>
>>Gaw, I laughed till I cried, and then some.
>>
>>
>>
>"Then the turkeys mounted a counterattack. It was as if they
>were...organized!"
>
>Then there's the one where the unscrupulous photographer secretly
>takes pictures of Jennifer getting changed, and the gang has to get

>them back. The scene where Johnny and Bailey impersonate a magazine
>editor and centerfold model (respectively) for a nonexistent magazine
>and con the bad guy is priceless.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Now identify the source of this quote:
>
>"Do you....enjoy.....knives?"
>
>

631. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 20:58:17 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2u1uvvgs25c572fom9b69cq5c9qrudtrhc@4ax.com>
Source record: 85407

Mike,

Heh - I have carefully avoided that discussion so far, as it seems to be taking on a life of its own.....aw, OK, if you insist......

For the record - and staying well away from the current "who edited whose post, was that ethical and did they intend t make it look like the original author did it?" debacle - my personal view of the "Kim's Call Sign" issue is as follows (and directed at no particular person or whacko in particular) :

- W5TIT is a valid and legal call sign issued by the US Government, via the FCC - if they believed that it was inappropriate, they could have removed it from the list of available suffixes just like the Motor Vehicle Licensing folks do with certain (ahem) words and acronyms

- she earned the right to it by becoming licensed, just like every other Amateur

- she has the right to pick any vanity call sign that she chooses, so long as the FCC has not prohibited it for whatever reason. Why that particular call? That's nobody's business except hers!

- she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate too!

- no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking over your life!

- in Ontario, VA3TIT is available - VE3TIT is in use (by a gentleman named Neil - would someone like to censor him too? :)).
Apparently, just like the US, the Canadian government sees nothing wrong with this suffix either. (and neither does Neil, I suppose...)

- the thing that really needs to be censored here is the sophomoric behaviour, boorishness and tittering (sorry - couldn't resist) of a few sadly immature folks here in the group.

- if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and I have something in common - so would I!

and, lastly

- Kim is definitely braver than me - I choose not to use my call sign on the Usenet groups, to limit the number of crazies that have access to my snail mail info, where she is willing to deal head on with whomever, whenever in defense of her rights as detailed above.

In summary - you go, girl!

73, Leo

On Fri, 09 Jan 2004 13:54:30 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>snip
>
>If we don't want to talk about the Morse code test, maybe Kim's
>callsign? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

632. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 22:41:20 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <C-6dncGQ5rR0rmKiRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85408

Leo wrote:

> Mike,
>
> Heh - I have carefully avoided that discussion so far, as it seems to
> be taking on a life of its own.....aw, OK, if you insist......
>
> For the record - and staying well away from the current "who edited
> whose post, was that ethical and did they intend t make it look like
> the original author did it?" debacle - my personal view of the "Kim's
> Call Sign" issue is as follows (and directed at no particular person
> or whacko in particular) :
>
> - W5TIT is a valid and legal call sign issued by the US Government,
> via the FCC - if they believed that it was inappropriate, they could
> have removed it from the list of available suffixes just like the
> Motor Vehicle Licensing folks do with certain (ahem) words and
> acronyms
>
> - she earned the right to it by becoming licensed, just like every
> other Amateur
>
> - she has the right to pick any vanity call sign that she chooses, so
> long as the FCC has not prohibited it for whatever reason. Why that
> particular call? That's nobody's business except hers!
>
> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> too!
>
> - no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her
> use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of
> the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to
> spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the
> air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking
> over your life!
>
> - in Ontario, VA3TIT is available - VE3TIT is in use (by a gentleman
> named Neil - would someone like to censor him too? :)).
> Apparently, just like the US, the Canadian government sees nothing
> wrong with this suffix either. (and neither does Neil, I suppose...)
>
> - the thing that really needs to be censored here is the sophomoric
> behaviour, boorishness and tittering (sorry - couldn't resist) of a

> few sadly immature folks here in the group.
>
> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
> I have something in common - so would I!

What you say is true, anyone has the right to exercise bad taste.

633. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 23:52:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <89HLb.23889$P%1.22228137@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85409

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FFE49E1.4070406@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >
> >btw, you might want to look up the origin of the word "Easter"...
> >
> >
>
> And what connection the resurection of Jesus Christ has with rabbits
hiding
> colored chicken eggs has.
>
> And why no holiday for "Wester", "Norther", and "Souther" :-)
>
> And why kids get dressed up in costumes and ask neighbors for candy on
> Halloween. A Chinese friend once asked me about that, all I could say
> was that it was an ancient tradition that nobody knows where it came from
> or why it was done.
>

Halloween is a run together form of "All Hallow's Eve, meaning "All Saint's Eve." It is the night before All Hallow's Day, which is a religious holy day to honor saints that do not have specific days set aside for them. The belief used to be that on the night before All Hallow's Day that the Devil's minions would roam the earth. If one dressed up like ghosts, devils, and goblins, etc, one would be protected from these creatures (it appears to have entered Christianity from some pagan religion). Now to prevent these evil creatures from harming them, ordinary people would give them gifts (food, candy, etc). Therefore the people who were disguised as these creatures also needed to do the same so that the devil's minions would not be able to penetrate their disguises. If a person did not appease the demons, the demons would play tricks on them. And thus the disguised people also needed to do the same if the did not receive a treat in order to maintain their disguise.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

634. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-09 23:55:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XbHLb.23891$P%1.22229022@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85410

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0401090242.36d45f3b@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<xxlLb.22847$P%1.21765796@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:WOcLb.32978$IM3.28342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > And the efforts of REACT and its
> > > > > members are commendable. However,
> > > > > any public service performed is informal
> > > > > in nature, not the result of any regulatory
> > > > > stipulation imposed by the FCC or
> > > > > federal government. There is nothing in
> > > > > part 95 that mandates public service like
> > > > > that found in part 97.
> > > >
> > > > OK, Dwight quote paragraph and section
> > > > that states that amateurs MUST do public
> > > > service.
> > >
> > > Okay, Dee, show me where I said Amateurs "must" do public service.
Part
> > 97
> > > offers that as one purpose of the ARS and gives us the mandate
(authority)
> > > to do so (ARES and so on), but it certainly isn't required.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> >
> > your words were:
> >
> > "...There is nothing in part 95 that mandates public service like that
found
> > in part 97."
> >
> > tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates
```

> > 1. To assign (a colony or territory) to a specified nation under a
mandate.
> > 2. To make mandatory, as by law; decree or require: mandated
desegregation
> > of public schools.
> >
> > The way you have used the word conforms to usage number 2. Therefore,
you
> > have stated that public service is required even though that may not be
what
> > you meant to say.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Here you go, Dee.
>
> ---------------------------
> From: "ARRL Letter"
> Date: Wed, 26 Nov 2003 19:02:59 -0500
> Subject: The ARRL Letter, Vol 22, No 47
>
> ==
> ==>FCC REORGANIZES WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS BUREAU
>
> The FCC has announced a reorganization of its Wireless Telecommunications
> Bureau (WTB) "to more effectively support the
> FCC's strategic goals--broadband, competition, spectrum, media, homeland
> security and modernizing the FCC." The WTB administers the Amateur Radio
> Service (Part 97) and amateur licensing, but the changes are expected to
> be transparent to the amateur community. The Amateur Service now will be
> administered by the newly named Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure
> Division. D'wana Terry, formerly chief of the Public Safety and Private
> Wireless Division, will head the new division.
>
> "The bureau's portfolios have been redistributed along the lines of
> strategic goals, consolidating similar functions to focus resources
> better," the FCC said in a November 24 public notice. As a result of the
> reorganization, which the FCC approved November 13, WTB expands from five
> to six divisions: Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure, Spectrum
> Management Resources and Technologies, Auctions and Spectrum Access,
> Spectrum and Competition Policy, Mobility, and Broadband.
>
> In addition to the Amateur Service, the Public Safety and Critical
> Infrastructure Division will oversee Part 95, Marine, Aviation,
> Intelligent Transportation Systems, Public Safety Fixed Microwave, Public
> Safety and Private Land Mobile services and E911, among other areas.
> Responsibilities moved elsewhere include Fixed Microwave (Part 101),
> Instructional Television Fixed Service, the Multipoint Distribution
> Service, and the Multichannel Video Distribution and Data Service.
>

> The action reduces the scope and size of WTB's larger divisions and
> eliminates separate branches below the division level, while retaining
> their current functions. One of those was the Licensing and Technical
> Analysis Branch, headquartered in the FCC's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania,
> office. Among other tasks, that branch has handled the granting and
> issuance of Amateur Radio licenses and the vanity call sign program.
> Another was the Policy and Rules Branch at FCC Headquarters, which has
> been the home of Bill Cross, W3TN, an FCC figure well-known within the
> amateur community. Among other tasks, that branch has handled Amateur
> Radio rule making petitions and Part 97 rules interpretations.
>
> A potential plus of the new arrangement is that Cross now will work under
> another amateur licensee, Mike Wilhelm, WS6BR, who will report to Terry.
>
> The FCC said eliminating branches would promote greater management
> flexibility in deploying resources and lead to a flatter, more flexible
> organization without altering the bureau's overall mission. The Commission
> said it was able to carry out the reorganization by redeploying existing
> positions.
>
> WTB Chief John Muleta said the reorganization will result in "a
> mission-driven team that will be innovative in its approach to regulatory
> policies and customer service."
>
> ==
> Required 'claimer:
> Material from The ARRL Letter may be republished or reproduced in whole or
> in part in any form without additional permission. Credit must be given to
> The ARRL Letter and The American Radio Relay League.
>
> "In addition to the Amateur Service, the Public Safety and Critical
> Infrastructure Division will oversee Part 95" Hello.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

OK Bert, show me where it says that Part 97 mandates public service. There
is nothing in this quote to that effect.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

635. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 00:35:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hr6weed.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 85411
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 07 Jan 2004 00:00:51 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>Don't know if it will help, but how about this:
>http://www.dosemu.org/
>I have no idea if it will help or not; I'm thinking of putting Linux in one
>of the boxes. A Google search of 'DOS emulators for Linux' yielded a ton of
>hits, but you've likely already researched them.

Thanks for the pointer - now I know where to get dosemu which I was
advised to try.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

636. Re: Radio Designer software package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 00:35:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hr6wbbc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 85412
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 06 Jan 2004 20:13:16 -0000, Dave Platt wrote:

>> I'm trying to find a DOS emulator for Linux to see if I can run two
>> circuits at once now...,..
>
>A version of F6FBB is available which runs native on Linux, using the
>Linux AX.25 networking support code. There ought to be no problem
>running multiple TNCs (either real ones in KISS mode on serial ports,
>or soundmodem versions), doing digipeating, etc. on Linux.

Thanks for the pointer, Dave. I'm getting back into the *nix world
after being away from it for almost 10 years and I've forgotten more
than I remember, it seems.

I'll try to find F6FBB and see if I like it. I've become very
attached to the look and feel of PkGold over the last 10+ years that
I've used it, and of course in a pinch I can use a straight terminal
program....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

637. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 01:06:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040109200620.21232.00003442@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 85413

In article <3FFF117D.4050209@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>"As they say in the sewer, here's mud in your eye!"

--

Ralph (reading from instruction book on how to play golf while Ed has club in
hand and ball on floor): "Step One: Address the ball"

Ed: "Hellllooooo, ball!

--

Remember the running gag where, when Norton had to do something important like
sign a paper, he would go through all sorts of preparatory motions until
finally Ralph would yell "WILL YOU COME ON"?

Turns out that the first time that was done, it was pure ad-lib by Art Carney.
His father used to do that sort of thing and Art simply exaggerated it.

>>Today we have "According to Jim" with Jim Belushi and Courtney
>>Thorne-Smith. Like THAT would ever happen...Before that, "Home
>>Improvement" was essentially the same show. All the way back to "Dick
>>Van Dyke", (Everyman nuclear family
>>
>My family ran on fossil fuel. Less radioactivity... :-)

There is a Petrie Road not far from here, in Rosemont, PA.
>
>>with scenes at both work and home)
>>which is still funnier than almost all of its imitators.
>>
>>(Hall closet full of walnuts? Morey Amsterdam's constant wisecracks
>>about Mel's hair?)

>>>Television sucks now. The only things I
>>>watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a >>>while,
and the History channel.

>>I think there's as much good programming today as at any time in the
>>past. The problem is that there is so much more programming today, so
>>almost anything can get on the air. Most of which is JUNK.
>>
>Some of the stuff I liked as a kid I found to suck today. "Couragous
>Cat and Minute Mouse" sucks when you're an adult.

It was awful when I was a kid. "Tom Terrific (with Manfred, the Wonder Dog)" was so bad it was good.

>But "Rocky and Bullwinkle" got better when viewed as an adult.

That's because it was actually an adult show. The network did not understand it at all. "Kirwood Derby"? Anti-anti-anti-missile-missile-missile? Mr. Peabody?

Matt Groenig credits "Rocky" as the inspiration for "The Simpsons". Homer's middle initial is J in honor of Jay Ward, creator of R&B.

>"My Mother the Car" had to be the worst TV show ever done. "Lost in Space"
>was decent for the first 2 episodes, then rapidly bit the big one
>thereafter.

The term used here is "jumped the shark". There's a whole website devoted to when particular series jumped.
>
>I rarely watch anything that is not the news or sports on TV anymore.
>
MST3K, anyone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

638. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 01:31:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <cCILb.993$i4.778@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85414

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> > Okay, Dee, show me where I said
> > Amateurs "must" do public service.
>
> your words were:
>
> "...There is nothing in part 95 that
> mandates public service like that
> found in part 97."
>
> tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates
> 1. To assign (a colony or territory) to
> a specified nation under a mandate.
> 2. To make mandatory, as by law;
> decree or require: mandated
> desegregation of public schools.
>
> The way you have used the word
> conforms to usage number 2. Therefore,
> you have stated that public service is
> required even though that may not be
> what you meant to say.

I don't have time to waste on this, Dee. You know what Part 97 says, and what it means (and therefore what I meant). A more complete definition of "mandate" is...

Noun: mandate ('man'deyt)
1. A document giving an official instruction or command
2. A territory surrendered by Turkey or Germany after World War I and inhabited by people not yet able to stand by themselves and so put under the tutelage of some other European power
3. (politics) the commission that is given to a government and its policies through an electoral victory

Verb: mandate (man'deyt)
1. Assign under a mandate; of nations
2. Assign authority to

I used mandate in the context that Part 97 assigns authority to Ham radio operators to perform public service through ARES, community organizations, and so on. There is nothing like that in Part 95. Obviously, there is nothing in "assigns authority to" that is required.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

639. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 01:38:18 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <eIILb.118379$Cs3.18633257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85415

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FFEF8B6.1000706@psu.edu...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> Egbert: September 13, 2003
> Jeff: September 29, 2003
> Leroy: December 31, 2003
> Bill: January 1, 2004
> Phil: March 15, 2004
> Jim H: April 1, 2004
> Jim M: April 15, 2004
> Alun: May 1, 2004
> Ryan: July 1, 2004
> Robert: August 1, 2004
> Larry: September 15, 2004
> Charles: December 30, 2004
> Dee: July 1, 2005
> Mike: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> Hans: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<
>
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
>
> Howzat?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Hey Mike,

My friends call me Bert. Only Len calls me Egbert. (Who said he doesn't know
his place?) ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

640. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 01:44:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <eOILb.10194$uF6.3046301@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85417

Bert Craig wrote:

> Hey Mike,
>
> My friends call me Bert. Only Len calls me Egbert. (Who said he doesn't know
> his place?) ;-)

oops, Sorry, Bert! I wasn't sure who everyone was by callsign, so I looked it up on arr.org.

- Mike KB3EIA -

641. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 01:52:39 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <HVILb.118531$Cs3.18701588@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85416

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:XbHLb.23891$P%1.22229022@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> OK Bert, show me where it says that Part 97 mandates public service.
There
> is nothing in this quote to that effect.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Sorry about that, Dee.

While the following is not an actual part of Part 97, I feel it means
something...especially since we were all issued a reminder by a very high
profile FCC employee directly responsible for an aspect of the ARS.

THE AMATEUR'S CREED

The Radio Amateur is:

CONSIDERATE---never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
pleasure of others.

LOYAL---offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateur, local
clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in
the United States is represented nationally and internationally.

PROGRESSIVE---with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient
station and operation above reproach.

FRIENDLY---slow and patient operating when requested, friendly advice and
counsel to the beginner, kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration
for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.

BALANCED---radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to
family, job, school, or community.

PATRIOTIC---station and skill always ready for service to country and
community.

(Paul M. Segal, W9EEA wrote the original Amateurs Code, in 1928

The PATRIOTIC description pretty much sums it up.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

642. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:36:47 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btnso8$kt7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85424

Jim, remove my name and prediction from this list.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040109075553.25815.00005808@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>
> K0HB: January 1, 2011 (first date not in "this decade")
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

643. As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:41:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040109224135.21457.00003274@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85418

In article <Xns946A7CDDFB124elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>Another domino falls.
>
>No more code testing in 9A now.
>
>They are now also the first country in Region 1 to get 7100-7200 kHz, not
>otherwise due until next year, I think. I'll be looking for 9A1A in 7150-
>7200 in the next contest.
>
>73 de Alun, N3KIP

Keep us posted as the world dumbs down, Alun. We're counting on you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

644. Re: Do Hams Tip?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:41:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040109224135.21457.00003275@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85419

In article <OwpLb.2493$8H.15153@attbi_s03>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>> BTW I'm on Day 5 of In Flew Enza. Haven't been to work yet this year.
>> Hopefully Thursday. I'm on some good antibiotics now, wish me luck.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>Whiskey and plenty of it ...take care Larry
>
>73 KI3R Tom

Tom:

Thanks for the tip. I'm on the mend, and yes, there was some whiskey
consumption involved! I did make it back to work on Thursday as
predicted.

73 de Larry, K3LT

645. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:43:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85423

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FFEA8B9.7060305@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
"K�HB"
> > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>>Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
> >>>indication that you're changing them?
> >>
> >>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond
that.
> >
> >
> > Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
> >
> > Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication of
having
> > done so?
> >
> > Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
> > signature?
> >
> >>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which he
and
> >>many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
> >
> >
> > To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is inappropriate
for
> > the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's evaluation of it. But I
have
> > tried not
> > to make a big deal about the issue.
> >
> > I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can*
control
> > what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases are edited
out by

> > me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet and email standards. I try to
> > always be clear what words were written by the original author and what words
> > were not.
> >
> > I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's choice of
> > callsign wrote many, many postings containing that callsign, therefore giving
> > it
> > far more visibility than it would otherwise get.
> >
> >
> >>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.
> >
> >
> > Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>
> Nope
>
> > Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication of having
> > done so?
>
>
> Nope
>
>
> > Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
> > signature?
>
>
> Nope
>
>
> >
> >>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think that
> >>they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my right.
> >
> >
> > "Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
> >
> >>YMMV. That's your right.
> >>
> >
> > It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far less

> > comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In fact, I've
been
> > omitting it for many months and no one has noticed until now.
>
> I did, but saw no need to comment until the mis-attribute letter came
along.
>
>
> > Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who
would
> > *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her status as
anything
> > else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise patronized by me. Or
by
> > anyone else.
> >
> > I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to change.
Deal
> > with it.
> >
> > But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it clear.
>
> Most of her posts have the correct attributes (or is that
> attributification) 8^) How this message became "different" is a mystery.
> Maybe it was an accident, maybe it was not. Heck if I did that, I'd send
> out an "oops" at least.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>

It was not an "oops" at all, Mike. I've noticed before that Jim sends that list out without my callsign associated with it. I consider that my prediction is probably among the most accurate of the predictions that have a true "pulse" on amateur radio--REGARDLESS of the callsign of *any* chosen ham.

Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious decision to participate in something he's providing for fun. I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.

I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person has a problem with that.

I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the list. If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.

Kim W5TIT

646. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:48:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btnsoa$kt7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85421

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:8AALb.465$zj7.113@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> >> K0HB: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Kim W5TIT

647. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:49:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btnsob$kt7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85425

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FFEF8B6.1000706@psu.edu...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> Egbert: September 13, 2003
> Jeff: September 29, 2003
> Leroy: December 31, 2003
> Bill: January 1, 2004
> Phil: March 15, 2004
> Jim H: April 1, 2004
> Jim M: April 15, 2004
> Alun: May 1, 2004
> Ryan: July 1, 2004
> Robert: August 1, 2004
> Larry: September 15, 2004
> Charles: December 30, 2004
> Dee: July 1, 2005
> Mike: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>
> Hans: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<
>
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
>
> Howzat?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Kim W5TIT

648. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:51:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btnsp6$kep@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85422

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:eOILb.10194$uF6.3046301@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > Hey Mike,
> >
> > My friends call me Bert. Only Len calls me Egbert. (Who said he doesn't
know
> > his place?) ;-)
>
> oops, Sorry, Bert! I wasn't sure who everyone was by callsign, so I
> looked it up on arr.org.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Mike, nice of ya....but just leave me off...

Kim W5TIT

649. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 03:52:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btnsr4$her@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85420

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040109224135.21457.00003274@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <Xns946A7CDDFB124elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
> >Another domino falls.
> >
> >No more code testing in 9A now.
> >
> >They are now also the first country in Region 1 to get 7100-7200 kHz, not
> >otherwise due until next year, I think. I'll be looking for 9A1A in 7150-
> >7200 in the next contest.
> >
> >73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Keep us posted as the world dumbs down, Alun. We're counting on you.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, Larry's waiting for everyone to catch up to his level...

Kim W5TIT

650. Re: As The World Wises Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 04:47:49 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946BF20FF1FE7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85426

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:btnsr4$her@library1.airnews.net:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20040109224135.21457.00003274@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> In article <Xns946A7CDDFB124elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>> >Another domino falls.
>> >
>> >No more code testing in 9A now.
>> >
>> >They are now also the first country in Region 1 to get 7100-7200 kHz,
>> >not otherwise due until next year, I think. I'll be looking for 9A1A
>> >in 7150- 7200 in the next contest.
>> >
>> >73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>
>> Keep us posted as the world dumbs down, Alun. We're counting on you.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
> Yeah, Larry's waiting for everyone to catch up to his level...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

I will indeed keep you informed.

Alun N3KIP

651. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 05:18:44 UTC
From: Jay <jay422000@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4a97b$3fff8b4a$d1cc7b3c$24689@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 85427

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:btnsr4$her@library1.airnews.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20040109224135.21457.00003274@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > In article <Xns946A7CDDFB124elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >
> > >Another domino falls.
> > >
> > >No more code testing in 9A now.
> > >
> > >They are now also the first country in Region 1 to get 7100-7200 kHz,
not
> > >otherwise due until next year, I think. I'll be looking for 9A1A in
7150-
> > >7200 in the next contest.
> > >
> > >73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Keep us posted as the world dumbs down, Alun. We're counting on you.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Yeah, Larry's waiting for everyone to catch up to his level...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Agreed Kim. I have been to Croatia twice since 2000
and I have found it to be both a friendly place and
progressive minded country. The food was a mix of
Italian and Eastern European and the bars/clubs/outdoor
restaurants were open from dusk till dawn. Despite this
everyone was well behaved, both the tourists
and locals. Designated drivers or people were there
to help those home who imbibed a tad too much but you
never saw a single alcohol related incident during both
my stays in holiday in Croatia, and I felt far safer walking
with my friends back to the hotel in Porec, Valalta and Trpanj
at 2:00 AM after an evening of wining and dining that I would have
felt doing similar activity in New York or Miami.

Is it not a shame that some hams (who claim to be "World Wise" ??)
would measure a whole Country's worth, solely on the basis of
if they kept a stupid Morse code test..?

I guess we can draw amusment from the fact they show
all their abysmal degree of ignorance by posting
such juvenile remarks.

652. Duz this still work????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 06:21:45 UTC
From: lorentzson@lycos.com
Message-ID: <400299d1.9484938@news.devtex.net>
Source record: 85428

At some time in the past, I don't recall when, I used to
go to Qrz or one of the others? and you could look up all
the amateure in town, I don't know if it worked for large cities
but I live in a samll town, and with a 'clic' you could locate ever
operator here. I tried to do that again, tonight and I am missing
something, cause I could not do the same thing. Have I just lost
track of something,,,,,,, or is this more """"9/11"""?????
tthank in advance. cl. 73

653. The way to deal with BPI:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 06:38:49 UTC
From: John Smith <djfinn2@nobellspsoutham.net>
Message-ID: <K4NLb.2626$PP5.1957@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85429

CW makes it thru BPI. New BPI activities left unchecked will bring great popularity back to the much maligned CW because, like it or not, CW morse get through when nothing else does..

de kr4aj

654. Re: The way to deal with BPI:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 06:46:07 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <bto73f$l1d$1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 85430

John Smith <djfinn2@nobellspsoutham.net> wrote:
> CW makes it thru BPI. New BPI activities left unchecked will bring great
> popularity back to the much maligned CW because, like it or not, CW morse
> get through when nothing else does..

> de kr4aj

What the hell is BPI?

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

655. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 09:46:09 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <BRPLb.119912$Cs3.20276734@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85431

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:eOILb.10194$uF6.3046301@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > Hey Mike,
> >
> > My friends call me Bert. Only Len calls me Egbert. (Who said he doesn't
know
> > his place?) ;-)
>
> oops, Sorry, Bert! I wasn't sure who everyone was by callsign, so I
> looked it up on arr.org.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

It's all good, my friend. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

656. Re: The way to deal with BPI:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 10:51:27 UTC
From: White Rover <deltapapa1@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <POQLb.43$Ez4.7@newsfep1-gui.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 85432

<jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
news:bto73f$l1d$1@mail.specsol.com...
> John Smith <djfinn2@nobellspsoutham.net> wrote:
> > CW makes it thru BPI. New BPI activities left unchecked will bring great
> > popularity back to the much maligned CW because, like it or not, CW
morse
> > get through when nothing else does..
>
> > de kr4aj
>
> What the hell is BPI?
>
> --
> Jim Pennino
>
> Remove -spam-sux to reply.

BIG PRICKS INTERNATIONAL

657. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 11:13:27 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <a6RLb.2699$PP5.42@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85433

All the talk about dumbing down and we get a thread with nothing to do
with radio at all. Dumb on...

Bert Craig wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:eOILb.10194$uF6.3046301@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bert Craig wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Hey Mike,
>>>
>>>My friends call me Bert. Only Len calls me Egbert. (Who said he doesn't
>
> know
>
>>>his place?) ;-)
>>
>>oops, Sorry, Bert! I wasn't sure who everyone was by callsign, so I
>>looked it up on arr.org.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> It's all good, my friend. :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

658. Re: Duz this still work????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 12:30:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401100430.597e4bf9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85434

lorentzson@lycos.com (n/a) wrote in message news:<400299d1.9484938@news.devtex.net>...
> At some time in the past, I don't recall when, I used to
> go to Qrz or one of the others? and you could look up all
> the amateure in town, I don't know if it worked for large cities
> but I live in a samll town, and with a 'clic' you could locate ever
> operator here. I tried to do that again, tonight and I am missing
> something, cause I could not do the same thing. Have I just lost
> track of something,,,,,,, or is this more """"9/11""""?????
> tthank in advance. cl. 73

Hwere's how I did it:

On the QRZ main page, go to the "Name lookup" way down on the left
hand column. Type in your zip code and hit enter.

659. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 12:38:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110073836.07578.00002516@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 85435

In article <8AALb.465$zj7.113@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>>> K0HB: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<

I can put you down for that date, Hans. However, note that the "first date not in 'this millenium' is January 1, 3001 - because there was no year 0 in our calendar.

73 de Jim, N2EY

660. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 12:48:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vwSLb.24086$P%1.22501975@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85436

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:cCILb.993$i4.778@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> > > Okay, Dee, show me where I said
> > > Amateurs "must" do public service.
> >
> > your words were:
> >
> > "...There is nothing in part 95 that
> > mandates public service like that
> > found in part 97."
> >
> > tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates
> > 1. To assign (a colony or territory) to
> > a specified nation under a mandate.
> > 2. To make mandatory, as by law;
> > decree or require: mandated
> > desegregation of public schools.
> >
> > The way you have used the word
> > conforms to usage number 2. Therefore,
> > you have stated that public service is
> > required even though that may not be
> > what you meant to say.
>
>
> I don't have time to waste on this, Dee. You know what Part 97 says, and
> what it means (and therefore what I meant). A more complete definition of
> "mandate" is...
>
> Noun: mandate ('man'deyt)
> 1. A document giving an official instruction or command
> 2. A territory surrendered by Turkey or Germany after World War I and
> inhabited by people not yet able to stand by themselves and so put under
the
> tutelage of some other European power
> 3. (politics) the commission that is given to a government and its
> policies through an electoral victory
>
> Verb: mandate (man'deyt)
> 1. Assign under a mandate; of nations
> 2. Assign authority to

>
> I used mandate in the context that Part 97 assigns authority to Ham
radio
> operators to perform public service through ARES, community organizations,
> and so on. There is nothing like that in Part 95. Obviously, there is
> nothing in "assigns authority to" that is required.
>
>

Your usage is still incorrect. There is nothing in Part 97 that assigns authority to hams to do public service either. I've read part 97 from beginning to end. Also there was no reason to include noun definitions when working with the verb.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

661. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 12:50:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <0ySLb.24087$P%1.22502320@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85437

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:HVILb.118531$Cs3.18701588@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:XbHLb.23891$P%1.22229022@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > OK Bert, show me where it says that Part 97 mandates public service.
> There
> > is nothing in this quote to that effect.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Sorry about that, Dee.
>
> While the following is not an actual part of Part 97, I feel it means
> something...especially since we were all issued a reminder by a very high
> profile FCC employee directly responsible for an aspect of the ARS.
>
> THE AMATEUR'S CREED
>
>
> The Radio Amateur is:
>
> CONSIDERATE---never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> pleasure of others.
>
> LOYAL---offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateur, local
> clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in
> the United States is represented nationally and internationally.
>
> PROGRESSIVE---with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and
efficient
> station and operation above reproach.
>
> FRIENDLY---slow and patient operating when requested, friendly advice and
> counsel to the beginner, kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration
> for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur
spirit.
>
> BALANCED---radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to
> family, job, school, or community.
>
> PATRIOTIC---station and skill always ready for service to country and
> community.
>
> (Paul M. Segal, W9EEA wrote the original Amateurs Code, in 1928

>
>
> The PATRIOTIC description pretty much sums it up.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Oh I definitely agree that part of being a ham is doing public service. It is just that there is a big difference between should and must.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

662. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 13:06:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ENSLb.24088$P%1.22506459@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85438

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:vwSLb.24086$P%1.22501975@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:cCILb.993$i4.778@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> > > > Okay, Dee, show me where I said
> > > > Amateurs "must" do public service.
> > >
> > > your words were:
> > >
> > > "...There is nothing in part 95 that
> > > mandates public service like that
> > > found in part 97."
> > >
> > > tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates
> > > 1. To assign (a colony or territory) to
> > > a specified nation under a mandate.
> > > 2. To make mandatory, as by law;
> > > decree or require: mandated
> > > desegregation of public schools.
> > >
> > > The way you have used the word
> > > conforms to usage number 2. Therefore,
> > > you have stated that public service is
> > > required even though that may not be
> > > what you meant to say.
> >
> >
> > I don't have time to waste on this, Dee. You know what Part 97 says,
and
> > what it means (and therefore what I meant). A more complete definition
of
> > "mandate" is...
> >
> > Noun: mandate ('man'deyt)
> > 1. A document giving an official instruction or command
> > 2. A territory surrendered by Turkey or Germany after World War I and
> > inhabited by people not yet able to stand by themselves and so put under
> the
> > tutelage of some other European power
> > 3. (politics) the commission that is given to a government and its
```

> > policies through an electoral victory
> >
> > Verb: mandate (man'deyt)
> > 1. Assign under a mandate; of nations
> > 2. Assign authority to
> >
> > I used mandate in the context that Part 97 assigns authority to Ham
> radio
> > operators to perform public service through ARES, community
organizations,
> > and so on. There is nothing like that in Part 95. Obviously, there is
> > nothing in "assigns authority to" that is required.
> >
> >
>
> Your usage is still incorrect. There is nothing in Part 97 that assigns
> authority to hams to do public service either. I've read part 97 from
> beginning to end. Also there was no reason to include noun definitions
when
> working with the verb.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Also please let me know which dictionary you are using. I've checked several and for the verb meaning your number 2 does not appear. The only ones that I find are your number 1 and the second meaning is always to make something required.

:Language is a tool that must be used correctly to convey the intended meaning. One should never operate on the basis that "you know what I mean" as sooner or later that gets a person in trouble.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

663. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 13:38:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110083843.15462.00005548@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85440

In article <3FFF07B4.1090408@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>All the way back to "Dick
>> Van Dyke", (Everyman nuclear family with scenes at both work and home)
>> which is still funnier than almost all of its imitators.
>
>Now there's a flashback moment! my first crush when I was a kid was MTM.
>Now if I see a rerun I'm immediately reminded why. BTW, Mary should get
>some consideration on this list. I think she is a classy lady, and still
>looks fine.

She, too, was extremely young when she got the role of Laura Petrie. Her later show probably set a record for spinoffs, resulting in "Rhoda", "Lou Grant" and a few others I can't recall.

But it is my understanding that MTM was one of the reasons WKRP was cancelled.
>
>Then comes my next crush, Barbara Eden. But boy was that show ever Stupid!
>
Oddly enough, she starred in an earlier film called "The Brass Bottle" in which Burl Ives played a genie.

Remember how they had to hide her navel with makeup?

>> (Hall closet full of walnuts? Morey Amsterdam's constant wisecracks
>> about Mel's hair?)
>>
>>>Television sucks now. The only things I
>>>watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a >>>while,
and the History channel.
>>>
>>
>> I think there's as much good programming today as at any time in the
>> past. The problem is that there is so much more programming today, so
>> almost anything can get on the air. Most of which is JUNK.
>
> Ahh, the dilution effect. Quite like diamond mining.

Exactly.
>
>> Here in Philly during the '50s and '60s there were three stations (one
>> for each network, 3, 6, 10) and they were on the air about 18 hours a
>> day. Then what is now the PBS station (12) came on the air. Great
>> stuff - but usually there was nothing worth watching.
>>
>> Then in the late '60s came three UHF stations (17, 29, 48). Then

>> cable, which caught on even in places where you could SEE the
>> Roxborough antenna farm on a clear day. Today, with a cheap TV and a
>> pair of rabbit ears I can see 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 23, 29, 35, 48, 52,
>> 65. But there's usually nothing worth watching.
>>
>> We remember the good shows and forget the bad ones. One of the reasons
>> the original "Star Trek" made such an impression was that it was so
>> different from the rest of the bad, bad, bad TV of the time. Such as
>> "Lost In Space", which recycled the same B-movie robot...
>
>What would you class Green Acres as? (be careful, I think it is
>television's pinnacle, disguised as an idiotic farce)
>
There were a whole raft of "country" comedies about that time - "Andy Griffith", "Beverly Hillbillies", "Petticoat Junction", and of course "Green Acres". To me they were about average, neither excellent nor terrible. "Green Acres" was probably the most original, though, because the characters and situations were almost surreal.

>> Now identify the source of this quote:
>>
>> "Do you....enjoy.....knives?"
>
>Got me there! Anyone?

Hints:

- it's an early 1970s cult film, not a TV show

- started Hal Ashby's career

- music by Cat Stevens, some of which was not available outside the movie for many years

"I suppose you think that's very funny, Harold"

73 de Jim, N2EY

-

664. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 13:38:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110083845.15462.00005549@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85439

In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
writes:

>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he
>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.

There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's your
perception, not my intent.

>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of the
>original message simply to include my callsign in the list.

At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the > symbols,
so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked that one up to
a simple typo and said nothing.

Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.

>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person has
>a problem with that.

If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
you do not give others.
>
>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
>list.

Done. No problem.

>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no
>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.

I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
choice.

But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal in
every way but license class.

I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your choice
of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio

service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it sequentially.

The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or in the best interests of all concerned.

73 de Jim, N2EY

665. Austria terminates BPL test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 14:44:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <rdULb.10367$uF6.3229119@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85441

A BPL field test was cut short because of HF radio interference recently The town of Linz in Austria.

The Government Ministry for Commerce, Innovation and Technology Closed down the tests after a Red Cross emergency service disaster response drill that was the victim of massive BPL interference.

The feild test has been plagued by problems before this, and the utility had been looking into some ways to reduce interference to Amateurs and others

One more nail in BPL's coffin, and considering what happened and who it happened to, it's a darn big one.

- Mike KB3EIA -

666. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 14:56:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110095609.23307.00005842@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85442

In article <1y6Kb.24526$IM3.7582@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>If you're one
>of the millions of immigrants entering this country, the speech we use on
>the radio, and on the radio tests, in this country is not already in the
>"toolbox."

That's true.

But is it unreasonable to expect immigrants who want a specialized US license to learn that language?

>And Spanish certainly isn't in the "toolbox" of many other Hams
>in this country.

True again!

How much Spanish do you hear on the ham bands being used by US hams?

>So, even if you ignore any skills needed for the voice
>modes (however minor), there is still some validity in Kim's argument.

You mean that there's no test for voice operation?

>Spanish is use more often the CW in this country (more popular), so perhaps
>we should test all operators on the ability to speak Spanish like we test
>for CW now.

Are you saying that more US hams use Spanish on the ham bands than US hams use Morse Code? That seems very far fetched.

btw, we *don't* test all hams for Morse skill now.

>Or, since English is more common (popular) in this country today
>than Spanish, perhaps we should test all on the ability to speak English
>like we test for CW now.

In a way, we do! WHile I've heard that in some areas Spanish license materials are used, I've never seen any. All the test materials, FCC forms, Q&A pools and other license stuff I've been able to find is all in English.

So in most parts of the USA, if you want a ham license, you need to be able to read and understand English well enough to fill out the forms and pass the written tests.

>In other words, as Kim says, popularity alone is
>not a justification for a code test unless it is equally so for voice.

So if a person can understand 43 words of English spoken at a rate of 25 words per minute, they pass....

Let's face it - most people over the age of about 3 could pass that test with no preparation whatever. If you make them write the words down, make it 6 years of age.

I think the real objection many folks have to the code test is that it requires them to learn a *skill* that is completely new and different, and specific to amateur radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

667. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 15:00:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <esULb.10376$uF6.3232669@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85443

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3FFF07B4.1090408@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>All the way back to "Dick
>>
>>>Van Dyke", (Everyman nuclear family with scenes at both work and home)
>>>which is still funnier than almost all of its imitators.
>>
>>Now there's a flashback moment! my first crush when I was a kid was MTM.
>>Now if I see a rerun I'm immediately reminded why. BTW, Mary should get
>>some consideration on this list. I think she is a classy lady, and still
>>looks fine.
>
>
> She, too, was extremely young when she got the role of Laura Petrie. Her later
> show probably set a record for spinoffs, resulting in "Rhoda", "Lou Grant" and
> a few others I can't recall.
>
> But it is my understanding that MTM was one of the reasons WKRP was cancelled.
>
>>Then comes my next crush, Barbara Eden. But boy was that show ever Stupid!
>>
>>
> Oddly enough, she starred in an earlier film called "The Brass Bottle" in which
> Burl Ives played a genie.
>
> Remember how they had to hide her navel with makeup?

One of the strangest things I've ever not seen. But although I didn't
think anything of it at the time, I guess the show was pushing the
envelope in the clothing area. There was at least once that makeup
forgot to hide her navel.

>
>>>(Hall closet full of walnuts? Morey Amsterdam's constant wisecracks
>>>about Mel's hair?)
>>>
>>>
>>>>Television sucks now. The only things I
>>>>watch any more are The Simpsons, Everyone loves Raymond once in a >>>while,
>
> and the History channel.
>

>>>I think there's as much good programming today as at any time in the
>>>past. The problem is that there is so much more programming today, so
>>>almost anything can get on the air. Most of which is JUNK.
>>
>> Ahh, the dilution effect. Quite like diamond mining.
>
>
> Exactly.
>
>>>Here in Philly during the '50s and '60s there were three stations (one
>>>for each network, 3, 6, 10) and they were on the air about 18 hours a
>>>day. Then what is now the PBS station (12) came on the air. Great
>>>stuff - but usually there was nothing worth watching.
>>>
>>>Then in the late '60s came three UHF stations (17, 29, 48). Then
>>>cable, which caught on even in places where you could SEE the
>>>Roxborough antenna farm on a clear day. Today, with a cheap TV and a
>>>pair of rabbit ears I can see 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 23, 29, 35, 48, 52,
>>>65. But there's usually nothing worth watching.
>>>
>>>We remember the good shows and forget the bad ones. One of the reasons
>>>the original "Star Trek" made such an impression was that it was so
>>>different from the rest of the bad, bad, bad TV of the time. Such as
>>>"Lost In Space", which recycled the same B-movie robot...
>>
>>What would you class Green Acres as? (be careful, I think it is
>>television's pinnacle, disguised as an idiotic farce)
>>
>
> There were a whole raft of "country" comedies about that time - "Andy
> Griffith", "Beverly Hillbillies", "Petticoat Junction", and of course "Green
> Acres". To me they were about average, neither excellent nor terrible. "Green
> Acres" was probably the most original, though, because the characters and
> situations were almost surreal.

And it had a consistency within it's little univers that showed the the
writers were paying attention. Bob Newhart has done a similar thing, and
does it well IMO. You pretty much know what is coming, but it's still funny

>
>>>Now identify the source of this quote:
>>>
>>>"Do you....enjoy.....knives?"
>>
>>Got me there! Anyone?
>
>
> Hints:
>
> - it's an early 1970s cult film, not a TV show
>

> - started Hal Ashby's career
>
> - music by Cat Stevens, some of which was not available outside the movie for
> many years
>
> "I suppose you think that's very funny, Harold"

Okay, it was "Harold and Maude". Very good and strange movie!

- Mike KB3EIA -

668. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 15:05:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9xULb.1368$q4.1086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85444

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040110095609.23307.00005842@mb-m29.aol.com...

> btw, we *don't* test all hams for Morse skill now.

Rephrased then... we DO test all hams that have or want a license
to operate HF for morse skill... but hey, maybe we should
reinstitute waivers again since the treaty is no longer
mandating the 5 wpm which the FCC never waivered before.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

669. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 15:43:49 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <V4VLb.2902$zj7.736@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85445

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> However, note that the "first date not
> in 'this millenium' is January 1, 3001.

You're mistaken Jim, but I don't want to carry on another pointless argument with you for the next 996 years, so just forget it.

With all kind wishes for Y3K,

de Hans, K0HB

670. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 15:47:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <48VLb.2904$zj7.1110@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85446

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> How much Spanish do you hear on the ham bands being used by US hams?
>

A lot.

Happy Y3K, de Hans, K0HB

671. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 16:04:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btp7r2$caa@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85447

Here here, Jay.

Kim W5TIT

"Jay" <jay422000@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:4a97b$3fff8b4a$d1cc7b3c$24689@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:btnsr4$her@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20040109224135.21457.00003274@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > > In article <Xns946A7CDDFB124elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >Another domino falls.
> > > >
> > > >No more code testing in 9A now.
> > > >
> > > >They are now also the first country in Region 1 to get 7100-7200 kHz,
> not
> > > >otherwise due until next year, I think. I'll be looking for 9A1A in
> 7150-
> > > >7200 in the next contest.
> > > >
> > > >73 de Alun, N3KIP
> > >
> > > Keep us posted as the world dumbs down, Alun. We're counting on you.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, Larry's waiting for everyone to catch up to his level...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Agreed Kim. I have been to Croatia twice since 2000
> and I have found it to be both a friendly place and
> progressive minded country. The food was a mix of
> Italian and Eastern European and the bars/clubs/outdoor
> restaurants were open from dusk till dawn. Despite this
> everyone was well behaved, both the tourists
> and locals. Designated drivers or people were there
> to help those home who imbibed a tad too much but you
> never saw a single alcohol related incident during both
> my stays in holiday in Croatia, and I felt far safer walking

> with my friends back to the hotel in Porec, Valalta and Trpanj
> at 2:00 AM after an evening of wining and dining that I would have
> felt doing similar activity in New York or Miami.
>
> Is it not a shame that some hams (who claim to be "World Wise" ??)
> would measure a whole Country's worth, solely on the basis of
> if they kept a stupid Morse code test..?
>
> I guess we can draw amusment from the fact they show
> all their abysmal degree of ignorance by posting
> such juvenile remarks.
>

672. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 16:14:27 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>
Source record: 85448

Jim,

My comments are below:

On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>writes:
>
>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he
>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
>
>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's your
>perception, not my intent.

But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public forum. That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as well! Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own personal morals and prejudices upon others? Did anyone here ask you to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally offensive? Certainly not.

>
>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of the
>>original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>

Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!

>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the > symbols,
>so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked that one up to
>a simple typo and said nothing.
>
>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>
>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person has
>>a problem with that.
>
>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
>you do not give others.

Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right? That doesn't sound like
you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.

>>
>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
>>list.
>
>Done. No problem.
>
>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no
>>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
>
>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
>choice.

That is not up to you to decide, Jim. The FCC could have refused to
issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
freely issue this suffix as well!

If you met Dick Van Dyke in person one day, would you refuse to
address him as anything other than 'Richard', because you felt that
his parents made an inappropriate choice? Of course not! That's
silly.

>
>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
>is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
>amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
>involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal in
>every way but license class.

Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
to. As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
vanity callsign, just like you! (and, up here, VE7TIT, VE3TIT and
VE2TIT - all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).

>
>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your choice
>of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio
>service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it
>sequentially.

Why not? It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement
to the contrary. In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.

>
>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or

>in the best interests of all concerned.

Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is in the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else here!

I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own value system to overrule something which is permitted by law. If Kim's callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts entirely. On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the killfile for this purpose. Not censorship! Intentional deletion of her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.

Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').

I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word "tit". Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.

Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio - as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.

Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just typing it, I'm sure I don't know. Whatever it it, I hope you are able to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.

73, Leo

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

673. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 16:21:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btp8q7$bv6@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85450

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040110083845.15462.00005549@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> writes:
>
> >Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when
he
> >chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
> >decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
>
> There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's
your
> perception, not my intent.
>

Of *course* it's my perception--and *that's* the only one that counts, from
my perspective.

> >
> >I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of
the
> >original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>
> At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
symbols,
> so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked that one up
to
> a simple typo and said nothing.
>

That was *your* perception, not my intention.

>
> Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
> signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>

It may have looked that way to a lot of folks. However, quick observation
(to an astute individual anyway) revealed the [refrain: sarcasm and
demonstrated indignation with which that entire action was meant to relay].

> >
> >I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person
has
> >a problem with that.
>

> If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
> your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
> you do not give others.
> >

You've been disrespectful since you began posting that list without my callsign. I daresay you made a conscious to *be* disrespectful when you did that: as evidenced by your statement, something to the effect of you could not believe no one has noticed it until now.

> >
> >I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
> >list.
>
> Done. No problem.
>

Good.

> >
> >If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
> >way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no
> >malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
>
> I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
> I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
> choice.
>

And, what if I suddenly decided that you made an inappropriate choice about something and decided to start calling you George, or Stan because I think "Jim" is too disrespectful for the community of man? My callsign *may* (and I wholeheartedly disagree with you) be inappropriate for amateur radio; however, it is my callsign. You have at times offered to communicate with me over the amateur bands, Jim. Did you intend on embarking upon a communication refraining from using my callsign? THAT would be entirely unacceptable to me. Would you throw away a QSL card from me?

If you are so affected by my callsign, why do you stop at just refusing to "print" or enter it somewhere? If you object enough to demonstrate *any* disrespect/shunning--whatever--then you should shun totally. You demonstrated that you will only act upon your belief to the point at which it is convenient for you.

>
> But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
> is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
> amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
> involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal
in
> every way but license class.
>

And, I thnk you are totally incorrect about that. Each of us being better at some things than others is exactly what makes us all equal in the wash. I am exactly as important to my company as the CEO; in different aspects, but nonetheless we are each as important as the other. The *only* difference between me and the CEO of my company is that he makes more money than I do. I am just as liable for actions and decisions I take at my company as he/she is. I am just as able to be terminated as he/she is. I am just as replaceable as he/she is. Each and every amateur is equal to the next.

> I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your choice
> of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio
> service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it
> sequentially.

As I said, if you are so fixated upon demonstrating by deletion of my callsign; then I dare you to carry further with that an shun me totally. In fact, I implore it of you! It totally has me upset to think that you are so affected, yet you communicate with me. (for those "unastute": that was sarcasm)

> The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or
> in the best interests of all concerned.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Oh, blah, blah, blah....

Kim W5TIT

674. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 16:21:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pEVLb.1433$q4.377@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85449

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Also please let me know which
> dictionary you are using. (snip)

Princeton University's WordNet...

http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn/

Click on "Use WordNet Online," enter "mandate," and scroll down to the verbs.

> (snip) I've checked several and
> for the verb meaning your number
> 2 does not appear.

Then you should perhaps find a better dictionary. WordNet is an online lexical (dictionary) reference system developed by the Cognitive Science Laboratory at Princeton University. The project was funded in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation and has been reviewed positively by linguistics researchers at MIT, Yale, Cambridge, Oxford, and numerous other universities.

> Language is a tool that must be used
> correctly to convey the intended
> meaning. One should never operate
> on the basis that "you know what I
> mean" as sooner or later that gets a
> person in trouble.

Thanks for the lecture, Dee. However, I used the correct word for the intended meaning.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

675. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 16:42:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fYVLb.1457$q4.385@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85351

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Your usage is still incorrect. There
> is nothing in Part 97 that assigns
> authority to hams to do public
> service either. I've read part 97
> from beginning to end. (snip)

Then you either cannot read or cannot understand what you've read.
Regardless, if you truly feel Part 97 does not authorize us to do public
service, then I simply don't have the time to convince you otherwise.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

676. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 16:56:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110115621.23171.00003329@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85352

In article <3FFEAFDF.9090505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <9RqLb.1231$Pg.336@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>>So when you gonna send that proposal to the FCC?
>>>
>>>I already did (as you knew perfectly well).
>>>
>>
>> But only as a comment to another's proposal, not as a stand-alone petition.
>
>
>
> Hopefully Hans has a ready supply of replies for the FCC to use when
>people comment on his petition.

So far, Hans has sent in his ideas only as a comment to others' petitions and proposals, Mike. He hasn't sent FCC a petition or proposal to FCC.

>It just won't seem right to comment on
>it there without being called stupid...oops, I mean novel! ;^)

I think that if Hans was really serious about his proposal, he'd send it off to FCC just like the other 14 petitioners recently did. I say this because it is highly doubtful that the major and unique features of his proposal would be adopted by any other group such as ARRL, NCVEC, or NCI. It is also highly doubtful that his proposal, when submitted as a comment, would have nearly so much effect nor gather nearly so much attention as if submitted as a proposal.

If and when Hans did submit it as a petition, FCC would then most probably assign it an RM number and take comments and reply comments on it. Which I sense is a process that Hans wants to avoid, because there are bound to be both supporting and opposing comments. It would be fascinating to see the reactions....

But it's Hans ideas and therefore his call as to whetehr to submit it or not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

677. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 17:05:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WhWLb.24192$P%1.22600542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85353

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:48VLb.2904$zj7.1110@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > How much Spanish do you hear on the ham bands being used by US hams?
> >
>
> A lot.
>
> Happy Y3K, de Hans, K0HB

Most of the Spanish I hear are Mexican, Central American, and South American hams not US hams.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

678. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 17:17:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <lsWLb.24202$P%1.22605936@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85354

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:pEVLb.1433$q4.377@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Also please let me know which
> > dictionary you are using. (snip)
>
>
> Princeton University's WordNet...
>
> http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn/
>
> Click on "Use WordNet Online," enter "mandate," and scroll down to the
> verbs.
>
>
> > (snip) I've checked several and
> > for the verb meaning your number
> > 2 does not appear.
>
>
> Then you should perhaps find a better dictionary. WordNet is an online
> lexical (dictionary) reference system developed by the Cognitive Science
> Laboratory at Princeton University. The project was funded in part by a
> grant from the National Science Foundation and has been reviewed
positively
> by linguistics researchers at MIT, Yale, Cambridge, Oxford, and numerous
> other universities.
>

Merriam Webster is a well respected source as are the others that I checked.

However, here you go and Part 97 does NONE of these. Your usage is still
incorrect.

http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/cgi-bin/webwn2.0?stage=2&word=mandate&posnum
ber=2&searchtypenumber=2&senses=&showglosses=1

Results for "Synonyms, ordered by estimated frequency" search of verb
"mandate"

3 senses of mandate

Sense 1
mandate -- (assign under a mandate; "mandate a colony")
=> delegate, designate, depute, assign -- (give an assignment to (a

person) to a post, or assign a task to (a person))

Sense 2
mandate -- (make mandatory; "the new director of the schoolbaord mandated regular tests")
=> order, prescribe, dictate -- (issue commands or orders for)

Sense 3
mandate -- (assign authority to)
=> delegate, designate, depute, assign -- (give an assignment to (a person) to a post, or assign a task to (a person))

Even sense 3 would be a requirement as when one is given an assignment, you are supposed to carry that assigment. It is not just a suggestion or desireable activity. If a person or group does not carry through on an assignment, then that assignment is given to a group who will.

I repeat, Part 97 does NOT mandate in any way shape or form that amateurs participate in public service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

679. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 17:23:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <kyWLb.24218$P%1.22608726@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85355

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:fYVLb.1457$q4.385@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Your usage is still incorrect. There
> > is nothing in Part 97 that assigns
> > authority to hams to do public
> > service either. I've read part 97
> > from beginning to end. (snip)
>
>
> Then you either cannot read or cannot understand what you've read.
> Regardless, if you truly feel Part 97 does not authorize us to do public
> service, then I simply don't have the time to convince you otherwise.

Since no one is prohibited from doing public service, no authorization is needed. However, if one wishes to use ham frequencies, they have to have license but that is an authorization to operate specified frequencies not an authorization to do public service.

If you will read 97.1, Basis and Purpose, it only lists recognition of and encouragement of public service as one part of the basis and purpose. That does not confer any type of mandate or authorization to the amateur to do public service. It is a recognition of what we do and the value of what we do. It is a good and solid justification to use for the continued existence of amateur radio. Nothing more.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

680. Re: Ham Whoppers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:11:13 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <pendragon@netsignia.net>
Message-ID: <40004027.4A1923B9@netsignia.net>
Source record: 85356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You forgott -------
At a ham fest -- "worked great last time I used it" (muttering to hizzelf
"course
I ain't used it since lightning struck the house" or "how could I "use" it if
it ain't working?")

garigue wrote:

> Good ones ..... how about ....
>
> Hey I just got my ticket ....your VEC group testing time didn't fit into my
> schedule so I drove 300 miles and "passed"
>
> To the person above .....you can borrow my key since you learned 5 WPM
> overnight .... naa don't have time for CW .....
>
> The band is always "open" here .....
>
> I can't pass the code test because of my hearing .....
>
> My wife says I can put up that 100 foot tower but ....
>
> Boy I'd love to help you guys but I have something going on this weekend
> ....
>
> Nobody wants to do anything for this club ....meanwhile this joker has done
> crap for years save bitch about everything ....
>
> Gee I'd really like to have that ----as I have been looking for one of those
> for years ...meanwhile your "good buddy" has cut a deal with a fellow cross
> town who wants one but doesn't want to miss out on a "score".
>
> To the widow ..... Ya know Mrs. RF your husband was such a good guy and he
> told me that you should only talk to me about getting rid of the "shack".
> Don't laugh '''this HAS happened at funeral homes ......
>
> To the grieving widow ..... Ya know Mrs. RF that you can't get parts for
> that old stuff any more ... I'll give you a few bucks and then give the
> radios to the scouts they can take them apart for a merit badge project ....
>
> It only "cuts out" now and then ....
>
> AND NOW FOR THE GRANDDADDY OF WHOPPERS .... drum roll .....
>

> CW always gets through ....
>
> God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

681. W0EX?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:27:46 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401101027.7e964438@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85357

Has anybody heard from (or about) Dick, W0EX? I fired off a couple of e-mails using the addresses that normally work and they got bounced back. Gettin' more than a little concerned here.

Tnx es 73 de Bert
WA2SI

682. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:56:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110135608.07961.00001293@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85359

In article <EjdLb.33011$IM3.27487@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> Regardless of the reasoning, do you
>> concur with altering peoples posts
>> to reflect your own wishes?
>
> Of course not.

But you have no negative comments for the person who does it.

>But do you concur with attempts to alter the perception of
>a person's status as a Ham by blatantly omitting that person's callsign in a
>list containing only the callsigns of others?

Yes, if the callsign is inappropriate to the ARS.

Do you think all possible callsigns are appropriate, Dwight?

Last year the treaty was changed so that hams can now be issued calls with four-letter suffixes (like W3PENN, for example). Think of what could be done with some of the combinations.

>Jim is aware of what he's
>doing. Kim had already asked him to include her callsign (a request which
>should have been unnecessary).

Why should such a request be honored? Is it against FCC rules for me to omit a callsign in a Usenet post?

You have had no problem when others have used insulting names rather than callsigns to refer to me, but when I use Kim's name instead of callsign you tell me what I should do. Looks like a double standard to me.

Kim has been asked to choose a more appropriate callsign. She has refused, which is her right, of course. Just as it is my right to avoid that callsign and others like it when possible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

683. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:56:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110135609.07961.00001294@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85362

In article <Xns946B6A8898F4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040109075552.25815.00005807@mb-m07.aol.com:
>
>> In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
>> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>>>
>>>> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>>>> indication that you're changing them?
>>>
>>>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond
>>>that.
>>
>> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>
>> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>> of having done so?
>>
>> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>> signature?
>>>
>>>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which
>>>he and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
>>
>> To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is
>> inappropriate for the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's
>> evaluation of it. But I have tried not
>> to make a big deal about the issue.
>>
>> I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can*
>> control what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases are
>> edited out by me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet and
>> email standards. I try to always be clear what words were written by
>> the original author and what words were not.
>>
>> I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's
>> choice of callsign wrote many, many postings containing that callsign,
>> therefore giving it
>> far more visibility than it would otherwise get.
>>

>>>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.
>>
>> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>
>> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>> of having done so?
>>
>> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>> signature?
>>
>>>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think
>>>that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my
>>>right.
>>
>> "Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>>>
>>>YMMV. That's your right.
>>>
>> It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far
>> less comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In
>> fact, I've been omitting it for many months and no one has noticed
>> until now.
>>
>
>You're kidding, right?

About what?

Do you think it's anyone's right to misattribute?

Do you think it's anyone's right to change quoted posts with no indication
of having done so?

Do you think it's anyone's right to end a post with someone else's typical
signature?

What would be your response if someone did the same thing to your posts,
Alun?

>Just because we didn't say anything doesn't mean we
>didn't notice.

But there was no comment from you except about what *I* should do.
>
>Personally, I think you should use her call if you are going to use
>everyone else's.

Why should I do that if I think the call is inappropriate?

> But I'm not an Internet cop.
>
Nor I. But there are certain accepted rules of Usenet.

>My reaction to Kim's post was initially "why did she post without adding
>anything". If I see something in quotes I don't even read it. In fact I can
>skip over it by clicking on a particular symbol, and usually do, unless I
>need to go back and get the context. And the name of the actual sender is
>very prominently displayed to me.

Of course. So why not indicate the changes, as is customary and proper?
>
>So, if this was misattribution it wasn't very successful, as I saw it was
>from Kim immediately and just thought she hit 'send' by mistake. Granted
>different people don't see the same screen, as they are using different
>newsreaders, but that's how it appears to me using XNews.

To the AOL and Google readers it appears as I wrote something I didn't.
>
>> Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who
>> would *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her status
>> as anything else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise
>> patronized by me. Or by anyone else.
>>
>> I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to
>> change. Deal with it.
>>
>> But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it clear.
>>
73 de Jim, N2EY

684. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:56:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110135610.07961.00001295@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85358

In article <5c01b95b.0401060040.6f3583e4@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040105212538.23171.00003179@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
>> That gives him absolute permission to behave as an

[expletive deleted]

>> off the radio.

Better than behaving that way *on* the ham bands. Which some of us are, and lenover21 is not.

>> No problem.

That tells us what behavior lenover21 seeks to inspire in others...
>
> Again with the profanities, Lennie?
>
Why are you surprised, Steve? Have you not read the same sort of thing over and over from the same source? Why would you expect anything different from the person whose idea of "civil debate" is displayed in his post of October 28, 2003, when he wrote (these are lenover21's words, not mine!):

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

He told a lot about himself in that post..

73 de Jim, N2EY

685. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:56:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110135610.07961.00001296@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85360

In article <5c01b95b.0401060034.175ca229@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> My "mad as hell" attitude resounds from nopt tolerating abusive
>pathological liars, such as yourself, who have no reservations about
>making up antagonistic rants as they go.

And in doing so, Steve, you reinforce the behavior of the other person, because that's what he *wants* you to do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

686. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 18:56:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110135611.07961.00001297@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85361

In article <dIGIb.32665$Gn5.16083@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Look at the bright side; all of the qrm will be on voice. Drop down to the
>bottom of 40 and life will be beautiful :)
>
I'm there much of the time - and life *is* beautiful!

73 de Jim, N2EY

687. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:34:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153455.01893.00002526@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85363

In article <f45722ac.0401090511.6d5bc9aa@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401080948.4a286fab@posting.google.com>...
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
>> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
>> > simulation.
>> >
>> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
>> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>>
>> Also Made In USA.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Now digital is not as good as analog? digital is a mere simulation?

Brian, "real" radios are ANALOG.

Real he-men morsemen don't use digital.

Digital is for techno-weebs who "don't have any interest in radio!"

Dave (who is interested in radio because he learned morse) can
download FIRMWARE for his Orion!

Analog morsemen are high tech, "interested in radio!"

LHA

What the heck is a "Southgate Type 7?"

Why is it named after a community in southern California?

Why doesn't Jimmie have a Type 8? Can't he download FIRMWARE
to improve it?

Did he ever have a Type 6?

Does he need a mailing address for the Jan Smithers Fan Club?

So many questions...

lha

688. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:34:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153456.01893.00002527@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85364

In article <3FFCE328.1733823E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> I believe that's the beauty of the Orion, it's never "ancient." The latest
>> upgrade is just a download away. I feel for the poor slob who finally
>breaks
>> down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800 Pro or Pro II comes out.
>
>TT just keeps making it better and better. The rig is now about eight
>months old and I've downloaded about ten firmware releases in that time.

"FIRMWARE releases?!?"

Gosh, you must be equipped with a Star Trek Transporter! :-)

Oh, you mean SOFTWARE updates, right?

Let's see, that's more than one per month.

I would think that Orion could have stabilized the programming by
now. No new band changes have happened in eight months... :-)

Gosh, Orion must "not be interested in radio" if they can't get
their software routines stabilized by now...

LHA

689. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:34:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153458.01893.00002528@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85365

In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>Date: 8 Jan 2004 08:32:16 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>> I don't live in newsgroups...(SNIP)
>
> Sure you do.

No. I already TOLD you where.

Geez, check it out with MapQuest if you've forgetten how to read a map.

>> (UNSNIP)...nor do I look to the computer to give me
>> either acceptance or love or respect.
>
> Good for you. The computer is an inanimate object.

Poor baby. It's your Entrance to Fantasyland, a dimension of sight
and sound. The signpost up ahead...The Twilight Zone!

> However the people you hope to snowjob with your wisdom and wit
>aren't, and unfortuantely for you, you've completely ruined your
>credibility, regardless of how "smart" you may really be.

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe, got a tummy ache from all your sour grapes
wine?

:-)

Check the ARRL pages. They might have some official Tums for sale.
[shipping charges extra].

> Sorry Lennie. Repeat that over and over if you care to, but the
>facts are that there are still thousands of pages of archived RRAP
>fodder wherein you've been caught with your britches down over and
>over.

"Fodder?" :-)

"Hello muddah, hello fodder?" :-)

Feel free to reprint every single one of them, over and over and over
again. Your freedom. Your fantasyland. No raddio kopps gonna
haul you away and give you a dishonorable discharge from ham radio.

Have fun "taking your revenge" on those who won't agree with you.

That's a popular pastime in here. :-)

>> So far you've not been able to "force" me to do anything, not even
>> with vague "threats" of some sort of veiled physical harm. Acting
>> the bully in here only demonstrates what bullies do. This isn't a
>> "personal battleground" that must be totally occupied by your
>> personal perceived slights/insults/whatever...yet you keep on with
>> that sort of thing. Ho hum. Boring to most readers. Doesn't work,
>> can never work...except in the fantasyland withing your head.
>
> That you're responding to this lays waste to THAT argument,
>Lennie.

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe, no one is really sure what happens in your head.

Your therapist is totally inept.

> That it's "boring" to "most" readers is irrelevent. These words
>are directed to one person...that they can or may be read by others is
>incidental to the medium in which they are offered.

Poor baby. Feeling picked-on?

I post in public.

No moderator in here. No newsgroupie cops here. No raddio kopps
here.

If you can't take the heat, quit wearing all that guilt-feeling body armor.

It has been penetrated so many times it is useless.

> As for "keeping on" with insults, etc, you should read some of
>your own postings. Why do you chastise me for doing that which you
>ahve made a career?

"ahve?" :-) Sure sign of RAGE there. Anger, resentment all causing
typos.

> And "force" you to do anything...?!?! If by humiliating your
>over and over that you "resist" actually becomming a licensed Amateur
>just to "spite" me, then yes, Your Putziness, I "forced" you to not be
>a Ham.

Only in your disordered little mind, little man.

>> Try to remember that you are NOT some high-rank NCO and that
>> this is NOT some kind of military service. Playing the Dill Sergeant
>> won't get you out of any pickle you make by your own words.
>

> I'm not the one with the lies to overcome, Lennie.

tsk, tsk, tsk...stebe, in reality, folks who have different opinions than yours aren't "lying."

You do NOT define reality.

Get out of your fantasyland and visit reality. It's a tough job but you have to do it someday...

You can start by telling us all the details of your many "hostile actions."

> As for being a bully, etc, that's your cowardly way of trying to
>duck out of the "fight" YOU started. Most bullies ARE cowards,
>Lennie, and I'd say you've done a fair job of "proving" that, too.

Poor little barbarian bully stebe. Everyone picking on you?

Are you going to "stop it" by exerting "a few ounces" (of trigger pull), mighty warrior?

> Putz.

Those aren't endearing words, little one.

But...they are the main words of this year's poster boy for US ham radio.

Let's all hear it for all that "goodwill" that hams have...!

Goodwill industries?

Are you goodwill hunting?

WMD

690. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153500.01893.00002529@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85366

In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>Date: 8 Jan 2004 08:32:16 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>> > There's no "hatred" of the "pros", Lennie. Only PROlific liars
>> >such as yourself. That you claim to have been a "radio" professional
>> >is unfortuante.
>>
>> Not a "claim," an actual fact...provable through several third-party
>> sources. You keep trying to say I never worked in the electronics
>> industry at all. I did. In aerospace since 1956. Got paid for it.
>
> I never said you "never" worked in electronics, Your Lyingness.

Yes you have. Both as just plain worker and as an engineer.

Well, you KNOW EVERYTHING about the electronics industry,
don't you? Worked less than half a year as a Purchasing Agent.
Super collosal electronics smarts required there, right?

> >>I<< said you never amounted to anything more than a very
>determined bench technician. I have complimented your cut-and-paste
>skills, however.

"Determined?" :-)

tsk, tsk, tsk stebe, you just can't get it right, can you? :-)

>> Or, reject all the facts, ignore reality, and say everything I've
>written
>> is "lies." That doesn't make your statement "true." It never will.
>
> Long list of "FACTS" snipped.
>
> The FACT is that I have spoken with people who KNEW you and wee
>not impressed.

Total utter bluffing BULLSHIT, sweetums.

You've NEVER "spoken with people who knew me."

Bluff. Bullshit. Very bad poker playing skills.

> The FACT is that YOU refuse to accept that your "professional"
>and military "experience" is NOT Amateur Radio.

That was never a subject except in your disordered little mind,
little man.

Radio is radio. It all works by the same principles of physics. It
doesn't "work differently" because some lawmakers create different
"services" for it.

> This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.

It is FOR that. This newsgroup is UNMODERATED, has no
"entrance" requirements, no raddio kopps to "arrest" those that
don't conform to some bigoted ideas of hamme raddio.

> You have yet to demonstrate an even rudimentary understanding of
>what it is, let alone have participated in it.

Oh, my, have you been reading a biography of "Judge" Roy Bean?
:-)

Or just Attila the Ham (or "Atilla" if you speak Hunnish with a dialect)?

I need only memorize the Holy Words of the League and "know" what
it is about.

I need only turn on my R-71 and listen to what Hams talk about.

I can walk into any HRO store in the country without showing any pass
or presenting "papers" to the guard at the door.

No security clearances are required, no background checks from the
FBI.

> The FACT is that YOU have been caught in NUMEROUS fabrications or
>misrepresentations of truth and "called" on them over and over.

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe, your therapist isn't doing so well.

You've regressed again into your imaginary world.

> YOU have no credibility herein as a result of that, Sir Putzy.

I might never be given credulity in Newington. :-)

Jim Fisk believed me. So did Alf Wilson. Even Rich Rosen.

You spoke to all of them about me, right?

> And (I've said this before) it's just peachy with me that you
>know more about electronics than I do or ever did, Lennie...Being able
>to quote Shannon's Law in your sleep is irrelevent here.

My wife says I sometimes snore a bit. Never heard me utter any
words or mathematical equations, though.

Buy me a long-run tape recorder and I'll set it up and run it. Will
get back to you if anything worthwhile is recorded.

You can send me yours. But leave out the tapes of close order
drill commands and the off-key Marines Hymn.

>> >> It's a wonderful life.
>> >
>> > Yes, it is. Too bad you'll die having not known exactly HOW
>> >wonderful it is.
>>
>> Perhaps. I'm not complaining. Why are you complaining?
>
> I only complain about having to tolerate compulsive liars and
>antagonists such as yourslef.

Well, "myslef" is totally guilty of saying nasty to neverland myths
or fantasyland fairy tales or the gross exaggerations printed by
the membership organization up somewhere in a suburb of Boston
(or Hartford or wherever)...

I'm sure your whole Hun club is as angry with me as "youslef."

>> I had to sit with the family gathering again to watch "It's A Wonderful
>> Life." :-) After seeing it so many times, it's still a good motion
>> picture even if very dated.
>
> "Family gathering"...?!?! You, Mrs Lennie and the cat?

? Far more than that. Why does that concern you?

Are you trying to find someone with a happy home life to insult and
demean?

>> >> Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, Brian, all the best to you
>> >> and your family.
>> >
>> > At least there was ONE person in this forum for you to exchange
>> >greetings with. Good for you. No one should be alone for the
>> >holidays. Even creeps like you, Lennie.
>>
>> Hardly "alone" during the Holidays. Wasn't even here (physically).
>> An inconvenience to access another's computer to check e-mail,
>> even if a close relative.
>
> I imagine the "inconvienience" was hoping they didn't see where
>you "hang out" and then follow behind you to see how you act in
>public.

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe's therapist is really falling down on its work.

must be a green card mental hygienist with only a few months left.

>> Why do you insist on painting all those imaginary scenarios, trying
>> to denigrate others?
>
> Because those are the "scenarios" that your conduct engenders.

tsk, tsk, tsk, you still think your fantasyland is "real?"

Poor baby. Still can't take any REAL debate, can you?

Must be the influence of the "gunnery sergeant" mentality. No one
can EVER talk back to a gunny. :-)

>> I don't live in newsgroups...(SNIP)
>
> Sure you do.

Nope. In a suburb of Los Angeles, CA.

The address given in my Ham Radio article bylines is still valid.

Now, all together...Hup, too, tree, foah! :-)

Get some better therapy, stebe.

LHA

691. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153503.01893.00002530@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85378

In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>Date: 8 Jan 2004 08:32:16 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > And unfortunately for you, your lies ARE archived in this very
>> >forum.
>>
>> No "lies."
>
> "I am going to get my Extra Lite out of the box".
>
> "The ARRL is dishonest".
>
> Do you really want your nose rubbed in ALL of them, Lennie?
>
>> > Sucks to be you, Leonard.
>>
>> Only when I turn on the ShopVac.
>
> I guess that's the ONLY suction in your house, Lennie...Which
>means it REALLY sucks to be you...
>
>> >> The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham
>> >> license and be proficient in morse code...(SNIP)
>> >
>> > Oh geeze...Here we go again.
>>
>> A 1x2 has stated the Word on that: The ONLY way one can be
>> "interested in radio" is to get a ham license and be a morseman.
>>
>> That's the Official Word.
>
> Quotes, Lennie...Cite the message thread, please (I have learned
>to not trust ANYthing you say unless I can cross-reference it to a
>third party source)
>

>> > Lennie, we're STILL waiting on you to cite the quotes wherein
>> >you've established this opinion.
>>
>> Observation of the human condition for over a half century.
>>
>> What's your excuse?
>
> Once again you avoid the request to prove your assertions with
>some sort of facts.
>
> And so far, your "observations" are just bitter rants against
>just about anything that you can't/weren't able to understand or
>master yourself.
>
> That's not "proof", unless just being a loser is your goal, in
>which case I'd say you have excelled.
>
>> > It's certainly not true in MY case, and just one more example of
>> >how you feel free to take liberties with the truth.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...role-playing in a fantasy land is not "reality" nor
>> is it "truth."
>
> There's only one "role-player" here, Lennie. Almost everyone
>else here HAS an Amateur Radio license and PARTICIPATES in teh "Real
>McCoy".
>
> YOU are the outsider here.
>
>> > I never claimed to be an engineer...But I did provide numerous
>> >references from that job that proved you WRONG on numerous occassions.
>>
>> Never once did you "prove" anything. Your imagination tells only
>> you that you were "right." Your imagination is WRONG.
>
> Sure I did. Starting with simple assertions about the
>"engineering community"...You said that there was "no such thing" and
>I provided you with an immediate quote from one of the periodicals
>that cited that very concept.
>
> And you further went on to say "real engineers" didn't need/use
>Amateur Radio...I gave you the callsigns of not only 13 engineers, but
>three of them were PhD's.
>
>> > I guess that had to hurt, knowing a "non-engineer" had access to
>> >references that took a bite out of your rants...
>>
>> "Hurt?" Only my sides from laughing. "References" from a weekly
>> newspaper from Podunk Hollow, TN, hardly counts for anything...
>

> They were hardly from "Podunk Hollow", Lennie. They were
>professional journals and periodicals.
>
> (Squirm a bit harder, Scummy...)
>
>> > Again with the "1930's" rant, Lennie?
>>
>> Call it "transistorized 1930s," Stebe.
>
> I call it your "1930's rant", Lennie...It's not truthful, nor
>even representitive of anything associated with MODERN Amateur Radio.
>
>> Standards and Practices remain the same as 70 years ago.
>> Imagination of Public Service and self-serving glory are still the
>> same. If ARRL writes it, all MUST believe, for their words are
>> sacred.
>
> No, they don't.
>
> But if you NEED to believe that in order to sleep well at night,
>please, be my guest...
>
>> > And in any case your sleight's against Amateur Radio's PROVEN
>> >track record of being able to provide the very emergency services you
>> >claim as "ineffectual" or "irrelevent" are DISproven over and ovr,
>> >even in the 21st Century.
>>
>> Of course (he said, humoring the mentally ill)...when any disaster
>> strikes, all the communications infrastructure fails but amateurs can
>> jump in and save the day. Using morse code, of course.
>>
>> [try "slight" and "over"...]
>
> Try "sleight" and excuse me for dropping the "e".
>
>> > There's no "hatred" of the "pros", Lennie. Only PROlific liars
>> >such as yourself. That you claim to have been a "radio" professional
>> >is unfortuante.
>>
>> Not a "claim," an actual fact...provable through several third-party
>> sources. You keep trying to say I never worked in the electronics
>> industry at all. I did. In aerospace since 1956. Got paid for it.
>
> I never said you "never" worked in electronics, Your Lyingness.
>
> >>I<< said you never amounted to anything more than a very
>determined bench technician. I have complimented your cut-and-paste
>skills, however.
>
>> Or, reject all the facts, ignore reality, and say everything I've

>written
>> is "lies." That doesn't make your statement "true." It never will.
>
> Long list of "FACTS" snipped.
>
> The FACT is that I have spoken with people who KNEW you and wee
>not impressed.
>
> The FACT is that YOU refuse to accept that your "professional"
>and military "experience" is NOT Amateur Radio.
>
> This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.
>
> You have yet to demonstrate an even rudimentary understanding of
>what it is, let alone have participated in it.
>
> The FACT is that YOU have been caught in NUMEROUS fabrications or
>misrepresentations of truth and "called" on them over and over.
>
> YOU have no credibility herein as a result of that, Sir Putzy.
>
> And (I've said this before) it's just peachy with me that you
>know more about electronics than I do or ever did, Lennie...Being able
>to quote Shannon's Law in your sleep is irrelevent here.
>
>> >> It's a wonderful life.
>> >
>> > Yes, it is. Too bad you'll die having not known exactly HOW
>> >wonderful it is.
>>
>> Perhaps. I'm not complaining. Why are you complaining?
>
> I only complain about having to tolerate compulsive liars and
>antagonists such as yourslef.
>
>> I had to sit with the family gathering again to watch "It's A Wonderful
>> Life." :-) After seeing it so many times, it's still a good motion
>> picture even if very dated.
>
> "Family gathering"...?!?! You, Mrs Lennie and the cat?
>
>> >> Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, Brian, all the best to you
>> >> and your family.
>> >
>> > At least there was ONE person in this forum for you to exchange
>> >greetings with. Good for you. No one should be alone for the
>> >holidays. Even creeps like you, Lennie.
>>
>> Hardly "alone" during the Holidays. Wasn't even here (physically).
>> An inconvenience to access another's computer to check e-mail,

>> even if a close relative.
>
> I imagine the "inconvienience" was hoping they didn't see where
>you "hang out" and then follow behind you to see how you act in
>public.
>
>> Why do you insist on painting all those imaginary scenarios, trying
>> to denigrate others?
>
> Because those are the "scenarios" that your conduct engenders.
>
>> I don't live in newsgroups...(SNIP)
>
> Sure you do.
>
>> (UNSNIP)...nor do I look to the computer to give me
>> either acceptance or love or respect.
>
> Good for you. The computer is an inanimate object.
>
> However the people you hope to snowjob with your wisdom and wit
>aren't, and unfortuantely for you, you've completely ruined your
>credibility, regardless of how "smart" you may really be.
>
>> Never thought that way since
>> getting on BBSs the first time 19 years ago. Computer-modem
>> communications are just another form of communications...just like
>> radio. You haven't reached that point in understanding this medium
>> yet...you can holler incessantly that I "lie" and vomit all sorts of bad
>> names but none of that is "true" anywhere but in your head.
>
> Sorry Lennie. Repeat that over and over if you care to, but the
>facts are that there are still thousands of pages of archived RRAP
>fodder wherein you've been caught with your britches down over and
>over.
>
>> So far you've not been able to "force" me to do anything, not even
>> with vague "threats" of some sort of veiled physical harm. Acting
>> the bully in here only demonstrates what bullies do. This isn't a
>> "personal battleground" that must be totally occupied by your
>> personal perceived slights/insults/whatever...yet you keep on with
>> that sort of thing. Ho hum. Boring to most readers. Doesn't work,
>> can never work...except in the fantasyland withing your head.
>
> That you're responding to this lays waste to THAT argument,
>Lennie.
>
> That it's "boring" to "most" readers is irrelevent. These words
>are directed to one person...that they can or may be read by others is
>incidental to the medium in which they are offered.

>
> As for "keeping on" with insults, etc, you should read some of
>your own postings. Why do you chastise me for doing that which you
>ahve made a career?
>
> And "force" you to do anything...?!?! If by humiliating your
>over and over that you "resist" actually becomming a licensed Amateur
>just to "spite" me, then yes, Your Putziness, I "forced" you to not be
>a Ham.
>
>> Try to remember that you are NOT some high-rank NCO and that
>> this is NOT some kind of military service. Playing the Dill Sergeant
>> won't get you out of any pickle you make by your own words.
>
> I'm not the one with the lies to overcome, Lennie.
>
> As for being a bully, etc, that's your cowardly way of trying to
>duck out of the "fight" YOU started. Most bullies ARE cowards,
>Lennie, and I'd say you've done a fair job of "proving" that, too.
>
> Putz.

692. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153505.01893.00002531@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85379

In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>Date: 8 Jan 2004 08:32:16 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>> > It's certainly not true in MY case, and just one more example of
>> >how you feel free to take liberties with the truth.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...role-playing in a fantasy land is not "reality" nor
>> is it "truth."
>
> There's only one "role-player" here, Lennie. Almost everyone
>else here HAS an Amateur Radio license and PARTICIPATES in teh "Real
>McCoy".

"teh ?" :-) Getting ANGRY again, are you?

There are several "McCoys" in electronics. Which one are you
referring to? Walter Brennan?

> YOU are the outsider here.

This newsgroup isn't "amateur radio."

This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.

I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
examination. That's all.

You are the one on an extended field trip into fantasyland.

>
>> > I never claimed to be an engineer...But I did provide numerous
>> >references from that job that proved you WRONG on numerous occassions.
>>
>> Never once did you "prove" anything. Your imagination tells only
>> you that you were "right." Your imagination is WRONG.
>
> Sure I did. Starting with simple assertions about the

>"engineering community"...You said that there was "no such thing" and
>I provided you with an immediate quote from one of the periodicals
>that cited that very concept.

Where is this "engineering community" located? Have you been
there? :-)

Is it part of a Kibbutz? A collective farm? Does it have fancy
alphabets like ASME?

Where did you read this? Or, rather, who read it to you from some
printed reference? Your therapist?

Go for it, EX purchasing agent...

> And you further went on to say "real engineers" didn't need/use
>Amateur Radio...I gave you the callsigns of not only 13 engineers, but
>three of them were PhD's.

Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio.

In other words, in your MIND, sweetums.

I'm still a Life Member of the IEEE and a former member of the ACM,
both professional organizations. None of their many, many
publications have had "news" about Ham Radio Saving The Day!

But, in your mind, you know "lots" of PhDs, and other smart folks
who all LOVE ham radio and cherish, honor, obey morse code....

>> > I guess that had to hurt, knowing a "non-engineer" had access to
>> >references that took a bite out of your rants...
>>
>> "Hurt?" Only my sides from laughing. "References" from a weekly
>> newspaper from Podunk Hollow, TN, hardly counts for anything...
>
> They were hardly from "Podunk Hollow", Lennie. They were
>professional journals and periodicals.

Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York TIMES.

Paris Review on a bad day maybe. St. Louis Post-Dispatch or the
Washington Post would hardly have such, would they?
George didn't have such, neither did Time, Life, Newsweek. Maybe
it was in People (which I only read in dentist offices). TV Guide?

Not in IEEE Proceedings or the monthlies from ComSoc (Communication
Society, a group within IEEE). ComSoc wants me back as a member.

It wasn't in EDN, or Electronic Design, or RF Design, or Microwaves &
RF. I don't bother with EE Times anymore. Maybe PET (Power
Engineering Technology)?

> (Squirm a bit harder, Scummy...)

Only if the mosquitos are biting. You WANT to but haven't gotten
any penetration yet...

>> > Again with the "1930's" rant, Lennie?
>>
>> Call it "transistorized 1930s," Stebe.
>
> I call it your "1930's rant", Lennie...It's not truthful, nor
>even representitive of anything associated with MODERN Amateur Radio.

Of course, Mr. PhD...MODERN amateur radio...extolling morse code
modes on HF as "always getting through when nothing else will..."

MODERN HF amateur radio: "What was good in the 1930s is still
good in 2000s!"

"Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."

>> Standards and Practices remain the same as 70 years ago.
>> Imagination of Public Service and self-serving glory are still the
>> same. If ARRL writes it, all MUST believe, for their words are
>> sacred.
>
> No, they don't.
>
> But if you NEED to believe that in order to sleep well at night,
>please, be my guest...

:-) Not even close, Mr. Hotellier or Mr. Innkeeper. :-)

Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
of a communicable disease.

Go get some therapy.

LHA

693. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153506.01893.00002532@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85373

In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Stebe Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>Date: 8 Jan 2004 08:32:16 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > And unfortunately for you, your lies ARE archived in this very
>> >forum.
>>
>> No "lies."
>
> "I am going to get my Extra Lite out of the box".
>
> "The ARRL is dishonest".
>
> Do you really want your nose rubbed in ALL of them, Lennie?
>
>> > Sucks to be you, Leonard.
>>
>> Only when I turn on the ShopVac.
>
> I guess that's the ONLY suction in your house, Lennie...Which
>means it REALLY sucks to be you...

Your boyfriend lives in your house now?

>> >> The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham
>> >> license and be proficient in morse code...(SNIP)
>> >
>> > Oh geeze...Here we go again.
>>
>> A 1x2 has stated the Word on that: The ONLY way one can be
>> "interested in radio" is to get a ham license and be a morseman.
>>
>> That's the Official Word.
>
> Quotes, Lennie...Cite the message thread, please (I have learned
>to not trust ANYthing you say unless I can cross-reference it to a
>third party source)

"Cite message thread?"

Why? Can't you read the English words in here?

Do you have attention deficit disorder that requires you to see
repeats of everything already written?

I'm sure you can "cross-reference." You are cross all of the time.

>> What's your excuse?
>
> Once again you avoid the request to prove your assertions with
>some sort of facts.

I asked a question.

You are trying to worm out of it.

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe.

You read "Witches of Karres" and are all stuck on "worm weather,"
right?

> And so far, your "observations" are just bitter rants against
>just about anything that you can't/weren't able to understand or
>master yourself.

Wow, do you ever need pre-med!

Sweetums, you've got diagnoses all mixed up.

Must be the Religion Thing about morsemanship that is clouding
your few mental synapses.

> That's not "proof", unless just being a loser is your goal, in
>which case I'd say you have excelled.

"Excelled in losing?"

I once won $55 in the California Lottery. Don't gamble normally.

Let's see...what "losses?"

I have a comfortable retirement, don't have to go to work and suck
up to bosses. No mortgage on either house.

My regular-hours jobs were in a field I like and deliberately chose
long ago. Even spent lots and lots of nights in classes to make
the "engineer" job "official."

Never got fired, never got arrested. Got a parking ticket in New
Jersey once (not a felony then).

I'm happily married to my high school sweetheart, reunited after
many years; even attended a 50th high school reunion and didn't
fight with anyone.

I got into the big leagues of HF radio communication a half century ago, then got an Honorable Discharge from the US Army...no "other" kind of discharge. No excuses for anything there. Good Conduct ribbon, too! :-)

I've been both author-contributor and a staffer at Ham Radio magazine when it was still existing as an independent periodical. Real ink on real paper, many times a month. Was a national magazine available on newsstands.

Never once did I have to suck up to any ex-gyrene foulmouth who has a hate complex because he can't handle hisself in here.

No real losses. :-)

LHA

694. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153507.01893.00002533@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85375

In article <uvqLb.9752$uF6.2759456@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>>
>>>>That way, no one who was
>>>>interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would
>>>be
>>>>incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.
>>>
>>>If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they
>>>can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely to
>>>be sufficient to become qualified.
>>
>> That may well be the case, Hans. And since some Morse Code skill is
>> obviously part of being a qualified full-privileges radio amateur, it makes
>
>> sense that the standard license would include a Morse Code test.
>>
>>>I can't imagine "one who was interested" would fail to qualify in 10 years,
>>>but if they didn't, well I guess there are other hobbies like finger
>>>painting which might be less challenging and not require a federal license
>>>to pursue.
>
>> Exactly.
>
> I can't imagein "one who was interested" not taking the time to learn
>Morse code either, but if they didn't want to I gues there are other
>things like wait around until it goes away, which might be less challenging!

You must be absolutely right, Mike, therefore all who don't learn
morse code "must not be interested in radio!"

In my case, exposure to the big leagues of HF radio communications
while in the US Army piqued an interest in radio that eventually led
to changing majors (drastic change) and entering the electronics
industry to become an engineer.

The US Army didn't use any morse code to send over 200,000
messages a month from a command Hq in Japan. There's no need
to know morse code for electronics engineering or for most of the

radio transmitters of the 1950s on through the 2000s.

A quarter million IEEE members worldwide (me included) must not have any "interest in radio" because we don't or didn't learn morse code.

I've never heard of any morse code classes as part of electrical engineering curricula anywhere in the world. Maybe all those students for EEs aren't "really" interested in radio?

Consider that there's NO communications carriers in the USA even using morse code for any communications purposes today. I guess they must "not be interested" because morse isn't used.

How about that?

LHA

695. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153508.01893.00002534@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85371

In article <20040108215302.12631.00004065@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>> That way, no one who was
>>> interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there would
>>be
>>> incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.
>>
>>If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they
>>can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely to
>>be sufficient to become qualified.
>
>That may well be the case, Hans. And since some Morse Code skill is
>obviously part of being a qualified full-privileges radio amateur, it makes
>sense that the standard license would include a Morse Code test.

Sorry but that makes NO sense.

FCC does NOT require any licensed radio amateur to use morse
code modes over and above any other allocated mode. Ergo, there
is no allocation requirement to satisfy.

Further, it makes NO sense that morse code skill "qualifies" any
radio amateur for "full privileges" on HF/MF bands. That is an
artificiality lobbied (successfully) for by olde-tyme morsemen.

If US amateur radio service were named "Artificial Radiotelegraph
Service," then it would make sense.

beep, beep

LHA

696. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153510.01893.00002536@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85372

In article <f45722ac.0401071641.2c3e8c73@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Of course, any former E-5 or higher that thinks "asshole" is a
>> terribly profane word must be of the sissy pink coloring.
>>
>> It's a gray area...
>>
>> LHA
>
>Hope he never sees a copy of Cinderella Liberty. I think Hans starred in it.

:-)

LHA

697. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153510.01893.00002535@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85376

In article <5c01b95b.0401080747.1bb17b2@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040107140058.21642.00003535@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>> It's "noblesse oblige" oriented, Brian. The "upper classes" and
>> royalty get to swear, vomit profanities, demean and denigrate the
>> lower classes because they all passed 20 WPM code tests.
>
> Nope.
>
> It's the standard YOU have tried to set, Scummy. YOU are the one
>stating "we" (the Amateur community) don't respect
>"professionals"...yet here you are spewing antgonisms, profanities and
>boldface lies.

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe...YOU don't respect professionals. :-)

I've never stated any "boldface lies." This web browser doesn't allow selection of boldface type.

> On contraire again, Lennie...I get to radiate more than adequate
>"great power". I hardly ever use more than 200 watts on ANY band,
>however, since it's not necessary to use it.

You have 40 KW RF output capability? :-)

How about 600 KW RF output?

tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe, look again at amateur radio band allocations and allowed RF output power. you can't use it on "ANY" band.

> Of course, unlike YOU, I have a station license that allows me to
>establish a radio station wherein I can use it.

wow, stebe, impressville all the way! your vewwy own wadio station!

So...if I go into K-Mart or Wal-Mart and plunk down $99 for a shrink-wrapped CB transceiver "it's not my own radio?"

Okay, if I own a Cessna 182 and buy a Civil Airways VHF Comm transceiver and install it, "I wouldn't own my own transceiver?" Who would own it? FAA? USAF? An airlines corporation?

If I have an ocean-going sailboat and buy the "civilian" version of an SBC-2020 and install it, "I wouldn't own my own radio?" Who would

own it? SBC? USN? USCG? A cruise line corporation?

If, as a private businessman, I buy several transceivers to put in my
delivery vehicles, "I wouldn't OWN them?" Who would own them?
A city department of communications? FCC? NTIA? DMV?

Suppose I buy a pair of FRS HTs. "I won't OWN them?" Who "owns"
them? The store I bought it from using a valid credit card?

Oh, yeah, the only "real radios" are ham radios where everyone
works DX on HF with CW.

>> Of course, any former E-5 or higher that thinks "asshole" is a
>> terribly profane word must be of the sissy pink coloring.
>
> Blatant evidence that you are not in touch with the "new"
>professional Armed Forces, Lennie. That kind of language, although
>rampant in your day, can get a prefessional soldier busted or fined.

aha, stebe, so that's how you got your non-honorable discharge!

we might have known.

I haven't been to a military base since 2001. Must mean I am
"out of touch!"

Heard a couple cuss words from military personnel then. No MPs
or APs showed up to arrest the miscreants. Must be slackers in
the military JAGs, right?

> Of course WE knew that, since all of your references to the Armed
>Forces start off "Back in 1953 at ADA..."...
>
>> It's a gray area...
>
> Nothing "gray" about it, Lennie. YOU keep trying to foist
>yourself off as a professional, both as an author and as an engineer,
>but YOUR conduct and YOUR language lend a different example.

No "foisting," pink one.

Got paid. That's the major distinction of the professional versus the
amateur.

IRS and Franchise Tax Board (of CA) both have my occupation down
as "electronics engineer" since the late 1960s. Several major
corporations' personnel departments have the same information.
The FBI has a dossier on me and has done a background check on
my work, family, and neighbors...no problems. Also DCAS (Defense
Contracts Administrative Service), CIA (!), NSA, DIA, IEEE, and AMA.

I am a published author in national monthly magazines...which can be
checked by examination of those issues. Real ink on real paper isn't
ephemeral like Internet newsgroup lying, pinkie.

If you want a real treat, hang around "Geek Boy Times" on the web.

That's in line with your claims, sweetums. [bet you don't even know what it's about and are going to bluff like heck about it...:-)]

> Sucks to be you, I'd say...

In addition to the Shop-Vac we have two Hoovers for the rugs here although one is really a floor cleaner and rug shampooer (but has a vacuum capability).

I can also pull a slight vacuum in the workshop with one of two Soldapults. Know what those are? :-)

Sold the little airbrush compressor hooked up in reverse to pull bubbles out of castings. No "sucking" there.

I'll bet you never sucked up to any boss, right? :-)

Pinkies do that. Don't think pink.

LHA

698. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153511.01893.00002537@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85370

In article <3FFEF8B6.1000706@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
>eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
>Egbert: September 13, 2003
>Jeff: September 29, 2003
>Leroy: December 31, 2003
>Bill: January 1, 2004
>Phil: March 15, 2004
>Jim H: April 1, 2004
>Jim M: April 15, 2004
>Alun: May 1, 2004
>Ryan: July 1, 2004
>Robert: August 1, 2004
>Larry: September 15, 2004
>Charles: December 30, 2004
>Dee: July 1, 2005
>Mike: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>Kim: June 1, 2008
>
>Hans: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<
>
>
>Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
>
>Howzat?

That's NOT in "UNIX format," Mike...you are NOT giving the right
attribute line prefixes!!!

LHA

699. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153512.01893.00002538@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85369

In article <icnLb.9643$uF6.2716564@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Kind of like:
>
>In Unix style commenting, a ">" is placed before each line of quoted
>text. Add your new text below the relevant quote.
>
>from http://www.magicpub.com/netprimer/netiquette.html

Mike...the quote-formatting standard originated on ARPANET
when USENET began there. Old stuff. Been there, done that.

It is a common-use standard, not a legal, lawful one.

5 minutes in the penalty box just because...

LHA

700. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153513.01893.00002539@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85368

In article <EjdLb.33011$IM3.27487@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> Regardless of the reasoning, do you
>> concur with altering peoples posts
>> to reflect your own wishes?
>
>
> Of course not. But do you concur with attempts to alter the perception of
>a person's status as a Ham by blatantly omitting that person's callsign in a
>list containing only the callsigns of others? Jim is aware of what he's
>doing. Kim had already asked him to include her callsign (a request which
>should have been unnecessary).

...it might have been a Preview of Coming Attractions advertising
a new Sermon on the Antenna Mount by Rev. Jim. :-)

Hans is right. A bunch of sanctimonious Church Ladies trying to
manufacture disputes with their production lines all broken down.

LHA

701. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153518.01893.00002540@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85374

In article <b7d1465c.0401090242.36d45f3b@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
(Bert Craig) writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:<xxlLb.22847$P%1.21765796@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>> news:WOcLb.32978$IM3.28342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> > >
>> > > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > And the efforts of REACT and its
>> > > > members are commendable. However,
>> > > > any public service performed is informal
>> > > > in nature, not the result of any regulatory
>> > > > stipulation imposed by the FCC or
>> > > > federal government. There is nothing in
>> > > > part 95 that mandates public service like
>> > > > that found in part 97.
>> > >
>> > > OK, Dwight quote paragraph and section
>> > > that states that amateurs MUST do public
>> > > service.
>> >
>> >
>> > Okay, Dee, show me where I said Amateurs "must" do public service. Part
>> 97
>> > offers that as one purpose of the ARS and gives us the mandate
>(authority)
>> > to do so (ARES and so on), but it certainly isn't required.
>> >
>> >
>> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>> >
>> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>> >
>>
>> your words were:
>>
>> "...There is nothing in part 95 that mandates public service like that
>found
>> in part 97."
>>
>> tr.v. manï¿½datï¿½ed, manï¿½datï¿½ing, manï¿½dates

>> 1. To assign (a colony or territory) to a specified nation under a mandate.
>> 2. To make mandatory, as by law; decree or require: mandated desegregation
>> of public schools.
>>
>> The way you have used the word conforms to usage number 2. Therefore, you
>> have stated that public service is required even though that may not be
>what
>> you meant to say.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>Here you go, Dee.
>
>----------------------------
>From: "ARRL Letter"
>Date: Wed, 26 Nov 2003 19:02:59 -0500
>Subject: The ARRL Letter, Vol 22, No 47
>
>==
>==>FCC REORGANIZES WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS BUREAU
>
>The FCC has announced a reorganization of its Wireless Telecommunications
>Bureau (WTB) "to more effectively support the

Ahem...the FCC's own announcement of what it was going to do
was on public display before the ARRL made any mention of it.

Old news.

LHA

702. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153520.01893.00002541@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85367

In article <xxlLb.22847$P%1.21765796@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>The way you have used the word conforms to usage number 2. Therefore, you
>have stated that public service is required even though that may not be what
>you meant to say.

The way you've kept on and on and on with this sub-thread
makes it sound like you MUST have the Last Word. :-)

LHA

703. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:35:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110153522.01893.00002542@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 85377

In article <T9kLb.697$Pg.151@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote
>
>> I personally believe that *one of* the valid cases in
>> favor of retaining Element 1 is that it requires an individual to
>> demonstrate a certain level of self-discipline that is not achieved by
>> cramming a published Q&A pool.
>
>I looked and looked and looked and looked and nowhere in 97.501, 97.503 nor
>anywhere in S25 did I find any regulatory requirement to "demonstrate a
>certain level of self-discipline" as part of the qualification procedures.
>Is this another of those "test of worthiness" things that occasionally
>floats to the surface around rrap?
>
>Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
>something like:
>
> " A really tough written test would surely separate those
> who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..
>
> " Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
> dedication to the service.", or..
>
> " I think it is effective at minimizing the undesirables.",
> or..
>
> " ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
> making it something to work for.", or..
> .
> "My opinion is that any obstacle you put in the way to any
> achievement guarantees that only those with dedication and
> strong interest will get there."
>
>All of the above quotations, gathered from rrap threads, were
>made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the best
>for the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in
>that they suggest that the examination process is the key to
>ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are
>"worthy") become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong
>kind of people" get filtered out.

>
>First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a
>"graduation" exam.
>
>Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" might
>be hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations
>do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other
>measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefore it
>is not the function of the examination process to determine (even
>if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine
>if he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should
>be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement that
>the examination process screens out applicants who lack
>"commitment".
>
>Don't get me wrong here, folks. I believe that the examination
>process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge
>and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash
>the bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the
>spectrum. I am not even suggesting that Morse testing is a
>"good thing" or a "poor idea". But I have no expectation that
>ANY examination can filter out "unworthy" applicants who lack
>the proper dedication or motivation.

Sounds eminently reasonable to me...

>Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of "worthy"?

Heh heh heh heh...EVERY self-righteous person who insists
that all MUST do as they did...:-) :-) :-) :-)

The regulars in here already have done that...

LHA

704. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:45:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6wZLb.3267$zj7.313@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85380

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>Which I sense is a process that Hans wants to avoid,
> because there are bound to be both
> supporting and opposing comments.

Avoid????? What a strange thought process, coming from someone who seems to be familiar with my participation here on rrap. Do I appear bashful about stating my ideas, and avoiding reactions to them?

The field is currently crowded with at least 14 petitions, and ARRL will likely make it 15. Would you like a petition of yours to be buried in that noise level? Timing, Jim, is EVERYTHING, and introducing another petition at this time would NOT be a way of gaining any significant mindshare from the rulemakers.

Happy Y3K,

de Hans, K0HB

705. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:49:45 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946CA1016F32Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85381

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040110135609.07961.00001294@mb-m03.aol.com:

> In article <Xns946B6A8898F4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20040109075552.25815.00005807@mb-m07.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
>>> "K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>>>>
>>>>> Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>>>>> indication that you're changing them?
>>>>
>>>>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond
>>>>that.
>>>
>>> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>>
>>> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>>> of having done so?
>>>
>>> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>>> signature?
>>>>
>>>>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which
>>>>he and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
>>>
>>> To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is
>>> inappropriate for the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's
>>> evaluation of it. But I have tried not
>>> to make a big deal about the issue.
>>>
>>> I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can*
>>> control what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases
>>> are edited out by me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet
>>> and email standards. I try to always be clear what words were written
>>> by the original author and what words were not.
>>>
>>> I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's

>>> choice of callsign wrote many, many postings containing that
>>> callsign, therefore giving it far more visibility than it would
>>> otherwise get.
>>>
>>>>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her
>>>>right.
>>>
>>> Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>>
>>> Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>>> of having done so?
>>>
>>> Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>>> signature?
>>>
>>>>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think
>>>>that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my
>>>>right.
>>>
>>> "Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>>>>
>>>>YMMV. That's your right.
>>>>
>>> It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far
>>> less comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In
>>> fact, I've been omitting it for many months and no one has noticed
>>> until now.
>>>
>>
>>You're kidding, right?
>
> About what?

About thinking no-one had noticed. I think if you actually asked you would
find that we all noticed

>
> Do you think it's anyone's right to misattribute?
>
> Do you think it's anyone's right to change quoted posts with no
> indication of having done so?
>
> Do you think it's anyone's right to end a post with someone else's
> typical signature?
>
> What would be your response if someone did the same thing to your
> posts, Alun?
>

Probably about the same as it would be if they left my callsign out of a
list of callsigns and put my name in instead.

>>Just because we didn't say anything doesn't mean we didn't notice.
>
> But there was no comment from you except about what *I* should do.
>>
>>Personally, I think you should use her call if you are going to use
>>everyone else's.
>
> Why should I do that if I think the call is inappropriate?

Because the FCC issued it

>
>> But I'm not an Internet cop.
>>
> Nor I. But there are certain accepted rules of Usenet.
>
>>My reaction to Kim's post was initially "why did she post without
>>adding anything". If I see something in quotes I don't even read it. In
>>fact I can skip over it by clicking on a particular symbol, and usually
>>do, unless I need to go back and get the context. And the name of the
>>actual sender is very prominently displayed to me.
>
> Of course. So why not indicate the changes, as is customary and proper?
>>
>>So, if this was misattribution it wasn't very successful, as I saw it
>>was from Kim immediately and just thought she hit 'send' by mistake.
>>Granted different people don't see the same screen, as they are using
>>different newsreaders, but that's how it appears to me using XNews.
>
> To the AOL and Google readers it appears as I wrote something I didn't.
>>
>>> Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who
>>> would *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her
>>> status as anything else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise
>>> patronized by me. Or by anyone else.
>>>
>>> I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to
>>> change. Deal with it.
>>>
>>> But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it
>>> clear.
>>>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

Jim, leaving Kim's callsign out of the list was calculated to annoy her.
There's little point complaining that she didn't like it and acted

accordingly.

FYI, both my G calls end in VUK, which is a banned combination on car licence plates in the same country, apparently due to similarity with the F*** word. G8VUK was sequentially issued. G0VUK was not, which apparently puts me in the same league as Kim.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

706. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:56:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110155603.11891.00003578@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85383

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
K0HB: January 1, 3000

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

707. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:56:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110155604.11891.00003579@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85382

In article <V4VLb.2902$zj7.736@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> However, note that the "first date not
>> in 'this millenium' is January 1, 3001.
>
>You're mistaken Jim

How am I mistaken, Hans? Did the new millenium start on January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2001?

I'll put you on the list for January 1, 3000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

708. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 20:56:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110155607.11891.00003580@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85384

In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>>writes:
>>
>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he
>>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
>>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
>>
>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's your
>>perception, not my intent.
>
>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to
>acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
>forum.

I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?

>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as
>well!

I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?

>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own
>personal morals and prejudices upon others?

Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the same to me.

Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my posts?

>Did anyone here ask you
>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
>offensive? Certainly not.

I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone else can
post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I have to repeat it.

What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?

Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the original
list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even *should* not do the
list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to censor *me*.

If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included, that's their
right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote something I did not.

>>
>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of
>>>the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>
>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!

So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
>
>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
>>symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked
>>that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>>
>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.

Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was their right
to do it?
>>
>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person has
>>>a problem with that.
>>
>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
>>you do not give others.
>
>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?

Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my posts.
I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".

Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as "wrong" is
really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals and prejudices upon
me.

>That doesn't sound like
>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.

I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
inappropriate for the ARS. She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
sequentially. It
was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to extinction" that
exceeded 3000 posts.

>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
>>>list.
>>
>>Done. No problem.
>>
>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no

>>>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
>>
>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
>>choice.
>
>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.

Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns are
not appropriate?

Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?

ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with four-letter
suffixes,
like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.

>The FCC could have refused to
>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
>motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
>freely issue this suffix as well!

FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the database, or
better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the suffixes immediately before
and after are much more common.
>
>If you met Dick Van Dyke in person one day, would you refuse to
>address him as anything other than 'Richard', because you felt that
>his parents made an inappropriate choice? Of course not! That's
>silly.

Invalid analogy. "Dick" is a common male nickname.
>
>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
>>is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
>>amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
>>involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal in
>>every way but license class.
>
>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
>to.

No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.

>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
>vanity callsign, just like you!

Of course! And she does use it here.

But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not have the
right to refrain from doing so?

>(and, up here,

(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)

>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
>
Were those calls sequentially issued?

>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your choice
>>of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio
>>service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it
>>sequentially.
>
>Why not?

Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns. FCC will,
however, issue them if requested through the vanity program.

>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement
>to the contrary.

I refer you to the Callbook and databases.

>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.

In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an opinion?

>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or
>>in the best interests of all concerned.
>
>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is in
>the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would
>prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and
>unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else
>here!

Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not be done by
othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they are deciding what is
"right" and "wrong" for more than themselves. It's an unavoidable consequence
of having an opinion. The only other option is to never express any opinions at
all.

For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur license should
be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on the issue should take
precedence over what others think and want. They're saying that the FCC's
current rules are incorrect and need to change.

And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for the code
test to go away. Do they have the right to say those things, and to try to get
their
will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and those who
disagree have rights, too.

>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own
>value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.

See above about the tests.

What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I *must not*
oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are permitted by law.

Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?

>If Kim's
>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
>entirely.

Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
with her about callsign choice.

What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by determining how
I can post here.

>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!

Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone from
posting anyhting?

> Intentional deletion of
>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.

I disagree.

Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS. IMHO YMMV
>
>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access
>covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').

I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on Usenet as
a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I *must* post in a certain
way. Why?
>
>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word

[slang word deleted]

Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's
not a birdwatcher.

>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.

I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
>
>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio -

>as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.

This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting names -
and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
disrespectful.
>
>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.

I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.

>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
>
I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to force
me to use it here on Usenet.

Or do they?

Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone *must*
include that word or phrase in any replies?

73 de Jim, N2EY

709. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 21:24:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110162424.21232.00003454@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 85385

In article <WhWLb.24192$P%1.22600542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:48VLb.2904$zj7.1110@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>> >
>> > How much Spanish do you hear on the ham bands being used by US hams?
>> >
>>
>> A lot.
>>
>> Happy Y3K, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Most of the Spanish I hear are Mexican, Central American, and South American
>hams not US hams.

De nada...

:-)

WMD

710. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 21:24:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110162424.21232.00003453@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 85386

In article <89HLb.23889$P%1.22228137@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3FFE49E1.4070406@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >btw, you might want to look up the origin of the word "Easter"...
>> >
>> >
>>
>> And what connection the resurection of Jesus Christ has with rabbits
>hiding
>> colored chicken eggs has.
>>
>> And why no holiday for "Wester", "Norther", and "Souther" :-)
>>
>> And why kids get dressed up in costumes and ask neighbors for candy on
>> Halloween. A Chinese friend once asked me about that, all I could say
>> was that it was an ancient tradition that nobody knows where it came from
>> or why it was done.
>>
>
>Halloween is a run together form of "All Hallow's Eve, meaning "All Saint's
>Eve." It is the night before All Hallow's Day, which is a religious holy
>day to honor saints that do not have specific days set aside for them. The
>belief used to be that on the night before All Hallow's Day that the Devil's
>minions would roam the earth. If one dressed up like ghosts, devils, and
>goblins, etc, one would be protected from these creatures (it appears to
>have entered Christianity from some pagan religion). Now to prevent these
>evil creatures from harming them, ordinary people would give them gifts
>(food, candy, etc). Therefore the people who were disguised as these
>creatures also needed to do the same so that the devil's minions would not
>be able to penetrate their disguises. If a person did not appease the
>demons, the demons would play tricks on them. And thus the disguised people
>also needed to do the same if the did not receive a treat in order to
>maintain their disguise.

I've looked all through Part 97...and ALL volumes of Title 47 C.F.R.
and there is NOTHING applicable to Halloween, Christianity,
Christmas, New Years Day, or anything else in your post.

Here there be demons, of course, but the above has NOTHING to
do with ham radio or even amateur radio.

What dictionary are you using?

What alternate reality are you living in?

WMD

711. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 22:44:18 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>
Source record: 85387

Jim,

Reply follows:

On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he
>>>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
>>>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
>>>
>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's your
>>>perception, not my intent.
>>
>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to
>>acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
>>forum.
>
>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?

Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.
>
>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as
>>well!
>
>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?

See above.
>
>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own
>>personal morals and prejudices upon others?
>
>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the same to me.
>
>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my posts?

Of course not - but that does not confer upon you the right to remove
or alter her personal data without her permission! For the benefit of
the amateur hobby, no less....

>
>>Did anyone here ask you
>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
>>offensive? Certainly not.
>
>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone else can
>post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I have to repeat it.
>
>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?

Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
callsign, because you found it "inappropriate". If you aren't
comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice? Wouldn't
that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!
>
>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the original
>list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even *should* not do the
>list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to censor *me*.
>
>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included, that's their
>right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote something I did not.

See above.

>>>
>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of
>>>>the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>>
>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!
>
>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?

Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
Hers, and yours.

>>
>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
>>>symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked
>>>that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>>>
>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>
>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was their right
>to do it?

No - but that isn't the issue here. Your obvious discomfort with her
call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*

consider it improper.

>>>
>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person has
>>>>a problem with that.
>>>
>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
>>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
>>>you do not give others.
>>
>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
>
>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my posts.
>I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".

Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
aren't you? Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by
her fellow amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour? Because you
have some bugaboo about the suffix?

>
>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as "wrong" is
>really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals and prejudices upon
>me.
>
>>That doesn't sound like
>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
>>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
>
>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
>inappropriate for the ARS.

That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.

> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
>sequentially. It
>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to extinction" that
>exceeded 3000 posts.

But it is her call - issued to her for her use.
>
>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
>>>>list.
>>>
>>>Done. No problem.
>>>
>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no
>>>>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
>>>
>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
>>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate

>>>choice.
>>
>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
>
>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns are
>not appropriate?

Of course it is.
>
>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?

Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
callsigns, not just hers. Do you not think that singling her out the
way that you did was disrespectful to her? Are you that
sanctimonious?
>
>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with four-letter
>suffixes,
>like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.

Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
old four letter combination? I'd be surprised! Even the vehicle
license plate guys have a handle on that one.....
>
>>The FCC could have refused to
>>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
>>motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
>>freely issue this suffix as well!
>
>FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the database, or
>better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the suffixes immediately before
>and after are much more common.

Does not prove the point.

>>
>>If you met Dick Van Dyke in person one day, would you refuse to
>>address him as anything other than 'Richard', because you felt that
>>his parents made an inappropriate choice? Of course not! That's
>>silly.
>
>Invalid analogy. "Dick" is a common male nickname.

And much more, as you know. So, as long as you are comfortable with
the word, then it's OK? Would you QSL with W5DICK, but refuse to
answer W5TIT? Why?
>>
>>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
>>>is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
>>>amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
>>>involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal in
>>>every way but license class.

>>
>>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
>>to.
>
>No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.

I suspect not - you are obviously much more savvy than that!
>
>>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
>>vanity callsign, just like you!
>
>Of course! And she does use it here.
>
>But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not have the
>right to refrain from doing so?

You may, of course, refrain from using it. But why do you feel that
you have the right to share your own personal views on why you have an
issue with it with the rest of the group?

And, do you belive that censorship is appropriate?
>
>>(and, up here,
>
>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)

...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
call signs! Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
>
>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
>>
>Were those calls sequentially issued?

You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether they
requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.
>
>>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your choice
>>>of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio
>>>service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it
>>>sequentially.
>>
>>Why not?
>
>Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns. FCC will,
>however, issue them if requested through the vanity program.

Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do
that? They have total authority over those calls - surely they
ccontrol them better than that?
>
>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement

>>to the contrary.
>
>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.

Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
exempt from sequential issue?
>
>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
>
>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an opinion?

Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.
>
>>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or
>>>in the best interests of all concerned.
>>
>>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is in
>>the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would
>>prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and
>>unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else
>>here!
>
>Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not be done by
>othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they are deciding what is
>"right" and "wrong" for more than themselves. It's an unavoidable consequence
>of having an opinion. The only other option is to never express any opinions at
>all.
>
>For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur license should
>be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on the issue should take
>precedence over what others think and want. They're saying that the FCC's
>current rules are incorrect and need to change.
>
>And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for the code
>test to go away. Do they have the right to say those things, and to try to get
>their
>will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and those who
>disagree have rights, too.
>
>>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own
>>value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.
>
>See above about the tests.

??

Sorry, Jim, I fail to see the connection between snubbing Kim
publically and whether Morse testing should be continued. I'll read

this over again a couple of Jack Daniels' from now, and see if it's
clearer then! :)
>
>What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I *must not*
>oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are permitted by law.
>
>Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?
>

Of course you are. But, as stated above, do you have the right to
impose your own personal standards upon others? Is it OK to single
out Kim in your list as the only one represented by name only in your
pool, because you are embarassed by her call? No. Of course not.
There are two gentlemanly things that you could do in this situation:

1. List all of the participants in the pool by name only, creating an
equal playing field and singling out no one.

2. End your participation in the pool on moral grounds, and let
someone else pick it up should they so choose.

It is never right to ostracize another person because you don't like,
or cannot deal, with something about them. What effect to you think
that doing this would have on Kim? Do you not see that your choice of
actions would hurt her feelings? Say, you weren't striking out at her
because she offended you, were you? Of course not!

>>If Kim's
>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
>>entirely.
>
>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
>with her about callsign choice.

Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my
friends a heck of a lot better than that!
>
>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by determining how
>I can post here.

Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.
>
>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
>>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
>
>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone from
>posting anyhting?

Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
you did!
>

>> Intentional deletion of
>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
>>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
>
>I disagree.

Sorry to hear that!
>
>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS. IMHO YMMV

And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a problem
with.
>>
>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access
>>covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').
>
>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on Usenet as
>a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I *must* post in a certain
>way. Why?

Please see the above comments.
>>
>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
>
>[slang word deleted]

...because you personally have an issue with it! See?
>
>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's
>not a birdwatcher.

I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but
she just might be!
>
>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
>
>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.

Yes you did! Kim, I believe....
>>
>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio -
>>as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.
>
>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
>to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting names -
>and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
>disrespectful.

And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?
>>
>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
>
>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.

Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!
>
>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
>>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
>>
>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to force
>*me* to use it here on Usenet.
>
>Or do they?

Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!
>
>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone *must*
>include that word or phrase in any replies?

Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....

Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections for dinner, and
they're my favourite! :)

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

712. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 22:47:23 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401101447.68bbf9b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85388

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040110135610.07961.00001296@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401060034.175ca229@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > My "mad as hell" attitude resounds from nopt tolerating abusive
> >pathological liars, such as yourself, who have no reservations about
> >making up antagonistic rants as they go.
>
> And in doing so, Steve, you reinforce the behavior of the other person, because
> that's what he *wants* you to do.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I agree with Jim, Steve. When I switched from CompuServe's default
e-mail/USENET reader (No killfile) to MS OE6, (Block Sender) my USENET
reading pleasure immediately doubled. Can you guess who my killfile's
very first customer was? ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

713. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 22:56:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110175616.15462.00005573@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85389

In article <60kJb.21046$IM3.6892@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>>
>> "Phil Kane" wrote:
>>
>> > Let's have the present Element 1
>> > replaced by this "rules" element -
>> > it is more relevant to all amateurs
>> > on any band, any class, any mode.
>>
>>
>> Should that not have been something
>> that should have been done at least 10,
>> 20 or even 30 years ago???
>
>
> Or 40, 50, or even 60, years ago.

Not really. Here's why:

Up until 30 years ago (before Bash books), a prospective ham did not know how many rules questions would be on the test, or exactly what they would ask. S/he only knew that anyhting in the regs was fair game. And it was such a pain in the [expletive deleted] to even get to an exam session, let alone retest, that most prospective hams overlearned in order to be sure of passing.

When I passed the General in 1968, the examiner said "why not try Advanced while you're here?" I had not studied for it at all, but there was no way a 14 year old who hadn't even started high school yet was going to argue with The Man! So I tried and passed easily. That's how much overlearning went on in my case.

>Which makes one wonder why this, and
>some of the other extended test ideas, are being advocated now.

Beacuse *now* is when rules violations are becoming more and more visible. And they're usually deliberate, operating-type violations, not technical mistakes.

30+ odd years ago, most violations were things like tuning up on the wrong harmonic, straying out of the band with a rig that had a dial mark every 50 kHz, etc. Look at today's enforcement letters - quite a contrast.

>I cannot
>help but suspect this is another example of the intolerance of newcomers by
>some existing Hams (and also a way for some to build themselves up by
>putting others down). Darn few of us knew everything when we started (I
>still don't).

Nor I!
>
>Every single person in this newsgroup, every existing Ham, has
>made mistakes (even those who started 40, 50, and even 60 years ago). Yet,
>when a newcomer does the same today, it is not simply inexperience, but
>instead malicious, or ignorance, or even the ruin of Amateur Radio.

I kind of think that when a new ham uses a modified transceiver to send false distress calls on a marine VHF frequency, it's not out of ignorance. Nor is the W6NUT repeater dominated by innocent mistakes.

>Some
>point to it to show how much better they are than that. And calls for a
>solution to this pending crisis are shouted from the rooftops. There is no
>need for proof of a wider problem - a few isolated examples are always
>enough for the intolerant. And, once ignited, intolerance fuels itself. I
>truly hope I'm wrong about this, but that suspicion continues to grow.

Part of the problem is simple lack of enforcement - for years. Another part is lack of respect for the amateur community.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

714. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 22:56:37 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Fq%Lb.17106$na.15009@attbi_s04>
Source record: 85390

> I guess we can draw amusment from the fact they show
> all their abysmal degree of ignorance by posting
> such juvenile remarks.

Jay draw all the amusement you or others want ...Larry's dumbing down context was regarding CW ...not the 9A national IQ. It is statements like yours that stretch and go into some bizarre perceived national insult that does no one any good and displays ignorance. Your statement is a classic juvenile non-sequitor as what does 9A night life have to do with CW.

BTW the 9A guys that I have worked on CW have been excellent ops. The sad condition is that a lot of the old YU ops met their end before their time.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

715. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 23:01:39 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <nv%Lb.18348$I06.132801@attbi_s01>
Source record: 85391

>
> I've looked all through Part 97...and ALL volumes of Title 47 C.F.R.
> and there is NOTHING applicable to Halloween, Christianity,
> Christmas, New Years Day, or anything else in your post.
>
> Here there be demons, of course, but the above has NOTHING to
> do with ham radio or even amateur radio.
>
> What dictionary are you using?
>
> What alternate reality are you living in?
>
> WMD

Oh-Oh Dee you have just violated Len's off topic rule. You better watch it on the air when he .....wait he doesn't have a ticket. Oh well ....

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R

716. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 23:10:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mD%Lb.10598$uF6.3339309@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85392

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Xns946B6A8898F4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20040109075552.25815.00005807@mb-m07.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>>>>>indication that you're changing them?
>>>>
>>>>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond
>>>>that.
>>>
>>>Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>>
>>>Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>>>of having done so?
>>>
>>>Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>>>signature?
>>>
>>>>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which
>>>>he and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
>>>
>>>To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is
>>>inappropriate for the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's
>>>evaluation of it. But I have tried not
>>>to make a big deal about the issue.
>>>
>>>I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can*
>>>control what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases are
>>>edited out by me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet and
>>>email standards. I try to always be clear what words were written by
>>>the original author and what words were not.

>>>
>>>I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's
>>>choice of callsign wrote many, many postings containing that callsign,
>>>therefore giving it
>>>far more visibility than it would otherwise get.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her right.
>>>
>>>Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>>
>>>Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>>>of having done so?
>>>
>>>Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>>>signature?
>>>
>>>
>>>>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think
>>>>that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my
>>>>right.
>>>
>>>"Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>>>
>>>>YMMV. That's your right.
>>>>
>>>
>>>It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far
>>>less comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In
>>>fact, I've been omitting it for many months and no one has noticed
>>>until now.
>>>
>>
>>You're kidding, right?
>
>
> About what?
>
> Do you think it's anyone's right to misattribute?
>
> Do you think it's anyone's right to change quoted posts with no indication
> of having done so?
>
> Do you think it's anyone's right to end a post with someone else's typical
> signature?
>
> What would be your response if someone did the same thing to your posts,
> Alun?
>
>

>>Just because we didn't say anything doesn't mean we
>>didn't notice.
>
>
> But there was no comment from you except about what *I* should do.
>
>>Personally, I think you should use her call if you are going to use
>>everyone else's.
>
>
> Why should I do that if I think the call is inappropriate?
>
>
>>But I'm not an Internet cop.
>>
>
> Nor I. But there are certain accepted rules of Usenet.
>
>
>>My reaction to Kim's post was initially "why did she post without adding
>>anything". If I see something in quotes I don't even read it. In fact I can
>>skip over it by clicking on a particular symbol, and usually do, unless I
>>need to go back and get the context. And the name of the actual sender is
>>very prominently displayed to me.
>
>
> Of course. So why not indicate the changes, as is customary and proper?
>
>>So, if this was misattribution it wasn't very successful, as I saw it was
>
>>from Kim immediately and just thought she hit 'send' by mistake. Granted
>
>>different people don't see the same screen, as they are using different
>>newsreaders, but that's how it appears to me using XNews.
>
>
> To the AOL and Google readers it appears as I wrote something I didn't.

I just went back through google too look at the post, Jim. The post is
probably about the same to misinterpret as the newsgroup mail style post.

But something interesting is in there.

In the post on 2004-01-06 at 20:15 PST is the particular post that got
all this started.

There is another post that is essentially the same that was posted at
02:49:03 PST, ealier in the day. That particular message *has* the
proper attributes.

Since all Kim's other posts have the proper attributes, I'd have to
guess that Kim knew pretty well that the second post would ensure some

controversy. Probably her way of making her point. Just a guess.

- Mike KB3EIA -

717. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 23:11:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zE%Lb.10599$uF6.3339800@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85393

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3FFEF8B6.1000706@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
>>eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>>
>>Egbert: September 13, 2003
>>Jeff: September 29, 2003
>>Leroy: December 31, 2003
>>Bill: January 1, 2004
>>Phil: March 15, 2004
>>Jim H: April 1, 2004
>>Jim M: April 15, 2004
>>Alun: May 1, 2004
>>Ryan: July 1, 2004
>>Robert: August 1, 2004
>>Larry: September 15, 2004
>>Charles: December 30, 2004
>>Dee: July 1, 2005
>>Mike: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>>Kim: June 1, 2008
>>
>>Hans: January 1, 3000 (first date not in "this millenium") <<
>>
>>
>>Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>>
>>
>>Howzat?
>
>
> That's NOT in "UNIX format," Mike...you are NOT giving the right
> attribute line prefixes!!!

That was half the point in this case! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

718. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 23:20:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <dN%Lb.10603$uF6.3341525@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85394

Alun wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20040110135609.07961.00001294@mb-m03.aol.com:
>
>
>>In article <Xns946B6A8898F4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>><alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>>news:20040109075552.25815.00005807@mb-m07.aol.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <g0YKb.43001$Pg1.16843@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
>>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
>>>>>>indication that you're changing them?
>>>>>
>>>>>Because she feels like it. I don't think she needs a reason beyond
>>>>>that.
>>>>
>>>>Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>>>
>>>>Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>>>>of having done so?
>>>>
>>>>Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>>>>signature?
>>>>
>>>>>Jim is apparently trying to make a point about Kim's call sign, which
>>>>>he and many of us think borders on 'tacky'. That's his right.
>>>>
>>>>To be exact, I think the callsign she chose for herself is
>>>>inappropriate for the amateur radio service. I agree with Riley's
>>>>evaluation of it. But I have tried not
>>>>to make a big deal about the issue.
>>>>
>>>>I cannot control what others put in their postings here, but I *can*

>>>>control what I post, and so certain inappropriate words and phrases
>>>>are edited out by me. The editing is done in accordance with Usenet
>>>>and email standards. I try to always be clear what words were written
>>>>by the original author and what words were not.
>>>>
>>>>I found it amusing that other posters who "had a problem" with Kim's
>>>>choice of callsign wrote many, many postings containing that
>>>>callsign, therefore giving it far more visibility than it would
>>>>otherwise get.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Kim is apparently trying to make a point about Jim. That's her
>>>>>right.
>>>>
>>>>Do you think it's her right to misattribute?
>>>>
>>>>Do you think it's her right to change quoted posts with no indication
>>>>of having done so?
>>>>
>>>>Do you think it's her right to end a post with someone else's typical
>>>>signature?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Never mind that they both remind me of the 'church lady', and I think
>>>>>that they and you are acting like sanctimonious twits. That's my
>>>>>right.
>>>>
>>>>"Well, isn't that special?" ;-)
>>>>
>>>>>YMMV. That's your right.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>It's surreal to note that Kim's alteration of quotes raises far, far
>>>>less comment and condemnation than my omission of her callsign. In
>>>>fact, I've been omitting it for many months and no one has noticed
>>>>until now.
>>>>
>>>
>>>You're kidding, right?
>>
>>About what?
>
>
> About thinking no-one had noticed. I think if you actually asked you would
> find that we all noticed
>
>
>>Do you think it's anyone's right to misattribute?
>>
>>Do you think it's anyone's right to change quoted posts with no

>>indication of having done so?
>>
>>Do you think it's anyone's right to end a post with someone else's
>>typical signature?
>>
>>What would be your response if someone did the same thing to your
>>posts, Alun?
>>
>
>
> Probably about the same as it would be if they left my callsign out of a
> list of callsigns and put my name in instead.
>
>
>>>Just because we didn't say anything doesn't mean we didn't notice.
>>
>>But there was no comment from you except about what *I* should do.
>>
>>>Personally, I think you should use her call if you are going to use
>>>everyone else's.
>>
>>Why should I do that if I think the call is inappropriate?
>
>
> Because the FCC issued it
>
>
>>>But I'm not an Internet cop.
>>>
>>
>>Nor I. But there are certain accepted rules of Usenet.
>>
>>
>>>My reaction to Kim's post was initially "why did she post without
>>>adding anything". If I see something in quotes I don't even read it. In
>>>fact I can skip over it by clicking on a particular symbol, and usually
>>>do, unless I need to go back and get the context. And the name of the
>>>actual sender is very prominently displayed to me.
>>
>>Of course. So why not indicate the changes, as is customary and proper?
>>
>>>So, if this was misattribution it wasn't very successful, as I saw it
>>>was from Kim immediately and just thought she hit 'send' by mistake.
>>>Granted different people don't see the same screen, as they are using
>>>different newsreaders, but that's how it appears to me using XNews.
>>
>>To the AOL and Google readers it appears as I wrote something I didn't.
>>
>>>>Of all the people who post here, Kim always struck me as the one who
>>>>would *least* need to have her status as a radio amateur (or her

>>>>status as anything else) validated, endorsed, supported or otherwise
>>>>patronized by me. Or by anyone else.
>>>>
>>>>I'm sometimes electro-politically incorrect. That's not going to
>>>>change. Deal with it.
>>>>
>>>>But I don't misattribute and then say the header should make it
>>>>clear.
>>>>
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> Jim, leaving Kim's callsign out of the list was calculated to annoy her.
> There's little point complaining that she didn't like it and acted
> accordingly.
>
> FYI, both my G calls end in VUK, which is a banned combination on car
> licence plates in the same country, apparently due to similarity with the
> F*** word. G8VUK was sequentially issued. G0VUK was not, which apparently
> puts me in the same league as Kim.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Alun, you can google up the background of Kim's call sign if you like.
It *is* a double entendre. I know this and am not particulary troubled
by it. Jim also knows this also, and is.

There is still also the issue of the two nearly identical posts from
the same day. THe difference is that post one is properly attributed,
and the second isn't.

- Mike KB3EIA -

719. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-10 23:24:59 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <fR%Lb.17287$na.14744@attbi_s04>
Source record: 85395

PS there Jay ..thanks for your service ...

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R.

720. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 00:04:10 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <btq3tq02vce@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 85396

In article <fYVLb.1457$q4.385@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dwight Stewart says...
>
>
>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>> Your usage is still incorrect. There
>> is nothing in Part 97 that assigns
>> authority to hams to do public
>> service either. I've read part 97
>> from beginning to end. (snip)
>
>
> Then you either cannot read or cannot understand what you've read.
>Regardless, if you truly feel Part 97 does not authorize us to do public
>service, then I simply don't have the time to convince you otherwise.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
Isn't that special, a vanity call for a no code dummy.

721. How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:12:02 UTC
From: "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net>
Message-ID: <gh81009f9oeh3l8kgsst6ok4bq6q3mdma2@4ax.com>
Source record: 85397

Someone is telling me if you pass the 5wpm code test today (element 1) along with element 2 (or even separately), that the element 1 portion is only good for 365 days. I have tried to read part 97 but it is confusing. It used to be that you always kept credit for any element taken. So in 3 years if you wanted to upgrade to General, your element 1 and 2 would be good. What's the story?

Chris, N7FNB

722. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:48:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <kX1Mb.24503$P%1.22808895@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85502

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:nv%Lb.18348$I06.132801@attbi_s01...
>
> >
> > I've looked all through Part 97...and ALL volumes of Title 47 C.F.R.
> > and there is NOTHING applicable to Halloween, Christianity,
> > Christmas, New Years Day, or anything else in your post.
> >
> > Here there be demons, of course, but the above has NOTHING to
> > do with ham radio or even amateur radio.
> >
> > What dictionary are you using?
> >
> > What alternate reality are you living in?
> >
> > WMD
>
> Oh-Oh Dee you have just violated Len's off topic rule. You better watch
it
> on the air when he .....wait he doesn't have a ticket. Oh well ....
>
> God Bless 73 Tom KI3R
>
>

I long ago killfiled Len. And as the old commercial went "Plop, Plop, Oh
what a relief it is".

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

723. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:48:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110204855.21457.00003289@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85400

In article <6wZLb.3267$zj7.313@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>Which I sense is a process that Hans wants to avoid,
>> because there are bound to be both
>> supporting and opposing comments.
>
>Avoid????? What a strange thought process, coming from someone who seems to
>be familiar with my participation here on rrap. Do I appear bashful about
>stating my ideas, and avoiding reactions to them?
>
>The field is currently crowded with at least 14 petitions, and ARRL will
>likely make it 15. Would you like a petition of yours to be buried in that
>noise level? Timing, Jim, is EVERYTHING, and introducing another petition
>at this time would NOT be a way of gaining any significant mindshare from
>the rulemakers.

Excellent point. There are a total of 4,661 documents on the ECFS
for those 14 petitions mainly concerned with code testing.

That's more than was gathered on NPRM 98-143 by close to 2K.

>Happy Y3K,

I think that should be "Y1K" considering the Reverend's love of the
past...

Just a thought.

WMD

724. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:48:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110204856.21457.00003290@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85398

In article <zE%Lb.10599$uF6.3339800@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> That's NOT in "UNIX format," Mike...you are NOT giving the right
>> attribute line prefixes!!!
>
> That was half the point in this case! 8^)

Not at all.

You are just busy swinging your stick, sweetums, because you have a need to Do Battle.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You make it seem like US ham radio is a bunch of white guys trying to make out like they are little boy scouts with church ladies as den mothers.

Prissy pinkness. [Expletive Deleted]

WMD

725. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:48:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110204858.21457.00003291@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85501

In article <20040110175616.15462.00005573@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(Expletive Deleted) writes:

>In article <60kJb.21046$IM3.6892@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>>>
>>> "Phil Kane" wrote:
>>>
>>> > Let's have the present Element 1
>>> > replaced by this "rules" element -
>>> > it is more relevant to all amateurs
>>> > on any band, any class, any mode.
>>>
>>>
>>> Should that not have been something
>>> that should have been done at least 10,
>>> 20 or even 30 years ago???
>>
>>
>> Or 40, 50, or even 60, years ago.
>
>Not really. Here's why:
>
>Up until 30 years ago (before Bash books), a prospective ham did
>not know how many rules questions would be on the test, or exactly
>what they would ask. S/he only knew that anyhting in the regs was
> fair game. And it was such a pain in the [expletive deleted] to even
>get to an exam session, let alone retest, that most prospective hams
>overlearned in order to be sure of passing.

Every single one of them were superb, excellent students who
all passed. All smarter than Hiram and possessed of near
superhuman character and motivation, showing the ultimate
respect for the amateur community.

>When I passed the General in 1968, the examiner said "why not try
>Advanced while you're here?" I had not studied for it at all, but there
>was no way a 14 year old who hadn't even started high school yet
>was going to argue with The Man! So I tried and passed easily.
>That's how much overlearning went on in my case.

Late getting into high school? In Illinois we started at 12 or 13.

Spent a whole year studying for the amateur radio test, did
you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>Which makes one wonder why this, and
>>some of the other extended test ideas, are being advocated now.
>
>Beacuse *now* is when rules violations are becoming more and more
>visible. And they're usually deliberate, operating-type violations, not
>technical mistakes.

Obviously due to character flaws, of not expressing enought
commitment to ham radio....all a result of lack of morse code
proficiency.

>30+ odd years ago, most violations were things like tuning up on
>the wrong harmonic, straying out of the band with a rig that had a
>dial mark every 50 kHz, etc. Look at today's enforcement letters -
>quite a contrast.

NO ONE was illegal over three decades ago...NO ONE.

It all happened NOW...and all due to low commitment and
dedication to the olde-tyme hammes and morse code.

>>I cannot
>>help but suspect this is another example of the intolerance of newcomers by
>>some existing Hams (and also a way for some to build themselves up by
>>putting others down). Darn few of us knew everything when we started (I
>>still don't).
>
>Nor I!

Being a year late for high school might explain some of that.

>>Every single person in this newsgroup, every existing Ham, has
>>made mistakes (even those who started 40, 50, and even 60 years ago). Yet,
>>when a newcomer does the same today, it is not simply inexperience, but
>>instead malicious, or ignorance, or even the ruin of Amateur Radio.
>
>I kind of think that when a new ham uses a modified transceiver to send false
>distress calls on a marine VHF frequency, it's not out of ignorance. Nor is
>the W6NUT repeater dominated by innocent mistakes.

Those things would NEVER happen in Pennsylvania, would they?

Reverend Jimmie sounds like working up to another...
Sermon On The Antenna Mount!

>>Some
>>point to it to show how much better they are than that. And calls for a
>>solution to this pending crisis are shouted from the rooftops. There is no
>>need for proof of a wider problem - a few isolated examples are always
>>enough for the intolerant. And, once ignited, intolerance fuels itself. I
>>truly hope I'm wrong about this, but that suspicion continues to grow.
>

>Part of the problem is simple lack of enforcement - for years. Another
>part is lack of respect for the amateur community.

For a dozen years. Ever since the creation of the no-code Tech
license.

All that disrespect and lack of dedication to the amateur community
for not embracing the healing, curative powers of morsemanship!

Terrible, isn't it?

All those years...those wasted years...all the olde-tymers getting
older, grumping around, kvetching and belching about newcomers
not having any respect for the goode olde values of amateurism!

Nobody could do anything, could they? They all sat around and
kvetched and nobody reported anybody, demanding that the feds
should have been dedicated to their Cause and making the ham
world safe for their elitist democratic-socialism where all got one
vote...to cast as one...on one viewpoint.

You tellum, Jimmie.

WMD

726. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:48:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110204859.21457.00003292@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85399

In article <nv%Lb.18348$I06.132801@attbi_s01>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>Oh-Oh Dee you have just violated Len's off topic rule. You better watch it
>on the air when he .....wait he doesn't have a ticket. Oh well ....

Dee (aka Ms Manners the Mother) has her "plonk filter" on...which
means she can't see my posts...she said.

Those who use "killfiles" are merely burrowing their heads in the
sand, refusing to look at other opinions.

In any other venue that would be an ultimate dumbing-down. A
firm refusal to even see another "unkind" post. Ostrich manner.

Sort of a psychnological refuge and "safe area" where all the seen
opinions are the "comfortable" ones that all agree upon.

I wouldn't fret none. All the "regulars" in here are mighty macho
morsemen...and one woman trying to sound off like she has a
pair.

I'll let you get back to the MAIN topic in this newsgroup...discussing
favorite female TV stars of the past. That's extremely important from
the aspect of amateur radio policy.

Nice not really talking at you, Tom...

WMD

727. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 01:59:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <h62Mb.24510$P%1.22813197@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85503

"DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
news:gh81009f9oeh3l8kgsst6ok4bq6q3mdma2@4ax.com...
> Someone is telling me if you pass the 5wpm code test today (element 1)
> along with element 2 (or even separately), that the element 1 portion
> is only good for 365 days. I have tried to read part 97 but it is
> confusing. It used to be that you always kept credit for any element
> taken. So in 3 years if you wanted to upgrade to General, your
> element 1 and 2 would be good. What's the story?
>
> Chris, N7FNB

A CSCE (Certificate of Successful Completion of Element) is only good for upgrading for 365 days no matter what. However, if you pass your Technician test and receive a Tech license, that is good for credit for Element 2 as long as you keep the license current (or within the grace period also I believe) even though the CSCE has expired.

Here's how the code test works:

CSCE for Element 1 - good for upgrade credit for 365 days but good for the Tech with HF operating privileges as long as your Tech license is valid and you keep that CSCE to prove that you passed the element.

So now let's look at your hypothetical case:

Today you pass the Element 1 (code) and Element 2 (Tech written). You will receive CSCEs for both. Your license arrives within a few days and off you go happily operating. Now 3 years pass. Your CSCEs will not be good for upgrade credit BUT the Technician license will still give you credit for Element 2. You will not have to retake Element 2. However, you will have to retake Element 1 because your upgrade credit has expired (it remains legal for you to use your HF privileges even so). Thus to get a General license, you will have to present your Tech license, pass the Element 3 test and re-pass the Element 1 test. Now lets suppose you decide to go to Extra after you get your General. All that you will have to do is present your General license (as long as it is in good standing) and pass the Element 4 test.

I hope this helps.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

728. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 02:21:34 UTC
From: "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net>
Message-ID: <rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com>
Source record: 85504

My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.

On Sun, 11 Jan 2004 01:59:41 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
>news:gh81009f9oeh3l8kgsst6ok4bq6q3mdma2@4ax.com...
>> Someone is telling me if you pass the 5wpm code test today (element 1)
>> along with element 2 (or even separately), that the element 1 portion
>> is only good for 365 days. I have tried to read part 97 but it is
>> confusing. It used to be that you always kept credit for any element
>> taken. So in 3 years if you wanted to upgrade to General, your
>> element 1 and 2 would be good. What's the story?
>>
>> Chris, N7FNB
>
>A CSCE (Certificate of Successful Completion of Element) is only good for
>upgrading for 365 days no matter what. However, if you pass your Technician
>test and receive a Tech license, that is good for credit for Element 2 as
>long as you keep the license current (or within the grace period also I
>believe) even though the CSCE has expired.
>
>Here's how the code test works:
>
>CSCE for Element 1 - good for upgrade credit for 365 days but good for the
>Tech with HF operating privileges as long as your Tech license is valid and
>you keep that CSCE to prove that you passed the element.
>
>So now let's look at your hypothetical case:
>
>Today you pass the Element 1 (code) and Element 2 (Tech written). You will
>receive CSCEs for both. Your license arrives within a few days and off you
>go happily operating. Now 3 years pass. Your CSCEs will not be good for
>upgrade credit BUT the Technician license will still give you credit for
>Element 2. You will not have to retake Element 2. However, you will have
>to retake Element 1 because your upgrade credit has expired (it remains
>legal for you to use your HF privileges even so). Thus to get a General
>license, you will have to present your Tech license, pass the Element 3 test
>and re-pass the Element 1 test. Now lets suppose you decide to go to Extra
>after you get your General. All that you will have to do is present your
>General license (as long as it is in good standing) and pass the Element 4

>test.
>
>I hope this helps.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

729. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 02:30:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xz2Mb.24520$P%1.22823404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85505

"DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
news:rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com...
> My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
> passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
> privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
> days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.
>

Your Novice privileges are good forever so long as you do not let your
license lapse. You do NOT have to retest to keep the privileges. You do
have to keep a copy of the CSCE in your file even though it has expired in
case you ever need to prove it.

To use the CSCE as credit for the General upgrade, you have to upgrade
within 365 days. If you do not upgrade in 365 days, you will have to retest
on code for the General.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> On Sun, 11 Jan 2004 01:59:41 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
> >news:gh81009f9oeh3l8kgsst6ok4bq6q3mdma2@4ax.com...
> >> Someone is telling me if you pass the 5wpm code test today (element 1)
> >> along with element 2 (or even separately), that the element 1 portion
> >> is only good for 365 days. I have tried to read part 97 but it is
> >> confusing. It used to be that you always kept credit for any element
> >> taken. So in 3 years if you wanted to upgrade to General, your
> >> element 1 and 2 would be good. What's the story?
> >>
> >> Chris, N7FNB
> >
> >A CSCE (Certificate of Successful Completion of Element) is only good for
> >upgrading for 365 days no matter what. However, if you pass your
Technician
> >test and receive a Tech license, that is good for credit for Element 2 as
> >long as you keep the license current (or within the grace period also I
> >believe) even though the CSCE has expired.
> >
> >Here's how the code test works:
> >
> >CSCE for Element 1 - good for upgrade credit for 365 days but good for
the

> >Tech with HF operating privileges as long as your Tech license is valid
and
> >you keep that CSCE to prove that you passed the element.
> >
> >So now let's look at your hypothetical case:
> >
> >Today you pass the Element 1 (code) and Element 2 (Tech written). You
will
> >receive CSCEs for both. Your license arrives within a few days and off
you
> >go happily operating. Now 3 years pass. Your CSCEs will not be good for
> >upgrade credit BUT the Technician license will still give you credit for
> >Element 2. You will not have to retake Element 2. However, you will
have
> >to retake Element 1 because your upgrade credit has expired (it remains
> >legal for you to use your HF privileges even so). Thus to get a General
> >license, you will have to present your Tech license, pass the Element 3
test
> >and re-pass the Element 1 test. Now lets suppose you decide to go to
Extra
> >after you get your General. All that you will have to do is present your
> >General license (as long as it is in good standing) and pass the Element
4
> >test.
> >
> >I hope this helps.
> >
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

730. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1378 – January 9, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 02:37:28 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040110213728.11201.00002570@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85506

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1378 – January 9, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1378 with a release date of Friday, January 9, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. V-K hams celebrate a new ham radio, some new Amateur Radio problems in Nepal, and Canadian hams learn that they may loose 220 to 22 MHz. All this and the latest in the war against B-P-L on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1378 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: NO-CODE COMES TO VK-LAND

Major changes to ham radio in Australia were celebrated on the air on New Years Day. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, listened in and tells us what he heard:

--

When 1 January 2004 arrived, so to did a new era for Amateur Radio operators around Australia. At one minute past midnight, amidst the fireworks across Australia, Amateur Radio short wave frequencies lit up, too, as they celebrated the removal of a requirement for Morse Code qualification by getting on air in unprecedented numbers.

A quick scan through the 80 meter band during the first hour of the QSO party showed that there was standing room only with stations of all license levels participating eagerly in the party with some limited and novice limited stations handling high amounts of static and nearby station noise with considerable skill .

All states and territories activated special radio stations for the event. There were plenty of Wireless Institute of Australia stations on the air to help with the bonus contacts with VK5WI, VK6WIA, VK2WI, VK4WIG, VK4WIA and VK4WIT heard during the quick scan around 80 meters.

In the act, the Wireless Institute of Australia's club station VK1WI was activated from the home of their President, Alan Hawes. Way up north long time WIA supporter John Stevens took to the airwaves from the Townsville region.

As the morning wore on the stations operating were fewer but still at a level that veteran operators say rival the heydays of HF operating when Novice licensees were first able to access the HF bands.

From Q-News Australia, I’m Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Still more changes to ham radio down-under is expected in the coming months. (Q-News)

**

RESTRUCTURING: NEW BANDS AND NO-CODE TO CROATIA

Croatia has become the first country in Region 1 to benefit from the expansion of the 40 metre band agreed at the World Radio Conference in Switzerland last summer. 9A amateurs have also been given privileges at 70 and 3,400 Mhz.

New amateur radio regulations came into effect in Croatia on the 26th of December. Since then, amateurs there may operate between 7,100 and 7,200 kHz on a Secondary basis, with a maximum power of 1,000 watts PEP, in addition to the normal Region 1 allocation of 7,000 to 7,100 kHz. On 4 metres, Croatian amateurs now have 70.000 to 70.450 MHz, with a power limit of 10 watts. They also gain a new band between 3,400 and 3,410 MHz, with a maximum permitted power of 150 watts.

The Morse code requirement for an HF bands licence was also dropped with the new regulations and there are now only two licence classes there: the full licence and a beginners' licence.

I’m Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in Nottingham England. (GB2RS)

**

RADIO POLITICS: HAM RADIO IN NEPAL

Some bad news about ham radio in Nepal. Charles Harpole, K4VUD, says that his efforts, along with those of 9N1AA, to expand ham radio in that nation and to establish a memorial club station for the late Father Marshall Moran, 9N1MM, are on an indefinite hold. This, due to the disturbed social and political conditions there.

Harpole says that all radios and other gear that was donated some years ago have been distributed to the currently licensed native 9 N hams. Harpole says that the gear will come back to a club station someday. Harpole asks that everyone bear with this situation and extend understanding. (OPDX)

**

SPECTRUM REALLOCATION: 220 - 222MHZ ON THE BLOCK IN CANADA

Canadian Amateurs may lose part of the 220 to 222 MHz in the 1 point 3 meter band. band. Thats the recommendation being made by the Radio Advisory Board of Canada to Industry Canada following an 18 month survey. Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, is in Antioch, Illinois, with more:

--
In a move reminiscent of the situation in the United Sates back in 1991, the 220 to 222 MHz band would be transferred away from Canada’s Amateur Radio operators and given to that nations Mobile Radio service. That’s the bad part. Here’s the good news. The Radio Advisory Board of Canada has

recommended that Amateur repeaters in this portion of the band be grandfathered to continue operation for a number of years. That time period would be decided by Industry Canada which is Canada’s radio and telecommunications regulator.

The Radio Advisory Board also recommended allocating 219 to 220 MHz to amateurs in Canada on a secondary, non-interfering basis. This says the R-A-B-C would put the band in agreement with a similar allocation now available to radio amateurs in the United States.

But here is where the Radio Advisory Board of Canada begins to think outside the proverbial box. While most administrations seems to frown on the idea of hams and non-hams sharing spectrum and talking with one another in a common allocation, Canada has other ideas.

The Radio Advisory Board wants a 150 kHz wide parcel in the reallocated band be designated as “Public Service Spectrum.” A small band to be shared by Canadian Amateur Radio operators and Canadian Mobile Services for special public safety and disaster communications applications. In other words, Canadian hams could talk with their non ham counterparts -- and vice versa -- in a disaster scenario.

Radio Amateurs of Canada, as a member of the Radio Advisory Board of Canada, has opposed any changes to the 220 to 222 MHz spectrum. Unfortunately, so far with very little success.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, reporting.

--

Industry Canada must now take this advice and decide what it will do with 220 to 222 Mhz, and how soon. The full story is on the web at http://www.rac.ca/news/canada.htm (RAC)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W9EAR Repeater Network serving Indiana, Ohio, Illinois and Kentuckey

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: BPL INTERFERENCE PROVEN TWO-WAY

Two organizations have filed comments with the FCC that augment previously expressed worries about potential interference from and to Broadband over Power Line systems. One of them shows that service providers could loose a lot of income if anyone operates even a low power radio near a B-P-L transmission line. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reports:

--
Picking up on the what it terms as grave concerns expressed by the Federal

Emergency Management Agency over implementation of B-P-L on December 4, the nonprofit Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response Association has called on the FCC to require impartial B-P-L field testing as well as additional public comment and full and open public hearings.

The ARRL Letter says that in comments to the FCC the Disaster Preparedness organization concluded that serious interference to and disruption of critical emergency communications systems in several licensed services throughout North America would almost certainly result from BPL implementation as currently proposed.

Endorsing earlier FEMA remarks, the group said that proposed B-P-L systems don't just pose a risk of interference. Rather, they have already been shown to actually cause harmful interference to licensed radio services.

Meanwhile, the Amateur Radio Research and Development Corporation has filed additional test data with the FCC. This, to support preliminary findings suggesting that BPL systems are susceptible to interference from even modest Amateur Radio HF signals. AMRAD said its newest data demonstrated that amateur operation in the test neighborhood would cause many homes to lose their Internet connectivity.

For its RF susceptibility experiment, AMRAD used the Potomac Electric Power Company system test site. It features a mid-1960s vintage home with unshielded interior electrical wiring and overhead power lines.

AMRAD's tests found that at a distance of just over one-half mile, data transfer ceased in the face of a signal from a mobile 100 watt transmitter on 3 point 980 MHz. When sited adjacent to the test property, AMRAD said data transfer went away in all but one instance at a transmitter power of just 4 watts operating in the proposed Broadband Over Powerline spectrum.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

What AMRAD has now done is to prove that interference with B-P-L will be a two way problem. More so for data providers who won't see much profit if something as simple as a 5 watt C-B radio can shut down a neighborhoods B-P-L operations. (ARRL)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: TAMPA TRIBUNE PRESENTS BOTH SIDES

An excellent article that details both sides of the B-P-L controversy appeared in the January 5th edition of the Tampa Tribune. In it, reporter Will Rodgers provides not only the industry side of the issue, but the ham radio side as well. The article can be read on-line at the cyberspace address in this weeks printed Amateur Radio Newsline report. You can read the article on-line at www.tampatrib.com/Business/mgalzo1pd.html (Via e-mail)

**

WITH THE FCC: CHAIRMAN POWELL PROMOTES A FREE MARKET TELECOM REVOLUTION

The chairman of the FCC is sending out a message that the migration to digital telecommunications will not falter. Michael Powell says that entrenched service providers such as telephone companies and cable television providers can either join the party or suffer the consequences.

In a December 29th interview with reporters and editors from the San Jose Mercury News, Michael Powell shared a number of personal views. At one point he stated the current migration to digital is really a simple thesis. One that says for the past 100 years we've had one kind of communications system. That being a system that's both analog and narrow band. And while it's the greatest machine ever built by mankind, it's also extremely mature, and it's really, in Powell's view, at the end of its innovation life.

Perhaps Powell's most controversial statement came in regard to companies that are not eager to invest in the digital revolution. He said -- quote: "I have no problem if a big and venerable company no longer exists tomorrow, as long as that value is transferred somewhere else in the economy."

You can read more of what FCC Chairman Powell had to say at www.siliconvalley.com/mld/siliconvalley/7591252.htm (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC STILL NOT "NAMING NAMES" IN ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The FCC's decision to no longer identify those hams allegedly violating the Part 97 Amateur Rules continues into the new year. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, N-N-Zero-W, has the latest word:

--

Duckworth: "The FCC, at least temporarilly, has revised the format in which it is supplying information on Amateur Radio enforcement actions. The new format provides only the state and city with a synopsys of the action taken, without naming any indiciduals.

Pursuant to privacy concerns, the FCC currently is reviewing its proceedures in its radio services regasrding the release of information about individuals. Following this review, the FCC will determine its privacy policy for the future. "

--

As we go to air there is still no word as to when the revirew of privacy proceedures at the FCC will be completed. Its been about two months since the ban on relesing names was put in place. (FCC)

**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW: NORWEGIAN COURT SAYS COPYING DVD'S NOT PIRACY

An appeals court in Oslo Norway has dealt a major blow to those trying to protect the intellectual copyright of material that they own from unauthorized duplication. This, after it upholds the acquittal of a 20-year-old Norwegian

man who posted a program on the Internet for cracking DVD security codes.

Prosecutors had appealed a lower court decision after Jon Lech Johansen was acquitted last January of violating Norway's data break-in laws with his DeCSS program for DVDs. The prosecution had sought a 90-day suspended jail sentence, confiscation of computer equipment and a $2,940 fine. But the judge ruled that Johansen could freely copy DVDs he bought, adding he didn't violate the Nordic country's laws protecting intellectual property.

The case was widely seen as a test of Norway's computer protection laws. Prosecutors said they were considering appealing to the country's supreme court. In the meantime, the decision is being viewed as a major setback for anti-piracy proponents in the entertainment industry, worldwide. (Published news reports)

**

RADIO HONORS: GARC HONORS MEMORY OF KU3Z

The Goddard Spaceflight Center Amateur Radio Club in Greenbelt Maryland has honored one of its own. By a unanimous vote at the clubs Christmas party, the "WA3NAN Space Shuttle Retransmission Facility" has ben renamed the "Joe Grzesik KU3Z Memorial Space Shuttle and I-S-S Retransmission Facility." This, in honor of Grzesik’s outstanding support of relaying of space shuttle and International Space Station ham radio communications on the terrestrial Amateur bands for over two decades. Joe Grzesik KU3Z became a Silent Key in 2003. (N8PK vis the WA3NAN News Exchange)

**

HAM RADIO HONORS: SELECTING THE TOP 5 QSL MANAGER SURVEY

John Shelton, K1XN, Editor of the Go List says that it’s time again for his newsletters’ annual “Top 5 QSL Manager” survey. This is is a process by which DX’ers get to choose those that they consider to be the best QSL Managers with whom they have had dealings with in the past 12 months. Its also a way to provide at least a small “thank-you” to the work performed by these and other QSL Managers around the world.

The results of this survey will be given to Carl Smith, N4AA, for inclusion in the QRZ-DX bulletin and also announced on the GO LIST Reflector by mid February. To vote, send your list of those who you are the five best 5 of 2003 by e-mail to golist@golist.net before February 1st. Again, that address is golist@golist.net. (OPDX)

**

HAMFESTS: WINTERFEST IN VA. IN FEB.

Turning to the ham radio social calendar, the 28th annual Winterfest sponsored by the Vienna Wireless Society is slated for Sunday, February 29th. The gathering will take place at Northern Virginia Community College in Annandale, Virginia. And if you're ready to take the test, an Examination Team will be on hand Saturday, February 28th. More information is on the web at

www.viennawireless.org (KG4OJT)

**

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES: AMSAT-NA IN FL IN FEBRUARY

And the next meeting of the Board of Directors of AMSAT-NA will take place at the Orlando Airport Clarion Hotel on Saturday, February 21 and Sunday, February 22nd. Starting at 8.30 am on Saturday, the meeting will be open to all AMSAT North America members wanting to take part.

Among the items to be discussed will be to develop the AMSAT North America Strategic Plan while considering current governing factors. AMSAT members wishing to attend and make a presentation to the Board should advise President Robin Haighton, VE3FRH by February 15th. Let him know the topic and the length of time needed to present. His e-mail is ve3frh@amsat.org (AMSAT-NA)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: NEW TRAVELING SPACE EXHIBIT

The largest traveling space exhibit ever has made its first stop The 12,000 square foot display will allow visitors to touch rocks from Mars and the moon, take a virtual visit to the red planet and explore the international space station.

The exhibit employs the most advanced technology available here on earth to get its message out. The exhibit will be at Seattle's Pacific Science Center through May 9th. Then, it begins its own journey on a 15 city tour over the next five years. (NASA News)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SIREN SENSOR TEST IN L.A.

On the technology front, the Los Angeles Fire Department has been asked to study the possibility of equipping engines with a device to turn traffic lights green. This, so vehicles responding to emergencies don't have to stop at intersections. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is in our Los Angeles studio with more:

--

Los Angeles City Councilman Tom LaBonge has asked the Fire Department to work with the City's Department of Transportation to start a pilot program using

technology such as SirenSensor. This is an acoustically activated device that can differentiate emergency sirens from ambient noise and then warn the civilian driver of the approach of an emergency vehicle. It does this by shutting of a near-by car's audio system or radio and activating both audible and visual signals. The councilman believes that this technology can help police and firefighters respond to emergencies with greater speed.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in the City of Angels.

--

No word when the tests of this remote control system might begin. More about SirenSensor is on the web at http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m4PRN/1998_Nov_13/53213508/p1/article.jhtml (LA News)

**

NEW PRODUCTS: NEW QUICK-CHARGE NiMH BATTERIES

Turning to the latest in electronic products of interest to hams, we have this from battery maker Rayovac. That company has announced a new charger that it says is capable of fully restoring a specially designed Nickel Metal Hydride cell in only 15 minutes. Dubbed the I-C3, the new rechargeable cells and charging system uses Rayovac's In-Cell Charge Control technology that puts the control of recharging into the battery instead of the charger. The company says that doing this offers significant performance and convenience advantages over existing rechargeable and disposable battery systems. More information is on-line at www.rayovac.com (Rayovac)

**

NEW PRODUCTS: INTEL IN YOUR TV

And the world's largest microchip maker will soon unveil plans to make integrated circuits for use in digital television receivers. Santa Clara, California based Intel is exploring a technology called liquid crystal on silicon which is a hybrid between the more expensive silicon microchips and liquid crystal displays. This could significantly lower the cost of flat panel high definition displays. Industry analysts say that if this technology is successful it would pose a serious threat to established consumer electronics chip makers in Europe and Japan, such as Philips and Sony Corp., as well as emerging players like Texas Instruments. (Intel)

**

DX

In D-X, keep an ear open for members of a French radio club who will be on the air from Togo. This as the F6KOP Le Radio Club de Provins 77 announce that they plan to be active from Grid Square JJ06 as 5V7C from March 6th to the 12th. More information is on-line at http://5v7c.free.fr/defaulteng.htm (OPDX)

And OPDX reports that S57CQ, is now active from Bhutan as A52CQ and is expected to stay there through January 14th. Activity is expected to be on all bands as much as possible. QSL via S57DX. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THAT FINAL ITEM: ARDF

Lastly, some hams have learned the secret of enjoying the hobby while staying physically fit. They're the fans of on-foot transmitter hunting, also called radio-orienteering and ARDF. Reporter Joe Moell, K0OV, has the story of a California ham who is rapidly becoming one of the best.

--

I've told you about the many direction-finding medals that have been won by Jay Thompson W6JAY, Newsline's Young Ham of the Year. But you don't have to be Jay's age to be a big winner at international on-foot transmitter hunts. 61-year-old Bob Cooley KF6VSE of Pleasanton, California has just brought home a couple of gold medals from the IARU Region 3 Championships in Australia.

The competitions began November 28 near Ballarat, a historic gold mining town in northwestern Victoria province. They were hosted by the Wireless Institute of Australia and organized by the Victorian ARDF Group.

Cooley competed in M60, the Superveteran Category for men age 60 and above. On the 4.7-kilometer two-meter course, he found his required three fox transmitters in 1:30:25, seven minutes ahead of the second-place finisher. Then on the 5.6-kilometer 80-meter course, he did even better, finding all three foxes and getting to the finish line in 1:15:22.

All three IARU Regions hold championships in odd-numbered years. These events for Region 3, encompassing Asia and Oceania, drew 50 male and 9 female competitors from Australia, China, Japan, Korea, and New Zealand. KF6VSE was the only guest from North America.

A long-time competitor at non-radio type orienteering events, Bob has improved greatly since he discovered ARDF in 1999. He finished among the top ten in his age and gender category at the 2000 ARDF World Championships near Nanjing, China. This past summer, he won gold medals on both bands at the 2003 USA ARDF Championships near Cincinnati.

You can get a link to the complete results from Australia and learn more about world-class transmitter hunting on the Web at www.homingin.com. There you will also find the details on the upcoming USA ARDF Championships, which will take place in California next June. That's homingin -- one word -- homingin.com

From southern California, where we do transmitter hunting every month of the year, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor, reporting for Newsline.

--

Again Joe’s website is www.homingin.com (K0OV, ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Fred Vobbe, W8HDU, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

(ARNewsline report 1378 was recorded in the studios of the National Radio Club DX Audio Service in Lima Ohio.)

731. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 02:43:49 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <FL2Mb.20071$I06.146451@attbi_s01>
Source record: 85507

>
> I'll let you get back to the MAIN topic in this newsgroup...discussing
> favorite female TV stars of the past. That's extremely important from
> the aspect of amateur radio policy.
>
> Nice not really talking at you, Tom...
>
> WMD

Naw Len ....I was just listening to some stations on the phone part of 40 as there is a CW contest on and I'm not really into that ....I turned off the rig after the topic turned to gall bladder surgery. You know Len my favorite TV lady was Emma Peale on the avengers AKA Dianna Rigg or Riggs. How is this related to ham radio ...easy ..she looks a heck of a lot better than the guys at the local radio club.

Take care Len and nice talking wif you ... Tom KI3R

732. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 04:19:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btqjbv$3o6@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85508

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040110155603.11891.00003578@mb-m11.aol.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> K0HB: January 1, 3000
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

W5TIT: January 1, 2008. However, I will add this sentence as I desire; I
DO NOT wish to be placed into a list under name only. Kim may not be a
ham radio operator. W5TIT is.

Kim W5TIT

733. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 04:59:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btql45$t7a@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85509

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:mD%Lb.10598$uF6.3339309@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
> I just went back through google too look at the post, Jim. The post is
> probably about the same to misinterpret as the newsgroup mail style post.
>
> But something interesting is in there.
>
> In the post on 2004-01-06 at 20:15 PST is the particular post that got
> all this started.
>
> There is another post that is essentially the same that was posted at
> 02:49:03 PST, ealier in the day. That particular message *has* the
> proper attributes.
>
> Since all Kim's other posts have the proper attributes, I'd have to
> guess that Kim knew pretty well that the second post would ensure some
> controversy. Probably her way of making her point. Just a guess.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

'S 'bout time. Now, to all who have been participating in this debate, WHICH style of post was it that got more noticed I had added my CALLSIGN to the list? It took you all (and actually it took only Mike because no one else noticed) almost exactly 3 days to notice that the two posts were made on the same day. One with (and first) and one without attributes. And, I honestly ask: who really noticed one (attributes) or the other (no attributes)? I'd almost bet a buck that even Jim wondered what in the world was in that post that was different, whether the attributes were there or not. By the way, note that the post that was made somewhere around a couple of days ago...where I again submitted the list without attributes, note that in *that* post, my information appears at the top of the post (the "Kim Walker said" stuff). Is anyone watching this stuff? Really?!

The entire point had been having my callsign *in the list* as a ham radio operator. Jim complains that to Google or whatever, it looked like he had posted something he had not said. A) the only thing he had not said was my callsign so who cares? B) What about someone who is casually looking at those posts and completely disregards my submission because it *looks* like I don't have a callsign?

At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as everyone thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...

Kim W5TIT

734. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 10:23:14 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <Tr9Mb.22067$qC.10647@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85510

K0HB, the perfect argument against code.

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>
>>Which I sense is a process that Hans wants to avoid,
>>because there are bound to be both
>>supporting and opposing comments.
>
>
> Avoid????? What a strange thought process, coming from someone who seems to
> be familiar with my participation here on rrap. Do I appear bashful about
> stating my ideas, and avoiding reactions to them?
>
> The field is currently crowded with at least 14 petitions, and ARRL will
> likely make it 15. Would you like a petition of yours to be buried in that
> noise level? Timing, Jim, is EVERYTHING, and introducing another petition
> at this time would NOT be a way of gaining any significant mindshare from
> the rulemakers.
>
> Happy Y3K,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

735. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 10:24:31 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401110224.675a93d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85511

LHA
You are a bitter little person and do not play well with others.
Perhaps you need something of a higher level in you life. Try Jesus
instead of all of this negative stuff. So much energy needs to be
focused on getting you to Heaven instead of bothering these nice
people.
JEP

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040110153505.01893.00002531@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
> >Date: 8 Jan 2004 08:32:16 -0800
> >
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040107140051.21642.00003529@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0401060515.4cdba18c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >
> >> > It's certainly not true in MY case, and just one more example of
> >> >how you feel free to take liberties with the truth.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk...role-playing in a fantasy land is not "reality" nor
> >> is it "truth."
> >
> > There's only one "role-player" here, Lennie. Almost everyone
> >else here HAS an Amateur Radio license and PARTICIPATES in teh "Real
> >McCoy".
>
> "teh ?" :-) Getting ANGRY again, are you?
>
> There are several "McCoys" in electronics. Which one are you
> referring to? Walter Brennan?
>
> > YOU are the outsider here.
>
> This newsgroup isn't "amateur radio."
>
> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
>

> I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
> examination. That's all.
>
> You are the one on an extended field trip into fantasyland.
>
>
>
> >
> >> > I never claimed to be an engineer...But I did provide numerous
> >> >references from that job that proved you WRONG on numerous occassions.
> >>
> >> Never once did you "prove" anything. Your imagination tells only
> >> you that you were "right." Your imagination is WRONG.
> >
> > Sure I did. Starting with simple assertions about the
> >"engineering community"...You said that there was "no such thing" and
> >I provided you with an immediate quote from one of the periodicals
> >that cited that very concept.
>
> Where is this "engineering community" located? Have you been
> there? :-)
>
> Is it part of a Kibbutz? A collective farm? Does it have fancy
> alphabets like ASME?
>
> Where did you read this? Or, rather, who read it to you from some
> printed reference? Your therapist?
>
> Go for it, EX purchasing agent...
>
> > And you further went on to say "real engineers" didn't need/use
> >Amateur Radio...I gave you the callsigns of not only 13 engineers, but
> >three of them were PhD's.
>
> Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
> of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio.
>
> In other words, in your MIND, sweetums.
>
> I'm still a Life Member of the IEEE and a former member of the ACM,
> both professional organizations. None of their many, many
> publications have had "news" about Ham Radio Saving The Day!
>
> But, in your mind, you know "lots" of PhDs, and other smart folks
> who all LOVE ham radio and cherish, honor, obey morse code....
>
>
>
> >> > I guess that had to hurt, knowing a "non-engineer" had access to
> >> >references that took a bite out of your rants...

> >>
> >> "Hurt?" Only my sides from laughing. "References" from a weekly
> >> newspaper from Podunk Hollow, TN, hardly counts for anything...
> >
> > They were hardly from "Podunk Hollow", Lennie. They were
> >professional journals and periodicals.
>
> Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York TIMES.
>
> Paris Review on a bad day maybe. St. Louis Post-Dispatch or the
> Washington Post would hardly have such, would they?
> George didn't have such, neither did Time, Life, Newsweek. Maybe
> it was in People (which I only read in dentist offices). TV Guide?
>
> Not in IEEE Proceedings or the monthlies from ComSoc (Communication
> Society, a group within IEEE). ComSoc wants me back as a member.
>
> It wasn't in EDN, or Electronic Design, or RF Design, or Microwaves &
> RF. I don't bother with EE Times anymore. Maybe PET (Power
> Engineering Technology)?
>
> > (Squirm a bit harder, Scummy...)
>
> Only if the mosquitos are biting. You WANT to but haven't gotten
> any penetration yet...
>
> >> > Again with the "1930's" rant, Lennie?
> >>
> >> Call it "transistorized 1930s," Stebe.
> >
> > I call it your "1930's rant", Lennie...It's not truthful, nor
> >even representitive of anything associated with MODERN Amateur Radio.
>
> Of course, Mr. PhD...MODERN amateur radio...extolling morse code
> modes on HF as "always getting through when nothing else will..."
>
> MODERN HF amateur radio: "What was good in the 1930s is still
> good in 2000s!"
>
> "Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."
>
> >> Standards and Practices remain the same as 70 years ago.
> >> Imagination of Public Service and self-serving glory are still the
> >> same. If ARRL writes it, all MUST believe, for their words are
> >> sacred.
> >
> > No, they don't.
> >
> > But if you NEED to believe that in order to sleep well at night,
> >please, be my guest...

>
> :-) Not even close, Mr. Hotellier or Mr. Innkeeper. :-)
>
> Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
> of a communicable disease.
>
> Go get some therapy.
>
> LHA

736. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 13:21:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <k5cMb.10813$uF6.3553725@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85512

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:mD%Lb.10598$uF6.3339309@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>I just went back through google too look at the post, Jim. The post is
>>probably about the same to misinterpret as the newsgroup mail style post.
>>
>>But something interesting is in there.
>>
>>In the post on 2004-01-06 at 20:15 PST is the particular post that got
>>all this started.
>>
>>There is another post that is essentially the same that was posted at
>>02:49:03 PST, ealier in the day. That particular message *has* the
>>proper attributes.
>>
>>Since all Kim's other posts have the proper attributes, I'd have to
>>guess that Kim knew pretty well that the second post would ensure some
>>controversy. Probably her way of making her point. Just a guess.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> 'S 'bout time. Now, to all who have been participating in this debate,
> WHICH style of post was it that got more noticed I had added my CALLSIGN to
> the list? It took you all (and actually it took only Mike because no one
> else noticed) almost exactly 3 days to notice that the two posts were made
> on the same day. One with (and first) and one without attributes. And, I
> honestly ask: who really noticed one (attributes) or the other (no
> attributes)? I'd almost bet a buck that even Jim wondered what in the world
> was in that post that was different, whether the attributes were there or
> not. By the way, note that the post that was made somewhere around a couple
> of days ago...where I again submitted the list without attributes, note that
> in *that* post, my information appears at the top of the post (the "Kim
> Walker said" stuff). Is anyone watching this stuff? Really?!
>
> The entire point had been having my callsign *in the list* as a ham radio
> operator. Jim complains that to Google or whatever, it looked like he had
> posted something he had not said. A) the only thing he had not said was my
> callsign so who cares? B) What about someone who is casually looking at
> those posts and completely disregards my submission because it *looks* like
> I don't have a callsign?

>
> At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as everyone
> thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...

"And that", as Paul Harvey says, "is the rest of the story." Point
made well.

- Mike KB3EIA -

737. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 13:38:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <plcMb.2501$q4.1909@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85513

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > (snip)
>
> But you have no negative comments
> for the person who does it.

Negative comments had already been posted by others. I don't kick people when they're already laying on the ground from the blows of others.

> Yes, if the callsign is inappropriate to
> the ARS.
>
> Do you think all possible callsigns are
> appropriate, Dwight?

Beyond the law, I don't think it is my mission in life to decide what is appropriate for others. If I have a problem with the laws (the callsigns allowed by the FCC), then my fight is with the lawmakers (the FCC). Whatever the case, I don't take it upon myself to engage in an ongoing campaign against those who make choices different then my own. Kim is aware of my opinion about her callsign (I wouldn't have chosen it myself). Beyond that, the discussion is over as far as I'm concerned. If I felt this is a real problem, I'd take up the issue of callsigns with the FCC.

> You have had no problem when others
> have used insulting names rather than
> callsigns to refer to me, (snip)

I've never seen anyone use insulting names to refer to you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

738. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 13:54:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111085434.11891.00003592@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85515

In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Jim,
>
>Reply follows:
>
>On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>>>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when
>>>>>he
>>>>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
>>>>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
>>>>
>>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's
>>>>your
>>>>perception, not my intent.
>>>
>>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to
>>>acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
>>>forum.
>>
>>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>
>Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.

Who says that anyone has that right? I've been called all kinds of
names here, rather than my callsign, and no one has said my
rights were violated.
>>
>>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as
>>>well!
>>
>>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>
>See above.

>>
>>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own
>>>personal morals and prejudices upon others?
>>
>>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the same to
>>me.
>>
>>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my posts?
>
>Of course not -

But that's exactly what is being demanded of me. You're saying that if I write a post and refer to Kim, I *must* use her callsign. You're saying I do *not* have the right to simply refer to her as "Kim".

oh wait - I just did....

>but that does not confer upon you the right to remove
>or alter her personal data without her permission!

"personal data"? Everyone here knows she's a ham, and knows her callsign. In all of the 7+ years I've been reading rrap, there's been only one Kim. There have been at least 4 Jims, though.
.
>For the benefit of the amateur hobby, no less....

For the exercise of my right of free speech that includes *not* having to write

certain things.

>>>Did anyone here ask you
>>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
>>>offensive? Certainly not.
>>
>>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone else can
>>post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I have to repeat it.
>
>>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?
>
>Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
>callsign, because you found it "inappropriate".

That's right. I did not change the meaning of anyhting anyone wrote. No one who reads this thread will think that Kim is not a ham.

>If you aren't
>comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
>someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice?

Because I have no prejudice in the matter. The word "prejudice" derives from "pre-judge", meaning to judge before all the facts are in. That's not the case here - the facts are in.

> Wouldn't
>that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
>with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!

There's nothing illegal about it.

>>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the
>>original
>>list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even *should* not do
>>the
>>list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to censor *me*.
>>
>>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included, that's
>>their
>>right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote something I did not.
>
>See above.

Where?

>>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of
>>>>>the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.

>>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
>>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!

>>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
>
>Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
>Hers, and yours.

I do not see that I have done anything wrong.

>>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
>>>>symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked
>>>>that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.

>>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.

>>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was their
>>right to do it?
>
>No - but that isn't the issue here.

Yes, it is. You are avoiding any criticism of Kim's actions. You're
telling me what I *must* or *should* do in my posts, based on *your*
personal morals and judgements - and then criticizing me for doing
what I think best in my own postings, based on *my* personal morals
and judgements.

>Your obvious discomfort with her
>call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
>You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*
>consider it improper.

Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?

Just as she got that callsign, and continues to keep it, even
though she knows others consider it inappropriate and that
it angers others.

She has her right to that callsign, and I have my right not
to publicize it here. But you deny my right.
>
>>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person
>>>>>has a problem with that.
>>>>
>>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
>>>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
>>>>you do not give others.
>>>
>>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
>>
>>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my posts.
>>I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".
>
>Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
>aren't you?

Nope. I'm editing it out.

"Censoring" would be if I tried to prevent her from posting it at all. I have
not
done that, and would not if I could.

>Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by
>her fellow amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour?

I think that not giving her callsign more exposure through my own posts is
appropriate behavior.

>Because you have some bugaboo about the suffix?

Because I think it's inappropriate and because I take responsibility for what I
post.
>
>>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as "wrong" is
>>really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals and prejudices
>>upon me.

Ahem...
>>
>>>That doesn't sound like
>>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
>>>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
>>
>>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
>>inappropriate for the ARS.
>

>That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.

Says who?

FCC is allowing BPL systems to be implemented even though they generate
enormous amounts of RF interference. FCC still requires code tests of
those who want US HF ham licenses, despite the loss of the treaty
requirement 6 months ago. FCC recently declined to penalize anyone when
a pop star used the "F-word" on network TV.

Does the fact that the FCC does the above mean I have no right to say the FCC
is
wrong?

Is it wrong for me to tell people not to sign up for BPL and cite the problems
it has?

Is it wrong for those who disagree with code tests to try to get the rules
changed?

Is it OK for hams to use the F-word on the air because FCC allowed it once on
TV?
>
>> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
>>sequentially. It
>>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to extinction"
>>that exceeded 3000 posts.
>
>But it is her call - issued to her for her use.

And she hasn't used it for over a year on the air. Just here.

And if Kim wants to use it here, that's her right. But *I* don't have to use it
here.
>>
>>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
>>>>>list.
>>>>
>>>>Done. No problem.
>>>>
>>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>>>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no
>>>>>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
>>>>
>>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
>>>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
>>>>choice.
>>>
>>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
>>
>>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns are
>>not appropriate?
>

>Of course it is.
>>
>>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?
>
>Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
>callsigns, not just hers.

Why?

>Do you not think that singling her out the
>way that you did was disrespectful to her?

No.

>Are you that sanctimonious?

No. I'm that honest.
>
>>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with four-letter
>>suffixes, like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.
>
>Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
>old four letter combination?

Yes.

>I'd be surprised!

I was surprised that they would issue Kim's call. But they did. Why would you
be surprised if they
issued four-letter combinations? They allowed that pop star to say a certain
word. All kinds of
words are permitted here on the 'net - (wire comms are regulated by the FCC
too).

>Even the vehicle
>license plate guys have a handle on that one.....

Those are issued by the states, not the FCC.
>>
>>>The FCC could have refused to
>>>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
>>>motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
>>>freely issue this suffix as well!
>>
>>FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the database, or
>>better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the suffixes immediately
>>before and after are much more common.
>
>Does not prove the point.
>
It proves the FCC considers Kim's call to be somewhat different from W5TIS or
W5TIU

>>>
>>>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
>>>>is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
>>>>amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
>>>>involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal
>>>>in
>>>>every way but license class.
>>>
>>>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
>>>to.
>>
>>No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.
>
>I suspect not - you are obviously much more savvy than that!

Is Kim equal to me in technical knowledge of ham radio? In historic knowledge?
In HF operating experience? In ability to homebrew equipment? At the risk
of blowing my own horn, I'd say no.
>>
>>>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
>>>vanity callsign, just like you!
>>
>>Of course! And she does use it here.
>>
>>But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not have the
>>right to refrain from doing so?
>
>You may, of course, refrain from using it.

Gee, thanks. ;-)

>But why do you feel that
>you have the right to share your own personal views on why you have an
>issue with it with the rest of the group?

Because they asked.
>
>And, do you belive that censorship is appropriate?

No - that's why I don't censor anyone.
>>
>>>(and, up here,
>>
>>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)
>
>...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
>call signs!

Doesn't mean they are appropropriate.

>>Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
>>

>>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
>>>
>>Were those calls sequentially issued?
>
>You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether they
>requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.

It makes a difference.
>>
>>>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your
>>>>choice
>>>>of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio
>>>>service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it
>>>>sequentially.
>>>
>>>Why not?
>>
>>Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns. FCC will,
>>however, issue them if requested through the vanity program.
>
>Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do
>that?

-Because they don't care
-Because it's handled by computer and nobody really looks at the system
-Because they don't want the complaints from those who want such calls
-Because FCC is too busy with other matters and has too few resources.

>They have total authority over those calls - surely they
>ccontrol them better than that?

Nope.

In case you didn't know, Kim emailed Riley Hollingsworth about it. He
replied that while such callsigns were legal, the request and use of such
callsigns moves the ARS "one step closer to extinction".

>>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
>>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement
>>>to the contrary.
>>
>>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.
>
>Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
>exempt from sequential issue?

Their actions are enough to prove the point.
>>
>>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
>>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
>>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
>>

>>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an
>>opinion?
>
>Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
>views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.

You're saying I don't have the right to protest. Just keep quiet, huh?
>>
>>>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or
>>>>in the best interests of all concerned.
>>>
>>>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is in
>>>the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would
>>>prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and
>>>unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else
>>>here!
>>
>>Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not be done
>>by
>>othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they are deciding what
>>is
>>"right" and "wrong" for more than themselves. It's an unavoidable
>>consequence
>>of having an opinion. The only other option is to never express any opinions
>>at all.
>>
>>For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur license
>>should
>>be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on the issue should take
>>precedence over what others think and want. They're saying that the FCC's
>>current rules are incorrect and need to change.
>>
>>And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for the code
>>test to go away. Do they have the right to say those things, and to try to
>>get their
>>will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and those who
>>disagree have rights, too.

And that's the way it should be. YMMV
>>
>>>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own
>>>value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.
>>
>>See above about the tests.
>
>??
>
>Sorry, Jim, I fail to see the connection between snubbing Kim
>publically and whether Morse testing should be continued. I'll read
>this over again a couple of Jack Daniels' from now, and see if it's
>clearer then! :)

>>
>>What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I *must
>>not*
>>oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are permitted by law.
>>
>>Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?
>>
>
>Of course you are. But, as stated above, do you have the right to
>impose your own personal standards upon others? Is it OK to single
>out Kim in your list as the only one represented by name only in your
>pool, because you are embarassed by her call? No. Of course not.
>There are two gentlemanly things that you could do in this situation:
>
>1. List all of the participants in the pool by name only, creating an
>equal playing field and singling out no one.
>
>2. End your participation in the pool on moral grounds, and let
>someone else pick it up should they so choose.

By stating those two as the onlt two options, *you* are trying to impose
your personal standards on *me*

I say there's a third option:

3. Do exactly what I've done, and state the reasons for doing so.

>It is never right to ostracize another person because you don't like,
>or cannot deal, with something about them.

I have not ostracized Kim.

>What effect to you think
>that doing this would have on Kim?

Perhaps it will make her reconsider her choice of callsign.

>Do you not see that your choice of
>actions would hurt her feelings?

What about *my* feelings?

>Say, you weren't striking out at her
>because she offended you, were you? Of course not!

That's right.
>
>>>If Kim's
>>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
>>>entirely.
>>
>>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
>>with her about callsign choice.
>

>Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my
>friends a heck of a lot better than that!

I did not say she was my friend. Kim reserves the term "friend" to a very
select few.
"Acquaintance" would be more accurate.
>>
>>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by determining
>>how I can post here.
>
>Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
>impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.

Not what I'm doing.
>>
>>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
>>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
>>>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
>>
>>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone from
>>posting anyhting?
>
>Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
>you did!

I edited. Not the same thing. Words have exact meanings.
>>
>>> Intentional deletion of
>>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
>>>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
>>
>>I disagree.
>
>Sorry to hear that!
>>
>>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS. IMHO YMMV
>
>And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
>really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a problem
>with.

So go ahead and use Kim's call all you want. Just please don't tell me that I
have to.
>>>
>>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
>>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access
>>>covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').
>>
>>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on Usenet
>>as
>>a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I *must* post in a

>>certain way. Why?
>
>Please see the above comments.
>>>
>>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
>>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
>>
>>[slang word deleted]
>
>...because you personally have an issue with it! See?
>>
>>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's
>>not a birdwatcher.
>
>I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but
>she just might be!

Kim chose that callsign for at least two obvious, prominent reasons:

1) She thought it was fun, and/or funny

2) She knew it would get lots of attention and create all sorts of reactions

She's told us all that here. Her picture used to be on qrz, too.

>>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
>>
>>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
>
>Yes you did!

No, I did not.

> Kim, I believe....
>>>
I notice that you use her name and not her callsign too....

>>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio -
>>>as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.
>>
>>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
>>to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting names
>-
>>and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
>>disrespectful.
>
>And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?

There was no problem when others did it. Only when I did. Double standard.

>>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
>>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
>>

>>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.
>
>Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!

Then why not choose another one?
>>
>>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
>>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
>>>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
>>>
>>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to force
>>*me* to use it here on Usenet.
>>
>>Or do they?
>
>Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!

But you want to force your values on me.
>>
>>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
>>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone *must*
>>include that word or phrase in any replies?
>
>Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....

I do ignore it! That's exactly what I've been doing!

Thanks for the validation, Leo!
>
>Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections for dinner, and
>they're my favourite! :)
>
Yum..But I'm a leg man, myself.

73 de Jim, N2EY

739. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 13:54:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111085435.11891.00003593@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85514

In article <6wZLb.3267$zj7.313@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>Which I sense is a process that Hans wants to avoid,
>> because there are bound to be both
>> supporting and opposing comments.
>
>Avoid?????

Why, yes.

>What a strange thought process, coming from someone who seems to
>be familiar with my participation here on rrap. Do I appear bashful about
>stating my ideas, and avoiding reactions to them?

Not here. But I don't know about in the much wider arena of petitions to the FCC.
>
>The field is currently crowded with at least 14 petitions, and ARRL will
>likely make it 15.

The comment and reply comment periods to all of those 14 petitions are long past. ARRL hasn't started yet.

>Would you like a petition of yours to be buried in that
>noise level?

What noise level? Right now there are no petitions/RMs/NPRMs on amateur license requirement changes out there. Yours would have the comment stage to itself right now.

Soon ARRL will have its board meeting, and then there will probably be a proposal that will gather all kinds of comments. Obviously you don't want to compete with that!

>Timing, Jim, is EVERYTHING, and introducing another petition
>at this time would NOT be a way of gaining any significant mindshare from
>the rulemakers.

Of course! But if you wait too long, the opportunity may be lost. Considering the way FCC tossed out 14 RM numbers in two batches of seven, if you wait you may find your proposal batched with ARRL's. If you wait too long, FCC could move on to the NPRM process before you ever get the petition sent in.

>Happy Y3K,

And looking forward to Y4K

73 de Jim, N2EY

740. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 14:23:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <d%cMb.2521$q4.1067@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85516

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) Even sense 3 would be a
> requirement as when one is given an
> assignment, you are supposed to
> carry that assigment. It is not just a
> suggestion or desireable activity. If
> a person or group does not carry
> through on an assignment, then that
> assignment is given to a group who
> will.

Dee, I've repeatedly explained to you what was meant by the word mandate. Nothing is required or mandatory in the context used. Likewise, without a stated obligation, there is nothing required or mandatory in giving an assignment or task to someone (or in giving authorization to someone). If you still cannot understand this, I suggest you look carefully at the words "mandate," "assigns," "authorization," and so on, including the synonyms. I have nothing more to say on the matter.

> I repeat, Part 97 does NOT mandate
> in any way shape or form that amateurs
> participate in public service.

Sorry, but public service is at the very heart of the basic and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service (as described in 97.1). And, while there is nothing mandatory about it, the mandate (authorization) to do so still remains. Likewise, I have nothing more to say on this matter.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

741. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 14:31:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_6dMb.24955$P%1.23043109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85517

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:btql45$t7a@library1.airnews.net...
[snip]
> 'S 'bout time. Now, to all who have been participating in this debate,
> WHICH style of post was it that got more noticed I had added my CALLSIGN
to
> the list? It took you all (and actually it took only Mike because no one
> else noticed) almost exactly 3 days to notice that the two posts were made
> on the same day. One with (and first) and one without attributes. And, I
> honestly ask: who really noticed one (attributes) or the other (no
> attributes)? I'd almost bet a buck that even Jim wondered what in the
world
> was in that post that was different, whether the attributes were there or
> not. By the way, note that the post that was made somewhere around a
couple
> of days ago...where I again submitted the list without attributes, note
that
> in *that* post, my information appears at the top of the post (the "Kim
> Walker said" stuff). Is anyone watching this stuff? Really?!
>
> The entire point had been having my callsign *in the list* as a ham radio
> operator. Jim complains that to Google or whatever, it looked like he had
> posted something he had not said. A) the only thing he had not said was
my
> callsign so who cares? B) What about someone who is casually looking at
> those posts and completely disregards my submission because it *looks*
like
> I don't have a callsign?
>
> At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as everyone
> thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

I pay attention to every single attribute and immediately noticed the
difference in both posts. I elected not to get into the debate and kept my
opinions to myself. However since you seem to think people ignore the
attributes, I decided I must repond to dispel that notion. And as far as
I'm concerned, deliberately making the attribute appear to be something
other than it was happens to be wrong. Making errors in keeping attributes
in long threads happens and is excusable. Choosing to make an attribute
appear something else is not excusable.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

742. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 14:33:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <D8dMb.24956$P%1.23043864@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85518

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:k5cMb.10813$uF6.3553725@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as
everyone
> > thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...
>
> "And that", as Paul Harvey says, "is the rest of the story." Point
> made well.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Mike, as I replied to Kim's post, I noticed it but chose to stay out of the fight that I knew was almost certain to come.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

743. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 14:42:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FhdMb.2543$q4.565@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85519

"Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> Since no one is prohibited from doing
> public service, no authorization is
> needed. (snip)

To do the types of public service we're authorized to do (MARS, RACES, and so on), authorization is required.

Sec. 97.407
(a) No station may transmit in RACES
unless it is an FCC-licensed primary,
club, or military recreation station and
it is certified by a civil defense organization
as registered with that organization, or it
is an FCC-licensed RACES station. (snip)

Care to show me where Part 95 authorizes CB'ers to operate a station at all similar to a RACES station? What about a MARS station? What about operations serving government agencies and others? In fact, show me where Part 95 authorizes any activity beyond the recreational use of those frequencies.

> (snip) It is a recognition of what we
> do and the value of what we do. It is
> a good and solid justification to use
> for the continued existence of amateur
> radio. Nothing more.

Sadly, far too many in Amateur Radio today have that attitude towards public service.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

744. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 14:46:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7ldMb.24959$P%1.23049684@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85520

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:d%cMb.2521$q4.1067@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Even sense 3 would be a
> > requirement as when one is given an
> > assignment, you are supposed to
> > carry that assigment. It is not just a
> > suggestion or desireable activity. If
> > a person or group does not carry
> > through on an assignment, then that
> > assignment is given to a group who
> > will.
>
>
> Dee, I've repeatedly explained to you what was meant by the word
mandate.
> Nothing is required or mandatory in the context used. Likewise, without a
> stated obligation, there is nothing required or mandatory in giving an
> assignment or task to someone (or in giving authorization to someone). If
> you still cannot understand this, I suggest you look carefully at the
words
> "mandate," "assigns," "authorization," and so on, including the synonyms.
I
> have nothing more to say on the matter.
>
>
> > I repeat, Part 97 does NOT mandate
> > in any way shape or form that amateurs
> > participate in public service.
>
>
> Sorry, but public service is at the very heart of the basic and purpose
of
> the Amateur Radio Service (as described in 97.1). And, while there is
> nothing mandatory about it, the mandate (authorization) to do so still
> remains. Likewise, I have nothing more to say on this matter.
>

Again nothing in Part 97 gives amateurs a mandate in any sense of the
meaning of the word. It does NOT in any section of Part 97 authorize us to
do or assign us to do public service. So you remain wrong. I've just
finished reviewing Part 97 and it's not there. In 97.1 it is "recognition
and enhancement of the value..". That is not a mandate, that is not

authorization, that is not an assignment. It is a way of justifying
allowing us to continue to have the frequencies and privileges that we enjoy
but that is not a mandate.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

745. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 14:56:35 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946D651C5AAF8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85521

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040111085434.11891.00003592@mb-m11.aol.com:

> In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo
> <nomail@noway.com> writes:
>
>>Jim,
>>
>>Reply follows:
>>
>>On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
>>><nomail@noway.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur
>>>>>>when he chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a
>>>>>>conscious decision to participate in something he's providing for
>>>>>>fun.
>>>>>
>>>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected
>>>>>that's your perception, not my intent.
>>>>
>>>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse
>>>>to acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
>>>>forum.
>>>
>>>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>>
>>Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.
>
> Who says that anyone has that right? I've been called all kinds of
> names here, rather than my callsign, and no one has said my
> rights were violated.
>>>
>>>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as well!
>>>
>>>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>>
>>See above.

>>>
>>>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own personal
>>>>morals and prejudices upon others?
>>>
>>>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the
>>>same to me.
>>>
>>>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my
>>>posts?
>>
>>Of course not -
>
> But that's exactly what is being demanded of me. You're saying that if
> I write a post and refer to Kim, I *must* use her callsign. You're
> saying I do *not* have the right to simply refer to her as "Kim".
>
> oh wait - I just did....
>
>>but that does not confer upon you the right to remove or alter her
>>personal data without her permission!
>
> "personal data"? Everyone here knows she's a ham, and knows her
> callsign. In all of the 7+ years I've been reading rrap, there's been
> only one Kim. There have been at least 4 Jims, though.
> .
>>For the benefit of the amateur hobby, no less....
>
> For the exercise of my right of free speech that includes *not* having
> to write
>
> certain things.
>
>>>>Did anyone here ask you
>>>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
>>>>offensive?
>>>> Certainly not.
>>>
>>>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone
>>>else can post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I
>>>have to repeat it.
>>
>>>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?
>>
>>Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
>>callsign, because you found it "inappropriate".
>
> That's right. I did not change the meaning of anyhting anyone wrote. No
> one who reads this thread will think that Kim is not a ham.
>

Unfortunately, I doubt that this is true

>>If you aren't
>>comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
>>someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice?
>
> Because I have no prejudice in the matter. The word "prejudice"
> derives from "pre-judge", meaning to judge before all the facts are
> in. That's not the case here - the facts are in.
>
>> Wouldn't
>>that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
>>with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!
>
> There's nothing illegal about it.
>
>>>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the
>>>original list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even
>>>*should* not do the list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to
>>>censor *me*.
>>>
>>>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included,
>>>that's their right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote
>>>something I did not.
>>
>>See above.
>
> Where?
>
>>>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the
>>>>>>attributes of the original message simply to include my callsign in
>>>>>>the list.
>
>>>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
>>>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!
>
>>>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
>>
>>Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
>>Hers, and yours.
>
> I do not see that I have done anything wrong.

If you publish a list of hams by callsign, and replace one of them with a
name, there will be very few people indeed who don't perceive this as a
deliberate slight.

>
>>>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the
>>>>>> symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I
>>>>>chalked that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>

>>>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>>>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>
>>>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was
>>>their right to do it?
>>
>>No - but that isn't the issue here.
>
> Yes, it is. You are avoiding any criticism of Kim's actions. You're
> telling me what I *must* or *should* do in my posts, based on *your*
> personal morals and judgements - and then criticizing me for doing
> what I think best in my own postings, based on *my* personal morals
> and judgements.
>
>>Your obvious discomfort with her
>>call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
>>You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*
>>consider it improper.
>
> Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?

Sure. Just don't expect to get away without retaliation.

>
> Just as she got that callsign, and continues to keep it, even
> though she knows others consider it inappropriate and that
> it angers others.
>
> She has her right to that callsign, and I have my right not
> to publicize it here. But you deny my right.
>>
>>>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other
>>>>>>person has a problem with that.
>>>>>
>>>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
>>>>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
>>>>>you do not give others.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
>>>
>>>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my
>>>posts. I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".

If her name was the only one there, I would agree

>>
>>Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
>>aren't you?
>
> Nope. I'm editing it out.
>

> "Censoring" would be if I tried to prevent her from posting it at all.
> I have not
> done that, and would not if I could.
>
>>Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by her fellow
>>amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour?
>
> I think that not giving her callsign more exposure through my own posts
> is appropriate behavior.
>
>>Because you have some bugaboo about the suffix?
>
> Because I think it's inappropriate and because I take responsibility
> for what I post.
>>
>>>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as
>>>"wrong" is really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals
>>>and prejudices upon me.
>
> Ahem...
>>>
>>>>That doesn't sound like
>>>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
>>>>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
>>>
>>>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
>>>inappropriate for the ARS.
>>
>>That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.
>
> Says who?
>
> FCC is allowing BPL systems to be implemented even though they generate
> enormous amounts of RF interference. FCC still requires code tests of
> those who want US HF ham licenses, despite the loss of the treaty
> requirement 6 months ago. FCC recently declined to penalize anyone when
> a pop star used the "F-word" on network TV.
>
> Does the fact that the FCC does the above mean I have no right to say
> the FCC is
> wrong?
>
> Is it wrong for me to tell people not to sign up for BPL and cite the
> problems it has?
>
> Is it wrong for those who disagree with code tests to try to get the
> rules changed?
>
> Is it OK for hams to use the F-word on the air because FCC allowed it
> once on TV?

>>
>>> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
>>>sequentially. It
>>>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to
>>>extinction" that exceeded 3000 posts.
>>
>>But it is her call - issued to her for her use.
>
> And she hasn't used it for over a year on the air. Just here.
>
> And if Kim wants to use it here, that's her right. But *I* don't have
> to use it here.
>>>
>>>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction
>>>>>>from the list.
>>>>>
>>>>>Done. No problem.
>>>>>
>>>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>>>>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately,
>>>>>>with no malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at
>>>>>>all.
>>>>>
>>>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
>>>>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an
>>>>>inappropriate choice.
>>>>
>>>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
>>>
>>>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns
>>>are not appropriate?
>>
>>Of course it is.
>>>
>>>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?
>>
>>Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
>>callsigns, not just hers.
>
> Why?

Because you treated her differently from everyone else. If you had listed
us all by name, that would have been the diplomatic thing to have done.

>
>>Do you not think that singling her out the way that you did was
>>disrespectful to her?
>
> No.

It was, Jim.

>
>>Are you that sanctimonious?
>
> No. I'm that honest.
>>
>>>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with
>>>four-letter suffixes, like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.
>>
>>Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
>>old four letter combination?
>
> Yes.
>
>>I'd be surprised!
>
> I was surprised that they would issue Kim's call. But they did. Why
> would you be surprised if they
> issued four-letter combinations? They allowed that pop star to say a
> certain word. All kinds of
> words are permitted here on the 'net - (wire comms are regulated by the
> FCC too).
>
>>Even the vehicle
>>license plate guys have a handle on that one.....
>
> Those are issued by the states, not the FCC.
>>>
>>>>The FCC could have refused to
>>>>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
>>>>motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
>>>>freely issue this suffix as well!
>>>
>>>FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the
>>>database, or better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the
>>>suffixes immediately before and after are much more common.
>>
>>Does not prove the point.
>>
> It proves the FCC considers Kim's call to be somewhat different from
> W5TIS or W5TIU
>>>>
>>>>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of
>>>>>us is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things
>>>>>involving amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are
>>>>>probably things involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you.
>>>>>So we are not equal in every way but license class.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
>>>>to.
>>>
>>>No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.

>>
>>I suspect not - you are obviously much more savvy than that!
>
> Is Kim equal to me in technical knowledge of ham radio? In historic
> knowledge? In HF operating experience? In ability to homebrew
> equipment? At the risk of blowing my own horn, I'd say no.
>>>
>>>>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued vanity
>>>>callsign, just like you!
>>>
>>>Of course! And she does use it here.
>>>
>>>But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not
>>>have the right to refrain from doing so?
>>
>>You may, of course, refrain from using it.
>
> Gee, thanks. ;-)
>
>>But why do you feel that
>>you have the right to share your own personal views on why you have an
>>issue with it with the rest of the group?
>
> Because they asked.
>>
>>And, do you belive that censorship is appropriate?
>
> No - that's why I don't censor anyone.
>>>
>>>>(and, up here,
>>>
>>>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)
>>
>>...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
>>call signs!
>
> Doesn't mean they are appropropriate.
>
>>>Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
>>>
>>>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
>>>>
>>>Were those calls sequentially issued?
>>
>>You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether they
>>requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.
>
> It makes a difference.
>>>
>>>>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that

>>>>>your choice of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to
>>>>>the amateur radio service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC
>>>>>would not have issued it sequentially.
>>>>
>>>>Why not?
>>>
>>>Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns. FCC
>>>will, however, issue them if requested through the vanity program.
>>
>>Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do that?
>>
>
> -Because they don't care
> -Because it's handled by computer and nobody really looks at the system
> -Because they don't want the complaints from those who want such calls
> -Because FCC is too busy with other matters and has too few resources.
>
>>They have total authority over those calls - surely they ccontrol them
>>better than that?
>
> Nope.
>
> In case you didn't know, Kim emailed Riley Hollingsworth about it. He
> replied that while such callsigns were legal, the request and use of
> such callsigns moves the ARS "one step closer to extinction".
>
>>>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
>>>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC
>>>>statement to the contrary.
>>>
>>>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.
>>
>>Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
>>exempt from sequential issue?
>
> Their actions are enough to prove the point.
>>>
>>>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
>>>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
>>>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
>>>
>>>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an
>>>opinion?
>>
>>Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
>>views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.
>
> You're saying I don't have the right to protest. Just keep quiet, huh?
>>>
>>>>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do,

>>>>>or in the best interests of all concerned.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is
>>>>in the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would
>>>>prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and
>>>>unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else
>>>>here!
>>>
>>>Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not be
>>>done by othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they are
>>>deciding what is "right" and "wrong" for more than themselves. It's an
>>>unavoidable consequence of having an opinion. The only other option is
>>>to never express any opinions at all.
>>>
>>>For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur
>>>license should be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on
>>>the issue should take precedence over what others think and want.
>>>They're saying that the FCC's current rules are incorrect and need to
>>>change.
>>>
>>>And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for the
>>>code test to go away. Do they have the right to say those things, and
>>>to try to get their
>>>will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and those
>>>who disagree have rights, too.
>
> And that's the way it should be. YMMV
>>>
>>>>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own
>>>>value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.
>>>
>>>See above about the tests.
>>
>>??
>>
>>Sorry, Jim, I fail to see the connection between snubbing Kim
>>publically and whether Morse testing should be continued. I'll read
>>this over again a couple of Jack Daniels' from now, and see if it's
>>clearer then! :)
>>>
>>>What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I
>>>*must not* oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are
>>>permitted by law.
>>>
>>>Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?
>>>
>>
>>Of course you are. But, as stated above, do you have the right to
>>impose your own personal standards upon others? Is it OK to single
>>out Kim in your list as the only one represented by name only in your

>>pool, because you are embarassed by her call? No. Of course not.
>>There are two gentlemanly things that you could do in this situation:
>>
>>1. List all of the participants in the pool by name only, creating an
>>equal playing field and singling out no one.
>>
>>2. End your participation in the pool on moral grounds, and let someone
>>else pick it up should they so choose.
>
> By stating those two as the onlt two options, *you* are trying to
> impose *your* personal standards on *me*
>
> I say there's a third option:
>
> 3. Do exactly what I've done, and state the reasons for doing so.
>
>>It is never right to ostracize another person because you don't like,
>>or cannot deal, with something about them.
>
> I have not ostracized Kim.
>
>>What effect to you think that doing this would have on Kim?
>
> Perhaps it will make her reconsider her choice of callsign.
>
>>Do you not see that your choice of actions would hurt her feelings?
>
> What about *my* feelings?
>
>>Say, you weren't striking out at her because she offended you, were
>>you? Of course not!
>
> That's right.
>>
>>>>If Kim's
>>>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
>>>>entirely.
>>>
>>>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
>>>with her about callsign choice.
>>
>>Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my
>>friends a heck of a lot better than that!
>
> I did not say she was my friend. Kim reserves the term "friend" to a
> very select few.
> "Acquaintance" would be more accurate.
>>>
>>>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by
>>>determining how I can post here.

>>
>>Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
>>impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.
>
> Not what I'm doing.
>>>
>>>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
>>>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
>>>>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
>>>
>>>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone
>>>from posting anyhting?
>>
>>Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
>>you did!
>
> I edited. Not the same thing. Words have exact meanings.
>>>
>>>> Intentional deletion of
>>>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
>>>>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
>>>
>>>I disagree.
>>
>>Sorry to hear that!
>>>
>>>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS.
>>>IMHO YMMV
>>
>>And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
>>really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a problem
>>with.
>
> So go ahead and use Kim's call all you want. Just please don't tell me
> that I have to.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
>>>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called
>>>>'access covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male
>>>>bias').
>>>
>>>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on
>>>Usenet as a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I
>>>*must* post in a certain way. Why?
>>
>>Please see the above comments.
>>>>
>>>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
>>>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
>>>

>>>[slang word deleted]
>>
>>...because you personally have an issue with it! See?
>>>
>>>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's not a
>>>birdwatcher.
>>
>>I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but she
>>just might be!
>
> Kim chose that callsign for at least two obvious, prominent reasons:
>
> 1) She thought it was fun, and/or funny
>
> 2) She knew it would get lots of attention and create all sorts of
> reactions
>
> She's told us all that here. Her picture used to be on qrz, too.
>
>>>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
>>>
>>>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
>>
>>Yes you did!
>
> No, I did not.
>
>> Kim, I believe....
>>>>
> I notice that you use her name and not her callsign too....
>
>>>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio
>>>>- as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.
>>>
>>>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
>>>to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting
>>>names - and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
>>>disrespectful.
>>
>>And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?
>
> There was no problem when others did it. Only when I did. Double
> standard.
>
>>>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
>>>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
>>>
>>>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.
>>
>>Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!

>
> Then why not choose another one?
>>>
>>>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
>>>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
>>>>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
>>>>
>>>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to
>>>force *me* to use it here on Usenet.
>>>
>>>Or do they?
>>
>>Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!
>
> But you want to force your values on me.
>>>
>>>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
>>>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone
>>>*must* include that word or phrase in any replies?
>>
>>Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....
>
> I do ignore it! That's exactly what I've been doing!
>
> Thanks for the validation, Leo!
>>
>>Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections

(Breasts)

>>for dinner, and
>>they're my favourite! :)
>>
> Yum..But I'm a leg man, myself.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

746. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 15:24:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <DUdMb.3445$i4.1886@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85522

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:6wZLb.3267$zj7.313@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >Which I sense is a process that Hans wants to avoid,
> > because there are bound to be both
> > supporting and opposing comments.
>
> Avoid????? What a strange thought process, coming from someone who seems
to
> be familiar with my participation here on rrap. Do I appear bashful about
> stating my ideas, and avoiding reactions to them?
>
> The field is currently crowded with at least 14 petitions, and ARRL will
> likely make it 15. Would you like a petition of yours to be buried in
that
> noise level? Timing, Jim, is EVERYTHING, and introducing another petition
> at this time would NOT be a way of gaining any significant mindshare from
> the rulemakers.

So what is your likly timetable for submission?
After an ARRL submission?
If yes, how soon after?

There is a risk of submitting beyond a point where the FCC has
already digested the 14 or probably will be 15 submissions and
then posts a NPRM. By that time any new proposals aren't
likly to get any attention...IMHO.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

747. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 15:37:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <35eMb.3455$i4.690@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85523

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:xz2Mb.24520$P%1.22823404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com...
> > My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
> > passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
> > privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
> > days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.
>
> Your Novice privileges are good forever so long as you do not let your
> license lapse. You do NOT have to retest to keep the privileges.

Correct.

> You do
> have to keep a copy of the CSCE in your file even though it has expired in
> case you ever need to prove it.

Many novices may not even have their original CSCE. The FCC would
also recognize a copy of your former Novice license as proof you passed
5 wpm.

> To use the CSCE as credit for the General upgrade, you have to upgrade
> within 365 days. If you do not upgrade in 365 days, you will have to
retest
> on code for the General.

My understanding is Novice has permanent credit for 5 wpm. No CSCE
needed if the Novice has a valid current license.

748. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 16:03:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btrs0b$lhr@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85524

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:plcMb.2501$q4.1909@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > >
> > > (snip)
> >
> > But you have no negative comments
> > for the person who does it.
>
>
> Negative comments had already been posted by others. I don't kick people
> when they're already laying on the ground from the blows of others.
>

DWIGHT!? (Grin) Puhleeze don't ever think I am "laying on the ground" or
even feel kicked! LOL!!

Kim W5TIT
OH--are you going to get all upset because I snipped the rest of the
original exchange below this point?

749. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 16:04:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <XteMb.4599$zj7.1219@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85525

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Of course! But if you wait too long, the opportunity may be lost. ......
> If you wait too long, FCC could move on to the NPRM process
> before you ever get the petition sent in.

Did I miss something? Is this the last NPRM that FCC will issue in Amateur Radio matters?

The current salad bowl of 14 (15?) petitions is primarily concerned with Morse testing for HF access. I've already commented on that matter.

The changes I'd like to see in the Amateur Radio service are only mildly concerned with Morse Code, but primarily concerned with the fundamental licensing structure of our service. I don't want that issue lost in the cacaphony of noise surrounding the Morse Code testing issue, so if I do submit a petition it will be timed to avoid being confused as a "Morse Code" petition.

73, Hans, K0HB

750. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 16:11:52 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <e0q200t2lf43asf4ojn6t3qihahbl43ums@4ax.com>
Source record: 85526

Jim,

Personally, I feel that it is indeed unfortunate that you do not see,
or will not admit to, your disrespectful treatment of Kim, W5TIT.
Your statements in defense of your conduct are based entirely upon
circular logic, rationalization, contradiction and denial - indicating
that you are not prepared to accept responsibility for your actions
towards a fellow ham here on the group. W5TIT told you straight up
that she felt disrespected by your actions. A simple apology to her
would have been appropriate. The right thing to do.

Jim, you have been a frequent victim of attack and insult here
yourself - frankly, you should know better.

Insulting a fellow amateur publically, then denying and justifying the
act with a litany of self-serving rhetoric. Do you believe that these
actions, your actions, are in the best interest of the Amateur
service? I suspect that few here join you in that belief.

"The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of
comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and
controversy." Martin Luther King, Jr.

73, Leo

On 11 Jan 2004 13:54:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>Jim,
>>
>>Reply follows:
>>
>>On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@noway.com>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>>>>>writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when

>>>>>>he
>>>>>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
>>>>>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
>>>>>
>>>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's
>>>>>your
>>>>>perception, not my intent.
>>>>
>>>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to
>>>>acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
>>>>forum.
>>>
>>>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>>
>>Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.
>
>Who says that anyone has that right? I've been called all kinds of
>names here, rather than my callsign, and no one has said my
>rights were violated.
>>>
>>>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as
>>>>well!
>>>
>>>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>>
>>See above.
>>>
>>>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own
>>>>personal morals and prejudices upon others?
>>>
>>>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the same to
>>>me.
>>>
>>>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my posts?
>>
>>Of course not -
>
>But that's exactly what is being demanded of me. You're saying that if I write
>a post and refer to Kim, I *must* use her callsign. You're saying I do *not*
>have the right to simply refer to her as "Kim".
>
>oh wait - I just did....
>
>>but that does not confer upon you the right to remove
>>or alter her personal data without her permission!
>
>"personal data"? Everyone here knows she's a ham, and knows her callsign.
>In all of the 7+ years I've been reading rrap, there's been only one Kim. There
>have been at least 4 Jims, though.
>.

>>For the benefit of the amateur hobby, no less....
>
>For the exercise of my right of free speech that includes *not* having to write
>
>certain things.
>
>>>>Did anyone here ask you
>>>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
>>>>offensive? Certainly not.
>>>
>>>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone else can
>>>post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I have to repeat it.
>>
>>>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?
>>
>>Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
>>callsign, because you found it "inappropriate".
>
>That's right. I did not change the meaning of anyhting anyone wrote. No one
>who reads this thread will think that Kim is not a ham.
>
>>If you aren't
>>comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
>>someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice?
>
>Because I have no prejudice in the matter. The word "prejudice"
>derives from "pre-judge", meaning to judge before all the facts are
>in. That's not the case here - the facts are in.
>
>> Wouldn't
>>that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
>>with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!
>
>There's nothing illegal about it.
>
>>>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the
>>>original
>>>list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even *should* not do
>>>the
>>>list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to censor *me*.
>>>
>>>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included, that's
>>>their
>>>right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote something I did not.
>>
>>See above.
>
>Where?
>
>>>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of

>>>>>>the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>
>>>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
>>>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!
>
>>>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
>>
>>Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
>>Hers, and yours.
>
>I do not see that I have done anything wrong.
>
>>>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
>>>>>symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I chalked
>>>>>that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>
>>>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>>>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>
>>>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was their
>>>right to do it?
>>
>>No - but that isn't the issue here.
>
>Yes, it is. You are avoiding any criticism of Kim's actions. You're
>telling me what I *must* or *should* do in my posts, based on *your*
>personal morals and judgements - and then criticizing me for doing
>what I think best in my own postings, based on *my* personal morals
>and judgements.
>
>>Your obvious discomfort with her
>>call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
>>You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*
>>consider it improper.
>
>Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?
>
>Just as she got that callsign, and continues to keep it, even
>though she knows others consider it inappropriate and that
>it angers others.
>
>She has her right to that callsign, and I have my right not
>to publicize it here. But you deny my right.
>>
>>>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person
>>>>>>has a problem with that.
>>>>>
>>>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
>>>>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
>>>>>you do not give others.

>>>>
>>>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
>>>
>>>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my posts.
>>>I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".
>>
>>Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
>>aren't you?
>
>Nope. I'm editing it out.
>
>"Censoring" would be if I tried to prevent her from posting it at all. I have
>not
>done that, and would not if I could.
>
>>Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by
>>her fellow amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour?
>
>I think that not giving her callsign more exposure through my own posts is
>appropriate behavior.
>
>>Because you have some bugaboo about the suffix?
>
>Because I think it's inappropriate and because I take responsibility for what I
>post.
>>
>>>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as "wrong" is
>>>really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals and prejudices
>>>upon me.
>
>Ahem...
>>>
>>>>That doesn't sound like
>>>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
>>>>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
>>>
>>>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
>>>inappropriate for the ARS.
>>
>>That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.
>
>Says who?
>
>FCC is allowing BPL systems to be implemented even though they generate
>enormous amounts of RF interference. FCC still requires code tests of
>those who want US HF ham licenses, despite the loss of the treaty
>requirement 6 months ago. FCC recently declined to penalize anyone when
>a pop star used the "F-word" on network TV.
>
>Does the fact that the FCC does the above mean I have no right to say the FCC

>is
>wrong?
>
>Is it wrong for me to tell people not to sign up for BPL and cite the problems
>it has?
>
>Is it wrong for those who disagree with code tests to try to get the rules
>changed?
>
>Is it OK for hams to use the F-word on the air because FCC allowed it once on
>TV?
>>
>>> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
>>>sequentially. It
>>>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to extinction"
>>>that exceeded 3000 posts.
>>
>>But it is her call - issued to her for her use.
>
>And she hasn't used it for over a year on the air. Just here.
>
>And if Kim wants to use it here, that's her right. But *I* don't have to use it
>here.
>>>
>>>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from the
>>>>>>list.
>>>>>
>>>>>Done. No problem.
>>>>>
>>>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
>>>>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with no
>>>>>>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
>>>>>
>>>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
>>>>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
>>>>>choice.
>>>>
>>>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
>>>
>>>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns are
>>>not appropriate?
>>
>>Of course it is.
>>>
>>>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?
>>
>>Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
>>callsigns, not just hers.
>
>Why?

>
>>Do you not think that singling her out the
>>way that you did was disrespectful to her?
>
>No.
>
>>Are you that sanctimonious?
>
>No. I'm that honest.
>>
>>>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with four-letter
>>>suffixes, like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.
>>
>>Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
>>old four letter combination?
>
>Yes.
>
>>I'd be surprised!
>
>I was surprised that they would issue Kim's call. But they did. Why would you
>be surprised if they
>issued four-letter combinations? They allowed that pop star to say a certain
>word. All kinds of
>words are permitted here on the 'net - (wire comms are regulated by the FCC
>too).
>
>>Even the vehicle
>>license plate guys have a handle on that one.....
>
>Those are issued by the states, not the FCC.
>>>
>>>>The FCC could have refused to
>>>>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
>>>>motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
>>>>freely issue this suffix as well!
>>>
>>>FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the database, or
>>>better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the suffixes immediately
>>>before and after are much more common.
>>
>>Does not prove the point.
>>
>It proves the FCC considers Kim's call to be somewhat different from W5TIS or
>W5TIU
>>>>
>>>>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
>>>>>is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things involving
>>>>>amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably things
>>>>>involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not equal

>>>>>in
>>>>>every way but license class.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
>>>>to.
>>>
>>>No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.
>>
>>I suspect not - you are obviously much more savvy than that!
>
>Is Kim equal to me in technical knowledge of ham radio? In historic knowledge?
>In HF operating experience? In ability to homebrew equipment? At the risk
>of blowing my own horn, I'd say no.
>>>
>>>>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
>>>>vanity callsign, just like you!
>>>
>>>Of course! And she does use it here.
>>>
>>>But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not have the
>>>right to refrain from doing so?
>>
>>You may, of course, refrain from using it.
>
>Gee, thanks. ;-)
>
>>But why do you feel that
>>you have the right to share your own personal views on why you have an
>>issue with it with the rest of the group?
>
>Because they asked.
>>
>>And, do you belive that censorship is appropriate?
>
>No - that's why I don't censor anyone.
>>>
>>>>(and, up here,
>>>
>>>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)
>>
>>...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
>>call signs!
>
>Doesn't mean they are appropropriate.
>
>>>Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
>>>
>>>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
>>>>
>>>Were those calls sequentially issued?

>>
>>You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether they
>>requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.
>
>It makes a difference.
>>>
>>>>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your
>>>>>choice
>>>>>of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur radio
>>>>>service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued it
>>>>>sequentially.
>>>>
>>>>Why not?
>>>
>>>Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns. FCC will,
>>>however, issue them if requested through the vanity program.
>>
>>Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do
>>that?
>
>-Because they don't care
>-Because it's handled by computer and nobody really looks at the system
>-Because they don't want the complaints from those who want such calls
>-Because FCC is too busy with other matters and has too few resources.
>
>>They have total authority over those calls - surely they
>>ccontrol them better than that?
>
>Nope.
>
>In case you didn't know, Kim emailed Riley Hollingsworth about it. He
>replied that while such callsigns were legal, the request and use of such
>callsigns moves the ARS "one step closer to extinction".
>
>>>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
>>>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement
>>>>to the contrary.
>>>
>>>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.
>>
>>Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
>>exempt from sequential issue?
>
>Their actions are enough to prove the point.
>>>
>>>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
>>>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
>>>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
>>>
>>>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an

>>>opinion?
>>
>>Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
>>views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.
>
>You're saying I don't have the right to protest. Just keep quiet, huh?
>>>
>>>>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or
>>>>>in the best interests of all concerned.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is in
>>>>the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would
>>>>prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and
>>>>unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else
>>>>here!
>>>
>>>Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not be done
>>>by
>>>othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they are deciding what
>>>is
>>>"right" and "wrong" for more than themselves. It's an unavoidable
>>>consequence
>>>of having an opinion. The only other option is to never express any opinions
>>>at all.
>>>
>>>For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur license
>>>should
>>>be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on the issue should take
>>>precedence over what others think and want. They're saying that the FCC's
>>>current rules are incorrect and need to change.
>>>
>>>And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for the code
>>>test to go away. Do they have the right to say those things, and to try to
>>>get their
>>>will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and those who
>>>disagree have rights, too.
>
>And that's the way it should be. YMMV
>>>
>>>>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own
>>>>value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.
>>>
>>>See above about the tests.
>>
>>??
>>
>>Sorry, Jim, I fail to see the connection between snubbing Kim
>>publically and whether Morse testing should be continued. I'll read
>>this over again a couple of Jack Daniels' from now, and see if it's
>>clearer then! :)

>>>
>>>What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I *must
>>>not*
>>>oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are permitted by law.
>>>
>>>Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?
>>>
>>
>>Of course you are. But, as stated above, do you have the right to
>>impose your own personal standards upon others? Is it OK to single
>>out Kim in your list as the only one represented by name only in your
>>pool, because you are embarassed by her call? No. Of course not.
>>There are two gentlemanly things that you could do in this situation:
>>
>>1. List all of the participants in the pool by name only, creating an
>>equal playing field and singling out no one.
>>
>>2. End your participation in the pool on moral grounds, and let
>>someone else pick it up should they so choose.
>
>By stating those two as the onlt two options, *you* are trying to impose
>*your* personal standards on *me*
>
>I say there's a third option:
>
>3. Do exactly what I've done, and state the reasons for doing so.
>
>>It is never right to ostracize another person because you don't like,
>>or cannot deal, with something about them.
>
>I have not ostracized Kim.
>
>>What effect to you think
>>that doing this would have on Kim?
>
>Perhaps it will make her reconsider her choice of callsign.
>
>>Do you not see that your choice of
>>actions would hurt her feelings?
>
>What about *my* feelings?
>
>>Say, you weren't striking out at her
>>because she offended you, were you? Of course not!
>
>That's right.
>>
>>>>If Kim's
>>>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
>>>>entirely.

>>>
>>>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
>>>with her about callsign choice.
>>
>>Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my
>>friends a heck of a lot better than that!
>
>I did not say she was my friend. Kim reserves the term "friend" to a very
>select few.
>"Acquaintance" would be more accurate.
>>>
>>>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by determining
>>>how I can post here.
>>
>>Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
>>impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.
>
>Not what I'm doing.
>>>
>>>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
>>>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
>>>>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
>>>
>>>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone from
>>>posting anyhting?
>>
>>Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
>>you did!
>
>I edited. Not the same thing. Words have exact meanings.
>>>
>>>> Intentional deletion of
>>>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
>>>>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
>>>
>>>I disagree.
>>
>>Sorry to hear that!
>>>
>>>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS. IMHO YMMV
>>
>>And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
>>really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a problem
>>with.
>
>So go ahead and use Kim's call all you want. Just please don't tell me that I
>have to.
>>>>
>>>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
>>>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access

>>>>covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').
>>>
>>>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on Usenet
>>>as
>>>a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I *must* post in a
>>>certain way. Why?
>>
>>Please see the above comments.
>>>>
>>>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
>>>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
>>>
>>>[slang word deleted]
>>
>>...because you personally have an issue with it! See?
>>>
>>>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's
>>>not a birdwatcher.
>>
>>I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but
>>she just might be!
>
>Kim chose that callsign for at least two obvious, prominent reasons:
>
>1) She thought it was fun, and/or funny
>
>2) She knew it would get lots of attention and create all sorts of reactions
>
>She's told us all that here. Her picture used to be on qrz, too.
>
>>>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
>>>
>>>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
>>
>>Yes you did!
>
>No, I did not.
>
>> Kim, I believe....
>>>>
>I notice that you use her name and not her callsign too....
>
>>>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio -
>>>>as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.
>>>
>>>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
>>>to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting names
>>-
>>>and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
>>>disrespectful.

>>
>>And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?
>
>There was no problem when others did it. Only when I did. Double standard.
>
>>>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
>>>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
>>>
>>>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.
>>
>>Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!
>
>Then why not choose another one?
>>>
>>>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
>>>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
>>>>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
>>>>
>>>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to force
>>>*me* to use it here on Usenet.
>>>
>>>Or do they?
>>
>>Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!
>
>But you want to force your values on me.
>>>
>>>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
>>>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone *must*
>>>include that word or phrase in any replies?
>>
>>Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....
>
>I do ignore it! That's exactly what I've been doing!
>
>Thanks for the validation, Leo!
>>
>>Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections for dinner, and
>>they're my favourite! :)
>>
>Yum..But I'm a leg man, myself.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

751. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 17:39:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eTfMb.25014$P%1.23129928@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85527

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:FhdMb.2543$q4.565@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >
> > Since no one is prohibited from doing
> > public service, no authorization is
> > needed. (snip)
>
>
> To do the types of public service we're authorized to do (MARS, RACES,
and
> so on), authorization is required.
>
> Sec. 97.407
> (a) No station may transmit in RACES
> unless it is an FCC-licensed primary,
> club, or military recreation station and
> it is certified by a civil defense organization
> as registered with that organization, or it
> is an FCC-licensed RACES station. (snip)
>
> Care to show me where Part 95 authorizes CB'ers to operate a station at
> all similar to a RACES station? What about a MARS station? What about
> operations serving government agencies and others? In fact, show me where
> Part 95 authorizes any activity beyond the recreational use of those
> frequencies.
>
>

That is an authorization to operate on those frequencies and an
authorization to operate the station not an authorization to do public
service. There is a difference. And to do MARS or CAP, it is not the FCC
that authorizes you but other agencies and services. But I repeat that is
authorization to use the frequencies not authorization to do public service.
RACES is the same way. You have to be authorized for RACES operation but
that is not the same as authorizing one to do public service. RACES is a
very specific organization with very specific goals and tasks.

You do not and never have needed an authorization to do public service.
Where in the rules does it say that I need the FCC's authorization to do
communications at a walk-a-thon? Where in the rules does it state that I
need FCC's authorization to be part of the team that deployed here in the
Michigan area during the August power blackout? Where in the rules does it
say that I need the FCC's authorization to join ARES. Nowhere. The list
could go on and on.

> > (snip) It is a recognition of what we
> > do and the value of what we do. It is
> > a good and solid justification to use
> > for the continued existence of amateur
> > radio. Nothing more.
>
>
> Sadly, far too many in Amateur Radio today have that attitude towards
> public service.

Most of do follow the personal commitment to participate in public service since it is not only a long and time honored tradition but the right thing to do. That does not change the fact that there is no mandate to do so.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

752. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 17:49:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <I0gMb.25016$P%1.23135128@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85528

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:35eMb.3455$i4.690@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:xz2Mb.24520$P%1.22823404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
> > news:rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com...
> > > My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
> > > passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
> > > privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
> > > days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.
> >
> > Your Novice privileges are good forever so long as you do not let your
> > license lapse. You do NOT have to retest to keep the privileges.
>
> Correct.
>
> > You do
> > have to keep a copy of the CSCE in your file even though it has expired
in
> > case you ever need to prove it.
>
> Many novices may not even have their original CSCE. The FCC would
> also recognize a copy of your former Novice license as proof you passed
> 5 wpm.
>

Yes that is true but I was addressing the case of someone who's first
license was a Technician. Since the the no-code Tech license became
available over a decade ago, very few people have entered the ARS through
the Novice license and since April of 2000, the issuance of new Novice
licenses was discontinued. So a lot of these people have never had a Novice
license to use as proof although it would indeed fulfill the requirements.

> > To use the CSCE as credit for the General upgrade, you have to upgrade
> > within 365 days. If you do not upgrade in 365 days, you will have to
> retest
> > on code for the General.
>
> My understanding is Novice has permanent credit for 5 wpm. No CSCE
> needed if the Novice has a valid current license.
>

Yes that is true but I was only addressing the case of where all they have is the CSCE. i.e. They never held a Novice license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

753. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 18:13:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111131317.07961.00001342@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85529

In article <XteMb.4599$zj7.1219@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Of course! But if you wait too long, the opportunity may be lost. ......
>> If you wait too long, FCC could move on to the NPRM process
>> before you ever get the petition sent in.
>
>Did I miss something?

No, but I did. Thank you for clearing up your thinking on your method of presenting your proposal, Hans.

>Is this the last NPRM that FCC will issue in Amateur
>Radio matters?

Of course not! But once FCC does so (probably some months after ARRL does its proposal), it will be a while before they want to reopen that can of worms again.

Of course I could be mistaken on that. I thought that FCC would simply dump Element 1 via Memorandum Report and Order soon after S25.5 changed. At most I thought there'd be a quickie NPRM. But instead it looks like we're in for a long ride.
>
>The current salad bowl of 14 (15?) petitions is primarily concerned with
>Morse testing for HF access. I've already commented on that matter.

So did I.

Perhaps my preference for doing a job once rather than nickel-and-diming it to death is showing in that I think a more comprehensive approach (like your proposal) is better. But that's just me - and it's *your* proposal anyway.
>
>The changes I'd like to see in the Amateur Radio service are only mildly
>concerned with Morse Code, but primarily concerned with the fundamental
>licensing structure of our service. I don't want that issue lost in the
>cacaphony of noise surrounding the Morse Code testing issue, so if I do
>submit a petition it will be timed to avoid being confused as a "Morse Code"
>petition.

I can certainly understand and respect that approach even if I don't agree with it 100%.

My main concern is that if you wait until the Morse Code test issue noise dies down, it may be a long wait *and* there may be an addy-tood of "oh no, we're

not going to reopen THAT can of worms again". Meanwhile, really bad proposals like the "21st Century" ideas may take the stage, or even be enacted. As much as I disagree with some parts of your proposal, it is infinitely preferable to the "21st Century" concepts.

So it becomes clear to me now that you will submit it to FCC when you know the time is right - which is not right now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

754. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 18:57:12 UTC
From: "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net>
Message-ID: <627300pd9kdemh3f29g0qt4papsjfabbn7@4ax.com>
Source record: 85530

Dee, you addressed exactly the case I had in mind, a newly licensed
Tech, who then passes element 1, and plans to upgrade to General in
the future.

Chris Lamb, N7FNB

On Sun, 11 Jan 2004 17:49:28 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:35eMb.3455$i4.690@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:xz2Mb.24520$P%1.22823404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >
>> > "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
>> > news:rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com...
>> > > My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
>> > > passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
>> > > privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
>> > > days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.
>> >
>> > Your Novice privileges are good forever so long as you do not let your
>> > license lapse. You do NOT have to retest to keep the privileges.
>>
>> Correct.
>>
>> > You do
>> > have to keep a copy of the CSCE in your file even though it has expired
>in
>> > case you ever need to prove it.
>>
>> Many novices may not even have their original CSCE. The FCC would
>> also recognize a copy of your former Novice license as proof you passed
>> 5 wpm.
>>
>
>Yes that is true but I was addressing the case of someone who's first
>license was a Technician. Since the the no-code Tech license became
>available over a decade ago, very few people have entered the ARS through
>the Novice license and since April of 2000, the issuance of new Novice
>licenses was discontinued. So a lot of these people have never had a Novice
>license to use as proof although it would indeed fulfill the requirements.
>

>> > To use the CSCE as credit for the General upgrade, you have to upgrade
>> > within 365 days. If you do not upgrade in 365 days, you will have to
>> retest
>> > on code for the General.
>>
>> My understanding is Novice has permanent credit for 5 wpm. No CSCE
>> needed if the Novice has a valid current license.
>>
>
>Yes that is true but I was only addressing the case of where all they have
>is the CSCE. i.e. They never held a Novice license.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

755. Re: The way to deal with BPI:

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 19:29:43 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <HuhMb.49179$sF5.5739@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 85531

I don't know how this will play out. BPL is apparently *highly* susceptable
to rf interference. If you think BPL is going to play havoc with ham radio,
you're right - but ham radio is going to play havoc with BPL as well :))
As for a good communications method, PSK should do even better than cw.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"John Smith" <djfinn2@nobellspsoutham.net> wrote in message
news:K4NLb.2626$PP5.1957@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
> CW makes it thru BPI. New BPI activities left unchecked will bring great
> popularity back to the much maligned CW because, like it or not, CW morse
> get through when nothing else does..
>
> de kr4aj
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.560 / Virus Database: 352 - Release Date: 1/8/04

756. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 19:51:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <POhMb.49180$nH5.32250@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 85532

Len,

Jim's point was well made. You appear to simply be trying to revive the code/no code arguement. My belief is that if the FCC enforcement bureau had not largely been disassembled, we wouldn't have the problems we do now. If we were to dismantle the police department of NYC and the murder rate shot through the roof, would you blame the drivers who insist everyone should stop for a red light?

You are seeing the same situation everywhere in society today. Nothing wrong with selling drugs to make some money, except, of course, for the stupid drug laws.

'Cmon, now, you can do better that that!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.560 / Virus Database: 352 - Release Date: 1/8/04

757. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 19:58:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85533

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040111085434.11891.00003592@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo
<nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >Jim,
> >
> >Reply follows:
> >
> >On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
> ><nomail@noway.com>
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >>>>writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur
when
> >>>>>he
> >>>>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
> >>>>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
> >>>>
> >>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's
> >>>>your
> >>>>perception, not my intent.
> >>>
> >>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to
> >>>acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
> >>>forum.
> >>
> >>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?
> >
> >Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.
>
> Who says that anyone has that right? I've been called all kinds of
> names here, rather than my callsign, and no one has said my
> rights were violated.
> >>
> >>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as

> >>>well!
> >>
> >>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?
> >
> >See above.
> >>
> >>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own
> >>>personal morals and prejudices upon others?
> >>
> >>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the same
to
> >>me.
> >>
> >>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my
posts?
> >
> >Of course not -
>
> But that's exactly what is being demanded of me. You're saying that if I
write
> a post and refer to Kim, I *must* use her callsign. You're saying I do
not
> have the right to simply refer to her as "Kim".
>
> oh wait - I just did....
>

GASP! Is that sarcasm from you, Jim?! No way!

> >
> >but that does not confer upon you the right to remove
> >or alter her personal data without her permission!
>
> "personal data"? Everyone here knows she's a ham, and knows her callsign.
> In all of the 7+ years I've been reading rrap, there's been only one Kim.
There
> have been at least 4 Jims, though.
> .

(original attributed "period" left above). And, Jim, by the same token
"everyone here" (a very general statement I might add--coming from you)
knows you disagree with my callsign and "everyone here" knows that you have
generally refrained from repeating it in a post. "Everyone here" knows
that. But "no one there" may know that when the post is encountered through
a search, casual observation, new folks, whatever.

> > <---- these two attributes inserted to "lock in" the attribution (I do
that all the time, nearly every post)
> >For the benefit of the amateur hobby, no less....
>
> For the exercise of my right of free speech that includes *not* having to

write
>
> certain things.
>
> >>>Did anyone here ask you
> >>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
> >>>offensive? Certainly not.
> >>
> >>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone else
can
> >>post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I have to repeat
it.
> >
> >>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?
> >
> >Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
> >callsign, because you found it "inappropriate".
>
> That's right. I did not change the meaning of anyhting anyone wrote. No
one
> who reads this thread will think that Kim is not a ham.
>

My perception says you *did* change the meaning of something I submitted (i.e., wrote). I intend for anyone, *anyone* looking at that list to see the same, the *exact same* thing in each and everyone's submission. No else had to ask you to include their callsign: you made the conscious decision to "just" insert everyone's callsign--*but mine.* Therefore, there is an implied "difference" to a casual observer. I do not wish my submission to be any different from anyone else's, as the difference could mean to be taken as negative or positive--and whatever impression it makes is not important to me. I don't want there to *be any difference* between my submission, oh: *as an amateur radio operator*, as any other amateur radio operator.

If Len Anderson, for example, submitted his prediction of a date that CW testing will be removed from the amateur licensing process, a) would you insert his submission, b) don't you find his whole general nature abhorrent and would you insert his submission anyway and, c) would you insert his first and last name, just first name, etc?

> ><--- these attributes inserted
> >If you aren't
> >comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
> >someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice?
>
> Because I have no prejudice in the matter. The word "prejudice"
> derives from "pre-judge", meaning to judge before all the facts are
> in. That's not the case here - the facts are in.
>

You cannot, on one hand, state that my callsign is a bad thing for the ARS--and you did state that--then, on the other hand, state that you have no prejudice. You *do* have prejudice and you demonstrate it every time you delete my callsign from a post. I've never (ahem, never) noticed if you keep my "signature" to my posts when you are replying to them, Jim. Do you? Or is my callsign just as offensive then as when I *intend* to include myself as an amateur radio in a list you have *generally* invited people to join? You have never stated "any offensive callsigns will not be listed." You have never stated, "Kim, I will include you in the list if you wish, but I will not include your callsign." You've actually never stated anything as to why you were refraining from submitting my prediction with my callsign *ATTRIBUTED* to it. You deliberately change the intention of my message by leaving my callsign out. *You*, Jim, did the *FIRST* deleting of attributions and, I might add, you have continued to do it for--what--over a year, about a year, somewhere around there.

> ><---these attributes inserted
> > Wouldn't
> >that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
> >with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!
>
> There's nothing illegal about it.
>
> >>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the
> >>original
> >>list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even *should* not
do
> >>the
> >>list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to censor *me*.
> >>
> >>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included, that's
> >>their
> >>right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote something I did
not.
> >
> >See above.
>
> Where?
>
> >>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the
attributes of
> >>>>>the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>
> >>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
> >>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!
>
> >>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
> >
> >Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
> >Hers, and yours.
>

> I do not see that I have done anything wrong.
>

Of course not. You probably *don't* have any prejudice where your own decsions and actions have been made. But, by my perception, you are *JUST AS WRONG* to take away--or leave out--*ATTRIBUTION TO MY CALLSIGN* as I am to take away--or leave out--attribution characters in an newsgroup post. I daresay, though, your deletion is far more offensive than mine. The basis, meaning, and original message and intent of that message was in no way harmed or changed when I added my callsign to the list. None. Except, perhaps, that it then could have looked like you had (God forbid) typed my callsign.

Your deletion--or leaving out, in this case--deliberately makes it look like I have no callsign.

> >>>><---these attributes inserted
> >>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
> >>>>symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I
chalked
> >>>>that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>
> >>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
> >>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>
> >>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was their
> >>right to do it?
> >
> >No - but that isn't the issue here.
>

I agree. That isn't the issue for me, either. I think the real issue is exhibiting a form of respect for another individual who has earned the right to have a callsign attributed to her--*WHETHER OR NOT* you agree with the callsign. The one thing that Larry Roll has never, ever done--to his credit arrrghhhh, yes I said that--is "strip" me of my callsign. You have, Jim, and your actions are wrong. They are not only wrong, they are meanspirited and, to me, hateful.

> <---this attribute inserted
> Yes, it is. You are avoiding any criticism of Kim's actions. You're
> telling me what I *must* or *should* do in my posts, based on *your*
> personal morals and judgements - and then criticizing me for doing
> what I think best in my own postings, based on *my* personal morals
> and judgements.
>
> >Your obvious discomfort with her
> >call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
> >You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*
> >consider it improper.
>
> Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?

>

No. You don't. Not in a "general" list you are compiling, where you have made no mention of how people will be listed. It was intended by me--and was when I first submitted my prediction--that I would be listed *just as every other amateur radio operator.* You *do not*, Jim--whether you think you do or not--have the right to *disascociated* me from my callsign. Period. But, especially in a list where you've invited people to join, yet you did not say anyone would be listed in any way differently than anyone else.

> <---this attribute inserted
> Just as she got that callsign, and continues to keep it, even
> though she knows others consider it inappropriate and that
> it angers others.
>
> She has her right to that callsign, and I have my right not
> to publicize it here. But you deny my right.
> <---this attribute inserted

You do not have the right to list me "differently" than any other amateur radio operator. You have the right to refrain from having my callsign in a post, I could agree on that. But NOT a list.

> >
> >>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other
person
> >>>>>has a problem with that.
> >>>>
> >>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect
> >>>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
> >>>>you do not give others.
> >>>
> >>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
> >>
> >>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my
posts.
> >>I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".
> >
> >Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
> >aren't you?
>
> Nope. I'm editing it out.
>

Worse. To censor would be to refrain from REPOSTING any submissions wherein I had added my prediction. That would have been far more respectable. My response would have been to ask you why you were not including me; you would have explained, and I would have respected--fully--your decision to act on a belief you have in a respectable manner. I do not respect your deliberate act to deny me listed as an amateur radio operator in a list of other amateur radio operators.

>
> "Censoring" would be if I tried to prevent her from posting it at all. I
have
> not
> done that, and would not if I could.
>
> >Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by
> >her fellow amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour?
>
> I think that not giving her callsign more exposure through my own posts is
> appropriate behavior.
>

Then, you would not be able to respond to any of my *OTHER POSTS*, Jim. Because each time you respond to a post from and *do not* remove my callsign from my original post, then you are "proliferating" my callsign--even more so, I might add, than when it would be in this thread, probably. This thread has only been this active because of this debate that is going on. I haven't checked, but do you deleted my callsign from replies to posts from me? You'd be leaving behind my name so people would still know someone named Kim has originally submitted the post. At any rate, deleting my callsign from a post would follow along with your reasoning above; that to do so would minimize the exposure to my callsign. And, I daresay, that to completely follow along with that reasoning and have it be valid and accepted as true and logical reasoning, then you would need to refrain from *any* post wherein my callsign is evidenced.

> ><---these attributes inserted
> >Because you have some bugaboo about the suffix?
>
> Because I think it's inappropriate and because I take responsibility for
what I
> post.
> >
> >>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as "wrong"
is
> >>really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals and
prejudices
> >>upon me.
>
> Ahem...
> >>
> >>>That doesn't sound like
> >>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
> >>>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
> >>
> >>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
> >>inappropriate for the ARS.
> >
> >That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.
>
> Says who?

> <---this attribute inserted

Well, I think Leo just said it. And, I agree.

>
> FCC is allowing BPL systems to be implemented even though they generate
> enormous amounts of RF interference. FCC still requires code tests of
> those who want US HF ham licenses, despite the loss of the treaty
> requirement 6 months ago. FCC recently declined to penalize anyone when
> a pop star used the "F-word" on network TV.
>
> Does the fact that the FCC does the above mean I have no right to say the
FCC
> is
> wrong?
>

You did not say that the FCC is wrong for issuing my callsign. You said my callsign is inappropriate for the ARS. It may be (and I wholeheartedly disagree with you), but it is not for you--as an individual and certainly as an amateur radio operator--to disassociate me from ham radio as an amateur radio operator by leaving off my callsign from something in which I have *intended* for it to be.

> <---this attribute inserted
> Is it wrong for me to tell people not to sign up for BPL and cite the
problems
> it has?
>

No. Not wrong at all. But, it would be wrong of you to delete a "name" someone goes by from a list of names in which people might be expressing their agreement or disagreement, simply because you disagree with the way it sounds or even that it might be risque. It would incorrect of you to delete or refuse to attribute their name to them for any reason.

> <---this attribute inserted
> Is it wrong for those who disagree with code tests to try to get the rules
> changed?
>

Not at all. And, I'd imagine that those who are so driven, are actively involved by contacting the appropriate agencies and departments and by active debate to state their cause and purpose. However, again, it would be incorrect for someone to keep a name or callsign (in this case) from a list in which they intended their name or callsign to appear.

> <---this attribute inserted
> Is it OK for hams to use the F-word on the air because FCC allowed it once
on
> TV?
>

I could drone on, but hopefully the point has been made.

> >
> >> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
> >>sequentially. It
> >>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to
extinction"
> >>that exceeded 3000 posts.
> >
> >But it is her call - issued to her for her use.
>
> And she hasn't used it for over a year on the air. Just here.
>

If I *had* used it regularly, once in a while, or every so often, on the air, would that have changed anything here? I think not, so don't bother using it. Regardless, it is my callsign and I thought it would be listed when I originally submitted my prediction.

> <---this attribute inserted
> And if Kim wants to use it here, that's her right. But *I* don't have to
use it
> here.
> >>

Nope. You sure don't. But, it would be nice in the future if you caution that any amatuer radio operator, with whose callsign you disagree, who submits something with the idea that he/she will be listed just as everyone else, *will not* be treated in such a manner.

> >>>>><---these attributes inserted
> >>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from
the
> >>>>>list.
> >>>>
> >>>>Done. No problem.
> >>>>
> >>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
> >>>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with
no
> >>>>>malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
> >>>>
> >>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
> >>>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
> >>>>choice.
> >>>
> >>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
> >>
> >>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns
are
> >>not appropriate?
> >
> >Of course it is.

> >>
> >>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?
> >
> >Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
> >callsigns, not just hers.
>
> Why?
>

For the reasons stated by me in this post, for many.

> ><---these attributes inserted
> >Do you not think that singling her out the
> >way that you did was disrespectful to her?
>
> No.
>

I do. And, it is my perception that counts--although it's quite obvious
that others have at least some degree of concern in this area as well.

> ><---these attributes inserted
> >Are you that sanctimonious?
>
> No. I'm that honest.
> >
> >>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with
four-letter
> >>suffixes, like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.
> >
> >Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
> >old four letter combination?
>
> Yes.
>

I do not.

> ><---these attributes inserted
> >I'd be surprised!
>
> I was surprised that they would issue Kim's call. But they did. Why would
you
> be surprised if they
> issued four-letter combinations? They allowed that pop star to say a
certain
> word. All kinds of
> words are permitted here on the 'net - (wire comms are regulated by the
FCC
> too).
>

Why is my callsign such a shock? Forget any reason that someone might request it. I say that becasue, keep in mind that Michael (I think his name was) requested and had K2TIT because it was the closest he could come to commemorating the Tet Offensive. So, regardless of *why* someone might request it, why the shock that the FCC would issue it? The mere word "tit" or even the tit itself is not vulgar. Good heavens, if you think it is then I am the one who is shocked! The word is not intended to be used as a nickname on the amateur bands; Indeed, I have sharply offended people who have done that. The full callsign is all that is ever responded to, on the air anyway.

And, mainly, and the thing *everyone* always likes to ignore is that, yes, the callsign was requested by me on a dare. HOWEVER, it was a dare *after* I made the verbal observation that if I were to ever request a *VANITY* callsign, it would certainly be associated with something of vanity--not simply my initials. As you will recall, the most important part of that story--and it is a true one--is that a) I had never desired to get a vanity call, b) was mentioning to my fellow hams [men] on the air that it was a pity they had no more creativity than to simply request their initials and, c) that if I were to request a callsign it would be related to my "vanity." Anyone who knew me (and the all did) personally knew exactly what I was inferring by that comment. Were I as famous as Dolly Parton, it would be for the same reason she is--minus that I am a performer (I am not). My unique callsign is unique because it is a woman's callsign who knows that others perceive first in me, my tits. My intellect, beauty, wit, charm, rogue behavior, honesty in dealing with all humas and nature, and very, very opinionated nature all come secondary to the fact that, on initial gaze, I am a large titted woman. And, my callsign uniquely says, "get the hell over it, there's a person here to be reckoned with." If anyone does not like the way I *like* and *prefer* to relay that message, then tough titties (and they are not).

If anyone else (and here's your argument coming back on ya) *perceives* my callsign to be vulgar, that is *their* perception. It is not my intention. If anyone else becomes deragotory with my callsign, as Larry, Dick, Dave, Waddles/ULX, and others have done in this newsgroup; I daresay your problem is with them for they are the ones acting in a vulgar nature.

> ><---these attributes inserted
> >Even the vehicle
> >license plate guys have a handle on that one.....
>
> Those are issued by the states, not the FCC.
> >>
> >>>The FCC could have refused to
> >>>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like the
> >>>motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for one)
> >>>freely issue this suffix as well!
> >>
> >>FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the
database, or
> >>better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the suffixes immediately

> >>before and after are much more common.
> >
> >Does not prove the point.
> >
> It proves the FCC considers Kim's call to be somewhat different from W5TIS
or
> W5TIU
>

Or, K2TIT

> >>><---these attributes inserted
> >>>
> >>>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each of us
> >>>>is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are things
involving
> >>>>amateur radio that you're better at than me, and there are probably
things
> >>>>involving amateur radio that I'm better at than you. So we are not
equal
> >>>>in
> >>>>every way but license class.
> >>>
> >>>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was referring
> >>>to.
> >>
> >>No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.
> >
> >I suspect not - you are obviously much more savvy than that!
>
> Is Kim equal to me in technical knowledge of ham radio? In historic
knowledge?
> In HF operating experience? In ability to homebrew equipment? At the risk
> of blowing my own horn, I'd say no.
> >>
> >>>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
> >>>vanity callsign, just like you!
> >>
> >>Of course! And she does use it here.
> >>
> >>But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not have
the
> >>right to refrain from doing so?
> >
> >You may, of course, refrain from using it.
>
> Gee, thanks. ;-)
>

But, you do not have the right to deliberately disassociate my callsign from
me in a situation where I am representing myself as a ham radio operator

among other ham radio operators with like actions. We are all participating in the same poll, "The Pool." We are all submitting our ideas, and every amateur radio operator--but me--has had their submission listed with association to their callsign.

> ><---attributes inserted
> >But why do you feel that
> >you have the right to share your own personal views on why you have an
> >issue with it with the rest of the group?
>
> Because they asked.
> >
> >And, do you belive that censorship is appropriate?
>
> No - that's why I don't censor anyone.
>

Sometimes, censorship is quite appropriate. I think censorship of my submission would have been more appropriate, and respectful, than to add my "name" to the list with a submission of other amateur radio operators where their callsigns are listed.

> >>
> >>>(and, up here,
> >>
> >>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)
> >
> >...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
> >call signs!
>
> Doesn't mean they are appropropriate.
>
> >>Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
> >>
> >>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
> >>>
> >>Were those calls sequentially issued?
> >
> >You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether they
> >requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.
>
> It makes a difference.
> <---attribute inserted

To *you*, Jim and some others. Not to me, not Leo, not to some others. That someone gets, or even requests--doesn't matter--a callsign, it behooves you as a fellow amateur to respect that person as an amateur radio operator unless and until the licensing agency decides they cannot be an amateur radio operator any more. Note I did not say you have to respect that person as a person. I have absolutely no respect in any way for Larry Roll, Dave Heil, Waddles/ULX, and quite a few others actually. In fact I regard them

with pure disdain. However, they are amateur radio operators and no one outside the FCC as the granting authority, can take that away from them. And, as fellow amateur radio operators, they deserve my respect. *If* (and that is a big if) I ever had to encounter them on the air, I would regard them and treat them with the same respect that I have for every other amateur radio operator.

Even here in this area, when we had two proven fake Navy SEAL amateurs (proven by the organization that investigates that kind of stuff), and I was the only one who took them on as idiots, I never disrespected them on the air with rude remarks or insulting behavior. They would come on the air and call me names, try to scare me, deliberately violate nearly every R&R there is regarding transmission, but I never did the same to them. I refrained from communicating with them and would not respond to their childish, impish behavior. One day, the last transmission ever made on the air to either of them, I reminded one that the frequency was mine--which is proper operating practice and still gives them the *appearance* of respect as an amateur.

> >>
> >>>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that your
> >>>>choice
> >>>>of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate to the amateur
radio
> >>>>service. You *chose* that callsign, and the FCC would not have issued
it
> >>>>sequentially.
> >>>
> >>>Why not?
> >>
> >>Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns. FCC
will,
> >>however, issue them if requested through the vanity program.
> >
> >Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do
> >that?
>
> -Because they don't care
> -Because it's handled by computer and nobody really looks at the system
> -Because they don't want the complaints from those who want such calls
> -Because FCC is too busy with other matters and has too few resources.
>

I feel it is becuase there may be a thought in their mind that someone might be embarrassed to have a callsign like that--and that is very nice of them to carry out issuing the call as one that might cause embarrassment to someone. They do care. Even though callsigns are issued by computer, it's obvious someone looks at them, because there are some set aside, as you say. I think the callsigns like mine are simply set aside to be requested, rather than sequentially issued, because they may cause embarrassment to someone--or maybe would even cause embarrassment to the FCC if someone asked, "why in the world would you have given me such a call?"

> ><---attributes inserted
> >They have total authority over those calls - surely they
> >ccontrol them better than that?
>
> Nope.
>
> In case you didn't know, Kim emailed Riley Hollingsworth about it. He
> replied that while such callsigns were legal, the request and use of such
> callsigns moves the ARS "one step closer to extinction".
>

No, his very general statement--in specific reference to activities on the air, I might add--about my callsign and other behaviors in the ARS (related, as I said, to on the air activities) could move the ARS one step closer to extinction. I happen to totally disagree with him. There is something about Riley that Larry doesn't understand, by the way, Riley offered his comments *as a person* not as an authority of the FCC. Big difference. The FCC officially has no remark on my callsign other than, when asked, to state that they do not legislate or regulate callsigns (something to that affect anyway--it was a long time ago that we had communication together).

It's also quite obvious that Riley is wrong. The ARS is still around, sitll healthy, and has even *gained* respect of important groups and agencies as a viable organization of people ready and capable to serve, if called upon to do so. The ARS is just fine and my callsign, nor the behaviors of idiots on the air, are moving it closer to extinction. There is not even a first step toward extinction of the ARS.

> >>><---attributes inserted
> >>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
> >>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement
> >>>to the contrary.
> >>
> >>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.
> >
> >Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
> >exempt from sequential issue?
>
> Their actions are enough to prove the point.
> >>
> >>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
> >>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
> >>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
> >>
> >>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an
> >>opinion?
> >
> >Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
> >views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.
>
> You're saying I don't have the right to protest. Just keep quiet, huh?
>

Why protest in an arena where the protest goes inactionable? Your protest to me will have no effect, whatsoever, in having me change my callsign. Even your refusal to list my callsign as an amateur radio operator with a submission, among other amateur radio operators with a submission, will have no positive effect on me changing my callsign.

You should simply stick to the argument that you find my callsign inappropriate. That is the strongest (even at its weakest) argument you can offer. To try and submit your actions as a demonstrable protest falls way short. At least in my opinion.

> >>
> >>>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to do, or
> >>>>in the best interests of all concerned.
> >>>
> >>>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is in
> >>>the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one would
> >>>prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable and
> >>>unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone else
> >>>here!
> >>
> >>Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not be done
> >>by
> >>othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they are deciding what
> >>is
> >>"right" and "wrong" for more than themselves. It's an unavoidable
> >>consequence
> >>of having an opinion. The only other option is to never express any opinions
> >>at all.
> >>
> >>For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur license
> >>should
> >>be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on the issue should take
> >>precedence over what others think and want. They're saying that the FCC's
> >>current rules are incorrect and need to change.
> >>
> >>And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for the code
> >>test to go away. Do they have the right to say those things, and to try to
> >>get their
> >>will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and those who
> >>disagree have rights, too.
>
> And that's the way it should be. YMMV

> >>
> >>>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your own
> >>>value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.
> >>
> >>See above about the tests.
> >
> >??
> >
> >Sorry, Jim, I fail to see the connection between snubbing Kim
> >publically and whether Morse testing should be continued. I'll read
> >this over again a couple of Jack Daniels' from now, and see if it's
> >clearer then! :)
> >>
> >>What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I
*must
> >>not*
> >>oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are permitted by law.
> >>
> >>Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?
> >>
> >
> >Of course you are. But, as stated above, do you have the right to
> >impose your own personal standards upon others? Is it OK to single
> >out Kim in your list as the only one represented by name only in your
> >pool, because you are embarassed by her call? No. Of course not.
> >There are two gentlemanly things that you could do in this situation:
> >
> >1. List all of the participants in the pool by name only, creating an
> >equal playing field and singling out no one.
> >

Absolutely. I agree. Or, state that any amateur's callsign deemed as
inappropriate by you will not be listed in your poll.

> ><---attributes inserted
> >2. End your participation in the pool on moral grounds, and let
> >someone else pick it up should they so choose.
>
> By stating those two as the onlt two options, *you* are trying to impose
> *your* personal standards on *me*
>
> I say there's a third option:
>
> 3. Do exactly what I've done, and state the reasons for doing so.
>

Which falls short of reasonable in any way.

> ><---attributes inserted
> >It is never right to ostracize another person because you don't like,
> >or cannot deal, with something about them.

>
> I have not ostracized Kim.
>

You have ostracized me as a valid amateur radio operator by refusing to include my callsign with my submission. You have ostracized me by treating my submission as an amateur radio operator differently than you treated a submission by any other amateur radio operator.

You have participated in ostracization (is that a word?) :)

> ><---attributes inserted
> >What effect to you think
> >that doing this would have on Kim?
>
> Perhaps it will make her reconsider her choice of callsign.
>

Oh, Jim. Puhleeze! Surely, surely you know way better than that!!!

> ><---attributes inserted
> >Do you not see that your choice of
> >actions would hurt her feelings?
>
> What about *my* feelings?
>

My feelings are not hurt, by the way. I could actually care less about the issue of whether my callsign is on the list or not. However, the reason *I* am persuing this as a topic of interest will be revealed at the end of this post. <snicker> Not to minimize the input of my ideas: I am representing exacly how I think about the issue! I am just not hurt at all by the exclusion of my callsign from the list.

> ><---attributes inserted
> >Say, you weren't striking out at her
> >because she offended you, were you? Of course not!
>
> That's right.
> >
> >>>If Kim's
> >>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
> >>>entirely.
> >>
> >>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
> >>with her about callsign choice.
> >

Thank you. And, I don't think you're a bad person, either; nor are you my enemy.

> ><---attributes inserted
> >Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my

> >friends a heck of a lot better than that!
>
> I did not say she was my friend. Kim reserves the term "friend" to a very
> select few.
> "Acquaintance" would be more accurate.
> >>

Exactly. Very few people are those whom I would consider "friends."
Certainly not someone I only have interaction with over the computer or even
amateur radio.

> >><---attributes inserted
> >>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by
determining
> >>how I can post here.
> >
> >Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
> >impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.
>
> Not what I'm doing.
> >>
> >>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
> >>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
> >>>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
> >>
> >>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone from
> >>posting anyhting?
> >

You have prevented my callsign being associated with other amateur radio
operators in a list where you treated them differently (by listing them with
a callsign). You have prevented, by mere omission of my callsign, me from
being viewed as an amateur radio among other amateur radio operators in a
list in which such omission could easily be taken out of context, I might
add.

> ><---attributes inserted
> >Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
> >you did!
>
> I edited. Not the same thing. Words have exact meanings.
> >>
> >>> Intentional deletion of
> >>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
> >>>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
> >>
> >>I disagree.
> >
> >Sorry to hear that!
> >>
> >>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS. IMHO

YMMV
> >
> >And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
> >really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a problem
> >with.
>
> So go ahead and use Kim's call all you want. Just please don't tell me
that I
> have to.
> >>>
> >>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
> >>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access
> >>>covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').
> >>
> >>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on
Usenet
> >>as
> >>a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I *must* post in a
> >>certain way. Why?
> >
> >Please see the above comments.
> >>>
> >>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
> >>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
> >>
> >>[slang word deleted]
> >
> >...because you personally have an issue with it! See?
> >>
> >>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's
> >>not a birdwatcher.
> >
> >I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but
> >she just might be!
>
> Kim chose that callsign for at least two obvious, prominent reasons:
>
> 1) She thought it was fun, and/or funny
>
> 2) She knew it would get lots of attention and create all sorts of
reactions
>

Oh, I thought you were going to say that my two, obvious, prominent reasons
were my tits. Because those were the two obvious, prominent reasons =:o

> <---attribute inserted
> She's told us all that here. Her picture used to be on qrz, too.
>

Uh, what does a picture of me, driving a car, from the shoulder area up,
have to do with my tits? Don't tell me you could "tell" by that picture
that I had big tits! Oh, no! It's worse than I thought! ;)

That'd be about like Larry being able to tell I'm fat (which I'm not) just
by looking at that picture!

> >>><---attributes inserted
> >>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
> >>
> >>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
> >
> >Yes you did!
>
> No, I did not.
>
> > Kim, I believe....
> >>>
> I notice that you use her name and not her callsign too....
>
> >>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio -
> >>>as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.
> >>
> >>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
> >>to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting
names
> >-

Then your issue is with them.

> >><---attributes inserted
> >>and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
> >>disrespectful.
> >
> >And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?
>
> There was no problem when others did it. Only when I did. Double standard.
>
> >>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
> >>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
> >>
> >>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.
> >

That's a good "Kim" response! <GRIN>

> ><---attributes inserted
> >Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!
>
> Then why not choose another one?
> <---attributes inserted

Oh goodness!!! My callsign is so uniquely me how could I ever do that?

> >>
> >>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
> >>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
> >>>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
> >>>
> >>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to
force
> >>*me* to use it here on Usenet.
> >>

However, you did not let anyone know, up front when the poll was first issued, that any inappropriateness would be looked for and dealt with accordingly. I submitted a prediction and do have the right and, feel correctly, expectation that my prediction would be listed just like every other amateur radio operator's.

My behavior on this newsgroup has always been blunt and honest. You could have even publicly said something to me about my callsign not be included and, as I would expect from you, asking if I would like not to particpate. That would have been so Jim/N2EY that I believe I have come to know. But, for some reason, your exhibited nature was not forthcoming here, and I don't know why--may not even be anything to it. But, I can see you posting a reply to my prediction that you would not be including my callsign--and would I like to withdraw.

> >><---attributes inserted
> >>Or do they?
> >
> >Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!
>
> But you want to force your values on me.
> >>
> >>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
> >>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone *must*
> >>include that word or phrase in any replies?
> >
> >Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....
>
> I do ignore it! That's exactly what I've been doing!
>
> Thanks for the validation, Leo!
> >
> >Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections for dinner, and
> >they're my favourite! :)
> >
> Yum..But I'm a leg man, myself.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Now, for the real reason I decided to engage as I have the last couple of weeks. Remember, Jim, how I used to get so insulted when you would seem to

"lead" someone into a corner they could not get out of? Well, this thread, and the lack of your treating my submission as any other amateur radio operator's became my path to doing the same thing to you. Not out of meanness, mind you, not at all. Out of pure fun.

I feel you do lead, by way of artful argument by the way, people into corners they don't think they can get out of. This was my answer to that--because I really do feel I waited long enough (practically a year), acted often enough (giving you every opportunity to act as I would have thought you would act, and participated strictly as a submitter (I engaged in no comments until recently, and those only to request that you include my submission with my callsign). It is even uncharacteristic of me to get involved to this level (being listed among the debaters over the CW testing issue) with this topic.

As I said, I would have thought of your nature that you would see my submission, and let me know that you would list it but without my callsign, and give me the opportunity to withdraw inclusion. Does anyone else agree that this would have been something one could reasonably have expected from Jim?

Anyway, I feel victorious, but maybe it's just me. As I said, I really do have the opinions stated in this response and really do believe you should have offered anything but leaving my callsign off the list. But, my greater purpose was to leave you with that same, frustrated feeling I used to have when you'd box me into a corner I couldn't get out of. Maybe you don't feel boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly insulted--at least it looked that way to me in this post!

Kim W5TIT!!!!!!!

758. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 20:07:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btsaak$e6o@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85534

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:_6dMb.24955$P%1.23043109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:btql45$t7a@library1.airnews.net...
> [snip]
> > 'S 'bout time. Now, to all who have been participating in this debate,
> > WHICH style of post was it that got more noticed I had added my CALLSIGN
> to
> > the list? It took you all (and actually it took only Mike because no
one
> > else noticed) almost exactly 3 days to notice that the two posts were
made
> > on the same day. One with (and first) and one without attributes. And,
I
> > honestly ask: who really noticed one (attributes) or the other (no
> > attributes)? I'd almost bet a buck that even Jim wondered what in the
> world
> > was in that post that was different, whether the attributes were there
or
> > not. By the way, note that the post that was made somewhere around a
> couple
> > of days ago...where I again submitted the list without attributes, note
> that
> > in *that* post, my information appears at the top of the post (the "Kim
> > Walker said" stuff). Is anyone watching this stuff? Really?!
> >
> > The entire point had been having my callsign *in the list* as a ham
radio
> > operator. Jim complains that to Google or whatever, it looked like he
had
> > posted something he had not said. A) the only thing he had not said was
> my
> > callsign so who cares? B) What about someone who is casually looking at
> > those posts and completely disregards my submission because it *looks*
> like
> > I don't have a callsign?
> >
> > At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as
everyone
> > thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >

>
> I pay attention to every single attribute and immediately noticed the
> difference in both posts. I elected not to get into the debate and kept
my
> opinions to myself. However since you seem to think people ignore the
> attributes, I decided I must repond to dispel that notion. And as far as
> I'm concerned, deliberately making the attribute appear to be something
> other than it was happens to be wrong. Making errors in keeping
attributes
> in long threads happens and is excusable. Choosing to make an attribute
> appear something else is not excusable.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

You must have missed where I said, "as" paid attention to, Dee! I am sure
some do as you do. I am sure many more do not.

Kim W5TIT

759. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:09:00 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <6UiMb.9062$v16.7252@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85535
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

How true.

N9PGE wrote:

> On Sun, 11 Jan 2004 05:23:14 -0500, Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote:
>
>>K0HB, the perfect argument against code.
>
>
> KE4TEW, the perfect argument against licensing felons.

760. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:12:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111161242.21457.00003298@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85537

In article <h%nJb.5583$6B.252@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0401020954.1dd578da@posting.google.com...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<gsBIb.16918$IM3.6633@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20031230185607.07961.00000897@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> > > In article <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>> > Sohl"
>> > > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> > >
>> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > > >news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> > > >> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Bill
>> > Sohl"
>> > > >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> > > >>
>> > > >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > > >> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> > > >> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
>> > > >> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> > > >> >>
>> > > >> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> > > >> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> > > >> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> > > >> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> > > >> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> > > >> >> >> >Message-id:
><f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>> > > >
>> > > First off, there's bound to be disagreement about what constitutes a
>> > > "rational relationship"
>> > >
>> > > Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an
>incentive,
>> > > what do we use?
>> > >
>> > > If we use power (as Hans suggests), there's little incentive for QRP
>and
>> > > low power folks to upgrade.
>> >

>> > The irony, however, is that I would bet most people that
>> > are dedicated QRPers are much more tehnically oriented
>> > to begin with and more likly to upgrade.
>>
>> Agreed!
>>
>> And you can bet that most dedicated QRPers are also primarily CW ops.
>>
>> > On the other hand,
>> > IF a QRPer is content with the entry level power limits
>> > and doesn't choose to upgrade, what's the harm?
>>
>> Depends on the observer, really.
>
>OK, as yourself as the observer, what's the harm?

The purpose of any incentive license system is to offer rewards for learning more. More spectrum (more room to play in) is one reward that is *almost* universal. More power, IMHO, is far less of an attraction.
>
>> > One can
>> > look at all those that don't upgrade today...even with
>> > spectrum privileges as the enhancement...to see folks that
>> > are content at their current license level and are also good
>> > hams.
>>
>> Yet there are those who claim that large numbers of "technically
>> oriented" hams *would* upgrade except for the "barrier" of the
>> code test......
>
>And you well know I'm not one of those that make that claim.

Of course! But NCI has long made it one of their selling points. "Bring amateur radio into the 21st Century" et al.
>
>> > > And since we're supposed to use the minimum power
>> > > required by the situation anyway.....
>> >
>> > True, but the FCC has never made a big case of checking to
>> > see that everyone is running at the least practical power.
>> > Additionally, I suspect the FCC concern on the "least power"
>> > is driven more by those running "big" power rather than
>> > anyone run a basic rig of 100 watts or less.
>>
>> Exactly. Also there's the interference considerations.
>> >
>> > > If we use modes as the incentive, which modes do we use for the
>incentive?
>> >
>> > I don't see modes as an incentive.
>>

>> Then there's not much left.
>> >
>> > > There's also the question of enforcement. You can tell right away if
>> > > someone is outside their allocated spectrum, but power is another
>issue.
>> >
>> > Yet it has been an aspect of Novice license for over 50 years.
>> > I agree the enforcement would have its problems, but I suspect
>> > the gross violations could be detected (e.g. if limit is 200 watts
>> > and someone is running a kilowatt).
>>
>> Depends on the antenna and conditions. On HF I have heard amazing
>> signals from QRP stations because of really good antennas. And
>> really poor signals from QRO stations because of poor antennas.
>
>But (IMHO) an occasional "great signal" would never be the only thing
>the FCC relied on for a notice of power violations.

Of course.
>
>> > In the end, I believe "most"
>> > hams want to operate legally and will do so.
>>
>> That's because it's part of the tradition and culture of amateur
>> radio to do so, not because of large amounts of enforcement. I'm all
>> for more and better enforcement, but it's clear that those who think
>> Riley can do it all are mistaken.
>
>Agreed.

Yet some have tried to sell us on the idea that enforcement is the be-all
and end-all. For example, the "21st Century" authors.
>
>> > Those that might run
>> > double their allowed power (say 400 when limited to 200) are
>> > only fooling themselves.
>>
>> Big difference between 400 vs. 200 hp under the hood, or between 80
>> MPH and 40 MPH on the highway. But it's only 3 dB on the air. Tough
>> concept for some...
>
>Exactly my point. The FCC would likly focus on 1000W vs 200W,
>not the cheater running 400.

Or even 10,000W...
>
>> > > >> >What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
>> > > >> >operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a
>> > > >> >General
>> > > >> >operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
>> > > >>

>> > > >> Not much!
>> > > >
>> > > >Not any as I see it.
>> > > >
>> > > Exactly.The difference is in operating skills and knowledge.
>> > > The Extra part is where the DX often goes.
>> >
>> > Maybe we could tie some power limits to frequency
>> > spectrum which would then create a valid reason to not allow
>> > a lower level licesnse in that spectrum slot.
>>
>> I'm not sure what you're proposing. Do you mean having some parts of a
>> band allowed 1500 W and others only, say, 150 W, as is done now in the
>> Novice parts of 80/40/15?
>
>Something to think about. Consider the discussion a "green-light"
>session. No proposal get's immediately shot down while trying to
>draw out as many new ideas/concepts as possible.

Certainly an option. But you'd face lots of opposition because it would mean
hams losing privs they have now.
>
>> > > >> But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
>> > > >> technical knowledge with more privileges.
>> > > >
>> > > >I don't oppose the concept, I oppose the illogical implementation.
>> > >
>> > > We can agree to disagree about the logic.
>> > >
>> > > But what should be used for an incentive besides spectrum?
>> >
>> > I agree with Hans that power certanly can be and has been.
>>
>> That's one possiblity.
>>
>> > Also, at the risk of being stoned, how has the Canadian
>> > entry level license been going which restricts those hams to
>> > commercial equipment only? Perhaps an entry level USA
>> > license could have a restriction of commercial only rigs
>> > "OR" hmebrew transmitter "IF" the homebrew has been
>> > checked out and signed off as OK by an Extra class ham.
>>
>> I'm not gonna throw any stones at ya, Bill. But please note how
>> I was asked to shut up a while back when I pointed out some logical
>> inconsistencies in the written testing....
>
>Who wanted to shut you down?

Carl, WK3C, for one. I was pointing out that a strong case can be made that the
Tech test contains all the theory and safety knowledge needed, and that most of
the General and Extra tests can be shown to be "hoop jumping" exercises if one

cares to look at them that way. I was politely but firmly asked to shut up
about it,
lest someone actually use those arguments with FCC to get the writtens watered
down still more.

That's my recollection of the exchange, anyway.

>We can discuss all we want. I'd
>be careful, however, with certain ideas presented officially
>to FCC.

Of course! But my main point was this: All of the arguments used against
the code test can also be reworded slightly and used against much of what's
in the written tests as well. It's already started.
>
>> The problem with such an "Appliance Class" license is that it cuts
>> off those who hold it from one of the main reasons for the ARS to
>> exist
>> in the USA. (Remember that the "basis and purpose" is an FCC/Part 97
>> thing and other countries have different ones, or none at all). Not
>> being *allowed* to homebrew, modify or repair one's own gear is
>> simply a bad idea. It would
>> *encourage* new hams to become even more dependent on manufacturers
>> rather than their own ingenuity.
>
>I'll ask again, what IS the experience in Canada. What "bad" things are
>happening or not happening?

I don;t know that Canada's B&P are the same as ours. One thing I do know is
that there are far fewer hams per capita there.
>
>> Some of the greatest experiences I have had in amateur radio have been
>> in
>> taking an idea and some parts and turning them into a working radio
>> station, then making contacts with that station. Started doing that
>> sort
>> of thing as a kid and never got out of the habit. Led me to EE
>> degrees, a
>> career and a bunch of other things. Never would have happened if I'd
>> had to use only "approved" gear.

>But any "commercial" limitation would only apply to transmitters.
>That still leaves receiver circuits, etc to experiment with.
>In fact, no one needs any license to build and use their own
>homebrew receiver.

True. But most manufactured ham gear these days is transceivers.
And one of the simplest practical projects for the beginner is a
simple low power transmitter. The "appliance" newcomer would be cut off
from such projects.

This isn't a minor point! One of the key factors in developing what I call
"practical radio skills" is being able to start with very simple projects and
work your way up to more complex stuff.
>
>> > Allowing "homebrew" via an Extra certification process would
>> > foster positive relationships and Elmering (IMHO).
>>
>> Maybe. OTOH, having to get one's projects approved by another ham
>> slows
>> down the process enormously and could result in all kinds of trouble.
>
>As above, not ALL projects would need approval. Also,
>can you give an idea about "could result in all kinds of trouble.?"

Gladly. For one thing, the mere possession of an Extra license doesn't mean
the holder is necessarily qualified to judge the work of another ham *and*
said ham's ability to use a project.

For another, whose responsibility would it be if the "appliance" op got into
trouble with spurious emissions or such? Or got a shock?

>> Add
>> to that the fact that the current written tests are by no means
>> adequate
>> to ensure that all Extras know everything they need to know in order
>> to
>> sign off on another's work.
>
>You just created Catch 22. Based on your perspective, even Extras
>today shouldn't be allowed to homebrew without some additional
>"certification" because the current Extra syllabus is inadequate to
>ensure the Extra knows enough to homebrew.

Not at all! A homebrewer is responsible for the performace of his/her own
station. If there's a problem, guess who is responsible. Most hams will not
attempt a project beyond their ability for just that reason.

But to be responsible for someone else's work is a different thing entirely.
Particularly when the person you're responsible for is not under your
supervision.
>
>> And what problem does such an "Appliance Class" license really solve?
>> Do we have lots of problems here in the USA with homebrewing hams'
>> creations mucking up the bands and causing interference? I don't
>> think so.
>
>I didin't say there was any problem. I merely suggested
>another "incentive" that could better be tied to knowledge
>at a certain license level.

My main concern is that we'd be setting up a new class of hams who
would be cut off from one of the main reasons to be a ham.

>> > > >> >The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>> > > >> >additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>> > > >> >additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>> > > >> >Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>> > > >>
>> > > >> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
>> > > >
>> > > >It only flows as to "pure incentive". It doesn't flow or relate
>> > > >at all to the additional knowledge tested to pass the license.
>> > >
>> > > Some of the knowledge does, such as HF propagation.
>> >
>> > Yet the "only" difference between technicians not allowed
>> > any HF and those allowed on the "novice" segments is a code test...
>> > no additional knowledge of HF needed for Tech with code
>> > to operate the Novice segments.
>>
>> Sure - because that HF knowledge is tested in the written for Tech,
>> and was tested for in the Novice when it was available.
>
>OK
>
>> > > >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
>> > > >> For that matter, what about the General?
>> > > >
>> > > >Did I even hint at that.
>> > >
>> > > Not at all!
>> > >
>> > > >The answer is basically no...although
>> > > >I have NO preference for or against changing license structure
>> > > >to a more rational basis for added privileges.
>> > > >
>> > > My point is simply that being anticodetest does *not* necessarily mean
>> > > someone
>> > > wants to water dwon the writtens or eliminate license classes.
>> >
>> > THANK YOU Jim!
>>
>> You're welcome.
>> >
>> > I wish certain others in this newsgroup had the ability to
>> > understand that.
>>
>> But let's be honest about the situation, Bill. There *are* some folks
>> who
>> want to further reduce *written* testing. (Not me!) Just look at the
>> "21st Century" paper for one example - particularly the attitude it
>> projects.
>
>Those that truly want to "further reduce written testing" are but

>a handful and, except for W5YI, who you may put in that
>category, they don't speak at all for a significant majority of
>hams (IMHO, YMMV)

But majority doesn't matter - remember? If they can make their case,
the mere fact that most hams oppose it won't mean a thing. Just
like with code tests....

Their argument that most hams use manufactured equipment that requires
no critical operating adjustments is pretty hard to argue against on an
"avoidance of interference" basis.
>
>> One of its rallying cries is that we need more new hams at any cost,
>> and not only is the code test scapegoated as a barrier, but also the
>> written test. That paper came from a NCVEC committee, too, and you can
>> bet they will push that agenda.
>
>Has that paper been submitted as official NCVEC input to the FCC?

Not yet. But I understand that it appeared in the December issue of CQ.

(Anybody got a copy, btw?)

The paper outlines their plan in detail. In fact they imply that we hams should
not offer proposals or petitions until FCC issues an NPRM!

>> > > A lot of things we thought impossible have come to pass. Heck, FCC
>> > > never imagined that cb would get out of their control...
>> >
>> > In hindsight, the FCC certainly should have seen it coming.
>>
>> Of course! But they didn't. They simply could not imagine that what
>> happened to cb could occur. It was simply not part of their mindset,
>> even though all of the indications were there.
>
>Water over the dam.

But a lesson to be learned! If it happened to cb, it could happen to ham radio.
>
>> > The big mistake,
>> > in my opinion, was the failure of the FCC to take into account the
>> > basic "plug-n-play aspect of CB, the multitude of sales outlets via
>> > Radio
>> > Shack (Tandy), and the constantly lowering of CB set costs, especially
>> > once they became all solid state.
>>
>> All of those things were considered *desirable* by the FCC! The whole
>> reason
>> that service was created by FCC was so that Everyman could get on the
>> air with inexpensive, easy-to-set-up-and-use radios for personal,
>> short-range communications. Particularly mobile.
>>

>> And if that's not bad enough, lookit BPL.
>>
>> The main point of all this is that FCC wasn't and isn't an infallible
>> bunch that Knows What Is Best For Radio. Let alone what is best for
>> ham radio.
>> They're simply the folks in charge, who have the unenviable task of
>> balancing
>> all the competing demands, and doing it with limited resources and
>> under various forms of pressure.
>>
>> So it's up to us hams to make our case and set our path, not FCC.
>
>That's why I am in ARRL and have been so since before NCI was
>even created.

Me too. Member since 1968. When Feb QST shows up, it will be the 445th issue
I have received as a member.

>I'll restate my position on the purpose of NCI as it
>relates to me. Once the code testing is actually gone, then I'll
>cease to be an NCI member as the goal will have been achieved.
>If any of the other NCI directors/members want NCI to
>continue on a different, expanded purpose, they will do so
>without me.

Understood!

But it has always been stated that once the code test goal was reached, NCI
would simply cease to function at all in those countries.

73 de Jim, N2EY

761. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:12:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111161243.21457.00003299@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 85536

In article <DUdMb.3445$i4.1886@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>So what is your likly timetable for submission?
>After an ARRL submission?
>If yes, how soon after?

Bill,

I think that the answer to all of the above questions is:

"When Hans thinks the time is right"
>
>There is a risk of submitting beyond a point where the FCC has
>already digested the 14 or probably will be 15 submissions and
>then posts a NPRM. By that time any new proposals aren't
>likly to get any attention...IMHO.

Agreed! But that's included in the above answer.

I'm not speaking for Hans - the above answers are IMHO.

73 de Jim, N2EY

762. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:20:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4001BE20.3040904@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85538

```
>
>
>>>
>>>
>>Many novices may not even have their original CSCE. The FCC would
>>also recognize a copy of your former Novice license as proof you passed
>>5 wpm.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Yes that is true but I was addressing the case of someone who's first
>license was a Technician.
>
If it was a tech plus, that means that they passed a 5wpm code test.
Which should also
be good. What strangely enough happened is say someone who never passed
a 5wpm
test but passed 13 or 20, doesn't get the lifetime credit. Some FCC
brearucrat writing
the rules didn't realize that he should have written "5 WPM or faster".
He might have
thught 5 was harder than 13 or something like that...
```

763. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:24:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <kajMb.5688$zj7.801@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85539

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> No. You don't. Not in a "general" list you are compiling, where you have
> made no mention of how people will be listed. It was intended by me--and
> was when I first submitted my prediction--that I would be listed *just as
> every other amateur radio operator.* You *do not*, Jim--whether you think
> you do or not--have the right to *disascociated* me from my callsign.
> Period. But, especially in a list where you've invited people to join,
yet
> you did not say anyone would be listed in any way differently than anyone
> else.
>
> You have prevented my callsign being associated with other amateur radio
> operators in a list where you treated them differently (by listing them
with
> a callsign). You have prevented, by mere omission of my callsign, me from
> being viewed as an amateur radio among other amateur radio operators in a
> list in which such omission could easily be taken out of context, I might
> add.
>
>
> Anyway, I feel victorious, but maybe it's just me. As I said, I really do
> have the opinions stated in this response and really do believe you should
> have offered anything but leaving my callsign off the list. But, my
greater
> purpose was to leave you with that same, frustrated feeling I used to have
> when you'd box me into a corner I couldn't get out of. Maybe you don't
feel
> boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly insulted--at
> least it looked that way to me in this post!

Kim ---> Jim has every right to not include your callsign in his messages.

Jim ---> Kim has every right to feel whatever she feels about that, and to
post messages which make her "feel victorous" in return.

In other words, you both have the right to make yourselves look like
laughable self-righteous sanctimonious twits, and you both are certainly
doing a superb job of that.

All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
that..... babble.

Attribute that.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

764. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:24:44 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wajMb.137021$Cs3.27315051@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85540

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:4001BE20.3040904@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>>
> >>>
> >>Many novices may not even have their original CSCE. The FCC would
> >>also recognize a copy of your former Novice license as proof you passed
> >>5 wpm.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >Yes that is true but I was addressing the case of someone who's first
> >license was a Technician.
> >
> If it was a tech plus, that means that they passed a 5wpm code test.
> Which should also
> be good. What strangely enough happened is say someone who never passed
> a 5wpm
> test but passed 13 or 20, doesn't get the lifetime credit. Some FCC
> brearucrat writing
> the rules didn't realize that he should have written "5 WPM or faster".
> He might have
> thught 5 was harder than 13 or something like that...

Kinda scary, eh? Should serve as a reminder to all who repeat the "but the FCC says..., but the FCC says..., but the FCC says..." mantra solely because it serves their current agenda.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

765. Re: Why Isn't Anyone Talking About The Jewish Factor? ------ SqWuxGOVT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:34:44 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <qijMb.20035$K6.16783@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Spam on dumbass.

Truth_In_Media@nomga.com.tw wrote:

> Governor Howard Dean is married to a Jewish woman and their children are being
> brought up in the Jewish faith. This has little relevancy for domestic matters, but its
> impact of foreign relations cannot be ignored, especially in an age where our
> greatest foreign policy challenge is repairing relations with the Muslim world.
> -
> Just something to think about, as the press has been less than forthcoming on
> this extremely relevant facet of this candidates profile.
> -
> END
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> -
> To be stale or wide will cover raw disks to fully clean. If the
> light powders can explain cruelly, the sticky ticket may smell more
> windows. She might join wickedly, unless Zephram attacks elbows
> in front of Larry's pen. The pitcher at the healthy fire is the
> lemon that opens undoubtably. It might receive worthwhile books
> within the dirty distant ladder, whilst Toni inadvertently rejects them too.
> Just now, go shout a teacher! It can cook once, improve stupidly, then
> measure below the smog about the street. Franklin's envelope
> hates at our sauce after we tease without it. The hats, potters, and
> pins are all shallow and rural. Hala plays, then Aziz partly
> irritates a proud gardner under Mustapha's window. I was irrigating
> shoes to bizarre Diane, who's nibbling before the twig's desert.
> Where will you dine the sad quiet tailors before Alexis does?
> Lots of full shirt or kiosk, and she'll unbelievably like everybody.
>
> Why doesn't Madeleine depart daily? Generally Ibraheem will
> learn the ointment, and if Beth actually talks it too, the farmer will
> pour before the easy river. Yesterday, butchers excuse among
> filthy springs, unless they're ugly. She can promise the cosmetic

> raindrop and solve it without its doorway. Let's order at the
> deep roads, but don't seek the sharp tags.
>
> Other young poor aches will lift truly at exits. He can arrive
> weekly if Ayub's unit isn't new. Do not live freely while you're
> climbing at a dry cap. She will converse brave desks, do you
> walk them?
>
> Both loving now, Doris and Paulie recommended the heavy caves
> with inner sticker. She'd rather scold incredibly than answer with
> Walter's humble film. Tell Mustafa it's glad changing beneath a
> pear. Don't even try to judge a tyrant! She may gently believe
> beneath Ghassan when the blank tapes move in the abysmal square.
> Where does Mustapha pull so easily, whenever Sadam recollects the
> pretty coffee very happily? I was behaving to help you some of my
> old sauces. If you will grasp Said's sign near drapers, it will
> weakly mould the card.
>
> Who did Brahimi kick the pool among the cheap code? While dryers
> subtly laugh balls, the dusts often fill between the angry grocers.
> A lot of sour smart games eerily taste as the urban jars dye. They are
> wasting towards lower, under good, over outer cats. What did
> Steven comb before all the onions? We can't fear bowls unless
> Haji will regularly sow afterwards. It jumped, you looked, yet
> Sheri never finally burned behind the island. It can totally
> expect in dark sweet obelisks. A lot of elder fresh goldsmiths will
> grudgingly attempt the shopkeepers. Try caring the ocean's noisy
> boat and Edward will wander you!
>
> I am wastefully fat, so I kill you. Just dreaming in a fork
> for the cellar is too wet for Roxanna to creep it. Hardly any
> rich cold cup calls coconuts on Ramez's think lentil. Ratana, have a
> empty weaver. You won't dye it. Are you thin, I mean, pouring
> about tired painters?
>
> Kareem, below diets sick and stupid, fills below it, smelling
> familiarly.
>
> He will crudely laugh younger and loves our clever, active buttons
> in front of a night.
>
>
>

766. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:38:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111163811.23307.00005889@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85542

In article <627300pd9kdemh3f29g0qt4papsjfabbn7@4ax.com>, "DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> writes:

>Dee, you addressed exactly the case I had in mind, a newly licensed
>Tech, who then passes element 1, and plans to upgrade to General in
>the future.
>
Dee's information is right on the money. Unless the person wants to have to take Element 1 again in the future, s/he should plan to upgrade to General within 365 days.

Yes, it's odd. An expired Novice license from 1952 is good for Element 1 credit but a 366-day-old CSCE isn't. But them's the rules - for now.

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

767. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 21:50:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btsgg6$ktn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85543

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:kajMb.5688$zj7.801@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > No. You don't. Not in a "general" list you are compiling, where you
have
> > made no mention of how people will be listed. It was intended by
me--and
> > was when I first submitted my prediction--that I would be listed *just
as
> > every other amateur radio operator.* You *do not*, Jim--whether you
think
> > you do or not--have the right to *disascociated* me from my callsign.
> > Period. But, especially in a list where you've invited people to join,
> yet
> > you did not say anyone would be listed in any way differently than
anyone
> > else.
> >
> > You have prevented my callsign being associated with other amateur radio
> > operators in a list where you treated them differently (by listing them
> with
> > a callsign). You have prevented, by mere omission of my callsign, me
from
> > being viewed as an amateur radio among other amateur radio operators in
a
> > list in which such omission could easily be taken out of context, I
might
> > add.
> >
> >
> > Anyway, I feel victorious, but maybe it's just me. As I said, I really
do
> > have the opinions stated in this response and really do believe you
should
> > have offered anything but leaving my callsign off the list. But, my
> greater
> > purpose was to leave you with that same, frustrated feeling I used to
have
> > when you'd box me into a corner I couldn't get out of. Maybe you don't
> feel
> > boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly

insulted--at
> > least it looked that way to me in this post!
>
>
>
> Kim ---> Jim has every right to not include your callsign in his messages.
>
> Jim ---> Kim has every right to feel whatever she feels about that, and to
> post messages which make her "feel victorous" in return.
>
> In other words, you both have the right to make yourselves look like
> laughable self-righteous sanctimonious twits, and you both are certainly
> doing a superb job of that.
>

Oh, wait. Oh, never mind. I thought I was seeing Hans with something other
than a gorilla thumping message. My mistake.

>
> All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
> that..... babble.
>
> Attribute that.
>

At least we can.

>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Kim W5TIT

768. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-11 23:39:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111183922.23171.00003353@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85544

In article <kX1Mb.24503$P%1.22808895@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:nv%Lb.18348$I06.132801@attbi_s01...
>>
>> > I've looked all through Part 97...and ALL volumes of Title 47 C.F.R.
>> > and there is NOTHING applicable to Halloween, Christianity,
>> > Christmas, New Years Day, or anything else in your post.
>> >
>> > Here there be demons, of course, but the above has NOTHING to
>> > do with ham radio or even amateur radio.
>> >
>> > What dictionary are you using?
>> >
>> > What alternate reality are you living in?
>> >
>> > WMD
>>
>> Oh-Oh Dee you have just violated Len's off topic rule. You better watch it
>> on the air when he .....wait he doesn't have a ticket. Oh well ....
>>
>> God Bless 73 Tom KI3R
>
>I long ago killfiled Len. And as the old commercial went "Plop, Plop, Oh
>what a relief it is".

Sure you did.

Doing the ostrich bit keeps your thinking prim, proper, and along
the Established Paths of Amateur Righteousness. That will keep
you in the 1930s Standards and Practices of Behavior (with
allowance of solid-state electronics...to show "state of the art").

Feel free to emulate a high-quality SPARK transmitter that was
capable only of on-off keying. Keeps Tradition alive well and
unhappy into this new millenium.

Hiram forbid that you should ever try to use another (shudder)
form of modulation in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

WMD

769. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 00:24:55 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut>
Message-ID: <btspgn02aem@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 85545

In article <f45722ac.0401111332.44b7d96d@posting.google.com>, Brian says...
>
>WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message news:<btq3tq02vce@drn.newsguy.com>...
>
>> Isn't that special, a vanity call for a no code dummy.
>
>Another class A jerk. Not so special. Plenty of 'em in amateur radio.
>
Don't call Dwight that, he is special.

770. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:17:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ans3005dfqn8joll1bedphl0k2knqbt5lk@4ax.com>
Source record: 85546

There are just over 57,600 licenced amateurs here in Canda, out of a
population of around 31,000,000 - a similar ratio your US amateur
population vs. total population.

There are two licence classes in Canada: Basic and Advanced. The
Basic licence is limited to, among other things, commercially built
transmitting equipment manufactured specifically for use in the
Amateur Radio service (homebuilding of all other types of equipment is
permitted). An Advanced licence removes this restriction.

For further info, please refer to the Industry Canada Radio
Information Circulars, accessible via the following web site:

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwGeneratedInterE/sf05478e.html

RIC-3 details the licence class info above.

73, Leo

On 11 Jan 2004 21:12:42 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>snip

>>> The problem with such an "Appliance Class" license is that it cuts
>>> off those who hold it from one of the main reasons for the ARS to
>>> exist
>>> in the USA. (Remember that the "basis and purpose" is an FCC/Part 97
>>> thing and other countries have different ones, or none at all). Not
>>> being *allowed* to homebrew, modify or repair one's own gear is
>>> simply a bad idea. It would
>>> *encourage* new hams to become even more dependent on manufacturers
>>> rather than their own ingenuity.
>>
>>I'll ask again, what IS the experience in Canada. What "bad" things are
>>happening or not happening?
>
>I don;t know that Canada's B&P are the same as ours. One thing I do know is
>that there are far fewer hams per capita there.
>73 de Jim, N2EY

771. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:20:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111202056.05539.00003606@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 85549

In article <YBXJb.23344$IM3.23102@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Frankly, soldering has never been
>a strong point with me...yet I've been able to do quite well
>technically in my career as well as ham radio. I can "get by"
>but prefer to have others do some of the connector soldering
>chores for me.

That argument can be applied to almost any part of any proposed test.

>
>Additionally, a soldering test, especially a PL-259 would be
>too subjective a determination. Even soldering can't be learned by
>all hams. Would we then have a soldering waiver for blind hams
>or other hams handicapped by some affliction that didn't allow
>them to ever pass a soldering test?

Bob Gunderson, W2JIO, demonstrated that blind people could
do all sorts of radio construction. Blind himself, he devised ways
to do almost every imaginable radio task without sight - including
tasks like soldering and reading meters. And this was before WW2.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

772. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:20:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111202057.05539.00003607@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 85547

In article <48VLb.2904$zj7.1110@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> How much Spanish do you hear on the ham bands being used by US hams?
>>
>
>A lot.

Not nearly as much as you hear Morse code, though...

73 de Jim, N2EY

773. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:20:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111202058.05539.00003608@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 85550

In article <9xULb.1368$q4.1086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040110095609.23307.00005842@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>> btw, we *don't* test all hams for Morse skill now.
>
>Rephrased then... we DO test all hams that have or want a license
>to operate HF for morse skill... but hey, maybe we should
>reinstitute waivers again since the treaty is no longer
>mandating the 5 wpm which the FCC never waivered before.
>
Perhaps!

But by the same token, why not waivers for some of the written tests?
Since it doesn't require any more technical knowledge to operate
on, say, 3.755 than it does on 3.995....

73 de Jim, N2EY

774. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:20:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111202059.05539.00003609@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 85548

In article <b7d1465c.0401090931.49192edf@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401080948.4a286fab@posting.google.com>...
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
>> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
>> > simulation.
>> >
>> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
>> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>>
>> Also Made In USA.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I feel likewise, there's just something about an analog meter.
>
There's a reason for that. In many applications, analog displays are preferred. For example, when adjustment for minimum or maximum is needed, or when a quick glance is all you can spare.

Remember when carmakers started making digital speedometers - and then found drivers didn;t like them because it took longer to get a reading?

Some of us even prefer an analog dial. Hopwever, my favorite mode is digital.

73 de Jim, N2EY

775. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:26:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040111202610.23307.00005895@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85451

In article <btnsr4$her@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Yeah, Larry's waiting for everyone to catch up to his level...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Well, I'm waiting for everyone but you, that is. You couldn't catch up to me
if someone stuck a Saturn V rocket up your bum and lit the fuse!

BTW, which HF digital modes have you been working lately? Your
implication is that you have no need to "catch up" to anyone, so please
tell us about all your recent HF digital operating experiences -- I'm sure
we will all be greatly impressed!

73 de Larry, K3LT
A Real Amateur Radio Operator -- which Kim would not recognize if one
landed right on her punkin' haid

776. Re: W0EX?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:26:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040111202610.23307.00005896@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 85452

In article <b7d1465c.0401101027.7e964438@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>
>Has anybody heard from (or about) Dick, W0EX? I fired off a couple of
>e-mails using the addresses that normally work and they got bounced
>back. Gettin' more than a little concerned here.
>
>Tnx es 73 de Bert
>WA2SI

Bert:

I haven't seen him in the newsgripe lately. BTW, speaking of Dick, I had a very nice long PSK-31 QSO with his old chum Jim Rosenthal, WA4STJ, early this afternoon! It was on 20-meters.

73 de Larry, K3LT

777. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:37:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <btu2d5$476@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85473

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040111202610.23307.00005895@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <btnsr4$her@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Yeah, Larry's waiting for everyone to catch up to his level...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Well, I'm waiting for everyone but you, that is. You couldn't catch up to
me
> if someone stuck a Saturn V rocket up your bum and lit the fuse!
>

Well. You're correct there, for sure. I could no more get down to your
level than I could get to the moon without mind travel.

>
> BTW, which HF digital modes have you been working lately? Your
> implication is that you have no need to "catch up" to anyone, so please
> tell us about all your recent HF digital operating experiences -- I'm sure
> we will all be greatly impressed!
>

Only you could stretch that far.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> A Real Amateur Radio Operator -- which Kim would not recognize if one
> landed right on her punkin' haid
>
>

You are, by no means, a real amateur radio operator. I've got more
potential amateur radio operator in my little finger than you have in all
your years as an amateur radio operator...

Kim W5TIT

778. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 01:39:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3VmMb.3598$q4.1068@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85453

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040111202058.05539.00003608@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <9xULb.1368$q4.1086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040110095609.23307.00005842@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >
> >> btw, we *don't* test all hams for Morse skill now.
> >
> >Rephrased then... we DO test all hams that have or want a license
> >to operate HF for morse skill... but hey, maybe we should
> >reinstitute waivers again since the treaty is no longer
> >mandating the 5 wpm which the FCC never waivered before.
> >
> Perhaps!
>
> But by the same token, why not waivers for some of the written tests?
> Since it doesn't require any more technical knowledge to operate
> on, say, 3.755 than it does on 3.995....

If that's something you want to do, feel free to file the petition.

Cheers :-) :-)

Bill K2UNK

779. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 02:05:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <GhnMb.3611$q4.2874@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85454

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > Negative comments had already
> > been posted by others. I don't kick
> > people when they're already laying
> > on the ground from the blows of
> > others.
>
>
> DWIGHT!? (Grin) Puhleeze don't
> ever think I am "laying on the ground"
> or even feel kicked! LOL!!

Metaphorically speaking, Kim.

> OH--are you going to get all upset
> because I snipped the rest of the
> original exchange below this point?

How dare you. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

780. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 02:12:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LonMb.11283$uF6.3714512@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85455

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:k5cMb.10813$uF6.3553725@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>>At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as
>
> everyone
>
>>>thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...
>>
>>"And that", as Paul Harvey says, "is the rest of the story." Point
>>made well.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Mike, as I replied to Kim's post, I noticed it but chose to stay out of the
> fight that I knew was almost certain to come.

And a good idea that is!

781. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 02:18:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4unMb.11286$uF6.3715663@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85456

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>
> All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
> that..... babble.

Just like all the high and mighty amateurs that seem to think it's a
good idea to follow the rules while on the air.

If ya breaks the usenet rulez, you getz flamed.

Mike KB3EIA -

782. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 03:43:32 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85457

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040111163811.23307.00005889@mb-m29.aol.com:

> In article <627300pd9kdemh3f29g0qt4papsjfabbn7@4ax.com>, "DeLores Lamb,
> KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> writes:
>
>>Dee, you addressed exactly the case I had in mind, a newly licensed
>>Tech, who then passes element 1, and plans to upgrade to General in
>>the future.
>>
> Dee's information is right on the money. Unless the person wants to
> have to take Element 1 again in the future, s/he should plan to upgrade
> to General within 365 days.
>
> Yes, it's odd. An expired Novice license from 1952 is good for Element
> 1 credit but a 366-day-old CSCE isn't. But them's the rules - for now.
>
> 73 es GL de Jim, N2EY
>
>

I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
element 1 is abolished.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

783. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 03:58:46 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946DE9B8472EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85458

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040111085434.11891.00003592@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo
>> <nomail@noway.com> writes:
>>
>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >Reply follows:
>> >
>> >On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>> >
>> >>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
>> >><nomail@noway.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" writes:
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an
>> >>>>>amateur when he chooses not to associate me as an amateur when
>> >>>>>I've made a conscious decision to participate in something he's
>> >>>>>providing for fun.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected
>> >>>>that's your perception, not my intent.
>> >>>
>> >>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse
>> >>>to acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a
>> >>>public forum.
>> >>
>> >>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?
>> >
>> >Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.
>>
>> Who says that anyone has that right? I've been called all kinds of
>> names here, rather than my callsign, and no one has said my rights
>> were violated.
>> >>
>> >>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as well!
>> >>
>> >>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?

>> >
>> >See above.
>> >>
>> >>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own personal
>> >>>morals and prejudices upon others?
>> >>
>> >>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the
>> >>same to me.
>> >>
>> >>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my
>> >>posts?
>> >
>> >Of course not -
>>
>> But that's exactly what is being demanded of me. You're saying that if
>> I write a post and refer to Kim, I *must* use her callsign. You're
>> saying I do *not* have the right to simply refer to her as "Kim".
>>
>> oh wait - I just did....
>>
>
> GASP! Is that sarcasm from you, Jim?! No way!
>
>> >
>> >but that does not confer upon you the right to remove or alter her
>> >personal data without her permission!
>>
>> "personal data"? Everyone here knows she's a ham, and knows her
>> callsign. In all of the 7+ years I've been reading rrap, there's been
>> only one Kim. There have been at least 4 Jims, though.
>> .
>
> (original attributed "period" left above). And, Jim, by the same token
> "everyone here" (a very general statement I might add--coming from you)
> knows you disagree with my callsign and "everyone here" knows that you
> have generally refrained from repeating it in a post. "Everyone here"
> knows that. But "no one there" may know that when the post is
> encountered through a search, casual observation, new folks, whatever.
>
>> > <---- these two attributes inserted to "lock in" the attribution (I
>> > do that all the time, nearly every post)
>> >For the benefit of the amateur hobby, no less....
>>
>> For the exercise of my right of free speech that includes *not* having
>> to write
>>
>> certain things.
>>
>> >>>Did anyone here ask you
>> >>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally

>> >>>offensive? Certainly not.
>> >>
>> >>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone
>> >>else can post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I
>> >>have to repeat it.
>> >
>> >>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't
>> >>it?
>> >
>> >Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
>> >callsign, because you found it "inappropriate".
>>
>> That's right. I did not change the meaning of anyhting anyone wrote.
>> No one who reads this thread will think that Kim is not a ham.
>>
>
> My perception says you *did* change the meaning of something I
> submitted (i.e., wrote). I intend for anyone, *anyone* looking at that
> list to see the same, the *exact same* thing in each and everyone's
> submission. No else had to ask you to include their callsign: you made
> the conscious decision to "just" insert everyone's callsign--*but
> mine.* Therefore, there is an implied "difference" to a casual
> observer. I do not wish my submission to be any different from anyone
> else's, as the difference could mean to be taken as negative or
> positive--and whatever impression it makes is not important to me. I
> don't want there to *be any difference* between my submission, oh: *as
> an amateur radio operator*, as any other amateur radio operator.
>
> If Len Anderson, for example, submitted his prediction of a date that
> CW testing will be removed from the amateur licensing process, a) would
> you insert his submission, b) don't you find his whole general nature
> abhorrent and would you insert his submission anyway and, c) would you
> insert his first and last name, just first name, etc?
>
>> ><--- these attributes inserted
>> >If you aren't
>> >comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
>> >someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice?
>>
>> Because I have no prejudice in the matter. The word "prejudice"
>> derives from "pre-judge", meaning to judge before all the facts are
>> in. That's not the case here - the facts are in.
>>
>
> You cannot, on one hand, state that my callsign is a bad thing for the
> ARS--and you did state that--then, on the other hand, state that you
> have no prejudice. You *do* have prejudice and you demonstrate it
> every time you delete my callsign from a post. I've never (ahem,
> never) noticed if you keep my "signature" to my posts when you are
> replying to them, Jim. Do you? Or is my callsign just as offensive

> then as when I *intend* to include myself as an amateur radio in a list
> you have *generally* invited people to join? You have never stated
> "any offensive callsigns will not be listed." You have never stated,
> "Kim, I will include you in the list if you wish, but I will not
> include your callsign." You've actually never stated anything as to
> why you were refraining from submitting my prediction with my callsign
> *ATTRIBUTED* to it. You deliberately change the intention of my
> message by leaving my callsign out. *You*, Jim, did the *FIRST*
> deleting of attributions and, I might add, you have continued to do it
> for--what--over a year, about a year, somewhere around there.
>
>> ><---these attributes inserted
>> > Wouldn't
>> >that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
>> >with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!
>>
>> There's nothing illegal about it.
>>
>> >>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote
>> >>the original list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or
>> >>even *should* not do the list a certain way, it's *they* who are
>> >>trying to censor *me*.
>> >>
>> >>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included,
>> >>that's their right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote
>> >>something I did not.
>> >
>> >See above.
>>
>> Where?
>>
>> >>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the
>> >>>>>attributes of the original message simply to include my callsign
>> >>>>>in the list.
>>
>> >>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
>> >>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!
>>
>> >>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
>> >
>> >Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
>> >Hers, and yours.
>>
>> I do not see that I have done anything wrong.
>>
>
> Of course not. You probably *don't* have any prejudice where your own
> decsions and actions have been made. But, by my perception, you are
> *JUST AS WRONG* to take away--or leave out--*ATTRIBUTION TO MY
> CALLSIGN* as I am to take away--or leave out--attribution characters in

> an newsgroup post. I daresay, though, your deletion is far more
> offensive than mine. The basis, meaning, and original message and
> intent of that message was in no way harmed or changed when I added my
> callsign to the list. None. Except, perhaps, that it then could have
> looked like you had (God forbid) typed my callsign.
>
> Your deletion--or leaving out, in this case--deliberately makes it look
> like I have no callsign.
>
>> >>>><---these attributes inserted
>> >>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing
>> >>>>the > symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not
>> >>>>write. I chalked that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>>
>> >>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
>> >>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>>
>> >>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was
>> >>their right to do it?
>> >
>> >No - but that isn't the issue here.
>>
>
> I agree. That isn't the issue for me, either. I think the real issue
> is exhibiting a form of respect for another individual who has earned
> the right to have a callsign attributed to her--*WHETHER OR NOT* you
> agree with the callsign. The one thing that Larry Roll has never, ever
> done--to his credit arrrghhhh, yes I said that--is "strip" me of my
> callsign. You have, Jim, and your actions are wrong. They are not
> only wrong, they are meanspirited and, to me, hateful.
>
>> <---this attribute inserted
>> Yes, it is. You are avoiding any criticism of Kim's actions. You're
>> telling me what I *must* or *should* do in my posts, based on *your*
>> personal morals and judgements - and then criticizing me for doing
>> what I think best in my own postings, based on *my* personal morals
>> and judgements.
>>
>> >Your obvious discomfort with her
>> >call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
>> >You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*
>> >consider it improper.
>>
>> Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?
>>
>
> No. You don't. Not in a "general" list you are compiling, where you
> have made no mention of how people will be listed. It was intended by
> me--and was when I first submitted my prediction--that I would be
> listed *just as every other amateur radio operator.* You *do not*,

> Jim--whether you think you do or not--have the right to *disascociated*
> me from my callsign. Period. But, especially in a list where you've
> invited people to join, yet you did not say anyone would be listed in
> any way differently than anyone else.
>
>> <---this attribute inserted
>> Just as she got that callsign, and continues to keep it, even
>> though she knows others consider it inappropriate and that
>> it angers others.
>>
>> She has her right to that callsign, and I have my right not
>> to publicize it here. But you deny my right.
>> <---this attribute inserted
>
> You do not have the right to list me "differently" than any other
> amateur radio operator. You have the right to refrain from having my
> callsign in a post, I could agree on that. But NOT a list.
>
>> >
>> >>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other
>> >>>>>person has a problem with that.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone
>> >>>>respect your desire to have your callsign included? You want
>> >>>>respect that you do not give others.
>> >>>
>> >>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
>> >>
>> >>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of
>> >>my posts. I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".
>> >
>> >Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
>> >aren't you?
>>
>> Nope. I'm editing it out.
>>
>
> Worse. To censor would be to refrain from REPOSTING any submissions
> wherein I had added my prediction. That would have been far more
> respectable. My response would have been to ask you why you were not
> including me; you would have explained, and I would have
> respected--fully--your decision to act on a belief you have in a
> respectable manner. I do not respect your deliberate act to deny me
> listed as an amateur radio operator in a list of other amateur radio
> operators.
>
>>
>> "Censoring" would be if I tried to prevent her from posting it at all.
>> I have not done that, and would not if I could.
>>

>> >Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by her fellow
>> >amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour?
>>
>> I think that not giving her callsign more exposure through my own
>> posts is appropriate behavior.
>>
>
> Then, you would not be able to respond to any of my *OTHER POSTS*, Jim.
> Because each time you respond to a post from and *do not* remove my
> callsign from my original post, then you are "proliferating" my
> callsign--even more so, I might add, than when it would be in this
> thread, probably. This thread has only been this active because of
> this debate that is going on. I haven't checked, but do you deleted my
> callsign from replies to posts from me? You'd be leaving behind my
> name so people would still know someone named Kim has originally
> submitted the post. At any rate, deleting my callsign from a post
> would follow along with your reasoning above; that to do so would
> minimize the exposure to my callsign. And, I daresay, that to
> completely follow along with that reasoning and have it be valid and
> accepted as true and logical reasoning, then you would need to refrain
> from *any* post wherein my callsign is evidenced.
>
>> ><---these attributes inserted
>> >Because you have some bugaboo about the suffix?
>>
>> Because I think it's inappropriate and because I take responsibility
>> for what I post.
>> >
>> >>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as
>> >>"wrong" is really a way of someone imposing their own personal
>> >>morals and prejudices upon me.
>>
>> Ahem...
>> >>
>> >>>That doesn't sound like
>> >>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does
>> >>>not follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
>> >>
>> >>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
>> >>inappropriate for the ARS.
>> >
>> >That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.
>>
>> Says who?
>> <---this attribute inserted
>
> Well, I think Leo just said it. And, I agree.
>
>>
>> FCC is allowing BPL systems to be implemented even though they

>> generate enormous amounts of RF interference. FCC still requires code
>> tests of those who want US HF ham licenses, despite the loss of the
>> treaty requirement 6 months ago. FCC recently declined to penalize
>> anyone when a pop star used the "F-word" on network TV.
>>
>> Does the fact that the FCC does the above mean I have no right to say
>> the FCC is wrong?
>>
>
> You did not say that the FCC is wrong for issuing my callsign. You
> said my callsign is inappropriate for the ARS. It may be (and I
> wholeheartedly disagree with you), but it is not for you--as an
> individual and certainly as an amateur radio operator--to disassociate
> me from ham radio as an amateur radio operator by leaving off my
> callsign from something in which I have *intended* for it to be.
>
>> <---this attribute inserted
>> Is it wrong for me to tell people not to sign up for BPL and cite the
>> problems it has?
>>
>
> No. Not wrong at all. But, it would be wrong of you to delete a
> "name" someone goes by from a list of names in which people might be
> expressing their agreement or disagreement, simply because you disagree
> with the way it sounds or even that it might be risque. It would
> incorrect of you to delete or refuse to attribute their name to them
> for any reason.
>
>> <---this attribute inserted
>> Is it wrong for those who disagree with code tests to try to get the
>> rules changed?
>>
>
> Not at all. And, I'd imagine that those who are so driven, are
> actively involved by contacting the appropriate agencies and
> departments and by active debate to state their cause and purpose.
> However, again, it would be incorrect for someone to keep a name or
> callsign (in this case) from a list in which they intended their name
> or callsign to appear.
>
>> <---this attribute inserted
>> Is it OK for hams to use the F-word on the air because FCC allowed it
>> once on TV?
>>
>
> I could drone on, but hopefully the point has been made.
>
>> >
>> >> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
>> >>sequentially. It

>> >>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to
>> >>extinction" that exceeded 3000 posts.
>> >
>> >But it is her call - issued to her for her use.
>>
>> And she hasn't used it for over a year on the air. Just here.
>>
>
> If I *had* used it regularly, once in a while, or every so often, on
> the air, would that have changed anything here? I think not, so don't
> bother using it. Regardless, it is my callsign and I thought it would
> be listed when I originally submitted my prediction.
>
>> <---this attribute inserted
>> And if Kim wants to use it here, that's her right. But *I* don't have
>> to use it here.
>> >>
>
> Nope. You sure don't. But, it would be nice in the future if you
> caution that any amatuer radio operator, with whose callsign you
> disagree, who submits something with the idea that he/she will be
> listed just as everyone else, *will not* be treated in such a manner.
>
>> >>>>><---these attributes inserted
>> >>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction
>> >>>>>from the list.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Done. No problem.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in
>> >>>>>every way but license class to any other amateur, then I
>> >>>>>deliberately, with no malice, and respectfully abstain from
>> >>>>>regarding *him* at all.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim.
>> >>>>But I do not post your callsign because I think you made an
>> >>>>inappropriate choice.
>> >>>
>> >>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
>> >>
>> >>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain
>> >>callsigns are not appropriate?
>> >
>> >Of course it is.
>> >>
>> >>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?
>> >
>> >Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
>> >callsigns, not just hers.
>>

>> Why?
>>
>
> For the reasons stated by me in this post, for many.
>
>> ><---these attributes inserted
>> >Do you not think that singling her out the way that you did was
>> >disrespectful to her?
>>
>> No.
>>
>
> I do. And, it is my perception that counts--although it's quite
> obvious that others have at least some degree of concern in this area
> as well.
>
>> ><---these attributes inserted
>> >Are you that sanctimonious?
>>
>> No. I'm that honest.
>> >
>> >>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with
>> >>four-letter suffixes, like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.
>> >
>> >Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
>> >old four letter combination?
>>
>> Yes.
>>
>
> I do not.
>
>> ><---these attributes inserted
>> >I'd be surprised!
>>
>> I was surprised that they would issue Kim's call. But they did. Why
>> would you be surprised if they
>> issued four-letter combinations? They allowed that pop star to say a
>> certain word. All kinds of
>> words are permitted here on the 'net - (wire comms are regulated by
>> the FCC too).
>>
>
> Why is my callsign such a shock? Forget any reason that someone might
> request it. I say that becasue, keep in mind that Michael (I think his
> name was) requested and had K2TIT because it was the closest he could
> come to commemorating the Tet Offensive. So, regardless of *why*
> someone might request it, why the shock that the FCC would issue it?
> The mere word "tit" or even the tit itself is not vulgar. Good
> heavens, if you think it is then I am the one who is shocked! The word

> is not intended to be used as a nickname on the amateur bands; Indeed,
> I have sharply offended people who have done that. The full callsign
> is all that is ever responded to, on the air anyway.
>
> And, mainly, and the thing *everyone* always likes to ignore is that,
> yes, the callsign was requested by me on a dare. HOWEVER, it was a
> dare *after* I made the verbal observation that if I were to ever
> request a *VANITY* callsign, it would certainly be associated with
> something of vanity--not simply my initials. As you will recall, the
> most important part of that story--and it is a true one--is that a) I
> had never desired to get a vanity call, b) was mentioning to my fellow
> hams [men] on the air that it was a pity they had no more creativity
> than to simply request their initials and, c) that if I were to request
> a callsign it would be related to my "vanity." Anyone who knew me (and
> the all did) personally knew exactly what I was inferring by that
> comment. Were I as famous as Dolly Parton, it would be for the same
> reason she is--minus that I am a performer (I am not). My unique
> callsign is unique because it is a woman's callsign who knows that
> others perceive first in me, my tits. My intellect, beauty, wit,
> charm, rogue behavior, honesty in dealing with all humas and nature,
> and very, very opinionated nature all come secondary to the fact that,
> on initial gaze, I am a large titted woman. And, my callsign uniquely
> says, "get the hell over it, there's a person here to be reckoned
> with." If anyone does not like the way I *like* and *prefer* to relay
> that message, then tough titties (and they are not).
>
> If anyone else (and here's your argument coming back on ya) *perceives*
> my callsign to be vulgar, that is *their* perception. It is not my
> intention. If anyone else becomes deragotory with my callsign, as
> Larry, Dick, Dave, Waddles/ULX, and others have done in this newsgroup;
> I daresay your problem is with them for they are the ones acting in a
> vulgar nature.
>
>> ><---these attributes inserted
>> >Even the vehicle
>> >license plate guys have a handle on that one.....
>>
>> Those are issued by the states, not the FCC.
>> >>
>> >>>The FCC could have refused to
>> >>>issue the call if they felt that it was inappropriate (just like
>> >>>the motor vehicle vanity plate folks do!). Other countries (VE for
>> >>>one) freely issue this suffix as well!
>> >>
>> >>FCC *does* refuse to issue the suffix sequentially. Look in the
>> >>database, or better yet an old callbook, and you'll see that the
>> >>suffixes immediately before and after are much more common.
>> >
>> >Does not prove the point.
>> >

>> It proves the FCC considers Kim's call to be somewhat different from
>> W5TIS or W5TIU
>>
>
> Or, K2TIT
>
>> >>><---these attributes inserted
>> >>>
>> >>>>But we hams are not "equal in every way but license class". Each
>> >>>>of us is better at some things than others. I'm sure there are
>> >>>>things involving amateur radio that you're better at than me, and
>> >>>>there are probably things involving amateur radio that I'm better
>> >>>>at than you. So we are not equal in every way but license class.
>> >>>
>> >>>Jim, you know that's not the level of equality that Kim was
>> >>>referring to.
>> >>
>> >>No, I do not. I took it the way she expressed it.
>> >
>> >I suspect not - you are obviously much more savvy than that!
>>
>> Is Kim equal to me in technical knowledge of ham radio? In historic
>> knowledge? In HF operating experience? In ability to homebrew
>> equipment? At the risk of blowing my own horn, I'd say no.
>> >>
>> >>>As an licensed amateur, she is entitled to use her FCC-issued
>> >>>vanity callsign, just like you!
>> >>
>> >>Of course! And she does use it here.
>> >>
>> >>But is there some rule that says I *have to* use it here? Do I not
>> >>have the right to refrain from doing so?
>> >
>> >You may, of course, refrain from using it.
>>
>> Gee, thanks. ;-)
>>
>
> But, you do not have the right to deliberately disassociate my callsign
> from me in a situation where I am representing myself as a ham radio
> operator among other ham radio operators with like actions. We are all
> participating in the same poll, "The Pool." We are all submitting our
> ideas, and every amateur radio operator--but me--has had their
> submission listed with association to their callsign.
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >But why do you feel that
>> >you have the right to share your own personal views on why you have
>> >an issue with it with the rest of the group?
>>

>> Because they asked.
>> >
>> >And, do you belive that censorship is appropriate?
>>
>> No - that's why I don't censor anyone.
>>
>
> Sometimes, censorship is quite appropriate. I think censorship of my
> submission would have been more appropriate, and respectful, than to
> add my "name" to the list with a submission of other amateur radio
> operators where their callsigns are listed.
>
>> >>
>> >>>(and, up here,
>> >>
>> >>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)
>> >
>> >...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
>> >call signs!
>>
>> Doesn't mean they are appropropriate.
>>
>> >>Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
>> >>
>> >>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
>> >>>
>> >>Were those calls sequentially issued?
>> >
>> >You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether
>> >they requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.
>>
>> It makes a difference.
>> <---attribute inserted
>
> To *you*, Jim and some others. Not to me, not Leo, not to some others.
> That someone gets, or even requests--doesn't matter--a callsign, it
> behooves you as a fellow amateur to respect that person as an amateur
> radio operator unless and until the licensing agency decides they
> cannot be an amateur radio operator any more. Note I did not say you
> have to respect that person as a person. I have absolutely no respect
> in any way for Larry Roll, Dave Heil, Waddles/ULX, and quite a few
> others actually. In fact I regard them with pure disdain. However,
> they are amateur radio operators and no one outside the FCC as the
> granting authority, can take that away from them. And, as fellow
> amateur radio operators, they deserve my respect. *If* (and that is a
> big if) I ever had to encounter them on the air, I would regard them
> and treat them with the same respect that I have for every other
> amateur radio operator.
>
> Even here in this area, when we had two proven fake Navy SEAL amateurs

> (proven by the organization that investigates that kind of stuff), and
> I was the only one who took them on as idiots, I never disrespected
> them on the air with rude remarks or insulting behavior. They would
> come on the air and call me names, try to scare me, deliberately
> violate nearly every R&R there is regarding transmission, but I never
> did the same to them. I refrained from communicating with them and
> would not respond to their childish, impish behavior. One day, the
> last transmission ever made on the air to either of them, I reminded
> one that the frequency was mine--which is proper operating practice and
> still gives them the *appearance* of respect as an amateur.
>
>> >>
>> >>>>I did not include your callsign in the list because I think that
>> >>>>your choice of callsign (even though it's legal) is inappropriate
>> >>>>to the amateur radio service. You *chose* that callsign, and the
>> >>>>FCC would not have issued it sequentially.
>> >>>
>> >>>Why not?
>> >>
>> >>Because of its obvious meaning. There are several such callsigns.
>> >>FCC will, however, issue them if requested through the vanity
>> >>program.
>> >
>> >Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do
>> >that?
>>
>> -Because they don't care
>> -Because it's handled by computer and nobody really looks at the
>> system -Because they don't want the complaints from those who want
>> such calls -Because FCC is too busy with other matters and has too few
>> resources.
>>
>
> I feel it is becuase there may be a thought in their mind that someone
> might be embarrassed to have a callsign like that--and that is very
> nice of them to carry out issuing the call as one that might cause
> embarrassment to someone. They do care. Even though callsigns are
> issued by computer, it's obvious someone looks at them, because there
> are some set aside, as you say. I think the callsigns like mine are
> simply set aside to be requested, rather than sequentially issued,
> because they may cause embarrassment to someone--or maybe would even
> cause embarrassment to the FCC if someone asked, "why in the world
> would you have given me such a call?"
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >They have total authority over those calls - surely they ccontrol
>> >them better than that?
>>
>> Nope.
>>

>> In case you didn't know, Kim emailed Riley Hollingsworth about it. He
>> replied that while such callsigns were legal, the request and use of
>> such callsigns moves the ARS "one step closer to extinction".
>>
>
> No, his very general statement--in specific reference to activities on
> the air, I might add--about my callsign and other behaviors in the ARS
> (related, as I said, to on the air activities) could move the ARS one
> step closer to extinction. I happen to totally disagree with him.
> There is something about Riley that Larry doesn't understand, by the
> way, Riley offered his comments *as a person* not as an authority of
> the FCC. Big difference. The FCC officially has no remark on my
> callsign other than, when asked, to state that they do not legislate or
> regulate callsigns (something to that affect anyway--it was a long time
> ago that we had communication together).
>
> It's also quite obvious that Riley is wrong. The ARS is still around,
> sitll healthy, and has even *gained* respect of important groups and
> agencies as a viable organization of people ready and capable to serve,
> if called upon to do so. The ARS is just fine and my callsign, nor the
> behaviors of idiots on the air, are moving it closer to extinction.
> There is not even a first step toward extinction of the ARS.
>
>> >>><---attributes inserted
>> >>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
>> >>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC
>> >>>statement to the contrary.
>> >>
>> >>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.
>> >
>> >Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
>> >exempt from sequential issue?
>>
>> Their actions are enough to prove the point.
>> >>
>> >>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
>> >>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
>> >>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
>> >>
>> >>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such
>> >>an opinion?
>> >
>> >Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
>> >views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.
>>
>> You're saying I don't have the right to protest. Just keep quiet, huh?
>>
>
> Why protest in an arena where the protest goes inactionable? Your
> protest to me will have no effect, whatsoever, in having me change my

> callsign. Even your refusal to list my callsign as an amateur radio
> operator with a submission, among other amateur radio operators with a
> submission, will have no positive effect on me changing my callsign.
>
> You should simply stick to the argument that you find my callsign
> inappropriate. That is the strongest (even at its weakest) argument
> you can offer. To try and submit your actions as a demonstrable
> protest falls way short. At least in my opinion.
>
>> >>
>> >>>>The fact that something is legal does not make it appropriate to
>> >>>>do, or in the best interests of all concerned.
>> >>>
>> >>>Jim, please do not put yourself in the position of deciding what is
>> >>>in the best interests of anyone other than yourself - I for one
>> >>>would prefer to make my own determination of what I find acceptable
>> >>>and unacceptable. that role does not belong to you, me or anyone
>> >>>else here!
>> >>
>> >>Any time a person expresses an opinion of what should or should not
>> >>be done by othr people, or what is acceptable or unacceptable, they
>> >>are deciding what is "right" and "wrong" for more than themselves.
>> >>It's an unavoidable consequence of having an opinion. The only other
>> >>option is to never express any opinions at all.
>> >>
>> >>For example, some people say the Morse code test for an amateur
>> >>license should be eliminated. They're saying that their judgement on
>> >>the issue should take precedence over what others think and want.
>> >>They're saying that the FCC's current rules are incorrect and need
>> >>to change.
>> >>
>> >>And many of them say that what is *best* for amateur radio is for
>> >>the code test to go away. Do they have the right to say those
>> >>things, and to try to get their
>> >>will imposed on others, or not? I say they have that right - and
>> >>those who disagree have rights, too.
>>
>> And that's the way it should be. YMMV
>> >>
>> >>>I would suggest that you are way out of line when you impose your
>> >>>own value system to overrule something which is permitted by law.
>> >>
>> >>See above about the tests.
>> >
>> >??
>> >
>> >Sorry, Jim, I fail to see the connection between snubbing Kim
>> >publically and whether Morse testing should be continued. I'll read
>> >this over again a couple of Jack Daniels' from now, and see if it's
>> >clearer then! :)

>> >>
>> >>What you are saying is that I *must* use Kim's callsign here, and I
>> >>*must not* oppose the choice of similar ones, because they are
>> >>permitted by law.
>> >>
>> >>Am I allowed to object to *anything* that is permitted by law?
>> >>
>> >
>> >Of course you are. But, as stated above, do you have the right to
>> >impose your own personal standards upon others? Is it OK to single
>> >out Kim in your list as the only one represented by name only in your
>> >pool, because you are embarassed by her call? No. Of course not.
>> >There are two gentlemanly things that you could do in this situation:
>> >
>> >1. List all of the participants in the pool by name only, creating an
>> >equal playing field and singling out no one.
>> >
>
> Absolutely. I agree. Or, state that any amateur's callsign deemed as
> inappropriate by you will not be listed in your poll.
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >2. End your participation in the pool on moral grounds, and let
>> >someone else pick it up should they so choose.
>>
>> By stating those two as the onlt two options, *you* are trying to
>> impose *your* personal standards on *me*
>>
>> I say there's a third option:
>>
>> 3. Do exactly what I've done, and state the reasons for doing so.
>>
>
> Which falls short of reasonable in any way.
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >It is never right to ostracize another person because you don't like,
>> >or cannot deal, with something about them.
>>
>> I have not ostracized Kim.
>>
>
> You have ostracized me as a valid amateur radio operator by refusing to
> include my callsign with my submission. You have ostracized me by
> treating my submission as an amateur radio operator differently than
> you treated a submission by any other amateur radio operator.
>
> You have participated in ostracization (is that a word?) :)
>
>> ><---attributes inserted

>> >What effect to you think that doing this would have on Kim?
>>
>> Perhaps it will make her reconsider her choice of callsign.
>>
>
> Oh, Jim. Puhleeze! Surely, surely you know way better than that!!!
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >Do you not see that your choice of actions would hurt her feelings?
>>
>> What about *my* feelings?
>>
>
> My feelings are not hurt, by the way. I could actually care less about
> the issue of whether my callsign is on the list or not. However, the
> reason *I* am persuing this as a topic of interest will be revealed at
> the end of this post. <snicker> Not to minimize the input of my
> ideas: I am representing exacly how I think about the issue! I am just
> not hurt at all by the exclusion of my callsign from the list.
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >Say, you weren't striking out at her because she offended you, were
>> >you? Of course not!
>>
>> That's right.
>> >
>> >>>If Kim's
>> >>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
>> >>>entirely.
>> >>
>> >>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
>> >>with her about callsign choice.
>> >
>
> Thank you. And, I don't think you're a bad person, either; nor are you
> my enemy.
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my
>> >friends a heck of a lot better than that!
>>
>> I did not say she was my friend. Kim reserves the term "friend" to a
>> very select few.
>> "Acquaintance" would be more accurate.
>> >>
>
> Exactly. Very few people are those whom I would consider "friends."
> Certainly not someone I only have interaction with over the computer or
> even amateur radio.
>

>> >><---attributes inserted
>> >>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by
>> >>determining how I can post here.
>> >
>> >Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
>> >impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.
>>
>> Not what I'm doing.
>> >>
>> >>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
>> >>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have
>> >>>the killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
>> >>
>> >>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone
>> >>from posting anyhting?
>> >
>
> You have prevented my callsign being associated with other amateur
> radio operators in a list where you treated them differently (by
> listing them with a callsign). You have prevented, by mere omission of
> my callsign, me from being viewed as an amateur radio among other
> amateur radio operators in a list in which such omission could easily
> be taken out of context, I might add.
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
>> >you did!
>>
>> I edited. Not the same thing. Words have exact meanings.
>> >>
>> >>> Intentional deletion of
>> >>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as
>> >>>a reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
>> >>
>> >>I disagree.
>> >
>> >Sorry to hear that!
>> >>
>> >>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS.
>> >>IMHO YMMV
>> >
>> >And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
>> >really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a
>> >problem with.
>>
>> So go ahead and use Kim's call all you want. Just please don't tell me
>> that I have to.
>> >>>
>> >>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
>> >>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called

>> >>>'access covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male
>> >>>bias').
>> >>
>> >>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on
>> >>Usenet as a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I
>> >>*must* post in a certain way. Why?
>> >
>> >Please see the above comments.
>> >>>
>> >>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
>> >>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
>> >>
>> >>[slang word deleted]
>> >
>> >...because you personally have an issue with it! See?
>> >>
>> >>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's not a
>> >>birdwatcher.
>> >
>> >I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but
>> >she just might be!
>>
>> Kim chose that callsign for at least two obvious, prominent reasons:
>>
>> 1) She thought it was fun, and/or funny
>>
>> 2) She knew it would get lots of attention and create all sorts of
>> reactions
>>
>
> Oh, I thought you were going to say that my two, obvious, prominent
> reasons were my tits. Because those were the two obvious, prominent
> reasons =:o
>
>> <---attribute inserted
>> She's told us all that here. Her picture used to be on qrz, too.
>>
>
> Uh, what does a picture of me, driving a car, from the shoulder area
> up, have to do with my tits? Don't tell me you could "tell" by that
> picture that I had big tits! Oh, no! It's worse than I thought! ;)
>
> That'd be about like Larry being able to tell I'm fat (which I'm not)
> just by looking at that picture!
>
>> >>><---attributes inserted
>> >>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
>> >>
>> >>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
>> >

>> >Yes you did!
>>
>> No, I did not.
>>
>> > Kim, I believe....
>> >>>
>> I notice that you use her name and not her callsign too....
>>
>> >>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur
>> >>>radio - as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for
>> >>>example.
>> >>
>> >>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have
>> >>refused to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of
>> >>insulting names -
>
> Then your issue is with them.
>
>> >><---attributes inserted
>> >>and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
>> >>disrespectful.
>> >
>> >And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?
>>
>> There was no problem when others did it. Only when I did. Double
>> standard.
>>
>> >>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
>> >>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
>> >>
>> >>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.
>> >
>
> That's a good "Kim" response! <GRIN>
>
>> ><---attributes inserted
>> >Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!
>>
>> Then why not choose another one?
>> <---attributes inserted
>
> Oh goodness!!! My callsign is so uniquely me how could I ever do that?
>
>> >>
>> >>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
>> >>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call,
>> >>>and you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
>> >>>
>> >>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right
>> >>to force *me* to use it here on Usenet.

>> >>
>
> However, you did not let anyone know, up front when the poll was first
> issued, that any inappropriateness would be looked for and dealt with
> accordingly. I submitted a prediction and do have the right and, feel
> correctly, expectation that my prediction would be listed just like
> every other amateur radio operator's.
>
> My behavior on this newsgroup has always been blunt and honest. You
> could have even publicly said something to me about my callsign not be
> included and, as I would expect from you, asking if I would like not to
> particpate. That would have been so Jim/N2EY that I believe I have come
> to know. But, for some reason, your exhibited nature was not
> forthcoming here, and I don't know why--may not even be anything to it.
> But, I can see you posting a reply to my prediction that you would not
> be including my callsign--and would I like to withdraw.
>
>> >><---attributes inserted
>> >>Or do they?
>> >
>> >Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!
>>
>> But you want to force your values on me.
>> >>
>> >>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
>> >>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone
>> >>*must* include that word or phrase in any replies?
>> >
>> >Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....
>>
>> I do ignore it! That's exactly what I've been doing!
>>
>> Thanks for the validation, Leo!
>> >
>> >Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections for dinner,
>> >and they're my favourite! :)
>> >
>> Yum..But I'm a leg man, myself.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
> Now, for the real reason I decided to engage as I have the last couple
> of weeks. Remember, Jim, how I used to get so insulted when you would
> seem to "lead" someone into a corner they could not get out of? Well,
> this thread, and the lack of your treating my submission as any other
> amateur radio operator's became my path to doing the same thing to you.
> Not out of meanness, mind you, not at all. Out of pure fun.
>
> I feel you do lead, by way of artful argument by the way, people into

> corners they don't think they can get out of. This was my answer to
> that--because I really do feel I waited long enough (practically a
> year), acted often enough (giving you every opportunity to act as I
> would have thought you would act, and participated strictly as a
> submitter (I engaged in no comments until recently, and those only to
> request that you include my submission with my callsign). It is even
> uncharacteristic of me to get involved to this level (being listed
> among the debaters over the CW testing issue) with this topic.
>
> As I said, I would have thought of your nature that you would see my
> submission, and let me know that you would list it but without my
> callsign, and give me the opportunity to withdraw inclusion. Does
> anyone else agree that this would have been something one could
> reasonably have expected from Jim?
>
> Anyway, I feel victorious, but maybe it's just me. As I said, I really
> do have the opinions stated in this response and really do believe you
> should have offered anything but leaving my callsign off the list.
> But, my greater purpose was to leave you with that same, frustrated
> feeling I used to have when you'd box me into a corner I couldn't get
> out of. Maybe you don't feel boxed...but you sure were getting
> defensive and unexpectedly insulted--at least it looked that way to me
> in this post!
>
> Kim W5TIT!!!!!!!
>
>
>

Bingo! Jim is very skilled at debating, but this time he has outsmarted himself.

Alun N3KIP

784. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:00:47 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946DEA16671B6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85459

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in
news:4unMb.11286$uF6.3715663@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> K&#65533;HB wrote:
>
>>
>> All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
>> that..... babble.
>
>
> Just like all the high and mighty amateurs that seem to think it's
> a
> good idea to follow the rules while on the air.
>
> If ya breaks the usenet rulez, you getz flamed.
>
> Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

True, but you can't get your Usenet licence taken away, which is a big
difference

785. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231526.11022.00003426@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85460

In article <f45722ac.0401111332.44b7d96d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.nut> wrote in message
>news:<btq3tq02vce@drn.newsguy.com>...
>
>> Isn't that special, a vanity call for a no code dummy.
>
>Another class A jerk. Not so special. Plenty of 'em in amateur radio.

He might be the cb-plusser that paid Broose to upgrade. :-)

[that makes two like him fer sure... :-)]

WMD

786. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231528.11022.00003427@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85464

In article <eTfMb.25014$P%1.23129928@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:FhdMb.2543$q4.565@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint wrote:
>> >
>> > Since no one is prohibited from doing
>> > public service, no authorization is
>> > needed. (snip)
>>
>>
>> To do the types of public service we're authorized to do (MARS, RACES,
>and
>> so on), authorization is required.
>>
>> Sec. 97.407
>> (a) No station may transmit in RACES
>> unless it is an FCC-licensed primary,
>> club, or military recreation station and
>> it is certified by a civil defense organization
>> as registered with that organization, or it
>> is an FCC-licensed RACES station. (snip)
>>
>> Care to show me where Part 95 authorizes CB'ers to operate a station at
>> all similar to a RACES station? What about a MARS station? What about
>> operations serving government agencies and others? In fact, show me where
>> Part 95 authorizes any activity beyond the recreational use of those
>> frequencies.
>>
>>
>
>That is an authorization to operate on those frequencies and an
>authorization to operate the station not an authorization to do public
>service. There is a difference. And to do MARS or CAP, it is not the FCC
>that authorizes you but other agencies and services. But I repeat that is
>authorization to use the frequencies not authorization to do public service.
>RACES is the same way. You have to be authorized for RACES operation but
>that is not the same as authorizing one to do public service. RACES is a
>very specific organization with very specific goals and tasks.
>
>You do not and never have needed an authorization to do public service.
>Where in the rules does it say that I need the FCC's authorization to do
>communications at a walk-a-thon? Where in the rules does it state that I

>need FCC's authorization to be part of the team that deployed here in the
>Michigan area during the August power blackout? Where in the rules does it
>say that I need the FCC's authorization to join ARES. Nowhere. The list
>could go on and on.
>
>
>> > (snip) It is a recognition of what we
>> > do and the value of what we do. It is
>> > a good and solid justification to use
>> > for the continued existence of amateur
>> > radio. Nothing more.
>>
>>
>> Sadly, far too many in Amateur Radio today have that attitude towards
>> public service.
>
>Most of do follow the personal commitment to participate in public service
>since it is not only a long and time honored tradition but the right thing
>to do. That does not change the fact that there is no mandate to do so.

Right...and folks who ain't got no ham license or morse code
test passings don't do the right thing and are bad citizens.

Hoo hah...

WMD

787. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231529.11022.00003428@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85469

In article <f45722ac.0401110717.1629fe44@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040110153522.01893.00002542@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <T9kLb.697$Pg.151@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote
>> >
>> >> I personally believe that *one of* the valid cases in
>> >> favor of retaining Element 1 is that it requires an individual to
>> >> demonstrate a certain level of self-discipline that is not achieved by
>> >> cramming a published Q&A pool.
>> >
>> >I looked and looked and looked and looked and nowhere in 97.501, 97.503
>nor
>> >anywhere in S25 did I find any regulatory requirement to "demonstrate a
>> >certain level of self-discipline" as part of the qualification procedures.
>> >Is this another of those "test of worthiness" things that occasionally
>> >floats to the surface around rrap?
>> >
>> >Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
>> >something like:
>> >
>> > " A really tough written test would surely separate those
>> > who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..
>> >
>> > " Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
>> > dedication to the service.", or..
>> >
>> > " I think it is effective at minimizing the undesirables.",
>> > or..
>> >
>> > " ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
>> > making it something to work for.", or..
>> > .
>> > "My opinion is that any obstacle you put in the way to any
>> > achievement guarantees that only those with dedication and
>> > strong interest will get there."
>> >
>> >All of the above quotations, gathered from rrap threads, were
>> >made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the best
>> >for the Amateur Radio Service.

>> >
>> >All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in
>> >that they suggest that the examination process is the key to
>> >ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are
>> >"worthy") become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong
>> >kind of people" get filtered out.
>> >
>> >First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a
>> >"graduation" exam.
>> >
>> >Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" might
>> >be hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations
>> >do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other
>> >measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefore it
>> >is not the function of the examination process to determine (even
>> >if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine
>> >if he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should
>> >be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement that
>> >the examination process screens out applicants who lack
>> >"commitment".
>> >
>> >Don't get me wrong here, folks. I believe that the examination
>> >process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge
>> >and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash
>> >the bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the
>> >spectrum. I am not even suggesting that Morse testing is a
>> >"good thing" or a "poor idea". But I have no expectation that
>> >ANY examination can filter out "unworthy" applicants who lack
>> >the proper dedication or motivation.
>>
>> Sounds eminently reasonable to me...
>>
>>
>> >Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of "worthy"?
>>
>> Heh heh heh heh...EVERY self-righteous person who insists
>> that all MUST do as they did...:-) :-) :-) :-)
>>
>> The regulars in here already have done that...
>>
>> LHA
>
>EVERY one of them (the self-righteous), to a man have done so.

Well, at least there's "consistency" there.

A consistency of thick mud.

WMD

788. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231530.11022.00003429@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85465

In article <7ldMb.24959$P%1.23049684@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:d%cMb.2521$q4.1067@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> >
>> > (snip) Even sense 3 would be a
>> > requirement as when one is given an
>> > assignment, you are supposed to
>> > carry that assigment. It is not just a
>> > suggestion or desireable activity. If
>> > a person or group does not carry
>> > through on an assignment, then that
>> > assignment is given to a group who
>> > will.
>>
>>
>> Dee, I've repeatedly explained to you what was meant by the word
>mandate.
>> Nothing is required or mandatory in the context used. Likewise, without a
>> stated obligation, there is nothing required or mandatory in giving an
>> assignment or task to someone (or in giving authorization to someone). If
>> you still cannot understand this, I suggest you look carefully at the
>words
>> "mandate," "assigns," "authorization," and so on, including the synonyms.
>I
>> have nothing more to say on the matter.
>>
>>
>> > I repeat, Part 97 does NOT mandate
>> > in any way shape or form that amateurs
>> > participate in public service.
>>
>>
>> Sorry, but public service is at the very heart of the basic and purpose
>of
>> the Amateur Radio Service (as described in 97.1). And, while there is
>> nothing mandatory about it, the mandate (authorization) to do so still
>> remains. Likewise, I have nothing more to say on this matter.
>>
>
>Again nothing in Part 97 gives amateurs a mandate in any sense of the
>meaning of the word. It does NOT in any section of Part 97 authorize us to

>do or assign us to do public service. So you remain wrong. I've just
>finished reviewing Part 97 and it's not there. In 97.1 it is "recognition
>and enhancement of the value..". That is not a mandate, that is not
>authorization, that is not an assignment. It is a way of justifying
>allowing us to continue to have the frequencies and privileges that we enjoy
>but that is not a mandate.

We will all laminate your words and keep them in our wallets...
especially for the next morseperson demanding that morse
code testing be kept for similar reasons... :-)

WMD

789. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231531.11022.00003430@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85461

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401110224.675a93d1@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>LHA
>You are a bitter little person and do not play well with others.

Stebe, quit trying to be somebody else. :-)

...and quit stealing phrases, sweetums, you get negative points
for plagiarism.

>Perhaps you need something of a higher level in you life.

"Higher level?" Heck and darn, the NOISE level in here is already
too high!

>Try Jesus instead of all of this negative stuff.

Sounds good but I already did that a long time ago.

This morning I eliminated the middleman and talked directly to
God. God must have been rather busy but his answering
machine worked...I got this wonderful posting from an anonymous
twit to liven my day! :-)

>So much energy needs to be
>focused on getting you to Heaven instead of bothering these nice people.

You flip out or get some bad yellow?

"Nice people?!?" HAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!!!!!

Get some help sweetums. Get a name while you're at it...

WMD

>JEP

790. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231532.11022.00003431@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85463

In article <xz2Mb.24520$P%1.22823404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
>news:rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com...
>> My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
>> passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
>> privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
>> days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.
>>
>
>Your Novice privileges are good forever so long as you do not let your
>license lapse.

Not quite. There will NOT being any renewals of a Novice. Or of
an Advanced class license. NOT after 2010.

As the restructured amateur radio regulations of 2000 are
concerned, the "forever" is going to be over in just about 6 years.

Sic transit gloria mundi.

WMD

791. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231533.11022.00003432@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85467

In article <POhMb.49180$nH5.32250@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Len,
>
>Jim's point was well made.

No, it was not.

>You appear to simply be trying to revive the code/no code arguement.

"Revive?!?"

Who said it "died?!?"

Destroying the code test requirement is a never-ending battle.

>My belief is that if the FCC enforcement bureau had
>not largely been disassembled, we wouldn't have the problems we do now.

?

Since WHEN was the FCC enforcement "stopped?"

FCC was very busy ENFORCING US civil radio ever since the end
of WW2. It's in the Reading Room at the FCC building if you care
to research it.

Your complaint should be rewritten to say the FCC "did not enforce
amateur radio ENOUGH"...to satisfy the purists and the prissy
olde-tymers who wanted to keep the standards and practices of the
1930s alive and well.

>If
>we were to dismantle the police department of NYC and the murder rate shot
>through the roof, would you blame the drivers who insist everyone should
>stop for a red light?

When in heck did the laws of New York City come under amateur radio
regulations?!?!?

You got a problem with NYC law, you take it to the NYC DA, okay?

>You are seeing the same situation everywhere in society today.

Yeah...all those prim, proper, pejoartive-pushing anti-sex-term
purists babbling like eco-destroyed brooks about callsigns!

Ptui.

>Nothing
>wrong with selling drugs to make some money, except, of course, for the
>stupid drug laws.

You had a bad toke or something?

This is NOT about "drugs" or "drug laws," Jim, nor is it about prim,
prissy, puritans forbidding sexist terms in callsigns. Geez!

>'Cmon, now, you can do better that that!

When someone PAYS me for my words, you can damn well assume
the words WILL be better.

You sure as hell need to think some more about what YOU said.

WMD

792. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231534.11022.00003433@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85462

In article <20040111131317.07961.00001342@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <XteMb.4599$zj7.1219@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>> Of course! But if you wait too long, the opportunity may be lost. ......
>>> If you wait too long, FCC could move on to the NPRM process
>>> before you ever get the petition sent in.
>>
>>Did I miss something?
>
>No, but I did. Thank you for clearing up your thinking on your
>method of presenting your proposal, Hans.
>
>>Is this the last NPRM that FCC will issue in Amateur
>>Radio matters?
>
>Of course not! But once FCC does so (probably some months after ARRL does its
>proposal), it will be a while before they want to reopen that can of worms
>again.
>
>Of course I could be mistaken on that. I thought that FCC would simply dump
>Element 1 via Memorandum Report and Order soon after S25.5 changed. At most I
>thought there'd be a quickie NPRM. But instead it looks like we're in for a
>long ride.

So, as the "insider" you don't consider consideration of the "ARS
Community" to be important?

Just on the petition comments alone, FCC has nearly twice the
documents that 98-143 had already and NO NPRM has yet been
issued.

If and when an NPRM on code-testing appears, the commentary
received is going to be gigantic in my estimation. It will make the
four-year-old-plus comments on 98-143 seem paltry in comparison.

>>The current salad bowl of 14 (15?) petitions is primarily concerned with
>>Morse testing for HF access. I've already commented on that matter.
>
>So did I.

There are 4,661 documents on the 14 petitions. What is your
percentage of the total?

>Perhaps my preference for doing a job once rather than nickel-and-diming it to
>death is showing in that I think a more comprehensive approach (like your
>proposal) is better. But that's just me - and it's *your* proposal anyway.

Perhaps you don't care to spend the time and effort to reply/comment
on all 14 petitions?

Did the FCC "lose" some of your comments? I don't see 14 comments
under your name. [it's all public, you know, no "google" needed...]

>My main concern is that if you wait until the Morse Code test issue noise dies
>down, it may be a long wait *and* there may be an addy-tood of "oh no, we're
>not going to reopen THAT can of worms again". Meanwhile, really bad proposals
>like the "21st Century" ideas may take the stage, or even be enacted. As much
>as I disagree with some parts of your proposal, it is infinitely preferable
>to the "21st Century" concepts.

Hiram forbid EVER taking the US amateur radio service "into the
21st century!"

Morse code uber alles! Marsch, marsch, marsch...

WMD

793. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231535.11022.00003434@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85466

In article <f45722ac.0401110658.4b8282e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040110153508.01893.00002534@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040108215302.12631.00004065@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <BMfKb.21595$lo3.3754@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> ><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>> >
>> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>> >>
>> >>> That way, no one who was
>> >>> interested would be forced off the air, but at the same time there
>would
>> be
>> >>> incentive to get a full-privs renewable license.
>> >>
>> >>If, after 10 years as a learner and exposed to mainstream ham radio they
>> >>can't qualify for a standard license, then another 10 years isn't likely
>to
>> >>be sufficient to become qualified.
>> >
>> >That may well be the case, Hans. And since some Morse Code skill is
>> >obviously part of being a qualified full-privileges radio amateur, it
>makes
>> >sense that the standard license would include a Morse Code test.
>>
>> Sorry but that makes NO sense.
>>
>> FCC does NOT require any licensed radio amateur to use morse
>> code modes over and above any other allocated mode. Ergo, there
>> is no allocation requirement to satisfy.
>>
>> Further, it makes NO sense that morse code skill "qualifies" any
>> radio amateur for "full privileges" on HF/MF bands. That is an
>> artificiality lobbied (successfully) for by olde-tyme morsemen.
>
>True. The two CW/Morse Code only segments in the ARS priveleges are
>in the entry level, No Code Tech portions of the ARS.

Actually those sub-bands are open to nearly all classes. Problem is,
"real hams" only work DX on HF with CW. :-)

>> If US amateur radio service were named "Artificial Radiotelegraph
>> Service," then it would make sense.
>>
>> beep, beep
>>
>> LHA
>
>Ah sure hope we think the next restructuring through, and have it make
>sense.

I dunno. The "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service" name change would
be appropriate. It's the last US radio service to require absolute CW
testing for entry into the sacred halls of hiram. Tradition. Honor.
All in line with The Service and that sort of pomp.

I can just imagine the front yard at Newington at sunset. All the
"servicemen" assemble in ranks...the League flag is lowered slowly...
W1AW fires up and plays the Retreat tatoo over the public address.
All salute the gold-plated J-38 on its marble pedastel.

Snif. All that emotion.

WMD

794. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 04:15:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040111231537.11022.00003435@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85468

In article <bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040111085434.11891.00003592@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >Reply follows:
>> >
>> >On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>> >
>> >>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
>> ><nomail@noway.com>
>> >>writes:
>> >>
>> >>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>> >>>>writes:

<snip>

>If Len Anderson, for example, submitted his prediction of a date that CW
>testing will be removed from the amateur licensing process, a) would you
>insert his submission, b) don't you find his whole general nature abhorrent
>and would you insert his submission anyway and, c) would you insert his
>first and last name, just first name, etc?

Actually, none of the above. :-)

Had I made any prediction (I didn't), such would be swallowed up
by a great deal of supurfluous, gratuitous misdirection by at
least two others. One would be a lot of pejorative perforations of
his own ulcer by the resident gunny-sack sergeant. The other
would be Herr Robust scowling squintily through his monocle and
babbling about "interest" and "no experience." :-)

The Amateur Formerly Known As Reverend Jim would have gone off
on a tangent, hyperbole at the ready, and consigning me to the
"in error" category somehow. It would stuff his sinusoids to his
adenoids.

>You cannot, on one hand, state that my callsign is a bad thing for the
>ARS--and you did state that--then, on the other hand, state that you have no
>prejudice. You *do* have prejudice and you demonstrate it every time you
>delete my callsign from a post. I've never (ahem, never) noticed if you
>keep my "signature" to my posts when you are replying to them, Jim. Do you?

Note: The Amateur Formerly Known As Reverend Jim sometimes
OMITS a "signature" on his own postings! [as Google is my witness
that is true!] Why a "signature" is needed on an all-typed-in post
is a mystery to me...the message header has all the information
already. :-)

Kim, as far as I'm concerned and as far as the LAW is concerned,
if you have a valid US amateur radio license with a specific callsign,
that's all that matters.

But, there's all these prissy, pompous hypocrites in here, all claiming
the Last Word and trying to act like a raddio version of Judge Roy
Bean.

The Amateur Formerly Known As Reverend Jim will never apologize.
He OWNS this newsgroup by squatter's rights. That alone gives
him some kind of immaculate right...right as in righteousness.

<more snipping...>

>> Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?
>
>No. You don't. Not in a "general" list you are compiling, where you have
>made no mention of how people will be listed. It was intended by me--and
>was when I first submitted my prediction--that I would be listed *just as
>every other amateur radio operator.* You *do not*, Jim--whether you think
>you do or not--have the right to *disascociated* me from my callsign.
>Period. But, especially in a list where you've invited people to join, yet
>you did not say anyone would be listed in any way differently than anyone
>else.

He feels an eminent right to do whatever. Noblesse oblige or something
like that...the "divine right of kings." :-)

>You did not say that the FCC is wrong for issuing my callsign. You said my
>callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.

He KNOWS what is "right." He IS the ARS. :-)

>Not at all. And, I'd imagine that those who are so driven, are actively
>involved by contacting the appropriate agencies and departments and by
>active debate to state their cause and purpose. However, again, it would be
>incorrect for someone to keep a name or callsign (in this case) from a list
>in which they intended their name or callsign to appear.

They are "driven" by a terrible need to Win A Newsgroup Argument!

Nothing else matters. All who do not agree with them are "faulty,"
"in error," etc., etc.

<snip>

>If anyone else (and here's your argument coming back on ya) *perceives* my
>callsign to be vulgar, that is *their* perception. It is not my intention.
>If anyone else becomes deragotory with my callsign, as Larry, Dick, Dave,
>Waddles/ULX, and others have done in this newsgroup; I daresay your problem
>is with them for they are the ones acting in a vulgar nature.

They are:
1. In the right because they are olde-tyme morsemen.
2. They are misogynists and haven't gotten laid recently.
3. They can't "lose face" by admitting defeat in a newsgroup argument.
4. All of the above.

Good grief, all of the wordy postings by a lot of posturing righteous
ones on this whole subject!

Kim, the FCC authorized your license and your callsign. Nobody
"authorized" these prissy pompous pejorative-tossing hosers
anything they said. But, they won't quit trying to make fun of you.
Mighty Macho Morsemen won't quit until the last code key is
torn from their cold, dead fingers.

WMD

795. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 11:04:53 UTC
From: Keith Hosman <log-remove-nospam-dshr@remove.bnnorth.nospam.net>
Message-ID: <smv4005jedvd46kk0o10onesbeubt9ndkq@4ax.com>
Source record: 85470

On 01 Jan 2004 08:56:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their
>>access to the airwaves after WW1.
>
>Could have very well happened, if not for the ARRL. Or, amateur radio could
>have been legislated out of existence at one of the radio conferences in the
>early 1920s. But fortunately it didn't happen.
>>
>> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
>>with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>
>Whoa there! How could that happen?
>
>And if it somehow did, what spectrum, power and modes would be allowed? What
>services would give up spectrum?
>
>> What should the testing regimen be?
>
>Depends entire on what the "new" service in this alternate-history line is
>like, don;t you think?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yeah but, following this new "history" of amateur radio, technology as
we know it today might not be the same. There might be no other
"services" to give up spectrum, seeing as how amateur radio has
pioneered much of the technology that people these days take for
granted.

73 de Keith
--
KC8TCQ
ARRL Member - ARES
SKYWARN

796. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 11:24:25 UTC
From: notveryfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112062425.14191.00003107@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85471

>Subject: Re: How long is element 1 good for
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/11/04 11:15 PM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040111231532.11022.00003431@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>In article <xz2Mb.24520$P%1.22823404@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>"DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE" <2awesome@cox.net> wrote in message
>>news:rlc100hvn2e089rnvq38nqkgkls5io10t6@4ax.com...
>>> My question is, if you have elements 1 and 2, even after a year has
>>> passed after taking element 1, do you still have the "novice" HF
>>> privileges of the Tech +HF, or do you have to take element 1 every 365
>>> days to keep the privilege, even if you don't upgrade to General.
>>>
>>
>>Your Novice privileges are good forever so long as you do not let your
>>license lapse.
>
> Not quite. There will NOT being any renewals of a Novice. Or of
> an Advanced class license. NOT after 2010.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk.

Len, you are
completely mistaken.
>
> As the restructured amateur radio regulations of 2000 are
> concerned, the "forever" is going to be over in just about 6 years.

How do you know that,
Len? Do you have a
crystal ball that tells
you how the Federal
Communications
Commission will
change the rules in the
future? Because the
current rules do not
support anything you
wrote.

Here are the facts:

1) The Federal
Communications

Commission has
continued to
renew Novice
licenses as Novice
right through the
rules changes of
2000. There are
currently no pending
plans for that to change.

2) The same is true for
Advanced class
licenses being
renewed as Advanced.

3) Novice licenses, current
or expired, convey
Element 1 credit for the
person who earned them.

Len, it appears that you have become
so desperate for attention in this newsgroup
that you will stoop to posting inaccurate,
false and mistaken information just to see
if anyone is still reading your ramblings here.

Poor, poor, misguided baby Len.

The answer is that there are a few who still
read your posts. Many others have killfiled
you because of your behavior.

Most of the time we simply ignore you, Len,
because you're simply not worth our time
or energy. Our reaction to you has moved
from interest, to anger, to disgust, to sadness
and finally to indifference.

I have only bothered to post this reply
because someone might mistakenly
think you know what you are talking
about. You do not know what you are
talking about, and your information
is worthless.

You may claim you were merely making
a prediction, but there is no indication
of that in your post.

Now you can get all upset and SHOUT some
expletives at me. You can rail and fuss and
fume over my being anonymous. You can
clame that your posting was merely "a trap"

and your poor grammar as some sort of
"Proof". You can repeat your mistaken,
incorrect, misleading, false information and
otherwise carry on in typical immature,
spoiled-brat Leonard Anderson fashion.

And even more people will ignore you.

But for the record: You are mistaken.

>
> Sic transit gloria mundi.
>
> WMD

You may call yourself "WMD" but all
you have destroyed is the respect
anyone here ever had for you.

P.S. Don't bother trying to find me. For I am already gone.

797. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 11:26:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3wvMb.4880$i4.1490@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85472

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > To do the types of public service
> > we're authorized to do (MARS,
> > RACES, and so on), authorization
> > is required.
> >
> > Sec. 97.407 (snip)
>
>
> That is an authorization to operate
> on those frequencies and an
> authorization to operate the station
> not an authorization to do public
> service. (snip)

"That is authorization to operate on those frequencies" to do what, Dee? The only answer is "public service" in this context. When it comes to Amateur Radio, we perform our public service using the Amateur Radio frequencies. And the FCC is the governing agency that says what is authorized on those frequencies (not everything is - your license is not a blank check to do what you want with the Amateur frequencies). For example, when it comes to the walk-a-thon you mentioned, the FCC has set rules on what is and isn't authorized in that situation. The same with your power blackout situation. And the same with ARES. In other words, you are only allowed to use your radio in situations authorized, and in the manner authorized. One situation authorized is public service.

> (snip) That does not change the fact
> that there is no mandate to do so.

Again, the words mandate and authorization are synonymous.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

798. len over 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 13:35:16 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401120535.3aaa6a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85474

What is your name anyway? LHA? WMD? Richard Cranium? You do have a problem. TROLL in the largest sense of the word. I do know you at least have a high school education. My, my, how many 50 cent words can you string together. I guess your education will not permit you to pass a morse test. Too much stuffed in there. Gotta be a no-code TECH or possibly a Conditional class from the 50's.

799. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 14:08:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112090857.12189.00003220@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 85475

> I've got more
>potential amateur radio operator in my little finger than you have in all
>your years as an amateur radio operator...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Spoken like a TRUE CBer

800. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 15:38:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2czMb.5627$1e.701@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85476

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

>
> Again, the words mandate and authorization are synonymous.
>

Not in any dictionary I can find, nor in Roget's.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Reality doesn't care what you believe.

801. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 16:04:49 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BAzMb.5641$1e.1232@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85477

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> I thought I was seeing Hans with something other
> than a gorilla thumping message.

I never thump my gorilla. My dad said I'd go blind if I did.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

802. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 17:04:43 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401121708540.2232@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85478

On Sat, 10 Jan 2004, DeLores Lamb, KD7ZAE wrote:
> Someone is telling me if you pass the 5wpm code test today (element 1)
> along with element 2 (or even separately), that the element 1 portion
> is only good for 365 days. I have tried to read part 97 but it is
> confusing. It used to be that you always kept credit for any element
> taken. So in 3 years if you wanted to upgrade to General, your
> element 1 and 2 would be good. What's the story?

For upgrade purposes, 365 days, just like any other element credit on a CSCE.

For operational purposes, forever (until the next rules change or you lose the document and have no proof of ever having passed code).

803. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 17:15:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401120915.3f82a9af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85479

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<e0q200t2lf43asf4ojn6t3qihahbl43ums@4ax.com>...
> Jim,
>
> Personally, I feel that it is indeed unfortunate that you do not see,
> or will not admit to, your disrespectful treatment of Kim,

[callsign deleted]

Your opinion noted, Leo. However, after much consideration, I do not
consider my omission of Kim's callsign to be disrespectful. YMMV.

> Your statements in defense of your conduct are based entirely upon
> circular logic, rationalization, contradiction and denial - indicating
> that you are not prepared to accept responsibility for your actions
> towards a fellow ham here on the group.

Basically what you are saying is that I should accept Kim's callsign
as appropriate for the ARS, and use it here, because:

1) FCC issued it
2) She asked me to
3) *You* don't 'have a problem' with the callsign, and therefore *I*
shouldn't, either.

As I have stated before, no disrespect was intended. But I am not
going to use Kim's callsign in my posts, because I think it is
inappropriate for the IRS.

You can use it in your posts all you want. So can Kim. I won't try to
impose my standards on others, even though they try to impose their
standards on me.

[Kim a licensed radio amateur]

> told you straight up that she felt disrespected by your actions.

I have felt disrespected by her action in choosing that callsign.
I told her that straight up a long time ago.

> A simple apology to her would have been appropriate.

I apologize if my posts have upset anyone. That was not the intent.
But I will not compromise my standards on this to avoid hurting
someone's feelings.

> The right thing to do.

In your opinion. Mine's different.
>
> Jim, you have been a frequent victim of attack and insult here
> yourself - frankly, you should know better.

Where is the insult in not using a word or phrase I think is
inappropriate?
>
> Insulting a fellow amateur publically, then denying and justifying the
> act with a litany of self-serving rhetoric.

I don't see it that way at all.

> Do you believe that these
> actions, your actions, are in the best interest of the Amateur
> service?

Yes. You may disagree, but I will not describe that disagreement
as "prejudice", "censorship" or "self-serving rhetoric".

> I suspect that few here join you in that belief.

Doesn't matter. Your quote below is quite appropriate. At times, Dr. King
held standards and beliefs that were not popular. His adherence to those
standards and beliefs was considered "insulting" by some. Should he have
listened to them, or followed his conscience?
>
> "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of
> comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and
> controversy."

Rev. Dr.

> Martin Luther King, Jr.

And at this 'time of challenge and controversy', I say that Kim's
callsign is inappropriate to the ARS, and I will not repeat it
in my posts. No insult is meant by this action. But it will not
change.

I don't use the term "friend" to describe Kim, because she reserves
that word for a very select group, and I respect that choice of hers.

But I will say that one of the characteristics of a true friend is
telling the truth as the true friend sees it, even if it is not
what someone wants to hear, and even if a person may get their
feelings hurt or feel insulted by that truth.

73 de Jim, N2EY

804. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 17:24:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401121717160.2232@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85480

On Fri, 9 Jan 2004, Robert Casey wrote:
> >btw, you might want to look up the origin of the word "Easter"...
>
> And what connection the resurection of Jesus Christ has with rabbits hiding
> colored chicken eggs has.
>
> And why no holiday for "Wester", "Norther", and "Souther" :-)
>
> And why kids get dressed up in costumes and ask neighbors for candy on
> Halloween. A Chinese friend once asked me about that, all I could say
> was that it was an ancient tradition that nobody knows where it came from
> or why it was done.

That I can answer - in part: All Hallows Day (November 1) is "The Day of the Dead" and may also have represented the end of the fall harvest. The dressing up as "evil" things (zombies, ghouls, then later, witches/warlocks and such) sources from that. How it became corrupted to permit anyone to dress up as ANYTHING like aliens, Superman, Princess Leia, etc., I cannot be certain of but is most like the result of corporate greed, advertising, and the fact that "costume party" (at least for adults) is what people really remember.

> Santa Claus actually has a religious tie in with Christmas. Santa is a
> modified version of St Nick, who, a few hundred years ago somewheres
> in Europe, would give the kids in his town small gifts to celebrate the
> birth of Christ.

There's a little more to this. Saint Niclaus was also the patron saint of children. It wasn't so much the time of year but the act of giving toys that was connected to him. Since children didn't have organized school then, giving them something to do during the winter when they couldn't play outside due to the weather (snow) led to toys at the beginning of winter - and guess what time of year that was. I don't believe that the tie-in to the birth of Christ was foremost but more coincidental.

> Up next: Q sign for Martin Luther King day: QMK

I think the most appropriate sign for this group is QFU. It is certainly screwed.

805. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 18:02:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401121002.3c510145@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85481

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040111085434.11891.00003592@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > In article <mks000lb33tk22b3go8fq33f6ts7t3ei28@4ax.com>, Leo
> <nomail@noway.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Jim,
> > >
> > >Reply follows:
> > >
> > >On 10 Jan 2004 20:56:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> > >
> > >>In article <ue5000hjhpnshhmhb103bj9i4p9jo65jc3@4ax.com>, Leo
> <nomail@noway.com>
> > >>writes:
> > >>
> > >>>On 10 Jan 2004 13:38:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>>In article <btnso9$kt7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > >>>>writes:
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur
> > >>>>>when he
> > >>>>>chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
> > >>>>>decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>There was no disrespect intended, Kim. If you feel disrespected that's
> > >>>>your
> > >>>>perception, not my intent.
> > >>>
> > >>>But Jim, it is disrespectful to intentionally and repeatedly refuse to
> > >>>acknowledge the rights of another person - especially in a public
> > >>>forum.
> > >>
> > >>I agree! What rights were not acknowledged by me?
> > >
> > >Obvious - her right to be recognized by her legally-issued callsign.
> >
> > Who says that anyone has that right? I've been called all kinds of
> > names here, rather than my callsign, and no one has said my
> > rights were violated.
> > >>
> > >>>That is not just her perception - it's pretty clear to me as

> > >>>well!
> > >>
> > >>I ask again: What rights were not acknowledged by me?
> > >
> > >See above.
> > >>
> > >>>Do you believe that you have the right to impose your own
> > >>>personal morals and prejudices upon others?
> > >>
> > >>Not to any extent beyond that which others have the right to do the same
> > >>to me.
> > >>
> > >>Do others have the "right" to demand that I use certain words in my
> > >>posts?
> > >
> > >Of course not -
> >
> > But that's exactly what is being demanded of me. You're saying that if I
> > write
> > a post and refer to Kim, I *must* use her callsign. You're saying I do
> > *not* have the right to simply refer to her as "Kim".
> >
> > oh wait - I just did....
>
> GASP! Is that sarcasm from you, Jim?! No way!

No sarcasm at all, Kim. Satire and a bit of irony. I
knew you would pick up on that, btw.

> > >but that does not confer upon you the right to remove
> > >or alter her personal data without her permission!
> >
> > "personal data"? Everyone here knows she's a ham, and knows her callsign.
> > In all of the 7+ years I've been reading rrap, there's been only one Kim.
> > There have been at least 4 Jims, though.
>
> (original attributed "period" left above). And, Jim, by the same token
> "everyone here" (a very general statement I might add--coming from you)
> knows you disagree with my callsign and "everyone here" knows that you have
> generally refrained from repeating it in a post. "Everyone here" knows
> that. But "no one there" may know that when the post is encountered through
> a search, casual observation, new folks, whatever.

Then they will quickly discern that from reading one or two posts in
this
thread...
>
> > > <---- these two attributes inserted to "lock in" the attribution (I do
> that all the time, nearly every post)
> > >For the benefit of the amateur hobby, no less....
> >

> > For the exercise of my right of free speech that includes *not* having to
> > write certain things.
> >
> > >>>Did anyone here ask you
> > >>>to go ahead and censor anything which you found to be personally
> > >>>offensive? Certainly not.
> > >>
> > >>I can't "censor" anyone on Usenet except myself. Kim, you or anyone else
> > >>can
> > >>post whatever their ISPs will allow. That does not mean I have to repeat
> > >>it.
>
> > >>What I did is called editing. It's my right to edit replies, isn't it?
> > >
> > >Depends upon the intent, I suppose. You intentionally edited out her
> > >callsign, because you found it "inappropriate".
> >
> > That's right. I did not change the meaning of anyhting anyone wrote. No
> > one who reads this thread will think that Kim is not a ham.
> >
>
> My perception says you *did* change the meaning of something I submitted
> (i.e., wrote).

Well, it's *my* perception that counts...(where did I read that?)

> I intend for anyone, *anyone* looking at that list to see
> the same, the *exact same* thing in each and everyone's submission. No else
> had to ask you to include their callsign: you made the conscious decision to
> "just" insert everyone's callsign--*but mine.* Therefore, there is an
> implied "difference" to a casual observer. I do not wish my submission to
> be any different from anyone else's, as the difference could mean to be
> taken as negative or positive--and whatever impression it makes is not
> important to me. I don't want there to *be any difference* between my
> submission, oh: *as an amateur radio operator*, as any other amateur radio
> operator.

Then change your callsign to something appropriate to the ARS, Kim.
>
> If Len Anderson, for example, submitted his prediction of a date that CW
> testing will be removed from the amateur licensing process,

Who is Len Anderson? ;-)

Why should I care ;-) ;-)

> a) would you insert his submission,

Maybe. Maybe not.

> b) don't you find his whole general nature abhorrent

Yes. His behavior is very inappropriate - even to Usenet.

> and would you insert his submission anyway

Maybe. Maybe not.

> and, c) would you insert his
> first and last name, just first name, etc?

Depends. He has used so many different screen names and signatures...
>
> > ><--- these attributes inserted
> > >If you aren't
> > >comfortable with her callsign, why would you not pass the pool on to
> > >someone who would be willing to handle it without prejudice?
> >
> > Because I have no prejudice in the matter. The word "prejudice"
> > derives from "pre-judge", meaning to judge before all the facts are
> > in. That's not the case here - the facts are in.
>
> You cannot, on one hand, state that my callsign is a bad thing for the
> ARS--and you did state that

I said it was "inappropriate".

That's my opinion. YMMV.

>--then, on the other hand, state that you have no
> prejudice.

Your choice of callsign is inappropriate and I have no
prejudice in the matter.

See? I just did what you said I cannot do.

> You *do* have prejudice and you demonstrate it every time you
> delete my callsign from a post.

Not prejudice. Standards that you disagree with. Calling my
standards prejudices is inaccurate.

> I've never (ahem, never) noticed if you
> keep my "signature" to my posts when you are replying to them, Jim. Do you?

Look and see.

> Or is my callsign just as offensive then as when I *intend* to include
> myself as an amateur radio in a list you have *generally* invited people to
> join?

Look and see.

> You have never stated "any offensive callsigns will not be listed."

I've never seen any reason to state that.

> You have never stated, "Kim, I will include you in the list if you wish, but
> I will not include your callsign." You've actually never stated anything as
> to why you were refraining from submitting my prediction with my callsign

> *ATTRIBUTED* to it.

Word games, Kim. You can do better than that.

> You deliberately change the intention of my message by
> leaving my callsign out. *You*, Jim, did the *FIRST* deleting of
> attributions and, I might add, you have continued to do it for--what--over a
> year, about a year, somewhere around there.

> > ><---these attributes inserted
> > > Wouldn't
> > >that be the right thing to do? There is nothing illegal or immoral
> > >with that callsign, except perhaps in the mind of the reader!
> >
> > There's nothing illegal about it.
> >
> > >>Note this: I started this thread. The poll is my idea, and I wrote the
> > >>original
> > >>list and its updates. So if someone says I *must* or even *should* not
> > >>do the
> > >>list a certain way, it's *they* who are trying to censor *me*.
> > >>
> > >>If someone wants to post a revised list with callsigns included, that's
> > >>their
> > >>right - as long as they don't make it look like I wrote something I did
> > >>not.
> > > >
> > > >See above.
> > >
> > Where?
> >
> > >>>>>I deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the
> > >>>>>attributes of
> > >>>>>the original message simply to include my callsign in the list.
>
> > >>>Without malice, perhaps, but not without prejudice. A prejudice, by
> > >>>the way, which I would rather not have thrust upon me!
>
> > >>So is what Kim did to my posts OK with you, Leo?
> > > >
> > > >Didn't say that, Jim - I said that two wrongs do not make a right.
> > > >Hers, and yours.
> > >
> > I do not see that I have done anything wrong.
> > >
>
> Of course not. You probably *don't* have any prejudice where your own
> decsions and actions have been made. But, by my perception, you are *JUST
> AS WRONG* to take away--or leave out--*ATTRIBUTION TO MY CALLSIGN* as I am
> to take away--or leave out--attribution characters in an newsgroup post.

Well, we disagree about that.

> I daresay, though, your deletion is far more offensive than mine.

I daresay the opposite is true.

> The basis,
> meaning, and original message and intent of that message was in no way
> harmed or changed when I added my callsign to the list. None. Except,
> perhaps, that it then could have looked like you had (God forbid) typed my
> callsign.

And that is the problem.
>
> Your deletion--or leaving out, in this case--deliberately makes it look like
> I have no callsign.

Anyone reading rrap knows better.
>
> > >>>><---these attributes inserted
> > >>>>At first, you simply changed the quoted text *without* changing the >
> > >>>>symbols, so it looked like I wrote something I did not write. I
> > >>>>chalked that one up to a simple typo and said nothing.
>
> > >>>>Then, you peeled off *all* the > symbols, including the one by my
> > >>>>signature line, so it looked like I had signed a post you made.
>
> > >>Leo - if someone did that to a post of yours, would you say it was their
> > >>right to do it?
> > >
> > >No - but that isn't the issue here.
> >
>
> I agree. That isn't the issue for me, either. I think the real issue is
> exhibiting a form of respect for another individual who has earned the right
> to have a callsign attributed to her--*WHETHER OR NOT* you agree with the
> callsign.

So you're saying that everyone who has a callsign has the right to
have
that callsign included. Yet you don't mention Larry's callsign in this
post....

> The one thing that Larry Roll has never, ever done--to his credit
> arrrghhhh, yes I said that--is "strip" me of my callsign. You have, Jim,
> and your actions are wrong. They are not only wrong, they are meanspirited
> and, to me, hateful.

That was not my intent. I apologize if my actions bothered you. But my
actions follow my standards and I will not compromise them.
>
> > <---this attribute inserted
> > Yes, it is. You are avoiding any criticism of Kim's actions. You're
> > telling me what I *must* or *should* do in my posts, based on *your*

> > personal morals and judgements - and then criticizing me for doing
> > what I think best in my own postings, based on *my* personal morals
> > and judgements.
> >
> > >Your obvious discomfort with her
> > >call sign, and your intentional removal of it from your posts, is.
> > >You know that it angers Kim, but to do it anyway - because *you*
> > >consider it improper.
> >
> > Sure. Don't I have the right to do that?
> >
>
> No. You don't.

And I say I do.

> Not in a "general" list you are compiling, where you have
> made no mention of how people will be listed. It was intended by me--and
> was when I first submitted my prediction--that I would be listed *just as
> every other amateur radio operator.* You *do not*, Jim--whether you think
> you do or not--have the right to *disascociated* me from my callsign.
> Period.

By what authority do you tell me that?

> But, especially in a list where you've invited people to join, yet
> you did not say anyone would be listed in any way differently than anyone
> else.
>
> > <---this attribute inserted
> > Just as she got that callsign, and continues to keep it, even
> > though she knows others consider it inappropriate and that
> > it angers others.
> >
> > She has her right to that callsign, and I have my right not
> > to publicize it here. But you deny my right.
> > <---this attribute inserted
>
> You do not have the right to list me "differently" than any other amateur
> radio operator.

Yes, I do.

> You have the right to refrain from having my callsign in a
> post, I could agree on that. But NOT a list.

Your opinion noted. Mine's different.
>
> > >>>>>I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other
> > > >>>>>person has a problem with that.
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>If you do not respect Usenet conventions, why should anyone respect

> > >>>>your desire to have your callsign included? You want respect that
> > >>>>you do not give others.
> > >>>
> > >>>Jim, since when do two wrongs make a right?
> > >>
> > >>Which two wrongs? Kim has incorrectly attributed at least three of my
> > >>posts. I do not see where my nonuse of her callsign is "wrong".
> > >
> > >Why not? You are deliberately censoring her call from your posts,
> > >aren't you?
> >
> > Nope. I'm editing it out.
> >
>
> Worse. To censor would be to refrain from REPOSTING any submissions wherein
> I had added my prediction.

Which I did not do because I don't censor anyone but myself.

> That would have been far more respectable. My
> response would have been to ask you why you were not including me; you would
> have explained, and I would have respected--fully--your decision to act on a
> belief you have in a respectable manner. I do not respect your deliberate
> act to deny me listed as an amateur radio operator in a list of other
> amateur radio operators.

That's fine. I do not respect your choice of callsign. That does not
mean I have no respect for *you*.
> >
> > "Censoring" would be if I tried to prevent her from posting it at all. I
> > have not done that, and would not if I could.
> >
> > >Do you believe that denying her right to be recognized by
> > >her fellow amateurs by this call is appropriate behaviour?
> >
> > I think that not giving her callsign more exposure through my own posts is
> > appropriate behavior.
>
> Then, you would not be able to respond to any of my *OTHER POSTS*, Jim.
> Because each time you respond to a post from and *do not* remove my callsign
> from my original post, then you are "proliferating" my callsign--even more
> so, I might add, than when it would be in this thread, probably. This
> thread has only been this active because of this debate that is going on. I
> haven't checked, but do you deleted my callsign from replies to posts from
> me?

Look and see.

> You'd be leaving behind my name so people would still know someone
> named Kim has originally submitted the post. At any rate, deleting my
> callsign from a post would follow along with your reasoning above; that to
> do so would minimize the exposure to my callsign. And, I daresay, that to

> completely follow along with that reasoning and have it be valid and
> accepted as true and logical reasoning, then you would need to refrain from
> *any* post wherein my callsign is evidenced.
>
> > ><---these attributes inserted
> > >Because you have some bugaboo about the suffix?
> >
> > Because I think it's inappropriate and because I take responsibility for
> > what I post.
> > >
> > >>Some might say that characterizing my nonuse of that callsign as "wrong"
> > >>is really a way of someone imposing their own personal morals and
> > >>prejudices upon me.
> >
> > Ahem...
> > >>
> > >>>That doesn't sound like
> > >>>you! Or are you saying that you deleted her call because she does not
> > >>>follow Usenet conventions? That's not true, either.
> > >>
> > >>I did not use her call when making up the list because I think it is
> > >>inappropriate for the ARS.
> > >
> > >That isn't up to you to decide, Jim. That is the role of the FCC.
> >
> > Says who?
> > <---this attribute inserted
>
> Well, I think Leo just said it. And, I agree.

And I don't. YMMV.
>
> >
> > FCC is allowing BPL systems to be implemented even though they generate
> > enormous amounts of RF interference. FCC still requires code tests of
> > those who want US HF ham licenses, despite the loss of the treaty
> > requirement 6 months ago. FCC recently declined to penalize anyone when
> > a pop star used the "F-word" on network TV.
> >
> > Does the fact that the FCC does the above mean I have no right to say the
> > FCC is wrong?
> >
>
> You did not say that the FCC is wrong for issuing my callsign.

Then I'll say it now: I think the FCC should not issue such callsigns,
because
they are inappropriate for the ARS.

> You said my
> callsign is inappropriate for the ARS. It may be (and I wholeheartedly

> disagree with you), but it is not for you--as an individual and certainly as
> an amateur radio operator--to disassociate me from ham radio as an amateur
> radio operator by leaving off my callsign from something in which I have
> *intended* for it to be.
>
> > <---this attribute inserted
> > Is it wrong for me to tell people not to sign up for BPL and cite the
> > problems it has?
>
> No. Not wrong at all. But, it would be wrong of you to delete a "name"
> someone goes by from a list of names in which people might be expressing
> their agreement or disagreement, simply because you disagree with the way it
> sounds or even that it might be risque. It would incorrect of you to delete
> or refuse to attribute their name to them for any reason.

I disagree.
>
> > <---this attribute inserted
> > Is it wrong for those who disagree with code tests to try to get the rules
> > changed?
>
> Not at all. And, I'd imagine that those who are so driven, are actively
> involved by contacting the appropriate agencies and departments and by
> active debate to state their cause and purpose. However, again, it would be
> incorrect for someone to keep a name or callsign (in this case) from a list
> in which they intended their name or callsign to appear.
>
> > <---this attribute inserted
> > Is it OK for hams to use the F-word on the air because FCC allowed it once
> > on TV?
> >
> I could drone on, but hopefully the point has been made.
>
> > >
> > >> She chose that call - FCC will not issue such calls
> > >>sequentially. It
> > >>was discussed to death in a thread called "one step closer to
> > >>extinction" that exceeded 3000 posts.
> > >
> > >But it is her call - issued to her for her use.
> >
> > And she hasn't used it for over a year on the air. Just here.
> >
>
> If I *had* used it regularly, once in a while, or every so often, on the
> air, would that have changed anything here? I think not, so don't bother
> using it. Regardless, it is my callsign and I thought it would be listed
> when I originally submitted my prediction.

It wasn't, and it won't be. Not by me, anyway. You can post it all you
want,

of course.
>
> > <---this attribute inserted
> > And if Kim wants to use it here, that's her right. But *I* don't have to
> use it
> > here.
> > >>
>
> Nope. You sure don't. But, it would be nice in the future if you caution
> that any amatuer radio operator, with whose callsign you disagree, who
> submits something with the idea that he/she will be listed just as everyone
> else, *will not* be treated in such a manner.
>
> > >>>>><---these attributes inserted
> > >>>>>I've requested that Jim just plain remove my name and prediction from
> > >>>>>the list.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Done. No problem.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>If he cannot accept me as an amateur radio operator, equal in every
> > >>>>>way but license class to any other amateur, then I deliberately, with
> > >>>>>no malice, and respectfully abstain from regarding *him* at all.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>I have *always* accepted you as an amateur radio operator, Kim. But
> > >>>>I do not post your callsign because I think you made an inappropriate
> > >>>>choice.
> > >>>
> > >>>That is not up to you to decide, Jim.
> > >>
> > >>Why not? Isn't it my right to have the opinion that certain callsigns
> > >>are not appropriate?
> > >
> > >Of course it is.
> > >>
> > >>Is there a law which says I *must* use callsigns in a Usenet post?
> > >
> > >Nope - but the gentlemanly thing to do would be to omit all of the
> > >callsigns, not just hers.
> >
> > Why?
> >
>
> For the reasons stated by me in this post, for many.
>
> > ><---these attributes inserted
> > >Do you not think that singling her out the
> > >way that you did was disrespectful to her?
> >
> > No.
>

> I do. And, it is my perception that counts--although it's quite obvious
> that others have at least some degree of concern in this area as well.
>
> > ><---these attributes inserted
> > >Are you that sanctimonious?
> >
> > No. I'm that honest.
> > >
> > >>ITU recently made it legal for countries to issue callsigns with
> > >>four-letter
> > >>suffixes, like W3PENN. Imagine the possibilities.
> > >
> > >Do you believe that the various administrations would issue just any
> > >old four letter combination?
> >
> > Yes.
> >
>
> I do not.

Time will tell.
>
> > ><---these attributes inserted
> > >I'd be surprised!
> >
> > I was surprised that they would issue Kim's call. But they did. Why would
> > you
> > be surprised if they
> > issued four-letter combinations? They allowed that pop star to say a
> > certain word. All kinds of
> > words are permitted here on the 'net - (wire comms are regulated by the
> > FCC too).
> >
>
> Why is my callsign such a shock? Forget any reason that someone might
> request it. I say that becasue, keep in mind that Michael (I think his name
> was) requested and had

(a similarly inappropriate callsign)
> because it was the closest he could come to
> commemorating the Tet Offensive. So, regardless of *why* someone might
> request it, why the shock that the FCC would issue it? The mere word

[word deleted]

> or even the

[same word deleted]

> itself is not vulgar.

It is inappropriate in many situations. Like amateur radio.

> Good heavens, if you think it is then
> I am the one who is shocked! The word is not intended to be used as a
> nickname on the amateur bands; Indeed, I have sharply offended people who
> have done that. The full callsign is all that is ever responded to, on the
> air anyway.
>
> And, mainly, and the thing *everyone* always likes to ignore is that, yes,
> the callsign was requested by me on a dare. HOWEVER, it was a dare *after*
> I made the verbal observation that if I were to ever request a *VANITY*
> callsign, it would certainly be associated with something of vanity--not
> simply my initials. As you will recall, the most important part of that
> story--and it is a true one--is that a) I had never desired to get a vanity
> call, b) was mentioning to my fellow hams [men] on the air that it was a
> pity they had no more creativity than to simply request their initials and,
> c) that if I were to request a callsign it would be related to my "vanity."
> Anyone who knew me (and the all did) personally knew exactly what I was
> inferring by that comment. Were I as famous as Dolly Parton, it would be
> for the same reason she is--minus that I am a performer (I am not). My
> unique callsign is unique because it is a woman's callsign who knows that
> others perceive first in me, my

[word deleted]

> My intellect, beauty, wit, charm,
> rogue behavior, honesty in dealing with all humas and nature, and very, very
> opinionated nature all come secondary to the fact that, on initial gaze, I
> am a large

[word deleted]

> woman.

But that was not the first thing *I* preceived about you, Kim.

> And, my callsign uniquely says, "get the

[expletive deleted}

> over
> it, there's a person here to be reckoned with." If anyone does not like the
> way I *like* and *prefer* to relay that message, then tough

[word deleted}

> (and they are not).

(I'll take your word for that last statement)
>
> If anyone else (and here's your argument coming back on ya) *perceives* my
> callsign to be vulgar, that is *their* perception. It is not my intention.
> If anyone else becomes deragotory with my callsign, as Larry, Dick, Dave,
> Waddles/ULX, and others have done in this newsgroup; I daresay your problem
> is with them for they are the ones acting in a vulgar nature.

I did not say vulgar. "Inappropriate"
>>
> > >>
> > >>>(and, up here,
> > >>
> > >>(several calls with suffixes identical to Kim's)
> > >
> > >...'censored', as it were, for some inane reason - those are valid VE
> > >call signs!
> >
> > Doesn't mean they are appropropriate.
> >
> > >>Not the breast - er, best way to treat these hams.....
> > >>
> > >>>all licensed amateurs, two of whom are male).
> > >>>
> > >>Were those calls sequentially issued?
> > >
> > >You may want to take that up with Rene, Neil and Shanta - whether they
> > >requested them or not I'm sure I don't know. Or care.
> >
> > It makes a difference.
> > <---attribute inserted
>
> To *you*, Jim and some others. Not to me, not Leo, not to some others.
> That someone gets, or even requests--doesn't matter--a callsign, it behooves
> you as a fellow amateur to respect that person as an amateur radio operator
> unless and until the licensing agency decides they cannot be an amateur
> radio operator any more. Note I did not say you have to respect that person
> as a person. I have absolutely no respect in any way for Larry Roll, Dave
> Heil, Waddles/ULX, and quite a few others actually. In fact I regard them
> with pure disdain. However, they are amateur radio operators and no one
> outside the FCC as the granting authority, can take that away from them.
> And, as fellow amateur radio operators, they deserve my respect. *If* (and
> that is a big if) I ever had to encounter them on the air, I would regard
> them and treat them with the same respect that I have for every other
> amateur radio operator.
>
> Even here in this area, when we had two proven fake Navy SEAL amateurs
> (proven by the organization that investigates that kind of stuff), and I was
> the only one who took them on as idiots, I never disrespected them on the
> air with rude remarks or insulting behavior. They would come on the air and
> call me names, try to scare me, deliberately violate nearly every R&R there
> is regarding transmission, but I never did the same to them. I refrained
> from communicating with them and would not respond to their childish, impish
> behavior. One day, the last transmission ever made on the air to either of
> them, I reminded one that the frequency was mine--which is proper operating
> practice and still gives them the *appearance* of respect as an amateur.
>
Amateur radio frequencies "belong" to no one...
> > >Why, if they are indeed "inappropriate to the ARS", would they do

> > >that?
> >
> > -Because they don't care
> > -Because it's handled by computer and nobody really looks at the system
> > -Because they don't want the complaints from those who want such calls
> > -Because FCC is too busy with other matters and has too few resources.
> >
>
> I feel it is becuase there may be a thought in their mind that someone might
> be embarrassed to have a callsign like that--and that is very nice of them
> to carry out issuing the call as one that might cause embarrassment to
> someone. They do care. Even though callsigns are issued by computer, it's
> obvious someone looks at them, because there are some set aside, as you say.
> I think the callsigns like mine are simply set aside to be requested, rather
> than sequentially issued, because they may cause embarrassment to
> someone--or maybe would even cause embarrassment to the FCC if someone
> asked, "why in the world would you have given me such a call?"

So there is a difference.

> > ><---attributes inserted
> > >They have total authority over those calls - surely they
> > >ccontrol them better than that?
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > In case you didn't know, Kim emailed Riley Hollingsworth about it. He
> > replied that while such callsigns were legal, the request and use of such
> > callsigns moves the ARS "one step closer to extinction".
> >
>
> No, his very general statement--in specific reference to activities on the
> air, I might add--about my callsign and other behaviors in the ARS (related,
> as I said, to on the air activities) could move the ARS one step closer to
> extinction. I happen to totally disagree with him. There is something
> about Riley that Larry doesn't understand, by the way, Riley offered his
> comments *as a person* not as an authority of the FCC. Big difference. The
> FCC officially has no remark on my callsign other than, when asked, to state
> that they do not legislate or regulate callsigns (something to that affect
> anyway--it was a long time ago that we had communication together).
>
> It's also quite obvious that Riley is wrong.

I'd say he's quite right.

> The ARS is still around, sitll
> healthy, and has even *gained* respect of important groups and agencies as a
> viable organization of people ready and capable to serve, if called upon to
> do so. The ARS is just fine and my callsign, nor the behaviors of idiots on
> the air, are moving it closer to extinction. There is not even a first step
> toward extinction of the ARS.

I say you are mistaken.
>
> > >>><---attributes inserted
> > >>>It is a legal suffix, and if it was not on some banned list
> > >>>it may have gone out in sequence. Please refer me to an FCC statement
> > >>>to the contrary.
> > >>
> > >>I refer you to the Callbook and databases.
> > >
> > >Not proof - is there a specific FCC document that lists certain calls
> > >exempt from sequential issue?
> >
> > Their actions are enough to prove the point.
> > >>
> > >>>In Canada, if you don't select a call when you pass
> > >>>your test, you get one issued randomly. If it's on the list, it's
> > >>>fair game! And this suffix is on the list in all of the VE areas.
> > >>
> > >>In my opinion, it's inappropriate. Do I not have the right to such an
> > >>opinion?
> > >
> > >Of course you do. The issue is, do you have the right to impose your
> > >views and mores upon others. I do not believe that you do.
> >
> > You're saying I don't have the right to protest. Just keep quiet, huh?
> >
>
> Why protest in an arena where the protest goes inactionable? Your protest
> to me will have no effect, whatsoever, in having me change my callsign.
> Even your refusal to list my callsign as an amateur radio operator with a
> submission, among other amateur radio operators with a submission, will have
> no positive effect on me changing my callsign.
>
> You should simply stick to the argument that you find my callsign
> inappropriate. That is the strongest (even at its weakest) argument you can
> offer. To try and submit your actions as a demonstrable protest falls way
> short. At least in my opinion.

To say it is inappropriate, and then have it in my posts is to
contradict myself.
>
> My feelings are not hurt, by the way. I could actually care less about the
> issue of whether my callsign is on the list or not. However, the reason *I*
> am persuing this as a topic of interest will be revealed at the end of this
> post. <snicker> Not to minimize the input of my ideas: I am representing
> exacly how I think about the issue! I am just not hurt at all by the
> exclusion of my callsign from the list.
>
> > ><---attributes inserted
> > >Say, you weren't striking out at her
> > >because she offended you, were you? Of course not!

> >
> > That's right.
> > >
> > >>>If Kim's
> > >>>callsign is that offensive to you, then you should ignore her posts
> > >>>entirely.
> > >>
> > >>Why? Kim is not a bad person. She is not my enemy. I simply disagree
> > >>with her about callsign choice.
> > >
>
> Thank you. And, I don't think you're a bad person, either; nor are you my
> enemy.

Exactly.

>
> > ><---attributes inserted
> > >Well, your actions certainly tell a different story, Jim. I treat my
> > >friends a heck of a lot better than that!
> >
> > I did not say she was my friend. Kim reserves the term "friend" to a very
> > select few.
> > "Acquaintance" would be more accurate.
> > >>
>
> Exactly. Very few people are those whom I would consider "friends."
> Certainly not someone I only have interaction with over the computer or even
> amateur radio.

And I respect that defintion.

>
> > >><---attributes inserted
> > >>What you seem to be saying is that you want to censor *me*, by
> determining
> > >>how I can post here.
> > >
> > >Not at all, Jim - just pointing out that you don't have the right to
> > >impose your beliefs and value systems upon others.
> >
> > Not what I'm doing.
> > >>
> > >>>On the air, you would probably ignore or refuse to reply to
> > >>>someone whom you found to be offensive - here in Usenet, we have the
> > >>>killfile for this purpose. Not censorship!
> > >>
> > >>Where have I censored anyone? Where Have I tried to prevent someone from
> > >>posting anyhting?
> > >
>
> You have prevented my callsign being associated with other amateur radio
> operators in a list where you treated them differently (by listing them with

> a callsign). You have prevented, by mere omission of my callsign, me from
> being viewed as an amateur radio among other amateur radio operators in a
> list in which such omission could easily be taken out of context, I might
> add.

And you chose an inappropriate callsign and chose to keep it.
>
> > ><---attributes inserted
> > >Come on, Jim, you know very well at this point in the discussion what
> > >you did!
> >
> > I edited. Not the same thing. Words have exact meanings.
> > >>
> > >>> Intentional deletion of
> > >>>her call is disrespectful, (it is!) and not within your mandate as a
> > >>>reader of this group or a fellow ham to do.
> > >>
> > >>I disagree.
> > >
> > >Sorry to hear that!
> > >>
> > >>Her choice of callsign is disrespectful ot other hams and the ARS. IMHO
> YMMV
> > >
> > >And that is your opinion. I can make up my own mind, thanks, and
> > >really don't need your help by filtering out things you have a problem
> > >with.
> >
> > So go ahead and use Kim's call all you want. Just please don't tell me
> that I
> > have to.
> > >>>
> > >>>Jim, doesn't our society have enough 'politcally correct' folks
> > >>>running around already (jeez, even 'manhole covers' are called 'access
> > >>>covers' now, because someone got offended by the 'male bias').
> > >>
> > >>I agree 100%. I see the attempt to force me to use Kim's callsign on
> Usenet
> > >>as
> > >>a form of political correctness. I'm being told that I *must* post in a
> > >>certain way. Why?
> > >
> > >Please see the above comments.
> > >>>
> > >>>I would think that inappropriate use of her call would be anything
> > >>>related to sexual innuendo, referenced to the slang word
> > >>
> > >>[slang word deleted]
> > >
> > >...because you personally have an issue with it! See?

> > >>
> > >>Why do you think Kim chose that particular call, Leo? She's
> > >>not a birdwatcher.
> > >
> > >I don't know that for sure, Jim - it wasn't on her QRZ profile, but
> > >she just might be!
> > >
> > Kim chose that callsign for at least two obvious, prominent reasons:
> >
> > 1) She thought it was fun, and/or funny
> >
> > 2) She knew it would get lots of attention and create all sorts of
> reactions
> >
>
> Oh, I thought you were going to say that my two, obvious, prominent reasons
> were my

[word deleted]

>Because those were the two obvious, prominent reasons =:o

To others, maybe, but not to me.
>
> > <---attribute inserted
> > She's told us all that here. Her picture used to be on qrz, too.
> >
>
> Uh, what does a picture of me, driving a car, from the shoulder area up,
> have to do with my

[word deleted]

> Don't tell me you could "tell" by that picture
> that I had big

[word deleted]

> Oh, no! It's worse than I thought! ;)

Or better.
>
> That'd be about like Larry being able to tell I'm fat (which I'm not) just
> by looking at that picture!

Fat is in the perception of the perceiver....
>
> > >>><---attributes inserted
> > >>>Those posts I ignore. Not censor, ignore.
> > >>
> > >>I ignore many posts here. I don't censor anyone.
> > >
> > >Yes you did!

> >
> > No, I did not.
> >
> > > Kim, I believe....
> > >>>
> > I notice that you use her name and not her callsign too....
> >
> > >>>Appropriate use, however, would be anything related to amateur radio -
> > >>>as it is a valid callsign. Like this newsgroup, for example.
> > >>
> > >>This newsgroup does not require callsigns. Other posters have refused
> > >>to use my callsign, and instead have called me all kinds of insulting
> names
> > >>-
>
> Then your issue is with them.
>
> > >><---attributes inserted
> > >>and their was no protest from folks who now tell me I am being
> > >>disrespectful.
> > >
> > >And this makes your behaviour correct and justifiable how?
> >
> > There was no problem when others did it. Only when I did. Double standard.
> >
> > >>>Why on Earth a man of your intelligence would have a problem just
> > >>>typing it, I'm sure I don't know.
> > >>
> > >>I don't have a problem typing it, Leo. I simply choose not to.
> > >
>
> That's a good "Kim" response! <GRIN>

bwaahaahaa
>
> > ><---attributes inserted
> > >Rather childish, isn't it? It's a callsign!
> >
> > Then why not choose another one?
> > <---attributes inserted
>
> Oh goodness!!! My callsign is so uniquely me how could I ever do that?

There's an FCC form you fill out. Or do it online
>
> > >>
> > >>>Whatever it it, I hope you are able
> > >>>to navigate past it, Jim. Kim earned the right to use her call, and
> > >>>you have no right to deny her that right to do so. Period.
> > >>>
> > >>I agree 100%! She has the right to use it. But no one has the right to

> force
> > >>*me* to use it here on Usenet.
> > >>
>
> However, you did not let anyone know, up front when the poll was first
> issued, that any inappropriateness would be looked for and dealt with
> accordingly. I submitted a prediction and do have the right and, feel
> correctly, expectation that my prediction would be listed just like every
> other amateur radio operator's.

Well, that's your perception.
>
> My behavior on this newsgroup has always been blunt and honest. You could
> have even publicly said something to me about my callsign not be included
> and, as I would expect from you, asking if I would like not to particpate.
> That would have been so Jim/N2EY that I believe I have come to know. But,
> for some reason, your exhibited nature was not forthcoming here, and I don't
> know why--may not even be anything to it. But, I can see you posting a
> reply to my prediction that you would not be including my callsign--and
> would I like to withdraw.

Since I had not used your callsign for a long time, I saw no reason to
do anything different.
>
> > >><---attributes inserted
> > >>Or do they?
> > >
> > >Nope - but it's not OK to force your values on others!
> >
> > But you want to force your values on me.
> > >>
> > >>Suppose - just suppose - someone included a word or phrase you found
> > >>inappropriate or offensive in a post. Would you say that everyone *must*
> > >>include that word or phrase in any replies?
> > >
> > >Me - I'd ignore it! Not worth getting bent out of shape over....
> >
> > I do ignore it! That's exactly what I've been doing!
> >
> > Thanks for the validation, Leo!
> > >
> > >Gotta go - we're having baked chicken frontal sections for dinner, and
> > >they're my favourite! :)
> > >
> > Yum..But I'm a leg man, myself.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Now, for the real reason I decided to engage as I have the last couple of
> weeks. Remember, Jim, how I used to get so insulted when you would seem to

> "lead" someone into a corner they could not get out of? Well, this thread,
> and the lack of your treating my submission as any other amateur radio
> operator's became my path to doing the same thing to you. Not out of
> meanness, mind you, not at all. Out of pure fun.

Too bad you failed, Kim. But I hope you had fun.
>
> I feel you do lead, by way of artful argument by the way, people into
> corners they don't think they can get out of. This was my answer to
> that--because I really do feel I waited long enough (practically a year),
> acted often enough (giving you every opportunity to act as I would have
> thought you would act, and participated strictly as a submitter (I engaged
> in no comments until recently, and those only to request that you include my
> submission with my callsign). It is even uncharacteristic of me to get
> involved to this level (being listed among the debaters over the CW testing
> issue) with this topic.
>
> As I said, I would have thought of your nature that you would see my
> submission, and let me know that you would list it but without my callsign,
> and give me the opportunity to withdraw inclusion. Does anyone else agree
> that this would have been something one could reasonably have expected from
> Jim?
>
> Anyway, I feel victorious, but maybe it's just me.

Did you ever see the film, "Gladiator"?

The emperor thought he was victorious over Maximus, too.

> As I said, I really do
> have the opinions stated in this response and really do believe you should
> have offered anything but leaving my callsign off the list. But, my greater
> purpose was to leave you with that same, frustrated feeling I used to have
> when you'd box me into a corner I couldn't get out of.

Then you failed, because I don't have that feeling at all. Sorry ;-)

> Maybe you don't feel
> boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly insulted--at
> least it looked that way to me in this post!
>
> Kim

[inappropriate callsign deleted]

So let's recap:

With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
lengthy
and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.

I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
rather than my own.

I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.

And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of inappropriate words.

So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has vanquished, as he says to the crowd:

"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"

73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY

806. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 18:02:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <njBMb.4436$q4.2153@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85482

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040112090857.12189.00003220@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > I've got more
> >potential amateur radio operator in my little finger than you have in all
> >your years as an amateur radio operator...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Spoken like a TRUE CBer

I noticed the key word there....'potential'. At least she admitted it,
even though she doesn't realize it.

Dan/W4NTI

807. Re: If Ham radio were invented today.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 18:50:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4002EC69.1030702@psu.edu>
Source record: 85483

Keith Hosman wrote:
> On 01 Jan 2004 08:56:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>
>>In article <AkMIb.1528$uF6.306090@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Let's say that for one reason or another that Hams never got back their
>>>access to the airwaves after WW1.
>>
>>Could have very well happened, if not for the ARRL. Or, amateur radio could
>>have been legislated out of existence at one of the radio conferences in the
>>early 1920s. But fortunately it didn't happen.
>>
>>> Fast forward to January 1, 2004. In 2003, amateur radio was reborn,
>>>with testing and privileges to commence on this first day of 2004.
>>
>>Whoa there! How could that happen?
>>
>>And if it somehow did, what spectrum, power and modes would be allowed? What
>>services would give up spectrum?
>>
>>
>>> What should the testing regimen be?
>>
>>Depends entire on what the "new" service in this alternate-history line is
>>like, don;t you think?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
>
> Yeah but, following this new "history" of amateur radio, technology as
> we know it today might not be the same. There might be no other
> "services" to give up spectrum, seeing as how amateur radio has
> pioneered much of the technology that people these days take for
> granted.

Well, Keith, UR free to contribute what you think it *might* be like!
It was an exercise in imagination.

As for things being different, no kidding!!!!! That was the idea! What
would happen? What would the new amateurs use in the way of modes and

the like?

Use of imagination is seen in things like the few posts that Leo and I made on likely modes and licensing methods.

Lack of imagination is shown in posts just saying "things would be different, so there is no use speculating".

- Mike KB3EIA -

808. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 18:55:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4002EDAF.6060208@psu.edu>
Source record: 85484

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:

<snippage>

>>You have had no problem when others
>>have used insulting names rather than
>>callsigns to refer to me, (snip)
>
>
>
> I've never seen anyone use insulting names to refer to you.

Surely you jest Dwight!!

- Mike KB3EIA

809. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 19:25:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4002F4AF.7000400@psu.edu>
Source record: 85485

Alun wrote:

<An ungodly amount of stuff snipped>

> Bingo! Jim is very skilled at debating, but this time he has outsmarted
> himself.

I hope this isn't more high and mighty newsgroup rules babble, Alun, but cudja maybe just trim the messages a wee little bit? I want to read your stuff, but all that messaging for a two sentence reply is a bit much, eh?

- Mike KB3EIA -

810. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 19:26:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4002F4F7.3010600@psu.edu>
Source record: 85486

Alun wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in
> news:4unMb.11286$uF6.3715663@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>
>>>All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
>>>that..... babble.
>>
>>
>> Just like all the high and mighty amateurs that seem to think it's
>> a
>>good idea to follow the rules while on the air.
>>
>> If ya breaks the usenet rulez, you getz flamed.
>>
>> Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> True, but you can't get your Usenet licence taken away, which is a big
> difference

So let me get this straight. Newsgroup rules are cool to be broken?

- Mike KB3EIA -

811. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 19:28:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4002F54C.8060600@psu.edu>
Source record: 85487

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
>>I thought I was seeing Hans with something other
>>than a gorilla thumping message.
>
>
> I never thump my gorilla. My dad said I'd go blind if I did.

Just do it till you need glasses, Hans.

- Mike KB3EIA -

812. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 20:29:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <gsDMb.5971$1e.4693@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85488

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

<
< So let me get this straight. Newsgroup rules are cool to be broken?
<

Far as I know, there are no Newsgroup rules, only habits and widely accepted conventions. Any one who takes exception to exceptions, is certain to accumulate an exceptional quantity of exceptions. If you are starting a collection, I have included three above.

With all kind wishes,
de Hans, K0HB

813. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 20:30:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <rtDMb.5973$1e.5669@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85489

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

<
< Just do it till you need glasses, Hans.
<

I'm already wearing tri-focals.

dit dit, de Hans, K0HB

814. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 20:55:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401121255.1cf29575@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85490

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040110153510.01893.00002535@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401080747.1bb17b2@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > It's the standard YOU have tried to set, Scummy. YOU are the one
> >stating "we" (the Amateur community) don't respect
> >"professionals"...yet here you are spewing antgonisms, profanities and
> >boldface lies.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe...YOU don't respect professionals.

I don't respect you. You are a liar...a documented pathological
liar.

> I've never stated any "boldface lies." This web browser doesn't allow
> selection of boldface type.

Sure you have. That you don't accept responsibility for them is
moot. They are here. No more need be said. You're busted...over and
over and over and......

> > On contraire again, Lennie...I get to radiate more than adequate
> >"great power". I hardly ever use more than 200 watts on ANY band,
> >however, since it's not necessary to use it.
>
> You have 40 KW RF output capability?
>
> How about 600 KW RF output?
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk, stebe, look again at amateur radio band allocations
> and allowed RF output power. you can't use it on "ANY" band.

tsk, tsk, tsk, Lennie.

Where did I say "40KW" or "600KW", Your Sliminess?

I paraphrased your "great power" and then cited that I hardly
ever use more than 200watts.

With very few exceptions, I can use 200 watts where I please.

And by the way, Anderscum, would you care to share a copy of the
station licensed where YOU were authorized those powers you
cited...???

I can show you MY station license and quote for you the
paragraphs that stipulate how much power >>I<< can use.

> > Of course, unlike YOU, I have a station license that allows me to
> >establish a radio station wherein I can use it.
>
> wow, stebe, impressville all the way! your vewwy own wadio
> station!

Yep.

> So...if I go into K-Mart or Wal-Mart and plunk down $99 for a shrink-
> wrapped CB transceiver "it's not my own radio?"

Sure it is. And you can have fun allllllllll day chatting with
foul mouthed truckers, 10 year old space cadets and rogue taxi cabs.

> Okay, if I own a Cessna 182 and buy a Civil Airways VHF Comm
> transceiver and install it, "I wouldn't own my own transceiver?"
> Who would own it? FAA? USAF? An airlines corporation?

Sure...ALLLLLLLLLL yours. No station license, of course, unless
you file for one from the FAA and obtain the Restricted Telephone
Operators Permit and intend to use the aircraft outside of the
territorial United States.

And while you're at it, just pick any old random frequency and
call "CQ" while you're at it.

> If I have an ocean-going sailboat and buy the "civilian" version of an
> SBC-2020 and install it, "I wouldn't own my own radio?" Who would
> own it? SBC? USN? USCG? A cruise line corporation?

Sure it's yours, Lennie. Still no station license unless you
operate it outside the United States...And THEN only (STILL "only") on
the fixed maritime frequencies with a type accepted rig. (Enjoy
plunking down those bucks, Lennie....You earned them...)

> If, as a private businessman, I buy several transceivers to put in my
> delivery vehicles, "I wouldn't OWN them?" Who would own them?
> A city department of communications? FCC? NTIA? DMV?
>
> Suppose I buy a pair of FRS HTs. "I won't OWN them?" Who "owns"
> them? The store I bought it from using a valid credit card?
>
> Oh, yeah, the only "real radios" are ham radios where everyone
> works DX on HF with CW.

Lennie, if you went on a buying spree RIGHT NOW, and bought one
of every radio that you could LEGALLY operate without a document from
the FCC, you'd still only have enough bandwidth to fit inside the 10
meter Amateur band.

I, on the other hand, can buy those SAME radios, thereby not only
having the entire AMATEUR allocations to play with, but all those SAME
services in which you might operate, and yet again would have more
OPERATING privileges than you do right now.

> >> Of course, any former E-5 or higher that thinks "asshole" is a
> >> terribly profane word must be of the sissy pink coloring.
> >
> > Blatant evidence that you are not in touch with the "new"
> >professional Armed Forces, Lennie. That kind of language, although
> >rampant in your day, can get a prefessional soldier busted or fined.
>
> aha, stebe, so that's how you got your non-honorable discharge!

Uh huh...right.

Rest of LennieRant clipped...Once again, made a fool of by his
own hand.

Keep it up Lennie. It's been a slow week.

Putz. Say Hi to Mrs Putz for me.

Steve

815. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 20:59:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401121259.3e155e54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85491

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040111231531.11022.00003430@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <5a5fcb7b.0401110224.675a93d1@posting.google.com>,
> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:
>
> >LHA
> >You are a bitter little person and do not play well with others.
>
> Stebe, quit trying to be somebody else.

Sorry...not me...read the headers, Your Putziness.

> ...and quit stealing phrases, sweetums, you get negative points
> for plagiarism.

You mean I can't follow in your footsteps, Lennie? Maybe I can
get them to UN-defunct "Ham Radio" and change all your plagerized
by-lines to my name...?!?!

> >Perhaps you need something of a higher level in you life.
>
> "Higher level?" Heck and darn, the NOISE level in here is already
> too high!
>
> >Try Jesus instead of all of this negative stuff.
>
> Sounds good but I already did that a long time ago.

Try again. You missed the mark.

> This morning I eliminated the middleman and talked directly to
> God. God must have been rather busy but his answering
> machine worked...I got this wonderful posting from an anonymous
> twit to liven my day!

Hearing voices, are you Lennie?

> Get some help sweetums. Get a name while you're at it...

Speaking of "get some help", Lennie...Guess you haven't opened up
any of Mrs. Putz's books yet, eh?

Steve

816. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:07:52 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <bur5001g2u88h116dg6edp4job551b8mit@4ax.com>
Source record: 85492

On 12 Jan 2004 09:15:19 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<e0q200t2lf43asf4ojn6t3qihahbl43ums@4ax.com>...
>> Jim,
>>
>> Personally, I feel that it is indeed unfortunate that you do not see,
>> or will not admit to, your disrespectful treatment of Kim,
>
>[callsign deleted]
>
>Your opinion noted, Leo. However, after much consideration, I do not
>consider my omission of Kim's callsign to be disrespectful. YMMV.

As stated before, it wasn't your omission of Kim's callsign that was
disrespectful, it was the context that it was done in - omitting hers,
but leaving everyone else's intact. Repeatedly.

As you are aware.

>
>> Your statements in defense of your conduct are based entirely upon
>> circular logic, rationalization, contradiction and denial - indicating
>> that you are not prepared to accept responsibility for your actions
>> towards a fellow ham here on the group.
>
>Basically what you are saying is that I should accept Kim's callsign
>as appropriate for the ARS, and use it here, because:
>
>1) FCC issued it
>2) She asked me to
>3) *You* don't 'have a problem' with the callsign, and therefore *I*
> shouldn't, either.

No - I said that Kim's callsign IS a valid one, accepted by the FCC
for use in the ARS. You can dislike it, revile it, be insulted by it
- whatever you choose to do. But, you must respect the fact that it
is a valid amateur callsign - because it is! Just like yours, issued
officially by the FCC.

Jim, you aren't the guy who gets to determine what is or is not
appropriate for the ARS. That role belongs to the regulatory
authorities. Whatever your problem is with this particular call, it
is between you and the FCC - not us! If they declare that it is
inappropriate, then it will be withdrawn. If not, it stays. Whatever
it is - it's their decision - not yours and mine!

As you are aware.

>
>As I have stated before, no disrespect was intended. But I am not
>going to use Kim's callsign in my posts, because I think it is
>inappropriate for the IRS.

In your opinion, Jim - not necessarily the opinion of the FCC, or many members of the ARS. However, no one is trying to say that you must use Kim's callsign in your posts - the issue is with your intentional exclusion of only her callsign from your list!

As you are aware.
>
>You can use it in your posts all you want. So can Kim. I won't try to
>impose my standards on others, even though they try to impose their
>standards on me.

No one is attempting to impose standards upon you, Jim. The message was (quite clearly) that it is inappropriate and disrespectful to omit just this one callsign from the pool, while leaving all others intact. As you well know. And as clearly stated in previous posts.

As you are aware.

>
>[Kim a licensed radio amateur]
>
>> told you straight up that she felt disrespected by your actions.
>
>I have felt disrespected by her action in choosing that callsign.
>I told her that straight up a long time ago.

Not sure I understand why you would feel personally disrespected by Kim's choice of callsign, Jim - I don't imagine that she did it to offend you personally.

You are of course free to express your opinion regarding this issue, however - but to do so in public isn't always a wise choice. Would you walk up to someone in a crowded mall and tell her exactly what you thought about their skitr being too short? Of course not - that would be impolite. And not too smart, perhaps - she might smack you! :)

Some opinions are best kept to one's self :)

>
>> A simple apology to her would have been appropriate.
>
>I apologize if my posts have upset anyone. That was not the intent.
>But I will not compromise my standards on this to avoid hurting
>someone's feelings.
>
>> The right thing to do.
>

>In your opinion. Mine's different.

Compromising standards isn't the issue, Jim. As you are aware.

If you had changed your poll to list everyone by their first name, would that have compromised your standards? Of course not. It would have created a Level Playing Field, and caused little fuss at all.

It would have removed the opportunity for you to try and punish Kim for her poor choice of callsign, though - say, you weren't trying to do that, were you? Of course not - your standards are too high for that......aren't they?

>>
>> Jim, you have been a frequent victim of attack and insult here
>> yourself - frankly, you should know better.
>
>Where is the insult in not using a word or phrase I think is
>inappropriate?

As stated above, and in previous posts - it is a situational thing. For example, yelling "Hey, Dick!" to a friend sitting over at a bar is quite appropriate. Yelling "Hey, Dick!" to some biker sitting at the bar is not. Same phrase - totally different intent. Context is everything!

As you are aware.

>>
>> Insulting a fellow amateur publically, then denying and justifying the
>> act with a litany of self-serving rhetoric.
>
>I don't see it that way at all.
>
>> Do you believe that these
>> actions, your actions, are in the best interest of the Amateur
>> service?
>
>Yes. You may disagree, but I will not describe that disagreement
>as "prejudice", "censorship" or "self-serving rhetoric".

What part of this statement are you having trouble with, Jim?

Definitions (and specific usage within the thread):

Prejudice: "an opinion formed beforehand" (your opinion that the callsign W5TIT is inappropriate to the ARS)

Censorship: "the supression of something considered objectionable" (like the intentional omission of just one callsign in a list, perhaps?)

Rhetoric: skill with language - (ahem)

>
>> I suspect that few here join you in that belief.
>
>Doesn't matter.

It certainly should!

>Your quote below is quite appropriate. At times, Dr. King
>held standards and beliefs that were not popular. His adherence to those
>standards and beliefs was considered "insulting" by some. Should he have
>listened to them, or followed his conscience?

Dr. King was a champion of equality and equal rights - a mission which cost him his life. He was dedicated to ensuring that people were treated equally, regardless of the "personal standards" of those who felt that they were not entitled to equal treatment.

Do you treat everyone equally, Jim? Even when you have a strong bias against some characteristic of theirs that you find objectionable? No matter what?

I'd refrain from drawing parallels to Dr. King until you can state that unequivocally. Without prejudice.

>>
>> "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of
>> comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and
>> controversy."
>
>Rev. Dr.
>
>> Martin Luther King, Jr.
>
>And at this 'time of challenge and controversy', I say that Kim's
>callsign is inappropriate to the ARS, and I will not repeat it
>in my posts. No insult is meant by this action. But it will not
>change.

Once again, no one is forcing you to use the dreaded callsign in your posts. Again, Jim, the issue is singling out one individual because there is something that you don't like personally! As you well know.

One's principles and beliefs, however righteous and sacrosanct, do not convey the right to treat others disrespectfully.

To return to the quotation from Dr. King - in this time of challenge and controversy, someone might choose to admit that they was wrong in singling out one individual due to personal opinion, and revise his list to indicate equal respect for the status of all participants. Someone else might choose to twist the words and concepts around ad infinitum to justify their actions. Still another would take the moral high ground, and justify their actions based on rigorous personal standards and ideals.

Which of these represents the Right Thing To Do? I know.

So do you, Jim.

>
>I don't use the term "friend" to describe Kim, because she reserves
>that word for a very select group, and I respect that choice of hers.
>
>But I will say that one of the characteristics of a true friend is
>telling the truth as the true friend sees it, even if it is not
>what someone wants to hear, and even if a person may get their
>feelings hurt or feel insulted by that truth.

An excellent homily, Jim - but with a fatal flaw. True friends would conduct this level of personal information interchange only in private, and with compassion, sensitivity and dignity. A true friend would not choose to do that in a public forum, would they, Jim?

As you well know.

And, as we are all quite well aware.

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

817. Re: len over 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:13:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112161325.21642.00003662@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85495

In article <5a5fcb7b.0401120535.3aaa6a6@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:

>What is your name anyway?

The same as on my comments for all the 14 petitions for/against
code testing in the US amateur radio service:

Leonard H. Anderson
10048 Lanark Street
Sun Valley, CA 91352-4236

I have the courage of my convictions to give my name in public.

YOU do NOT.

You remain a nearly-uneducated TROLL who slithers out from
under a bridge now and then to make nasty...ALWAYS hiding
your identity. No guts. No possibility of glory.

You are only a small step below Broose, about "$250" worth.

LHA / WMD

818. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:13:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112161326.21642.00003663@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85493

In article <20040112062425.14191.00003107@mb-m28.aol.com>, notveryfine@aol.com (Notveryfine) writes:

>P.S. Don't bother trying to find me. For I am already gone.

Dood, you were GONE before that posting...

Stebe, go get some therapy.

LHA / WMD

819. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:13:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112161326.21642.00003664@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85494

In article <BAzMb.5641$1e.1232@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>> I thought I was seeing Hans with something other
>> than a gorilla thumping message.
>
>I never thump my gorilla. My dad said I'd go blind if I did.

Quit the monkey business in public...

LHA / WMD

820. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:13:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112161327.21642.00003665@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85496

In article <Xns946DEA16671B6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in
>news:4unMb.11286$uF6.3715663@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
>> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>> All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
>>> that..... babble.
>>
>> Just like all the high and mighty amateurs that seem to think it's a
>> good idea to follow the rules while on the air.
>>
>> If ya breaks the usenet rulez, you getz flamed.
>>
>> Mike KB3EIA -
>
>True, but you can't get your Usenet licence taken away, which is a big
>difference

Mike got one of those shiney shields signifying his "official" radio
cop status for Christmas?

Tsk, tsk, he doesn't know that "Dragnet" got cancelled... :-)

LHA / WMD

821. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:13:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112161329.21642.00003666@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85497

In article <3wvMb.4880$i4.1490@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> > To do the types of public service
>> > we're authorized to do (MARS,
>> > RACES, and so on), authorization
>> > is required.
>> >
>> > Sec. 97.407 (snip)
>>
>> That is an authorization to operate
>> on those frequencies and an
>> authorization to operate the station
>> not an authorization to do public
>> service. (snip)
>
> "That is authorization to operate on those frequencies" to do what, Dee?
>The only answer is "public service" in this context. When it comes to
>Amateur Radio, we perform our public service using the Amateur Radio
>frequencies. And the FCC is the governing agency that says what is
>authorized on those frequencies (not everything is - your license is not a
>blank check to do what you want with the Amateur frequencies). For example,
>when it comes to the walk-a-thon you mentioned, the FCC has set rules on
>what is and isn't authorized in that situation. The same with your power
>blackout situation. And the same with ARES. In other words, you are only
>allowed to use your radio in situations authorized, and in the manner
>authorized. One situation authorized is public service.

Dwight, throughout ALL of Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations,
the word "service" is a regulatory term used to denote the type
and kind of radio activity being regulated.

Too many self-enobling amateurs wish to wrap themselves in the
finery of some kind of "patriotism" or "good works" and say they
do their hobby activity "for the public good."

AMATEUR radio is, de facto, a hobby, a recreational activity
involving radio transmission, done without pecuniary interest.

There should be NOTHING WRONG with having a fun hobby just
to have a hobby. One hundred seventy thousand members of the
AMA use a number of 72 MHz frequencies for model radio control.
That's purely a recreational activity. Not one whit of "public
service" about it, no dreaming about being a "service to the nation"

by using those allocated, authorized radio frequencies.

Anyone thinking that amateur radio is "primarily about public service" is deluding themselves and/or living in a fantasyland of daydreams. Amateur radio is a hobby. It was never anything else and it may never be anything else. Why should it be more than a hobby?

I've never needed a "license" to do jury duty, yet I've done it four times. I've never needed a "license" to be a court witness yet I've done that once. I've never needed a "license" to contribute to a charity or be a hospital volunteer or anything else to do REAL public/civic service. Anyone physically capable can do all of those things without any "license" or "special authorization/allocation" by some "authority."

The five volumes of regulations on Title 47 C.F.R. concern normal operation of all the US civil radio services, its operators, and the structure and activities of the FCC. The authorization/allocation of ALL services is specifically stated therein. For those wishing to get into REAL public service radio, that is mostly in Part 90 under Public Safety Radio Services.

Part 97.1 "Definitions" does NOT specifically "authorize public service" nor is it in any way some kind of Important Noble Medal surrogate to wear/show-off/brag-about. 97.1 is basically old, standard political boilerplate CHAFF, words to use as political radar screening (a time-honored American law tradition even if the names of it vary) to INFER a raison d'etre for the radio service.

Political chaff is very important in lawmaking. It carries with it a fantastic amount of emotional baggage...but all that baggage is essential to the creation of whatever the law is defining. A particular activity being legislated cannot readily exist without all that baggage. That kind of baggage gets politicians elected and it lets those politicians enact legislation that is so "important" to some of the citizenry.

While all the radio amateurs - and especiall the league - were busy thumping their gorilla chests to beats of self-importance rhythm, the AMA quietly lobbied for, and got a number of R/C frequencies. Not for any national "public service" to "do good works" or anything else except make several thousand model hobbyists happy. Nothing in there about "pioneering flight" or anything else pretentious, just for a recreational hobby, to have fun, to enjoy themselves.

The membership of the AMA is approximately equal to the member-ship of the ARRL...170 thousand each. Isn't that curious? :-)

The AMA (Academy of Model Aeronautics) doesn't constantly pretend to be anything else but a hobby membership organization, affiliated internationally with other model hobby organizations. ARRL on the other hand is terribly self-pretentious with a constant PR of

self-importance, "radio pioneering" and general self-grandeur.

Amateur radio transmissions fall under the federal laws concerning United States civil radio. Such are given specific regulations by the FCC. That isn't enoblement "to do the public good," it is merely a separation of the various radio activities for regulatory purposes.

Trying to draw "conclusions, authorizations" from the first part of Part 97 - for any reason - is like saying all politicians' statements are "true." The definitions of 97.1 are just general statements, political chaff (or any other spin-equivalent name you want) of the old style to justify the existance of the radio activity in the political arena.

LHA

822. Current FCC data

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:24:41 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tgEMb.6004$1e.4431@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85498

http://www.hamdata.com/fccinfo.html

823. VE's may lose 220-222MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 21:39:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <auEMb.6010$1e.1851@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85499

RAC Bulletin 03-034E - Canadian Amateurs may lose part of the 220 MHz band

After studying the spectrum needs of various services over the past 18 months, the Radio Advisory Board of Canada (RABC) has decided to recommend
to Industry Canada that the 220-222 MHz band be transferred from the amateur
to the mobile service. The RABC also recommends that:

- - Amateur repeaters in this portion of the band be grandfathered to continue
operation for a number of years, with the number to be decided by Industry
Canada.

- -A section of 150 kHz of spectrum in the 220-222 MHz band be designated as
public service spectrum to be shared by amateur and mobile services for special public safety and disaster communications applications.

- - The band 219-220 MHz is allocated on a secondary basis to the Amateur
service in Canada, which would be in harmony with a similar allocation in
the USA.

- - The band from 222-225 MHz remains as a primary exclusive amateur allocation.

Following consultation with Canadian amateurs in a survey conducted in July
2002 RAC, as a member of the RABC, has vigorously opposed these proposed changes without success.

Industry Canada must now take this advice, together with input from RAC, decide on a course of action, and in all likelihood conduct a public consultation before issuing a decision. The prospects do not look good. For the full story, visit the RAC web site at
http://www.rac.ca/news/canada.htm

824. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-12 23:20:24 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>
Source record: 85500

On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>snip
>
>So let's recap:
>
>With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
>lengthy
>and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>
>I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>rather than my own.
>
>I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>
>And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>inappropriate words.

Jim,

This is really uncharacteristic of you. I am amazed that a well
educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
Bully-like behaviour, Jim? I wouldn't have thought it possible.

That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.

>
>So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
>vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>
>
>"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"

No.

>
>73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY

Brilliant.

73, Leo

825. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 00:55:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040112195509.00545.00003559@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 85551

In article <plcMb.2501$q4.1909@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> >
>> > (snip)
>>
>> But you have no negative comments
>> for the person who does it.
>
> Negative comments had already been posted by others. I don't kick people
>when they're already laying on the ground from the blows of others.
>
I don't see anyone in that condition...
>
>> Yes, if the callsign is inappropriate to
>> the ARS.
>>
>> Do you think all possible callsigns are
>> appropriate, Dwight?
>
> Beyond the law, I don't think it is my mission in life to decide what is
>appropriate for others. If I have a problem with the laws (the callsigns
>allowed by the FCC), then my fight is with the lawmakers (the FCC). Whatever
>the case, I don't take it upon myself to engage in an ongoing campaign
>against those who make choices different then my own. Kim is aware of my
>opinion about her callsign (I wouldn't have chosen it myself). Beyond that,
>the discussion is over as far as I'm concerned. If I felt this is a real
>problem, I'd take up the issue of callsigns with the FCC.

You very neatly avoided the question.
>
>> You have had no problem when others
>> have used insulting names rather than
>> callsigns to refer to me, (snip)
>
> I've never seen anyone use insulting names to refer to you.

Then you must have killfiled Len Anderson and Brian Burke a long time ago.
Which is probably a very smart thing to do. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

826. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 01:21:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85552

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> element 1 is abolished.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather iffy.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

827. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 01:36:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <fYHMb.26243$P%1.23844114@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85553

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:rtDMb.5973$1e.5669@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> <
> < Just do it till you need glasses, Hans.
> <
>
> I'm already wearing tri-focals.
>
> dit dit, de Hans, K0HB

I find the progressive lenses much more comfortable and useful myself.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

828. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 02:09:15 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0401121809.1a9b20a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85554

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

< And, while there is nothing mandatory about it,
< the mandate (authorization) to do so still
< remains.

Dwight, do you read and understand what you write prior to mashing the
<send> button?

If there is nothing mandat(ory) about something, how can it be a
mandate?

A mandate is a command, *requiring* a certain action.

An authorization is a grant of permission, but does not *require* an
action.

73, de Hans, K0HB

829. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 02:17:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401121817.287af855@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85555

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<_6dMb.24955$P%1.23043109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:btql45$t7a@library1.airnews.net...
> [snip]
> > 'S 'bout time. Now, to all who have been participating in this debate,
> > WHICH style of post was it that got more noticed I had added my CALLSIGN
> to
> > the list? It took you all (and actually it took only Mike because no one
> > else noticed) almost exactly 3 days to notice that the two posts were made
> > on the same day. One with (and first) and one without attributes. And, I
> > honestly ask: who really noticed one (attributes) or the other (no
> > attributes)? I'd almost bet a buck that even Jim wondered what in the
> world
> > was in that post that was different, whether the attributes were there or
> > not. By the way, note that the post that was made somewhere around a
> couple
> > of days ago...where I again submitted the list without attributes, note
> that
> > in *that* post, my information appears at the top of the post (the "Kim
> > Walker said" stuff). Is anyone watching this stuff? Really?!
> >
> > The entire point had been having my callsign *in the list* as a ham radio
> > operator. Jim complains that to Google or whatever, it looked like he had
> > posted something he had not said. A) the only thing he had not said was
> my
> > callsign so who cares? B) What about someone who is casually looking at
> > those posts and completely disregards my submission because it *looks*
> like
> > I don't have a callsign?
> >
> > At any rate, I don't think attributes are as paid attention to as everyone
> > thinks...UNTIL they come up like this...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> I pay attention to every single attribute and immediately noticed the
> difference in both posts. I elected not to get into the debate and kept my
> opinions to myself. However since you seem to think people ignore the
> attributes, I decided I must repond to dispel that notion. And as far as
> I'm concerned, deliberately making the attribute appear to be something
> other than it was happens to be wrong. Making errors in keeping attributes
> in long threads happens and is excusable. Choosing to make an attribute

> appear something else is not excusable.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

So in the end, knowing the Code at 20 or even 35 WPM really doesn't guarantee good character.

Thanks for the lesson in ethics, Jim.

73, Brian

830. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 09:14:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZFOMb.5513$q4.280@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85556

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) Anyone thinking that amateur
> radio is "primarily about public service"
> is deluding themselves and/or living in
> a fantasyland of daydreams. Amateur
> radio is a hobby. It was never anything
> else and it may never be anything else.
> Why should it be more than a hobby?

Of course, those quotes don't reflect anything said by me. Instead, I said public service is a key component of the basis and purpose of this radio service (97.1a).

> (snip) I've never needed a "license"
> to do jury duty, yet I've done it four
> times. I've never needed a "license"
> to be a court witness yet I've done
> that once. I've never needed a
> "license" to contribute to a charity or
> be a hospital volunteer or anything
> else to do REAL public/civic service.
> Anyone physically capable can do
> all of those things without any
> "license" or "special authorization/
> allocation" by some "authority."

Obviously, Len. We were talking public service relating to Amateur radio. Nothing said precludes public service in some other means or manner.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

831. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 10:19:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vCPMb.5528$q4.2861@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85557

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> >
> > Again, the words mandate and authorization
> > are synonymous.
>
>
> Not in any dictionary I can find, nor in Roget's.

Princeton University's WordNet...

http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn/

Click on "Use WordNet Online" and enter "mandate." Notice the word "authorization" right next to it for the first definition. Notice the word "mandatory" next to it for the second definition. Mandate and authorization are synonymous in the context used.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

832. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 10:29:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85558

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401121002.3c510145@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>...

Just a mention before I take off for the office:

>
> > Maybe you don't feel
> > boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly
insulted--at
> > least it looked that way to me in this post!
> >
> > Kim
>
> [inappropriate callsign deleted]
>
> So let's recap:
>
> With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
> lengthy
> and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>

Ummmmm, that's quite standard for this newsgroup.

>
> I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
> rather than my own.
>

Not at all. I didn't see that. Your angst was for the fact that someone changed attributes in a post. For that, you are wrong; as I am. It doesn't matter *why* the posts are getting changed; that part of the debate was mere distraction. Fact still remains that you bitched at me for something you, yourself, have been doing.

>
> I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>

There's something good in everything...and I do mean everything. For each and every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. Most people take that to mean good=good and bad=bad. It can also, and more often, mean good=bad and bad=good.

>
> And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
> inappropriate words.
>

Typical behavior for you. Although, the implication of you being a leg man--and stating so in such a way as to imply something sexual about it, also defeats your whole stance of removing inappropriate things from posts you take part in. But, you can be contradictory--that's OK.

>
> So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
> vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>
>
> "ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>
> 73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>

As I said, you've been changing my original posts for over a year now (by deleting my callsign from them--by the way, that was just pointed out to me by someone else a bit of time ago--I've been "watching" since) so if you want to get offended, upset, etc., about changing posts then be upset at yourself first. Whether by changing attributes or deleting things from original posts--both a) are supposedly against standard conventions of newsgroups/Usenet and, b) both could be strewn to be disrespectful, deceitful, inappropriate, incorrect, and causation for a long debate. You began the behavior before me, I trumped it.

As I said, you may not "feel" boxed. However, you have been just uncharacteristic enough in several examples that I am quite sure you were, in some way, caught up in being very defensive over something you did. I remain with a feeling of debate victory...

However, there is something rather interesting about the thread the last few days: it's obviously had Hans occupied.

Kim W-5-T-I-T

833. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 10:33:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QPPMb.5539$q4.3628@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85559

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> Dwight, do you read and understand
> what you write prior to mashing the
> <send> button?
>
> If there is nothing mandat(ory) about
> something, how can it be a mandate?

Mandatory is only one definition, or contextual sense, of the word "mandate," Hans. There are others.

> An authorization is a grant of
> permission, but does not
> *require* an action.

A mandate does not always "require" action. For example, a people can give a mandate to their elected leaders, but those leaders are not required to follow it. For example, the people can give a president a mandate to raise taxes to finance schools, but he can finance those schools some other way. In that sense, the people have their president an authorization to act, not a requirement he must follow.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

834. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 10:33:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu0hil$crn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85560

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:vCPMb.5528$q4.2861@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "K HB" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> > >
> > > Again, the words mandate and authorization
> > > are synonymous.
> >
> >
> > Not in any dictionary I can find, nor in Roget's.
>
>
> Princeton University's WordNet...
>
> http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn/
>
> Click on "Use WordNet Online" and enter "mandate." Notice the word
> "authorization" right next to it for the first definition. Notice the word
> "mandatory" next to it for the second definition. Mandate and
authorization
> are synonymous in the context used.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Circumlocutory, Dwight. I understood your implied intent by the use of the word mandate and they did, too. ;)

Kim W5TIT

835. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 10:43:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <aZPMb.5540$q4.598@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85561

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > I've never seen anyone use insulting
> > names to refer to you.
>
> Surely you jest Dwight!!

No, I'm not. Contrary to what some may think, I don't follow each of the discussions here. I trash about half the threads without even a glance. A good chunk of the remaining threads get trashed after I've read only one or two messages to see if I'm at all interested. And, finally, of the remaining threads, I certainly don't read all messages. The only name I've seen recently relating to Jim is Len's "Rev. Jim," and I'd hardly call that a great insult.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

836. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 11:13:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rpQMb.6565$i4.1387@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85562

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Circumlocutory, Dwight. I understood
> your implied intent by the use of the
> word mandate and they did, too. ;)

That's a mighty big word, Kim. Unnecessarily wordy? Perhaps.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

837. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 12:31:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401130431.4d601897@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85563

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> > I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> > element 1 is abolished.
> >
> > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep in
> mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for General
> or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With the
> speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather
> iffy.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Don't forget to factor in the leap year.

838. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 12:56:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040113075617.12631.00004182@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85565

In article <kajMb.5688$zj7.801@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Kim ---> Jim has every right to not include your callsign in his messages.

I agree.
>
>Jim ---> Kim has every right to feel whatever she feels about that, and to
>post messages which make her "feel victorous" in return.

I agree again.
>
>In other words, you both have the right to make yourselves look like
>laughable self-righteous sanctimonious twits, and you both are certainly
>doing a superb job of that.

We're just following your lead, Hans.

>All the high-sounding babble about usenet attribution rules is exactly
>that..... babble.

Foma! All foma!

>
>Attribute that.

I got yer attributions right here....
>
>With all kind wishes,
>

73 de Jim, N2EY

839. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 12:56:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040113075618.12631.00004183@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85564

In article <gsDMb.5971$1e.4693@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
><
>< So let me get this straight. Newsgroup rules are cool to be broken?
><
>
>Far as I know, there are no Newsgroup rules, only habits and widely accepted
>conventions. Any one who takes exception to exceptions, is certain to
>accumulate an exceptional quantity of exceptions. If you are starting a
>collection, I have included three above.
>
I take exception to that.

73 de Jim "gorilla my dreams" N2EY

840. Re: Current FCC data

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 15:38:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401130738.6b227e8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85566

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<tgEMb.6004$1e.4431@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> http://www.hamdata.com/fccinfo.html

Fascinating stuff!

Note that the totals shown are for the entire database, including
licenses that have expired but which are still in the grace period.
Station-only licenses (like clubs) are also included.

The numbers I post in "ARS License Numbers" are the unexpired total of
individuals only.

73 de Jim, N2EY

841. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 16:16:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400419F9.9D46093C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85567

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > I think Kim's complaint is valid. Jim
> > > obviously has some issue with her
> > > callsign. Without saying why, he refuses
> > > to use her callsign as he has done with
> > > everyone else on his list. That callsign
> > > was issued by the FCC and, if Jim has
> > > an issue with that, he should take it up
> > > with the FCC. Regardless, until the
> > > FCC says otherwise, that callsign is
> > > legitimate and should be treated as
> > > such by all within the Ham radio
> > > community - just as any ham operator,
> > > including Jim, would expect his or her
> > > own callsign to be treated.
> >
> >
> > Nice, Dwight. Very touchy-feely and
> > politically correct.
>
> No, just civil, polite, manners, Dave. My mother wasn't thinking of
> political correctness when she taught me to try to respect others, even if
> they may not deserve it.

I'm not in disagreement over the use of manners.

> Sadly, too many people today consider polite
> manners to be an unwelcomed human attribute, now described as political
> correctness by those people.

Sadly, some people attempt to forge a tie between the terms "polite" and
"political correctness". There is no link between them. Jim didn't
treat Kim's callsign badly; he didn't use it at all. After all, it
could be easily argued that Kim didn't treat amateur radio with respect
in choosing her call.
A number of us believe that her choice was tacky and tactless.

> > I'm certain that Jim has an issue with
> > Kim's call. Quite a number of us have
> > issues with Kim's call. Even Riley
> > Hollingsworth has issues with Kim's

> > call. For you to attempt the equation
> > of Kim's tacky choice of vanity call
> > with Jim's non-vanity call is ludicrous.
>
> Regardless, the agency that Hollingsworth works for, and that issued the
> other callsigns on Jim's list, does equate the validity of Kim's callsign to
> Jim's. Some may wish to dismiss that, but doing so perhaps says a lot about
> their own character.

It might say something about their character but it doesn't say anything negative about it. The FCC looks the other way with regard to language used in prime time television these days. If I object and state that I find the use of such language to be offensive, it says nothing negative at all about my character. The FCC often does and often has abdicated its responsibilities in a number of areas. That it does so, does not confirm the correctness of those inactions.

Dave K8MN

842. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 16:28:37 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0401130828.5398f925@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85568

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> > I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> > element 1 is abolished.
> >
> > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep in
> mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for General
> or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With the
> speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather
> iffy.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

And ... a code CSCE is only "good" as follows:
1. For upgrade to General, one year. However, once a General, then the
element is part of the General package and allows upgrade to Extra
without the one-year deadline or retaking.
2. Without upgrade to General/Extra, the element allows "Tech Plus"
privileges, which were the bands and frequencies alloted to the Novice
ticket, for as long as the holder remains a Technician.

Carl

843. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 16:30:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40041D36.8DCD5783@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85569

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FFB8BC9.9CB4C0DF@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040106211822.23171.00003209@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > > Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> > > eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.
> > >
> > > WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> > > KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> > > KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> > > K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> > > K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> > > AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> > > N2EY: April 15, 2004
> > > N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> > > KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> > > WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> > > K3LT: September 15, 2004
> > > WK3C: December 30, 2004
> > > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> > > W5TIT: June 1, 2008
> > >
> > > Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Kim,
> >
> > Why do you persist in changing Jim's posts and re-posting with no
> > indication that you're changing them? That kind of thing could further
> > reflect on your character.

>
> Dave: First,

[word deleted]

> you and what you think "character" is all about. You
> are nothing short of a self-serving, high-nosed, snobbish, educated idiot--and
> nothing more; and some of those are even questionable.

It would seem that all of those are questionable. Thanks though, for proving my point.

> Second: on
> character, like I care.

That has long been evident.

> And, if I've made a post I'VE OBVIOUSLY CHANGED IT OR AM JUST PLAIN
> REPOSTING IT. What is so hard about that?

It isn't hard at all; it is evident. It is also wrong.
I dropped a word used by you in my comments above. It is clear from this post that *you* did not drop the word and that I did so.

> Jim refuses to put my callsign
> associated with my prediction.

Good for him. Live with it.

> I will add it whenever I feel (yeah, one of
> those "feeling" things you know nothing about) like it.

I wouldn't want you to get tangled up in reality or fact, Kim.

Dave K8MN

844. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 16:41:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40041FB4.9A4CABFD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85570

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> Mike, how in the Hell is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear like
> someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that
> actually sent it? The "art" of making it look like someone else had sent it
> would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had also
> changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.

Here's an example for you, Kim, just for purposes of illustration:

> I know that I often post before taking the time to think things out and have often > been guilty of acting from emotion before or instead of taking the time to gather > the facts.

Now the above was written by me but it has been made to look as if you
wrote it.

> That Dave Heil is so damned bored with life that he has to concoct things
> from thin air is usual and status quo for him.

It wasn't from thin air, Kim. It was from posts made by you. They
exist. They can't now be denied.

> Don't be so quick to jump on
> a Dave Heil bandwagon...because those wagons don't travel far at all.

I have a bandwagon?

> For anyone with computer sense, it is unreasonable to even consider that a
> post could be issued under the guise of someone else--contrary to the
> opinion that it can be done. And, when I resubmit "The Pool" list with my
> callsign attributed to my prediction date, it is certainly weak, at best, to
> display anger and make it seem as though I was doing *anything* else but
> resubmitting a post an attributing my callsign to my prediction.

That's simply incorrect.

Let's do another example for purposes of illustration:

> I have given some thought to my choice of callsigns and feel that I may have made a > mistake. My choice reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual.

If not for the fact that I've made clear that this is an illustration
added by me--if I'd simply taken out the white space and my comments,
I'd be adding the material to make it look as if the statements came
from you. Are you starting to get the picture?

> However, if you or anyone else, is so desperate to reach for the stars in
> some display of dislike for me--then go for it.

No, it has simply been pointed out to you that you have crossed the line between what's right and what's wrong.

Dave K8MN

845. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 16:43:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042045.42A09D1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85571

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message

> > If I were in this situation, I would post a polite note with my
> > callsign, and not post it as if Jim did the posting. I know until I
> > looked back up at the from area on the screen, I though it was from Jim.
> >
> > I dobt any of us wants our posts altered. We could eventually get like
> > the crazies thaat post here from tim to time.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Oh, yeah, Mike. And God forbid that you think that Jim posted my prediction
> with MY callsign next to it, rather than my name!!! Oh, that would be just
> awful...

Jim is under no obligation to use your callsign.

Dave K8MN

846. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 16:48:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042153.14C35E30@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85572

Kim wrote:

> Ahem...at least he hasn't said he's going to "pray for you" yet. I love it
> when someone says that to me with that certain "tone of voice" LOL

I'll bet you get that a lot. However, why should I do all of the work
for you?
Are you too busy to pray for yourself?

Dave K8MN

847. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:10:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4004269C.D42913D3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85573

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> > Regardless of the reasoning, do you
> > concur with altering peoples posts
> > to reflect your own wishes?
>
> Of course not. But do you concur with attempts to alter the perception of
> a person's status as a Ham by blatantly omitting that person's callsign in a
> list containing only the callsigns of others?

Alter the preception? Blatently omitting? How silly!

> Jim is aware of what he's doing.

I'm sure he is. Who can tell him that he must use a callsign that he
finds offensive?

> Kim had already asked him to include her callsign (a request which
> should have been unnecessary).

Kim could ask me to forget some things she's written in the past, but
that doesn't mean that I should, I must or that I will. Kim could ask
me to loan her money but that doesn't mean that I should, I must or that
I will.

Dave K8MN

848. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:17:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042812.6D86CDB7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85574

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> >
> > Not to mention, support a product made in the USA.
> >
>
> Ya mean like an AMC Gremlin, or an MFJ (anything they make), or Budweiser
> beer?

No, more like a Dodge Viper, a GE refrigerator or a Rolling Rock beer.

> I'll do my part for the hillbilly economy and support Jack Daniels. You and
> Dave can support TenTec.

I'm getting something which lasts and which produces no unpleasant after
effects. It also costs several magnitudes less than the '7800.

Dave K8MN (Don't feel obligated to use my callsign)

849. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:18:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85575

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> > simulation.
> >
> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>
> Also Made In USA.

Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?

Dave K8MN

850. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:24:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400429DE.50A5C6CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85576

Leo wrote:

> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> too!

She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.

> - no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her
> use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of
> the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to
> spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the
> air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking
> over your life!

Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
required to respond.

> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
> I have something in common - so would I!

Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
callsign.

> - Kim is definitely braver than me - I choose not to use my call sign
> on the Usenet groups, to limit the number of crazies that have access
> to my snail mail info, where she is willing to deal head on with
> whomever, whenever in defense of her rights as detailed above.

Well, "Leo", maybe you have an offensive call; maybe you don't. It is
your perogative to keep us in the dark.

Dave K8MN

851. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:26:54 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <yTVMb.13378$G04.2606696@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85577

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40042812.6D86CDB7@earthlink.net...
> "K HB" wrote:
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > Not to mention, support a product made in the USA.
> > >
> >
> > Ya mean like an AMC Gremlin, or an MFJ (anything they make), or
Budweiser
> > beer?
>
> No, more like a Dodge Viper, a GE refrigerator or a Rolling Rock beer.

Well said, Dave. On a more personal AR level...more like an Elecraft K2/100,
a Palstar AT1500C transmatch, and...oops, I don't drink. <hihi>

> > I'll do my part for the hillbilly economy and support Jack Daniels. You
and
> > Dave can support TenTec.
>
> I'm getting something which lasts and which produces no unpleasant after
> effects. It also costs several magnitudes less than the '7800.

Here here.

> Dave K8MN (Don't feel obligated to use my callsign)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

852. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:27:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401130927.21d6469f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85578

"Kim

" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0401121002.3c510145@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>...

> > > Maybe you don't feel
> > > boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly
> > > insulted--at least it looked that way to me in this post!

That's *your* perception.

In *my* perception, ti's the other way around.

> > > Kim
> >
> > [inappropriate callsign deleted]
> >
> > So let's recap:
> >
> > With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
> > lengthy
> > and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.

> Ummmmm, that's quite standard for this newsgroup.

Then let me rephrase:

With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
lengthy and involved *amateur radio policy* debate that had *nothing*
to do with code testing.

That's certainly *not* standard for this NG.

> > I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
> > rather than my own.
>
> Not at all. I didn't see that.

"There are none so blind as those who will not see"

I've been repeatedly told in this thread how I *must* or *should*
conduct "the pool", how I must not remove someone's callsign
from a post, how only the FCC can decide what is appropriate
and inappropriate, etc., etc., etc.

> Your angst was for the fact that someone
> changed attributes in a post.

No angst at all! In fact, someone else first pointed out
that you repeatedly responded to my posts in such a way
that it looked like I wrote something which I did not,
in fact, write.

And you did.

I did not.

> For that, you are wrong; as I am.

I'm not wrong.

Your admission of guilt in the matter is quite admirable, but
unnecessary.

> It doesn't
> matter *why* the posts are getting changed; that part of the debate was mere
> distraction.

Not a question of change. A question of how the change
altered the apparent authorship.

> Fact still remains that you

[expletive deleted]

> at me for something you, yourself, have been doing.

Incorrect! I have not intentionally made it appear
that you or anyone else wrote something you did not
write.

You did.

That's the point.
>
> > I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>
> There's something good in everything...and I do mean everything.

I think you mean "everyone". And I agree to that, though it takes a
lot of looking in some cases.

But not in "everything". For example, tell me what's good in:

binary nerve gases
intentional release of deadly diseases such as smallpox
drunk driving

> For each and every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction.

Only in certain physics problems. Otherwise, there are all sorts of
situations.

Sometimes actions are ignored.

Sometimes there's an over-reaction.

Sometimes there's a chain reaction.

And sometimes there's a big brouhaha and then things return to
a state indistinguishable fromthat previous to the action.

> Most people take
> that to mean good=good and bad=bad. It can also, and more often, mean
> good=bad and bad=good.

I don't take it to mean anything.
>
> > And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
> > inappropriate words.

> Typical behavior for you.

Thank you

> Although, the implication of you being a leg
> man--and stating so in such a way as to imply something sexual about it,
> also defeats your whole stance of removing inappropriate things from posts
> you take part in.

The subject under discussion was baked chicken, Kim. See the
original post - the poster was talking about dinner in the
oven. And it's a fact that I prefer thighs and drumsticks
to wings and [other chicken parts].

With one exception: genuine Buffalo wings - but they're not baked.

If there's anything sexual about my baked-chicken preferences, that's
in *your* mind, not in my post.

> But, you can be contradictory--that's OK.

Can be. Wasn't.

> > So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
> > vanquished, as he says to the crowd:

> > "ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
> >
> > 73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY

Did you see the movie?

> As I said, you've been changing my original posts for over a year now (by
> deleting my callsign from them--by the way, that was just pointed out to me
> by someone else a bit of time ago--I've been "watching" since) so if you
> want to get offended, upset, etc., about changing posts then be upset at
> yourself first.

Not the same thing at all. You're equating my editing
with your own improper attribution.

> Whether by changing attributes or deleting things from
> original posts--both a) are supposedly against standard conventions of
> newsgroups/Usenet and,

There is no convention that the entirety of a post be quoted. Headers
and footers are routinely trimmed.

There *is* a convention that the apparent authorship of words not be
changed in the process of quoting them.

> b) both could be strewn to be disrespectful,
> deceitful, inappropriate, incorrect, and causation for a long debate. You
> began the behavior before me, I trumped it.

By using the term "trump", you admit that your action was far worse
than
mine.

And mine wasn't wrong to begin with. Yours was.
>
> As I said, you may not "feel" boxed.

And I'm not.

> However, you have been just
> uncharacteristic enough in several examples that I am quite sure you were,
> in some way, caught up in being very defensive over something you did.

Being uncharacteristic is a way of drawing in the opponent. Being too
predictable sets one up for defeat. You would not have been drawn in
had I been too predictable.

> I remain with a feeling of debate victory...

That makes two of us. Maximus did not win by himself, y'know.
>
> However, there is something rather interesting about the thread the last few
> days: it's obviously had Hans occupied.

So perhaps we should ask him:

"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"

"IS THIS NOT WHAT YOU CAME TO SEE?!!!"

73 de Jim, "at my signal - unleash [expletive deleted]" N2EY

853. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:28:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042AC5.EBFD2085@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85579

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he
> chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious
> decision to participate in something he's providing for fun.

Oh, for crying out loud, Kim.

> I
> deliberately, with no malice, and consciously deleted the attributes of the
> original message simply to include my callsign in the list.

No, that isn't what you did.

> I don't give a hoot if you, the Usenet police, Jim, or any other person has
> a problem with that.

That has been evident for a very long time.

Dave K8MN

854. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:33:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042C07.AAA5E587@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85580

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Brian, "real" radios are ANALOG.

When this comes back to bit you down the line, reflect upon the fact
that only you have made such a statement here.

> Real he-men morsemen don't use digital.

How would you know, kindly old gent?

> Digital is for techno-weebs who "don't have any interest in radio!"
>
> Dave (who is interested in radio because he learned morse) can
> download FIRMWARE for his Orion!

You never quite get things right. Dave is interested in radio. Dave
has been a licensed radio amateur for four decades. Dave knows morse.
Dave can and does download firmware for his Orion. You too can download
Orion firmware but it won't do much for you unless you buy an Orion.

Dave K8MN

855. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:49:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40042FCA.3F2834BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85581

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FFCE328.1733823E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I believe that's the beauty of the Orion, it's never "ancient." The latest
> >> upgrade is just a download away. I feel for the poor slob who finally
> >breaks
> >> down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800 Pro or Pro II comes out.
> >>
> >TT just keeps making it better and better. The rig is now about eight
> >months old and I've downloaded about ten firmware releases in that time.
>
> "FIRMWARE releases?!?"

Yes, firmware releases.

> Gosh, you must be equipped with a Star Trek Transporter! :-)

No, just a PC with an internet connection.

> Oh, you mean SOFTWARE updates, right?

No, I don't. I mean firmware updates.

> Let's see, that's more than one per month.

- Version 1.325 - initial release
03/26/03 Version 1.326
03/27/03 Version 1.327
03/28/03 Version 1.328
03/31/03 Version 1.329
04/01/03 Version 1.330
04/02/03 Version 1.331
04/03/04 Version 1.332
04/04/03 Version 1.333
04/06/03 Version 1.334
04/07/03 Version 1.335
04/08/03 Version 1.336
04/10/03 Version 1.337
04/11/03 - 04/13/03 Version 1.338
04/14/03 - 04/16/03 Version 1.339
04/26/03-05/06/03 Version 1.340
05/12/03-05/14/03 Version 1.341
05/19/03-05/22/03 Version 1.342
05/27/03 Version 1.343

06/03/03 Version 1.344
06/06/03 Version 1.345
06/11/03 Version 1.346
06/13/03 Version 1.347
06/25/03 Version 1.348
07/08/03 Version 1.349
07/10/03 VERSION 1.350
07/29/03 Version 1.351
08/07/03 Version 1.352
08/11/03 Version 1.353
08/12/03 Version 1.354
08/15/03 Version 1.355
08/19/03 Version 1.356
08/21/03 Version 1.357
08/22/03 Version 1.358
08/25/03 Version 1.359
09/12/03 Version 1.360
09/16/03 Version 1.361
09/25/03 Version 1.362
10/06/03 Version 1.363
10/22/03 Version 1.364
10/23/03 Version 1.365
11/14/03 Version 1.366
12/19/03 Version 1.367

Well, it certainly looks like more than one per month, doesn't it old fellow?
Interestingly, the manufacturer lists the above list under "Firmware Revision History".

> I would think that Orion could have stabilized the programming by
> now. No new band changes have happened in eight months... :-)

Really? I seem to recall adding 60m capability to the Orion. Weren't you paying attention? Were you under the impression that "band changes" were the only things which could be modified in the Orion?

> Gosh, Orion must "not be interested in radio" if they can't get
> their software routines stabilized by now...

"Orion" isn't? It would seem that the Ten-Tec folks would show their lack of interest by not issuing any updates at all. You may resume your nap, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

856. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:53:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400430AD.49C5BDF5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85582

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Or just Attila the Ham (or "Atilla" if you speak Hunnish with a dialect)?

That'd be you, since you're the fellow who coined the terms "Atila" and "beligerant", Leonard. You used both words more than once. Some dialect.

Dave K8MN

857. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 17:54:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401130954.2935c798@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85583

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<bur5001g2u88h116dg6edp4job551b8mit@4ax.com>...
> On 12 Jan 2004 09:15:19 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<e0q200t2lf43asf4ojn6t3qihahbl43ums@4ax.com>...
> >> Jim,
> >>
> >> Personally, I feel that it is indeed unfortunate that you do not see,
> >> or will not admit to, your disrespectful treatment of Kim,
> >>
> >[callsign deleted]
> >
> >Your opinion noted, Leo. However, after much consideration, I do not
> >consider my omission of Kim's callsign to be disrespectful. YMMV.
>
> As stated before, it wasn't your omission of Kim's callsign that was
> disrespectful, it was the context that it was done in - omitting hers,
> but leaving everyone else's intact. Repeatedly.
>
> As you are aware.

I am aware that you preceive it that way. Are you aware that no disrespect
was intended?

> >> Your statements in defense of your conduct are based entirely upon
> >> circular logic, rationalization, contradiction and denial - indicating
> >> that you are not prepared to accept responsibility for your actions
> >> towards a fellow ham here on the group.
> >>
> >Basically what you are saying is that I should accept Kim's callsign
> >as appropriate for the ARS, and use it here, because:
> >
> >1) FCC issued it
> >2) She asked me to
> >3) *You* don't 'have a problem' with the callsign, and therefore *I*
> > shouldn't, either.
>
> No - I said that Kim's callsign IS a valid one, accepted by the FCC
> for use in the ARS.

It's a *legal* one. No one disputes that.

> You can dislike it, revile it, be insulted by it
> - whatever you choose to do. But, you must respect the fact that it

> is a valid amateur callsign - because it is! Just like yours, issued
> officially by the FCC.

I did not ask for this specific callsign. Kim asked for hers.
>
> Jim, you aren't the guy who gets to determine what is or is not
> appropriate for the ARS.

Not true!

We *all* have a say in what is and is not appropriate for the ARS. And that
includes me.

> That role belongs to the regulatory authorities.

And to all of us hams.

> Whatever your problem is with this particular call, it
> is between you and the FCC - not us! If they declare that it is
> inappropriate, then it will be withdrawn. If not, it stays. Whatever
> it is - it's their decision - not yours and mine!

That's only true as far as the issuance of a callsign. Not its use.
>
> As you are aware.

> >As I have stated before, no disrespect was intended. But I am not
> >going to use Kim's callsign in my posts, because I think it is
> >inappropriate for the IRS.
>
> In your opinion, Jim - not necessarily the opinion of the FCC, or many
> members of the ARS.

I'm not telling them not to use Kim's callsign.

You are telling me I *must* use it.

Not gonna happen.

> However, no one is trying to say that you must
> use Kim's callsign in your posts - the issue is with your intentional
> exclusion of only her callsign from your list!

Which is the same as saying I *must* use it!
>
> As you are aware.
> >
> >You can use it in your posts all you want. So can Kim. I won't try to
> >impose my standards on others, even though they try to impose their
> >standards on me.
>
> No one is attempting to impose standards upon you, Jim.

Yes, they are.

> The message
> was (quite clearly) that it is inappropriate and disrespectful to omit
> just this one callsign from the pool, while leaving all others intact.
> As you well know. And as clearly stated in previous posts.
>
> As you are aware.
>
"inappropriate and disrespectful" by whose standards?

Answer: YOURS!
>
> >[Kim a licensed radio amateur]
> >
> >> told you straight up that she felt disrespected by your actions.
> >
> >I have felt disrespected by her action in choosing that callsign.
> >I told her that straight up a long time ago.
>
> Not sure I understand why you would feel personally disrespected by
> Kim's choice of callsign, Jim - I don't imagine that she did it to
> offend you personally.

She didn't. But that was my perception. And to paraphrase Kim: 'that's the
perception that counts'
>
> You are of course free to express your opinion regarding this issue,
> however - but to do so in public isn't always a wise choice. Would
> you walk up to someone in a crowded mall and tell her exactly what you
> thought about their skitr being too short?

Depends on who it was.

> Of course not - that would
> be impolite. And not too smart, perhaps - she might smack you! :)

What if it was my teenage daughter? (Not saying I do or do not have one).
>
> Some opinions are best kept to one's self :)

And some are best expressed rather than repressed.

> >> A simple apology to her would have been appropriate.
> >
> >I apologize if my posts have upset anyone. That was not the intent.
> >But I will not compromise my standards on this to avoid hurting
> >someone's feelings.
> >
> >> The right thing to do.
> >
> >In your opinion. Mine's different.
>
> Compromising standards isn't the issue, Jim. As you are aware.

No, it's *exactly* the issue. To use Kim's call here would compromise my
standards.
>
> If you had changed your poll to list everyone by their first name,
> would that have compromised your standards? Of course not. It would
> have created a Level Playing Field, and caused little fuss at all.

It would have caused confusion because there are several people with
the same first name here.
>
> It would have removed the opportunity for you to try and punish Kim
> for her poor choice of callsign, though - say, you weren't trying to
> do that, were you?

Nope.

> Of course not - your standards are too high for
> that......aren't they?
>
Yep.

> >> Jim, you have been a frequent victim of attack and insult here
> >> yourself - frankly, you should know better.
> >
> >Where is the insult in not using a word or phrase I think is
> >inappropriate?
>
> As stated above, and in previous posts - it is a situational thing.
> For example, yelling "Hey, Dick!" to a friend sitting over at a bar is
> quite appropriate. Yelling "Hey, Dick!" to some biker sitting at the
> bar is not.

What if that's the biker's name?

> Same phrase - totally different intent. Context is
> everything!
>
> As you are aware.

Yet yelling both phrases is *legal* - although not always
advisable or appropriate.

And in the context of amateur radio callsigns, I think Kim's choice
of callsign is inadvisable and inappropriate.

Your own logic proves it.
>
> >> Insulting a fellow amateur publically, then denying and justifying the
> >> act with a litany of self-serving rhetoric.
> >
> >I don't see it that way at all.
> >
> >> Do you believe that these
> >> actions, your actions, are in the best interest of the Amateur

> >> service?
> >
> >Yes. You may disagree, but I will not describe that disagreement
> >as "prejudice", "censorship" or "self-serving rhetoric".
>
> What part of this statement are you having trouble with, Jim?

The words ""prejudice", "censorship" and "self-serving rhetoric", for a start.
They are inaccurate
>
> Definitions (and specific usage within the thread):
>
> Prejudice: "an opinion formed beforehand" (your opinion that the
> callsign

[inappropriate callsign deleted]

> is inappropriate to the ARS)

It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered the
callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues.

Therefore, it's not prejudice.
>
> Censorship: "the supression of something considered objectionable"
> (like the intentional omission of just one callsign in a list,
> perhaps?)

I use the word "inappropriate", not "objectionable". And I did not
"suppress" it - I just won't put it in a post of mine.

Therefore, it's not censorship.
>
> Rhetoric: skill with language - (ahem)
>
The phrase was "self-serving rhetoric", not just the word "rhetoric".

AHEM.

> >> I suspect that few here join you in that belief.
> >
> >Doesn't matter.
>
> It certainly should!

So you're saying the majority opinion should rule? What if
the majority says it's inappropriate?
>
> >Your quote below is quite appropriate. At times, Dr. King
> >held standards and beliefs that were not popular. His adherence to those
> >standards and beliefs was considered "insulting" by some. Should he have
> >listened to them, or followed his conscience?
>

> Dr. King was a champion of equality and equal rights - a mission which
> cost him his life. He was dedicated to ensuring that people were
> treated equally, regardless of the "personal standards" of those who
> felt that they were not entitled to equal treatment.

Equal rights under law. Equal opportunities. Not equal results. Not
an abandonment of standards.
>
> Do you treat everyone equally, Jim?

I treat them appropriately. What is appropriate for an adult is not
appropriate for a child. To treat them equally could be very unsafe.

> Even when you have a strong bias
> against some characteristic of theirs that you find objectionable? No
> matter what?

The only bias I have is in my Southgate Type 7.
>
> I'd refrain from drawing parallels to Dr. King until you can state
> that unequivocally. Without prejudice.

I state without prejudice that I don't have the bias you accuse me of.
I have standards that I adhere to.
> >>
> >> "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of
> >> comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and
> >> controversy."
> >
> >Rev. Dr.
> >
> >> Martin Luther King, Jr.
> >
> >And at this 'time of challenge and controversy', I say that Kim's
> >callsign is inappropriate to the ARS, and I will not repeat it
> >in my posts. No insult is meant by this action. But it will not
> >change.
>
> Once again, no one is forcing you to use the dreaded callsign in your
> posts. Again, Jim, the issue is singling out one individual because
> there is something that you don't like personally! As you well know.
>
> One's principles and beliefs, however righteous and sacrosanct, do not
> convey the right to treat others disrespectfully.

Some people said that when people organized marches and protests against
things that violated *their standards*, they were acting disrespectfully.
>
> To return to the quotation from Dr. King - in this time of challenge
> and controversy, someone might choose to admit that they was wrong in
> singling out one individual due to personal opinion, and revise his
> list to indicate equal respect for the status of all participants.

> Someone else might choose to twist the words and concepts around ad
> infinitum to justify their actions. Still another would take the moral
> high ground, and justify their actions based on rigorous personal
> standards and ideals.
>
> Which of these represents the Right Thing To Do? I know.

And by saying you know, you are doing exactly what you describe.
>
> So do you, Jim.
>
> >I don't use the term "friend" to describe Kim, because she reserves
> >that word for a very select group, and I respect that choice of hers.
> >
> >But I will say that one of the characteristics of a true friend is
> >telling the truth as the true friend sees it, even if it is not
> >what someone wants to hear, and even if a person may get their
> >feelings hurt or feel insulted by that truth.
>
> An excellent homily, Jim - but with a fatal flaw. True friends would
> conduct this level of personal information interchange only in
> private, and with compassion, sensitivity and dignity. A true friend
> would not choose to do that in a public forum, would they, Jim?

Some would. I did. So did Kim, and so have you. And while I respect
Kim's use of the word "friend", I would say that the honesty and openness
here - even in disagreement - are the actions of "true friends".

73 de Jim, N2EY

858. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:00:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401131000.5d254f7b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85584

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >snip
> >
> >So let's recap:
> >
> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
> >lengthy
> >and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
> >
> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
> >rather than my own.
> >
> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
> >
> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
> >inappropriate words.
>
> Jim,
>
> This is really uncharacteristic of you.

That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.

> I am amazed that a well
> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.

You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
something I didn't? Water under the bridge.

> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?

Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
threats at all in my actions or postings.

> I wouldn't have thought it possible.

It isn't.
>
> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.

Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
others said he "must" do or "should" do?
> >

> >So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
> >vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
> >
> >"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>
> No.

dang. I thought you of all people would be.
>
> >
> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>
> Brilliant.
>
Thank you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

859. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:01:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85585

Len Over 21 wrote:

> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.

You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.

> I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
> examination. That's all.

"Go for it, EX purchasing agent..."

"Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio."

"Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York
TIMES."

"MODERN HF amateur radio: 'What was good in the 1930s is still
good in 2000s!'"

"Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."

"Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
of a communicable disease."

"Go get some therapy."

Yep, it appears quite evident from the quoted material just from one of
your posts, Len. You just want to eliminate a code test.

Dave K8MN

860. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:05:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40043372.CC51FEB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85586

Len Over 21 wrote:

> ...it might have been a Preview of Coming Attractions advertising
> a new Sermon on the Antenna Mount by Rev. Jim. :-)
>
> Hans is right. A bunch of sanctimonious Church Ladies trying to
> manufacture disputes with their production lines all broken down.

What have your comments to do with elimination of morse testing in the
Amateur Radio Service (your only aim here)?

Dave K8MN

861. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:08:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4004343A.8C7ECE44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85587

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Every single one of them were superb, excellent students who
> all passed. All smarter than Hiram and possessed of near
> superhuman character and motivation, showing the ultimate
> respect for the amateur community.
> Late getting into high school? In Illinois we started at 12 or 13.
>
> Spent a whole year studying for the amateur radio test, did
> you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Obviously due to character flaws, of not expressing enought
> commitment to ham radio....all a result of lack of morse code
> proficiency.

> NO ONE was illegal over three decades ago...NO ONE.
>
> It all happened NOW...and all due to low commitment and
> dedication to the olde-tyme hammes and morse code.

> Being a year late for high school might explain some of that.

> Those things would NEVER happen in Pennsylvania, would they?
>
> Reverend Jimmie sounds like working up to another...
> Sermon On The Antenna Mount!

> All that disrespect and lack of dedication to the amateur community
> for not embracing the healing, curative powers of morsemanship!
>
> Terrible, isn't it?
>
> All those years...those wasted years...all the olde-tymers getting
> older, grumping around, kvetching and belching about newcomers
> not having any respect for the goode olde values of amateurism!
>
> Nobody could do anything, could they? They all sat around and
> kvetched and nobody reported anybody, demanding that the feds
> should have been dedicated to their Cause and making the ham
> world safe for their elitist democratic-socialism where all got one
> vote...to cast as one...on one viewpoint.
>
> You tellum, Jimmie.

> WMD

Len, won't you tell us again about your purpose here? You know, the thing about only being here for the civil debate of code test issue? That's such a good tale.

Dave K8MN

862. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:12:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85588

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <nv%Lb.18348$I06.132801@attbi_s01>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
> writes:
>
> >Oh-Oh Dee you have just violated Len's off topic rule. You better watch it
> >on the air when he .....wait he doesn't have a ticket. Oh well ....
>
> Dee (aka Ms Manners the Mother) has her "plonk filter" on...which
> means she can't see my posts...she said.
>
> Those who use "killfiles" are merely burrowing their heads in the
> sand, refusing to look at other opinions.
>
> In any other venue that would be an ultimate dumbing-down. A
> firm refusal to even see another "unkind" post. Ostrich manner.
>
> Sort of a psychnological refuge and "safe area" where all the seen
> opinions are the "comfortable" ones that all agree upon.
>
> I wouldn't fret none. All the "regulars" in here are mighty macho
> morsemen...and one woman trying to sound off like she has a
> pair.
>
> I'll let you get back to the MAIN topic in this newsgroup...discussing
> favorite female TV stars of the past. That's extremely important from
> the aspect of amateur radio policy.
>
> Nice not really talking at you, Tom...
>
> WMD

Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
to view the landfill.

In this scenario, you are the landfill.

Dave K8MN

863. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:16:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SBWMb.7572$1e.129@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85589

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

<
< No, more like a Dodge Viper, a GE refrigerator or a Rolling Rock beer.
<

If you'd drink Rolling Rock beer, then you'd probably drive an AMC
Gremlin, wear a badge laden jumpsuit to a hamfest, and date Moms Mabley.

73, de Hans, K0HB

864. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:25:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4004381C.B3517A16@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85590

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> <
> < No, more like a Dodge Viper, a GE refrigerator or a Rolling Rock beer.
> <
>
> If you'd drink Rolling Rock beer, then you'd probably drive an AMC
> Gremlin, wear a badge laden jumpsuit to a hamfest, and date Moms Mabley.

C'mon, Hans. They don't make Gremlins any longer, I've never parachuted into the Dayton fleamarket and Moms Mabley has been dead for years.

In honesty, I did buy a Chevy Vega back in '73 (much to my regret), have worn a navy blue, velvet cap with scrambled eggs on the bill and my call embroidered on the front (a gift from old salt K3FK) and I once went out with a female jailer from Savannah who kept talking about cuffs, shackles and body slams.

Those things aside, the Orion is built in the U.S. and is one fine transceiver.

Dave K8MN

865. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:26:07 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <3LWMb.13826$G04.2789854@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85591

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > Dee (aka Ms Manners the Mother) has her "plonk filter" on...which
> > means she can't see my posts...she said.
> >
> > Those who use "killfiles" are merely burrowing their heads in the
> > sand, refusing to look at other opinions.
>
> Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
> lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
> Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
> decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
> to view the landfill.
>
> In this scenario, you are the landfill.
>
> Dave K8MN

Lol, nice description. If you don't feed the trolls, they'll eventually go
back under their bridge.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

866. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 18:57:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QcXMb.7615$1e.6186@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85592

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

< Those things aside, the Orion is built in the U.S. and is one fine
< transceiver.

Yes it is, and yes it is. Did you see ON4UN's review in the current
NCJ? Very complimentary.

But Rolling Rock beer ranks about .001 on a scale of 1 to 10, where "4"
is "barely drinkable". (Yes, that means it needs to improve 1000-fold
be be a "1".)

73, de Hans, K0HB

867. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 21:56:42 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <1tl800lng2lcnmie9onnqru6g8vmt429u8@4ax.com>
Source record: 85593

On 13 Jan 2004 09:54:02 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<bur5001g2u88h116dg6edp4job551b8mit@4ax.com>...
>> On 12 Jan 2004 09:15:19 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<e0q200t2lf43asf4ojn6t3qihahbl43ums@4ax.com>...
>> >> Jim,
>> >>
>> >> Personally, I feel that it is indeed unfortunate that you do not see,
>> >> or will not admit to, your disrespectful treatment of Kim,
>> >
>> >[callsign deleted]
>> >
>> >Your opinion noted, Leo. However, after much consideration, I do not
>> >consider my omission of Kim's callsign to be disrespectful. YMMV.
>>
>> As stated before, it wasn't your omission of Kim's callsign that was
>> disrespectful, it was the context that it was done in - omitting hers,
>> but leaving everyone else's intact. Repeatedly.
>>
>> As you are aware.
>
>I am aware that you preceive it that way. Are you aware that no disrespect
>was intended?

No.

>
>> >> Your statements in defense of your conduct are based entirely upon
>> >> circular logic, rationalization, contradiction and denial - indicating
>> >> that you are not prepared to accept responsibility for your actions
>> >> towards a fellow ham here on the group.
>> >
>> >Basically what you are saying is that I should accept Kim's callsign
>> >as appropriate for the ARS, and use it here, because:
>> >
>> >1) FCC issued it
>> >2) She asked me to
>> >3) *You* don't 'have a problem' with the callsign, and therefore *I*
>> > shouldn't, either.
>>
>> No - I said that Kim's callsign IS a valid one, accepted by the FCC
>> for use in the ARS.

>
>It's a *legal* one. No one disputes that.

Thank you!
>
>> You can dislike it, revile it, be insulted by it
>> - whatever you choose to do. But, you must respect the fact that it
>> is a valid amateur callsign - because it is! Just like yours, issued
>> officially by the FCC.
>
>I did not ask for this specific callsign. Kim asked for hers.
>>
>> Jim, you aren't the guy who gets to determine what is or is not
>> appropriate for the ARS.
>
>Not true!
>
>We *all* have a say in what is and is not appropriate for the ARS. And that
>includes me.

That wasn't the point - I said specifically that you are not the one
who gets to make that decision.

>
>> That role belongs to the regulatory authorities.
>
>And to all of us hams.

No - we can recommend and advise, but the regulatory authorities make
the decision. Not us.

>
>> Whatever your problem is with this particular call, it
>> is between you and the FCC - not us! If they declare that it is
>> inappropriate, then it will be withdrawn. If not, it stays. Whatever
>> it is - it's their decision - not yours and mine!
>
>That's only true as far as the issuance of a callsign. Not its use.

Absolutely. But not the point.

The issue is between you and the FCC. They issued it - they can
recall it if it's "inappropriate".

>>
>> As you are aware.
>
>> >As I have stated before, no disrespect was intended. But I am not
>> >going to use Kim's callsign in my posts, because I think it is
>> >inappropriate for the IRS.
>>
>> In your opinion, Jim - not necessarily the opinion of the FCC, or many
>> members of the ARS.

>
>I'm not telling them not to use Kim's callsign.
>
>You are telling me I *must* use it.

Incorrect. Not at all.

That isn't the issue. I said omitting just one callsign from your
post was wrong. No one denies your right to not use it - but you
could have omitted all of them, to level the field. What standards
woul that have compromised, Jim?.

>
>Not gonna happen.

>
>> However, no one is trying to say that you must
>> use Kim's callsign in your posts - the issue is with your intentional
>> exclusion of only her callsign from your list!
>
>Which is the same as saying I *must* use it!

Nope - just omitting call one out of a group was wrong. Disrespectful,
in fact - or at least perceived that way. You could have left all of
the calls out - then it wouldn't be a problem, would it?

>>
>> As you are aware.
>> >
>> >You can use it in your posts all you want. So can Kim. I won't try to
>> >impose my standards on others, even though they try to impose their
>> >standards on me.
>>
>> No one is attempting to impose standards upon you, Jim.
>
>Yes, they are.

Nope - not at all.

>
>> The message
>> was (quite clearly) that it is inappropriate and disrespectful to omit
>> just this one callsign from the pool, while leaving all others intact.
>> As you well know. And as clearly stated in previous posts.
>>
>> As you are aware.
>>
>"inappropriate and disrespectful" by whose standards?
>
>Answer: YOURS!

Not just mine - as you are aware.

> >
>> >[Kim a licensed radio amateur]
>> >
>> >> told you straight up that she felt disrespected by your actions.
>> >
>> >I have felt disrespected by her action in choosing that callsign.
>> >I told her that straight up a long time ago.
>>
>> Not sure I understand why you would feel personally disrespected by
>> Kim's choice of callsign, Jim - I don't imagine that she did it to
>> offend you personally.
>
>She didn't. But that was my perception. And to paraphrase Kim: 'that's the
>perception that counts'
>>
>> You are of course free to express your opinion regarding this issue,
>> however - but to do so in public isn't always a wise choice. Would
>> you walk up to someone in a crowded mall and tell her exactly what you
>> thought about their skitr being too short?
>
>Depends on who it was.

Sidestepping the issue.

But, no matter who she was, would you say it in front of a crowd of
people? Or discreetly?

>
>> Of course not - that would
>> be impolite. And not too smart, perhaps - she might smack you! :)
>
>What if it was my teenage daughter? (Not saying I do or do not have one).

Different scenario entirely. Parental control gives you the right to
do so.

But, would you say it in front of a crowd of people? Or discreetly?

>>
>> Some opinions are best kept to one's self :)
>
>And some are best expressed rather than repressed.

Not in a public forum, Jim.

>
>> >> A simple apology to her would have been appropriate.
>> >
>> >I apologize if my posts have upset anyone. That was not the intent.
>> >But I will not compromise my standards on this to avoid hurting
>> >someone's feelings.
>> >
>> >> The right thing to do.
>> >

>> >In your opinion. Mine's different.
>>
>> Compromising standards isn't the issue, Jim. As you are aware.
>
>No, it's *exactly* the issue. To use Kim's call here would compromise my
>standards.

Nope - it is not the issue. The point was not that you refused to use
it - simply that you singled her out in a list of other calls.
Intentionally and repeatedly.

>>
>> If you had changed your poll to list everyone by their first name,
>> would that have compromised your standards? Of course not. It would
>> have created a Level Playing Field, and caused little fuss at all.
>
>It would have caused confusion because there are several people with
>the same first name here.
>>
>> It would have removed the opportunity for you to try and punish Kim
>> for her poor choice of callsign, though - say, you weren't trying to
>> do that, were you?
>
>Nope.
>

Really? Didn't look that way. Say, didn't you agree with Kim that
"perception is everything"?

>> Of course not - your standards are too high for
>> that......aren't they?
>>
>Yep.

Of course! :)

>
>> >> Jim, you have been a frequent victim of attack and insult here
>> >> yourself - frankly, you should know better.
>> >
>> >Where is the insult in not using a word or phrase I think is
>> >inappropriate?
>>
>> As stated above, and in previous posts - it is a situational thing.
>> For example, yelling "Hey, Dick!" to a friend sitting over at a bar is
>> quite appropriate. Yelling "Hey, Dick!" to some biker sitting at the
>> bar is not.
>
>What if that's the biker's name?

Sidestepping the issue. And potentially suicidal :)

>
>> Same phrase - totally different intent. Context is
>> everything!

>>
>> As you are aware.
>
>Yet yelling both phrases is *legal* - although not always
>advisable or appropriate.

Sidestepping the issue.

>
>And in the context of amateur radio callsigns, I think Kim's choice
>of callsign is inadvisable and inappropriate.
>
>Your own logic proves it.

Sidestepping the issue.

>>
>> >> Insulting a fellow amateur publically, then denying and justifying the
>> >> act with a litany of self-serving rhetoric.
>> >
>> >I don't see it that way at all.
>> >
>> >> Do you believe that these
>> >> actions, your actions, are in the best interest of the Amateur
>> >> service?
>> >
>> >Yes. You may disagree, but I will not describe that disagreement
>> >as "prejudice", "censorship" or "self-serving rhetoric".
>>
>> What part of this statement are you having trouble with, Jim?
>
>The words ""prejudice", "censorship" and "self-serving rhetoric", for a start.
>They are inaccurate
>>
>> Definitions (and specific usage within the thread):
>>
>> Prejudice: "an opinion formed beforehand" (your opinion that the
>> callsign
>
>[inappropriate callsign deleted]
>
>> is inappropriate to the ARS)
>
>It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered the
>callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues.
>
>Therefore, it's not prejudice.

I see. So it's not just the callsign that you find inappropriate, but
the owner and other issues?

Please elaborate!

>>
>> Censorship: "the supression of something considered objectionable"
>> (like the intentional omission of just one callsign in a list,
>> perhaps?)
>
>I use the word "inappropriate", not "objectionable". And I did not
>"suppress" it - I just won't put it in a post of mine.

Do you not also find it objectionable? Or are you playing semantics
again? :)

>
>Therefore, it's not censorship.

Disagree - see above!

>>
>> Rhetoric: skill with language - (ahem)
>>
>The phrase was "self-serving rhetoric", not just the word "rhetoric".
>
>AHEM.

You mean it isn't? :) Seems to be!
>
>> >> I suspect that few here join you in that belief.
>> >
>> >Doesn't matter.
>>
>> It certainly should!
>
>So you're saying the majority opinion should rule? What if
>the majority says it's inappropriate?

Do they?

>>
>> >Your quote below is quite appropriate. At times, Dr. King
>> >held standards and beliefs that were not popular. His adherence to those
>> >standards and beliefs was considered "insulting" by some. Should he have
>> >listened to them, or followed his conscience?
>>
>> Dr. King was a champion of equality and equal rights - a mission which
>> cost him his life. He was dedicated to ensuring that people were
>> treated equally, regardless of the "personal standards" of those who
>> felt that they were not entitled to equal treatment.
>
>Equal rights under law. Equal opportunities. Not equal results. Not
>an abandonment of standards.

Actually, the upholding of standards...but this isn't about standards,
Jim. It's about singling someone out intentionally. And
disrespectfully.

>>
>> Do you treat everyone equally, Jim?
>
>I treat them appropriately. What is appropriate for an adult is not
>appropriate for a child. To treat them equally could be very unsafe.

Avoiding the question.

>
>> Even when you have a strong bias
>> against some characteristic of theirs that you find objectionable? No
>> matter what?
>
>The only bias I have is in my Southgate Type 7.

>>
>> I'd refrain from drawing parallels to Dr. King until you can state
>> that unequivocally. Without prejudice.
>
>I state without prejudice that I don't have the bias you accuse me of.
>I have standards that I adhere to.

Your actions speak differently.

>> >>
>> >> "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of
>> >> comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and
>> >> controversy."
>> >
>> >Rev. Dr.
>> >
>> >> Martin Luther King, Jr.
>> >
>> >And at this 'time of challenge and controversy', I say that Kim's
>> >callsign is inappropriate to the ARS, and I will not repeat it
>> >in my posts. No insult is meant by this action. But it will not
>> >change.
>>
>> Once again, no one is forcing you to use the dreaded callsign in your
>> posts. Again, Jim, the issue is singling out one individual because
>> there is something that you don't like personally! As you well know.
>>
>> One's principles and beliefs, however righteous and sacrosanct, do not
>> convey the right to treat others disrespectfully.
>
>Some people said that when people organized marches and protests against
>things that violated *their standards*, they were acting disrespectfully.

True enough. Not directly related to this one single solitary isssue
that we're discussing here, though, is it? Nope.

>>
>> To return to the quotation from Dr. King - in this time of challenge
>> and controversy, someone might choose to admit that they was wrong in
>> singling out one individual due to personal opinion, and revise his
>> list to indicate equal respect for the status of all participants.
>> Someone else might choose to twist the words and concepts around ad
>> infinitum to justify their actions. Still another would take the moral
>> high ground, and justify their actions based on rigorous personal
>> standards and ideals.
>>
>> Which of these represents the Right Thing To Do? I know.
>
>And by saying you know, you are doing exactly what you describe.

A puzzling response, Jim - I'm an Option 1 kind of guy myself.

How about you? A bit 2, a little 3 maybe....

>>
>> So do you, Jim.
>>
>> >I don't use the term "friend" to describe Kim, because she reserves
>> >that word for a very select group, and I respect that choice of hers.
>> >
>> >But I will say that one of the characteristics of a true friend is
>> >telling the truth as the true friend sees it, even if it is not
>> >what someone wants to hear, and even if a person may get their
>> >feelings hurt or feel insulted by that truth.
>>
>> An excellent homily, Jim - but with a fatal flaw. True friends would
>> conduct this level of personal information interchange only in
>> private, and with compassion, sensitivity and dignity. A true friend
>> would not choose to do that in a public forum, would they, Jim?
>
>Some would. I did. So did Kim, and so have you. And while I respect
>Kim's use of the word "friend", I would say that the honesty and openness
>here - even in disagreement - are the actions of "true friends".

One last sidestep for the road, Jim? Honesty and openness isn't what
your actions were about, now were they? :)

Be honest. And do try to stick to the facts!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

868. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-13 23:08:44 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <8ks800156l9p9e86d72hc44p69i5vau0ee@4ax.com>
Source record: 85594

On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
>> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>> too!
>
>She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.

Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call. Wouldn't it?
You bet.

Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.

>
>> - no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her
>> use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of
>> the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to
>> spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the
>> air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking
>> over your life!
>
>Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
>the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
>required to respond.

Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
Amateur Radio right there..... :)

And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
huh? Wow.
>
>
>> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
>> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
>> I have something in common - so would I!
>
>Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
>callsign.

The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.

Not the required thing, Dave - the courteous thing. Considerate, even - like the Amateur's Code says:

"CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the pleasure of others."

You can read the whole thing if you like at the following address:

http://www.arrl.org/acode.html

Friendly is in there too. Worth a read sometime.

>
>> - Kim is definitely braver than me - I choose not to use my call sign
>> on the Usenet groups, to limit the number of crazies that have access
>> to my snail mail info, where she is willing to deal head on with
>> whomever, whenever in defense of her rights as detailed above.
>
>Well, "Leo", maybe you have an offensive call; maybe you don't. It is
>your perogative to keep us in the dark.

Thanks!

Personally, I don't suffer from some Freudian thing that causes me to find call signs offensive. People can be offfensive, but not call signs - it's just a license number, Dave......

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

869. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 00:04:22 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>
Source record: 85595

On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
>> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>> >snip
>> >
>> >So let's recap:
>> >
>> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
>> >lengthy
>> >and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>> >
>> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>> >rather than my own.
>> >
>> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>> >
>> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>> >inappropriate words.
>>
>> Jim,
>>
>> This is really uncharacteristic of you.
>
>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.

Nope - not that one :)
>
>> I am amazed that a well
>> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
>> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
>
>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.

Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.

You remember that, don't you, Jim?
>
>> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
>
>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?

>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
>threats at all in my actions or postings.

Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.

>
>> I wouldn't have thought it possible.
>
>It isn't.

(ahem)

>>
>> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.
>
>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
>others said he "must" do or "should" do?

Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
now did he?

>> >
>> >So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
>> >vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>> >
>> >"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>>
>> No.
>
>dang. I thought you of all people would be.

Nope. Just wondering where the high behavioural standards of which you
frequently speak have gotten to. That's all.

You have read the Amateur's Code, haven't you? Courteous? Friendly?

You know.

But hey, you beat Kim, right! That's all that matters.....
>>
>> >
>> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>>
>> Brilliant.
>>
>Thank you.

Not really :)
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

870. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 00:46:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40049168.4079036E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85596

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> < Those things aside, the Orion is built in the U.S. and is one fine
> < transceiver.
>
> Yes it is, and yes it is. Did you see ON4UN's review in the current
> NCJ? Very complimentary.

It showed on the TT reflector and I saw it there. I also find it quite satisfying to wish that the transceiver would do something, to send those wishes to TT and to have them incorporate them in a firmware release.

> But Rolling Rock beer ranks about .001 on a scale of 1 to 10, where "4"
> is "barely drinkable". (Yes, that means it needs to improve 1000-fold
> be be a "1".)

Actually, aside from a couple of Karjalainen brews in Helsinki in October, my yearly beer intake is about four bottles. I mostly stick to vodka or with Jack Daniels and branch water.

Dave K8MN

871. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 00:55:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ys0Nb.29756$P%1.24318162@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85597

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:3wvMb.4880$i4.1490@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > To do the types of public service
> > > we're authorized to do (MARS,
> > > RACES, and so on), authorization
> > > is required.
> > >
> > > Sec. 97.407 (snip)
> >
> >
> > That is an authorization to operate
> > on those frequencies and an
> > authorization to operate the station
> > not an authorization to do public
> > service. (snip)
>
>
> "That is authorization to operate on those frequencies" to do what, Dee?
> The only answer is "public service" in this context. When it comes to
> Amateur Radio, we perform our public service using the Amateur Radio
> frequencies. And the FCC is the governing agency that says what is
> authorized on those frequencies (not everything is - your license is not a
> blank check to do what you want with the Amateur frequencies). For
example,
> when it comes to the walk-a-thon you mentioned, the FCC has set rules on
> what is and isn't authorized in that situation. The same with your power
> blackout situation. And the same with ARES. In other words, you are only
> allowed to use your radio in situations authorized, and in the manner
> authorized. One situation authorized is public service.
>
>
> > (snip) That does not change the fact
> > that there is no mandate to do so.
>
>
> Again, the words mandate and authorization are synonymous.
>

There is no authorization from the FCC required to do public service. We
have never needed government authorization to do public service. That the
FCC has simply formally recognized the value of amateur's public service
efforts does not constitute authorization to do public service. I've read

Part 97 beginning to end. All it authorizes is the use of specific frequencies for specific license classes. It mandates meeting safety and signal requirements and operational limits. The only words relating to public service are simply those recognizing the fact of our value in public service and encouraging us to continue.

You have just demonstrated how little you know about ARES and RACES.

RACES isn't allowed to function (except for limited practice sessions) unless specifically activated and called to action by the government. The FCC isn't even granting any more RACES station authorizations. They really are not a public service group but instead are a volunteer civilian auxiliary to the government. Thus RACES cannot do anything other than follow the specific orders of the government when specifically activated. They cannot do walk-a-thons or any other volunteer work or public service work.

On the other hand, ARES is totally independent of the government and is strictly an organization set up by and run by hams. The hams themselves decide if, when and where they will do public service. ARES is not even mentioned in the FCC rules. They can do any public service they want to so long as they do not violate the FCC rules. The FCC has nothing whatsoever to do with ARES.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

872. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 00:59:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1w0Nb.29760$P%1.24318852@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85598

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ZFOMb.5513$q4.280@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Of course, those quotes don't reflect anything said by me. Instead, I
said
> public service is a key component of the basis and purpose of this radio
> service (97.1a).
>
>

I repeat the words in 97.1a amount only to a recognition of the fact that we do public service and encouragement to us to continue. It is not an authorization to do public service. We need no authorization whatsoever to do public service. Amateur radio operators have always participated in public service and have done so since before those words were incorporated into the FCC rules. There is NO mandate. There is NO authorization.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

873. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:08:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VD0Nb.29763$P%1.24320616@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85599

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:vCPMb.5528$q4.2861@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> > >
> > > Again, the words mandate and authorization
> > > are synonymous.
> >
> >
> > Not in any dictionary I can find, nor in Roget's.
>
>
> Princeton University's WordNet...
>
> http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn/
>
> Click on "Use WordNet Online" and enter "mandate." Notice the word
> "authorization" right next to it for the first definition. Notice the word
> "mandatory" next to it for the second definition. Mandate and
authorization
> are synonymous in the context used.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

But that is not the context in which you used it. There is nothing in Part
97 authorizing us to do public service. Public service is briefly mentioned
but only in recognition and encouragement. Paragraph 97.1a does not
authorize any one to do a thing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

874. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:09:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EF0Nb.29764$P%1.24321101@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85600

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:QPPMb.5539$q4.3628@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Hans K0HB" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, do you read and understand
> > what you write prior to mashing the
> > <send> button?
> >
> > If there is nothing mandat(ory) about
> > something, how can it be a mandate?
>
>
> Mandatory is only one definition, or contextual sense, of the word
> "mandate," Hans. There are others.
>
>
> > An authorization is a grant of
> > permission, but does not
> > *require* an action.
>
>
> A mandate does not always "require" action. For example, a people can
give
> a mandate to their elected leaders, but those leaders are not required to
> follow it. For example, the people can give a president a mandate to raise
> taxes to finance schools, but he can finance those schools some other way.
> In that sense, the people have their president an authorization to act,
not
> a requirement he must follow.
>
>

So quote the exact words from Part 97 that give us an authorization to do
public service. There is none. So regarding the FCC rules you have misused
the term.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

875. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:17:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7N0Nb.29766$P%1.24322749@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85651

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0401130431.4d601897@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >
> > > I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> > > element 1 is abolished.
> > >
> > > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep
in
> > mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for
General
> > or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With
the
> > speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather
> > iffy.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Don't forget to factor in the leap year.

Absolutely. The rules say 365 days not 1 year. So if the dates would end
up crossing February in a leap year, the CSCE is good for one day less than
a year.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

876. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:23:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hS0Nb.29767$P%1.24323667@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85652

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net...
>
> Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
> lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
> Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
> decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
> to view the landfill.
>
> In this scenario, you are the landfill.
>
> Dave K8MN

Thank you for a marvelous analogy. While we often can't change the world,
we can beautify our own little corner of it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

877. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:24:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <iT0Nb.29769$P%1.24323785@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85653

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:3LWMb.13826$G04.2789854@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net...
> > Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
> > lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
> > Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
> > decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
> > to view the landfill.
> >
> > In this scenario, you are the landfill.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Lol, nice description. If you don't feed the trolls, they'll eventually go
> back under their bridge.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Yup they get weak if they are not fed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

878. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:27:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <iW0Nb.29770$P%1.24324661@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85654

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:8ks80015619p9e86d72hc44p69i5vau0ee@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >
> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> >> too!
> >
> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>
> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call. Wouldn't it?
> You bet.
>

Actually it is quite easy to QSO someone without using their call sign.
Except when 3rd party traffic is involved, the FCC rules only require that
we give our own call on the air. We do not have to give the other
station's. For example in working a pileup, we throw in our call. The DX
station manages to pick it out of the mess, responds, and gives a report.
We repeat our call sign and give our report. Many times we do not say the
DX station's call just to keep things moving.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

879. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:40:35 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <fd6900pd2g4a5esgsm0tdrjbkjmbc7o0li@4ax.com>
Source record: 85655

Dee,

The belief that a mandate for anateur radio to participate in public service communications is quite common - just did a quick search on Google, and II have attached an ARRL reference as well as one amateur radio club, who both clearly call it a "mandate".

Not sure where in the regs this is, or whether it is an interpretation of the Part 97 sections already quoted.

73, Leo

ARRL:

http://www2.arrl.org/qst/features-columns.html :

Public Service: Our mandate from the FCC includes the need to put our knowledge and equipment to use in service to our fellow citizens. Every month you'll read about what your fellow hams are doing to fulfill this promise of service to their communities.

Kentucky Amateur Radio Web Site - ARES Operator Registration

http://www.qsl.net/kyham/forms/aresreg.html

Thank you very much for having the desire to serve your community, and help to fulfill Amateur Radio's FCC mandate of public service in time of emergency.

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:08:05 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:vCPMb.5528$q4.2861@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>> >
>> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>> > >
>> > > Again, the words mandate and authorization
>> > > are synonymous.
>> >
>> >
>> > Not in any dictionary I can find, nor in Roget's.
>>
>>
>> Princeton University's WordNet...
>>

>> http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn/
>>
>> Click on "Use WordNet Online" and enter "mandate." Notice the word
>> "authorization" right next to it for the first definition. Notice the word
>> "mandatory" next to it for the second definition. Mandate and
>authorization
>> are synonymous in the context used.
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>
>But that is not the context in which you used it. There is nothing in Part
>97 authorizing us to do public service. Public service is briefly mentioned
>but only in recognition and encouragement. Paragraph 97.1a does not
>authorize any one to do a thing.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

880. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:53:13 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <qk79005sialigjavkvbtq14v0tm6u10ot1@4ax.com>
Source record: 85656

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:27:42 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

Good point, Dee - I'm not a contester, and was unaware of this mode of
operation. I'm more familiar with the one-on-one ragchew session, or
the 'net' scenario, where you identify the particular station that you
want to speak to, and go from there.

Now, if we can convince these two that Texas is DX from West Virginia,
maybe we can get them talking! :)

73, Leo

>
>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:8ks80015619p9e86d72hc44p69i5vau0ee@4ax.com...
>> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >
>> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
>> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>> >> too!
>> >
>> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>>
>> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
>> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
>> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
>> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call. Wouldn't it?
>> You bet.
>>
>
>Actually it is quite easy to QSO someone without using their call sign.
>Except when 3rd party traffic is involved, the FCC rules only require that
>we give our own call on the air. We do not have to give the other
>station's. For example in working a pileup, we throw in our call. The DX
>station manages to pick it out of the mess, responds, and gives a report.
>We repeat our call sign and give our report. Many times we do not say the
>DX station's call just to keep things moving.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

881. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 01:55:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mk1Nb.29777$P%1.24329662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85657

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:fd6900pd2g4a5esgsm0tdrjbkjmbc7o0li@4ax.com...
>
> Dee,
>
> The belief that a mandate for anateur radio to participate in public
> service communications is quite common - just did a quick search on
> Google, and II have attached an ARRL reference as well as one amateur
> radio club, who both clearly call it a "mandate".
>
> Not sure where in the regs this is, or whether it is an interpretation
> of the Part 97 sections already quoted.
>
> 73, Leo
>
>
> ARRL:
>
> http://www2.arrl.org/qst/features-columns.html :
>
> Public Service: Our mandate from the FCC includes the need to put our
> knowledge and equipment to use in service to our fellow citizens.
> Every month you'll read about what your fellow hams are doing to
> fulfill this promise of service to their communities.
>
>
> Kentucky Amateur Radio Web Site - ARES Operator Registration
>
> http://www.qsl.net/kyham/forms/aresreg.html
>
> Thank you very much for having the desire to serve your community, and
> help to fulfill Amateur Radio's FCC mandate of public service in time
> of emergency.
>

These mistakes are quite common Leo and sometimes are fostered intentionally just to make a good show. This is why every ham should read Part 97 from beginning to end. The exact words in Part 97.1a are as follows (and this is the only place public service is even mentioned.

97.1a
"Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur radio service to the public as a voluntary noncommercial communication service, particularly with respect to providing emergency communications."

This wording certainly is no mandate or authorization. It's a recognition of what we do and what we have always done. While public service is indeed a time honored and honorable tradition and something that we should continue to do, the FCC regs can hardly be construed to be either a mandate or an authorization.

However, political grandstanding for selling your cause is also a long and time honored tradition. I don't really agree with such actions (even on the part of the ARRL) but calling a house a castle doesn't make it one.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

882. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 02:04:15 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <6i89009lbs0jur2usqr6fahj88g2plm7kc@4ax.com>
Source record: 85658

Revision to Post:

Um, operator error - looks like I started typing on the wrong line,
just under Dee's header - this made the post look like it came from
Dee. (It also looks like Dee is replying to Dee......that ain't right
either :))

Fixed header and post below - sorry, Dee!

73, Leo

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:53:13 GMT, Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:

>
>Good point, Dee - I'm not a contester, and was unaware of this mode of
>operation. I'm more familiar with the one-on-one ragchew session, or
>the 'net' scenario, where you identify the particular station that you
>want to speak to, and go from there.
>
>Now, if we can convince these two that Texas is DX from West Virginia,
>maybe we can get them talking! :)
>
>73, Leo
>

>On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:27:42 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>wrote:
>>
>>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:8ks80015619p9e86d72hc44p69i5vau0ee@4ax.com...
>>> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>> >Leo wrote:
>>> >
>>> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
>>> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>>> >> too!
>>> >
>>> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>>>
>>> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
>>> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
>>> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
>>> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>>> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call. Wouldn't it?

>>> You bet.
>>>
>>
>>Actually it is quite easy to QSO someone without using their call sign.
>>Except when 3rd party traffic is involved, the FCC rules only require that
>>we give our own call on the air. We do not have to give the other
>>station's. For example in working a pileup, we throw in our call. The DX
>>station manages to pick it out of the mess, responds, and gives a report.
>>We repeat our call sign and give our report. Many times we do not say the
>>DX station's call just to keep things moving.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

883. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 02:18:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <c89900923bft6nncp4knunt9n3hktj7tjp@4ax.com>
Source record: 85659

Dee,

Agreed, the paragraph that you quote simply recognizes the value of public service comms, no mandate or authorization is expressed or implied.

I'm surprised, though, that an organization as large as the ARRL would carry such a statement on their site without something to back it up - an error, perhaps, or they found a lost FCC scroll, or ?

Has anyone emailed them to inquire just exactly where they got this mandate idea from? I'm a ARRL member, and would be willing to do so if you wish!

73, Leo

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:55:30 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:fd6900pd2g4a5esgsm0tdrjbkjmbc7o0li@4ax.com...
>>
>> Dee,
>>
>> The belief that a mandate for anateur radio to participate in public
>> service communications is quite common - just did a quick search on
>> Google, and II have attached an ARRL reference as well as one amateur
>> radio club, who both clearly call it a "mandate".
>>
>> Not sure where in the regs this is, or whether it is an interpretation
>> of the Part 97 sections already quoted.
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>>
>> ARRL:
>>
>> http://www2.arrl.org/qst/features-columns.html :
>>
>> Public Service: Our mandate from the FCC includes the need to put our
>> knowledge and equipment to use in service to our fellow citizens.
>> Every month you'll read about what your fellow hams are doing to
>> fulfill this promise of service to their communities.
>>
>>

>> Kentucky Amateur Radio Web Site - ARES Operator Registration
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/kyham/forms/aresreg.html
>>
>> Thank you very much for having the desire to serve your community, and
>> help to fulfill Amateur Radio's FCC mandate of public service in time
>> of emergency.
>>
>
>These mistakes are quite common Leo and sometimes are fostered intentionally
>just to make a good show. This is why every ham should read Part 97 from
>beginning to end. The exact words in Part 97.1a are as follows (and this is
>the only place public service is even mentioned.
>
>97.1a
>"Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur radio service to
>the public as a voluntary noncommercial communication service, particularly
>with respect to providing emergency communications."
>
>This wording certainly is no mandate or authorization. It's a recognition
>of what we do and what we have always done. While public service is indeed
>a time honored and honorable tradition and something that we should continue
>to do, the FCC regs can hardly be construed to be either a mandate or an
>authorization.
>
>However, political grandstanding for selling your cause is also a long and
>time honored tradition. I don't really agree with such actions (even on the
>part of the ARRL) but calling a house a castle doesn't make it one.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

884. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 02:20:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nH1Nb.29785$P%1.24335005@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85660

No problem. Anyway just to continue, there are other occasions that people don't give both call signs. Take a net for example. The individuals in the net may end up never stating the net control's call sign. For example, I might finish my turn and say "Back to net control, this is N8UZE". It varies depending on the customs of that particular net. However, in a rag chew, it would be difficult to completely avoid the other station's call sign. You will probably say it at least once just to insure that you have it correct.

I find the constant repetition of both call signs that some people do a bit irritating actually. Once I've established the contact in case of a rag chew, I simply use the person's name and then give my own ID as required under the 10 minute rule. If I've got someone longwinded or am working CW, I'll give mine each time I turn it over to them just in case they run long enough that I might not make the 10 minute ID.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:6i89009lbs0jur2usqr6fahj88g2plm7kc@4ax.com...
> Revision to Post:
>
> Um, operator error - looks like I started typing on the wrong line,
> just under Dee's header - this made the post look like it came from
> Dee. (It also looks like Dee is replying to Dee......that ain't right
> either :))
>
> Fixed header and post below - sorry, Dee!
>
> 73, Leo
>
>
> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:53:13 GMT, Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >Good point, Dee - I'm not a contester, and was unaware of this mode of
> >operation. I'm more familiar with the one-on-one ragchew session, or
> >the 'net' scenario, where you identify the particular station that you
> >want to speak to, and go from there.
> >
> >Now, if we can convince these two that Texas is DX from West Virginia,
> >maybe we can get them talking! :)
> >
> >73, Leo
> >

>
> >On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:27:42 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> >wrote:
> >>
> >>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> >>news:8ks80015619p9e86d72hc44p69i5vau0ee@4ax.com...
> >>> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> wrote:
> >>>
> >>> >Leo wrote:
> >>> >
> >>> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so
chooses - I
> >>> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> >>> >> too!
> >>> >
> >>> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
> >>>
> >>> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
> >>> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
> >>> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> >>> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> >>> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call. Wouldn't it?
> >>> You bet.
> >>>
> >>
> >>Actually it is quite easy to QSO someone without using their call sign.
> >>Except when 3rd party traffic is involved, the FCC rules only require
that
> >>we give our own call on the air. We do not have to give the other
> >>station's. For example in working a pileup, we throw in our call. The
DX
> >>station manages to pick it out of the mess, responds, and gives a
report.
> >>We repeat our call sign and give our report. Many times we do not say
the
> >>DX station's call just to keep things moving.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

885. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 02:28:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JP1Nb.29787$P%1.24336800@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85661

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:c89900923bft6nncp4knunt9n3hktj7tjp@4ax.com...
> Dee,
>
> Agreed, the paragraph that you quote simply recognizes the value of
> public service comms, no mandate or authorization is expressed or
> implied.
>
> I'm surprised, though, that an organization as large as the ARRL would
> carry such a statement on their site without something to back it up -
> an error, perhaps, or they found a lost FCC scroll, or ?
>
> Has anyone emailed them to inquire just exactly where they got this
> mandate idea from? I'm a ARRL member, and would be willing to do so
> if you wish!
>
> 73, Leo
>

Oh I wouldn't get too excited about it. Remember that among its other functions, ARRL is a political entity. Political entities do use and abuse the language. However note that even though the term is used on the website, the study guides do not refer to public service as a mandate.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

886. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 03:17:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu2cns$73c@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85663

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40041FB4.9A4CABFD@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Mike, how in the Hell is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear
like
> > someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that
> > actually sent it? The "art" of making it look like someone else had
sent it
> > would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had
also
> > changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.
>
> Here's an example for you, Kim, just for purposes of illustration:
>
> > I know that I often post before taking the time to think things out and
have often > been guilty of acting from emotion before or instead of taking
the time to gather > the facts.
>
> Now the above was written by me but it has been made to look as if you
> wrote it.
>
> > That Dave Heil is so damned bored with life that he has to concoct
things
> > from thin air is usual and status quo for him.
>
> It wasn't from thin air, Kim. It was from posts made by you. They
> exist. They can't now be denied.
>
> > Don't be so quick to jump on
> > a Dave Heil bandwagon...because those wagons don't travel far at all.
>
> I have a bandwagon?
>
> > For anyone with computer sense, it is unreasonable to even consider that
a
> > post could be issued under the guise of someone else--contrary to the
> > opinion that it can be done. And, when I resubmit "The Pool" list with
my
> > callsign attributed to my prediction date, it is certainly weak, at
best, to
> > display anger and make it seem as though I was doing *anything* else but
> > resubmitting a post an attributing my callsign to my prediction.
>

> That's simply incorrect.
>
> Let's do another example for purposes of illustration:
>
> > I have given some thought to my choice of callsigns and feel that I may
have made a > mistake. My choice reflects badly on amateur radio and on me
as an individual.
>
> If not for the fact that I've made clear that this is an illustration
> added by me--if I'd simply taken out the white space and my comments,
> I'd be adding the material to make it look as if the statements came
> from you. Are you starting to get the picture?
>
> > However, if you or anyone else, is so desperate to reach for the stars
in
> > some display of dislike for me--then go for it.
>
> No, it has simply been pointed out to you that you have crossed the line
> between what's right and what's wrong.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Live with it, Dave, live with it...

Kim W5TIT

887. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 03:18:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu2cnt$73c@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85662

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40042153.14C35E30@earthlink.net...
> Kim wrote:
>
> > Ahem...at least he hasn't said he's going to "pray for you" yet. I love
it
> > when someone says that to me with that certain "tone of voice" LOL
>
> I'll bet you get that a lot. However, why should I do all of the work
> for you?
> Are you too busy to pray for yourself?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?

Kim W5TIT

888. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 03:51:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu2ecr$o0d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85664

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401130927.21d6469f@posting.google.com...
> "Kim
>
> " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0401121002.3c510145@posting.google.com...
> > > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>...
>
> > > > Maybe you don't feel
> > > > boxed...but you sure were getting defensive and unexpectedly
> > > > insulted--at least it looked that way to me in this post!
>
> That's *your* perception.
>

And to a few others.

>
> In *my* perception, ti's the other way around.
>

Not just yours, by the way. The lines of agreement/disagreement, in this
newsgroup anyway, are drawn by most people from whatever "side" or person
it is they see a need to align themselves with.

>
> > Ummmmm, that's quite standard for this newsgroup.
>
> Then let me rephrase:
>
> With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
> lengthy and involved *amateur radio policy* debate that had *nothing*
> to do with code testing.
>

Hmmmm. Amateur radio policy has nothing to do with attributes in a
newsgroup, but...

>
> That's certainly *not* standard for this NG.
>
> > > I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
> > > rather than my own.

> >
> > Not at all. I didn't see that.
>
> "There are none so blind as those who will not see"
>

I think I still don't see that anyone wants to see you depart from your "standards," Jim. I saw people suggesting different ways in which you could still support your "standards" and be a whole lot more diplomatic about it. Diplomacy is a choice, though, that you apparently do not wish to make. I don't like diplomacy, either.

>
> I've been repeatedly told in this thread how I *must* or *should*
> conduct "the pool", how I must not remove someone's callsign
> from a post, how only the FCC can decide what is appropriate
> and inappropriate, etc., etc., etc.
>

I didn't pay close enough attention to see any "must" or "should" messages.

> >
> > Your angst was for the fact that someone
> > changed attributes in a post.
>
> No angst at all! In fact, someone else first pointed out
> that you repeatedly responded to my posts in such a way
> that it looked like I wrote something which I did not,
> in fact, write.
>

I don't know that I'd find myself all that worried over something like this...but...

>
> And you did.
>
> I did not.
>

Yeah, you did.

> >
> > For that, you are wrong; as I am.
>
> I'm not wrong.
>

Yeah, I think you were.

>
> Your admission of guilt in the matter is quite admirable, but
> unnecessary.

>
> > It doesn't
> > matter *why* the posts are getting changed; that part of the debate was
mere
> > distraction.
>
> Not a question of change. A question of how the change
> altered the apparent authorship.
>
> > Fact still remains that you
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> > at me for something you, yourself, have been doing.
>
> Incorrect! I have not intentionally made it appear
> that you or anyone else wrote something you did not
> write.
>
> You did.
>
> That's the point.
> >

My perception leads me to believe that there's a very, very thin line of distinction between the two angles of this discussion. You apparently don't think so. I will decide to disagree with you.

> > >
> > > I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
> >
> > There's something good in everything...and I do mean everything.
>
> I think you mean "everyone". And I agree to that, though it takes a
> lot of looking in some cases.
>

No, actually I did mean everything. And, it's the "lot of looking" situations that test us against some of our highest moral beliefs and belief systems.

>
> But not in "everything". For example, tell me what's good in:
>
> binary nerve gases
> intentional release of deadly diseases such as smallpox
> drunk driving
>

I could get into that debate, but I don't think there's anyone in this newsgroup that open minded or willing to stretch outside their prejudices.

> >
> > For each and every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction.
>
> Only in certain physics problems. Otherwise, there are all sorts of
> situations.
>

Metaphysically and philosophically speaking, for each and every action,
there is an equal and opposite reaction. It is not so metaphysical or
philosophical, though, that evidence of the statement cannot be found.

>
> Sometimes actions are ignored.
>

And, for that, there will be a reaction--somewhere, sometime, there will be
a reaction. That reaction will be of equal and opposite significance.

>
> Sometimes there's an over-reaction.
>

Perhaps one hasn't looked closely enough to what the "over" part of the
reaction is in response to.

>
> Sometimes there's a chain reaction.
>

To a long chain of events, I'm sure.

>
> And sometimes there's a big brouhaha and then things return to
> a state indistinguishable fromthat previous to the action.
>

Existentionalism at its finest.

> >
> > Most people take
> > that to mean good=good and bad=bad. It can also, and more often, mean
> > good=bad and bad=good.
>
> I don't take it to mean anything.
> >
> > > And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
> > > inappropriate words.
>
> > Typical behavior for you.
>
> Thank you
>
> > Although, the implication of you being a leg
> > man--and stating so in such a way as to imply something sexual about it,

> > also defeats your whole stance of removing inappropriate things from
posts
> > you take part in.
>
> The subject under discussion was baked chicken, Kim. See the
> original post - the poster was talking about dinner in the
> oven. And it's a fact that I prefer thighs and drumsticks
> to wings and [other chicken parts].
>
>
> With one exception: genuine Buffalo wings - but they're not baked.
>

Thinly veiled, but nice try.

>
> If there's anything sexual about my baked-chicken preferences, that's
> in *your* mind, not in my post.
>

And, equally, I say if there is anything sexual about my callsign, that's in
your mind and in the mind of others. I simply have it because I have big
tits. Ask N5BIG why he has that callsign. He's a friend, tell 'im I sent
ya.

> >
> > But, you can be contradictory--that's OK.
>
> Can be. Wasn't.
>
> > > So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
> > > vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>
> > > "ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>
> Did you see the movie?
>

Yeah, but I was awake, asleep, awake, asleep. It just wasn't my kind of
movie. Master and Commander was pretty darned good, but rushed, in my
opinion. That movie had a lot of potential that never got released. Oh,
but I am terrible at retaining phrases, etc.

> >
> > As I said, you've been changing my original posts for over a year now
(by
> > deleting my callsign from them--by the way, that was just pointed out to
me
> > by someone else a bit of time ago--I've been "watching" since) so if you
> > want to get offended, upset, etc., about changing posts then be upset at

> > yourself first.
>
> Not the same thing at all. You're equating my editing
> with your own improper attribution.
>

One man's junk is another man's treasure, etc.

> >
> > Whether by changing attributes or deleting things from
> > original posts--both a) are supposedly against standard conventions of
> > newsgroups/Usenet and,
>
> There is no convention that the entirety of a post be quoted. Headers
> and footers are routinely trimmed.
>
> There *is* a convention that the apparent authorship of words not be
> changed in the process of quoting them.
>
> > b) both could be strewn to be disrespectful,
> > deceitful, inappropriate, incorrect, and causation for a long debate.
You
> > began the behavior before me, I trumped it.
>
> By using the term "trump", you admit that your action was far worse
> than
> mine.
>

Oh, absolutely. No doubt. Would I have it any other way?

>
> And mine wasn't wrong to begin with. Yours was.
> >

Uh uh uh. Too late. We just reached a crux...and I am tired...

> >
> > As I said, you may not "feel" boxed.
>
> And I'm not.
>
> > However, you have been just
> > uncharacteristic enough in several examples that I am quite sure you
were,
> > in some way, caught up in being very defensive over something you did.
>
> Being uncharacteristic is a way of drawing in the opponent. Being too
> predictable sets one up for defeat. You would not have been drawn in
> had I been too predictable.
>

Uh uh uh...you've never done that before...maybe in teeny tiny instances.
By your usual standards, this was very dramatic. 'S OK.

> >
> > I remain with a feeling of debate victory...
>
> That makes two of us. Maximus did not win by himself, y'know.
> >

There's that equal and opposite again.

> >
> > However, there is something rather interesting about the thread the last
few
> > days: it's obviously had Hans occupied.
>
> So perhaps we should ask him:
>
> "ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>
> "IS THIS NOT WHAT YOU CAME TO SEE?!!!"
>
>
> 73 de Jim, "at my signal - unleash [expletive deleted]" N2EY
>

No doubt another movie or show reference...lost on me, for sure.

Kim W5TIT

889. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 04:09:16 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Mh3Nb.8220$1e.1355@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85665

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

< There is nothing in Part 97 authorizing us to do public service.
< Public service is briefly mentioned but only in recognition and
< encouragement. Paragraph 97.1a does not
< authorize any one to do a thing.

"Everything not specifically prohibited is mandatory."
--W5NET

890. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 04:19:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85666

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote-

< I repeat the words in 97.1a amount only to a recognition of the fact
that we
<do public service and encouragement to us to continue. It is not an
< authorization to do public service. We need no authorization
whatsoever to
< do public service. Amateur radio operators have always participated
in
< public service and have done so since before those words were
incorporated
< into the FCC rules. There is NO mandate. There is NO authorization.

You guys are engaged in picking flyshit out of the pepper pot. Since 97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that 97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.

Putting it another way, if ARRL BoD at their meeting this weekend passes a resolution that the FCC has not authorized us to public service communications, and therefore hams are no longer mandated to provide it, our continued use of the spectrum would come to a quick end.

73, de Hans, K0HB

891. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 04:46:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WQ3Nb.645$iD6.289457@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85667

N2EY wrote:
> "Kim
>
> " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...

> Not a question of change. A question of how the change
> altered the apparent authorship.
>
>
>>Fact still remains that you
>
>
> [expletive deleted]

Here we have a very interesting point to examine.

IF Jim finds that Kim's callsign, which *was* and *is* a double entendre; an objectionable thing, (google it up folks - it's there)

AND Jim finds some language that she used objectionable,

AND Jim types "[expletive deleted]" instead of the word he finds objectionable. in replies to her,

IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he shows for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?

Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that he finds objectionable.

Any less would be disrepectful.

Good luck with this one.

- Mike KB3EIA -

892. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 04:48:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040113234829.07961.00001416@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85670

In article <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
>>> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>> >snip
>>> >
>>> >So let's recap:
>>> >
>>> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
>>> >lengthy and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>>> >
>>> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>>> >rather than my own.
>>> >
>>> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>>> >
>>> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>>> >inappropriate words.
>>>
>>> Jim,
>>>
>>> This is really uncharacteristic of you.
>>
>>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.
>
>Nope - not that one :)

That's the one I was referring to.

Or did you mean the avoidance of name-calling and use of inappropriate words?
>>
>>> I am amazed that a well
>>> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
>>> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
>>
>>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
>>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.
>
>Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
>violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
>changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.

So her wishes are more important than my standards?
>
>You remember that, don't you, Jim?
>>
>>> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
>>
>>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
>>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
>>threats at all in my actions or postings.
>
>Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
>intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.

Nope. Not from where I sit.

>>> I wouldn't have thought it possible.
>>
>>It isn't.
>
>(ahem)
>>>
>>> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.
>>
>>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
>>others said he "must" do or "should" do?
>
>Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
>now did he?

Some would say that's mostly what he did. He was very very "annoying", saying
that India should be independent, that Hindus and Moslems could live together,
making salt when it was against the law....

Very annoying fellow at times.
>
>>> >So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
>>> >vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>>> >
>>> >"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>>>
>>> No.
>>
>>dang. I thought you of all people would be.
>
>Nope. Just wondering where the high behavioural standards of which you
>frequently speak have gotten to. That's all.
>
>You have read the Amateur's Code, haven't you? Courteous? Friendly?

Where have I been uncourteous or unfriendly?

Those words do not mean I must hide my standards under a bushel.
>

>You know.
>
>But hey, you beat Kim, right!

Not according to Kim.

Kim thinks she "beat" me. I disagree.

So we have a situation where neither Kim nor I feels like the loser.

That's perhaps the biggest achievement of the thread.

> That's all that matters.....

Not at all. What matters is that I cannot be bullied into using a
callsign I think is inappropriate.

>>> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>>>
>>> Brilliant.
>>>
>>Thank you.
>
>Not really :)

Ever see the film "Demolition Man"? Think of Edgar Friendly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

893. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 04:48:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040113234830.07961.00001417@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85668

In article <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
>> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
>> > simulation.
>> >
>> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
>> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>>
>> Also Made In USA.
>
>Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?
>
Nope. That's a Heath HW-2036. Only has one meter - analog.

But my shack clock is digital. It's a Tymeter 24-hour one, made from
the parts of three junkers more than 15 years ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

894. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 04:48:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040113234831.07961.00001418@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 85669

In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
>> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
>
>You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
>and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.
>
>> I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
>> examination. That's all.
>
> "Go for it, EX purchasing agent..."
>
> "Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
> of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio."
>
> "Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York
>TIMES."
>
> "MODERN HF amateur radio: 'What was good in the 1930s is still
> good in 2000s!'"
>
> "Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."
>
> "Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
> of a communicable disease."
>
> "Go get some therapy."
>
>Yep, it appears quite evident from the quoted material just from one of
>your posts, Len. You just want to eliminate a code test.
>
Dave,

Remember this gem of an example of "civil debate" from the same author as the
above:

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

(October 28, 2003)

895. Silliness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 05:19:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aj4Nb.8282$1e.8002@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85671

If you're not subscribed to the ARRL Rate Sheet edited by N0AX,
beg/borrow/steal a copy and read "Silly Amplifiers".

73, Hans, K0HB

896. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 05:46:43 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85672

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
>> element 1 is abolished.
>>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep
> in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for
> General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF
> privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a
> year from now seems rather iffy.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.

897. Re: Why Isn't Anyone Talking About The Jewish Factor? ------ SqWuxGOVT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 05:59:35 UTC
From: "Rev. Fartgass" <hubbykrockpot3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <95710$4004dad1$d1cc5672$10434@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 85673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Truth_In_Media@nomga.com.tw> wrote in message
news:2fc52b6a.40707b23@nomga.com.tw...

(much bullshit snipped)

Take your Prozac as prescribed

898. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 09:01:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <aA7Nb.6912$q4.3596@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85674

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) We need no authorization whatsoever
> to do public service. (snip) There is NO
> mandate. There is NO authorization.

How can you sit there and say that, Dee? Again, if you're going to do public service with a Ham radio, you're only allowed to do public service which is authorized. You may not do it for profit. You may not do it for a for-profit business or organization unless it serves the public only, not the for-profit entity. You may not do it for a non-profit entity if it can be used for profit (status reports for a walk-a-thon, for example). You may do it only on the frequencies authorized. And so on. There are rules across the board as to what is and isn't authorized.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

899. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 09:11:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qJ7Nb.6914$q4.2052@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85675

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> But that is not the context in which you used
> it. There is nothing in Part 97 authorizing us
> to do public service. (snip)

Okay, lets try a different tact, Dee. If you use your radio for public service, what types of public service are you authorized to do? What frequencies are you authorized to use? What types of transmissions are you authorized to make? What messages are you authorized to transmit? Are you honestly going to say nothing to each of these questions?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

900. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 09:27:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <cY7Nb.6920$q4.664@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85676

"Leo" wrote:
>
> The belief that a mandate for amateur
> radio to participate in public service
> communications is quite common -
> just did a quick search on Google,
> and II have attached an ARRL
> reference as well as one amateur
> radio club, who both clearly call it a
> "mandate".

No, the real problem is that some simply don't understand the full meaning of the word "mandate." They feel there is some kind of requirement behind it. So, of course, they get confused when it is used in a non-required context. However, there is no requirements associated associated with the other senses of the word. For example, the president can be given a mandate by the voters to lower taxes, but there is no requirement to do so. Amateur Radio operators have a mandate to perform public service (it's in the basis and purpose of this radio service), but there is no requirement to do so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

901. Re: len over 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 09:39:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401140139.1be2fd5b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85677

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040112161325.21642.00003662@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <5a5fcb7b.0401120535.3aaa6a6@posting.google.com>,
> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com (JEP) writes:
>
> >What is your name anyway?
>
> The same as on my comments for all the 14 petitions for/against
> code testing in the US amateur radio service:
>
> Leonard H. Anderson
> 10048 Lanark Street
> Sun Valley, CA 91352-4236
>
> I have the courage of my convictions to give my name in public.

Yhis is, however, your ONLY redeeming feature.

> YOU do NOT.

Agreed. One needs to put a real name to valid comments. That's
why I don't mind calling Lennie a putz, a liar and a scumbag. I am
not worried about the fear of contradiction. Lennie provides me with
plenty of validation.

> You remain a nearly-uneducated TROLL who slithers out from
> under a bridge now and then to make nasty...ALWAYS hiding
> your identity. No guts. No possibility of glory.

And that's what all this NG trolling that you do is all about,
Lennie...Your own form of glory. You were too "proud" to take the
Amateur exams and be a part of something greater than yourself, so you
come out mudslinging and antagonizing...Sucks to be you.

> You are only a small step below Broose, about "$250" worth.

And about $251 more than you, Your Scumminess.

Steve, K4YZ

902. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 09:41:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <y98Nb.6922$q4.1786@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85678

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> There is no authorization from the FCC
> required to do public service. (snip)

I give up, Dee. You simply cannot get past the word "required." Again, there is no "required" associated with "mandate" or "authorization" in the sense used.

> You have just demonstrated how little
> you know about ARES and RACES.

I've said nothing in the message you replied to about ARES or RACES other than "the FCC has set rules on what is and isn't authorized in that situation." Please explain how that demonstrates how little I know about them?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

903. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 09:46:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401140146.14639444@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85679

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:

> > Those who use "killfiles" are merely burrowing their heads in the
> > sand, refusing to look at other opinions.

> Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
> lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
> Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
> decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
> to view the landfill.
>
> In this scenario, you are the landfill.

Ka....BOOM! On the head, Dave...nice one!~

73

Steve, K4YZ

904. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 10:05:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Qv8Nb.6928$q4.1662@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85680

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Sadly, some people attempt to forge
> a tie between the terms "polite" and
> "political correctness". There is no
> link between them. Jim didn't treat
> Kim's callsign badly; he didn't use it
> at all. After all, it could be easily
> argued that Kim didn't treat amateur
> radio with respect in choosing her
> call. A number of us believe that her
> choice was tacky and tactless. (snip)

So, because Kim did something, it gave Jim the right to do something?
Isn't that a two wrongs don't make a right situation, Dave?

Regardless, lets get to the basics of this issue. What is wrong with the word "tit?" My dictionary defines it as a noun meaning "either of two soft fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman." Seem rather innocuous to me. I assume Kim, like most women, has those "soft fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs." So why would so many be offended by her very mention of that fact? It's not like she's refering to the sexual organs or something.

> It might say something about their
> character but it doesn't say anything
> negative about it. The FCC looks
> the other way with regard to language
> used in prime time television these
> days. (snip)

So you're comparing a woman's breasts to the filthy or offensive language on television? Isn't that somewhat prudish, Dave?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

905. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 10:11:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu34k6$al7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85681

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WQ3Nb.645$iD6.289457@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Kim
> >
> > " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
>
> > Not a question of change. A question of how the change
> > altered the apparent authorship.
> >
> >
> >>Fact still remains that you
> >
> >
> > [expletive deleted]
>
> Here we have a very interesting point to examine.
>
> IF Jim finds that Kim's callsign, which *was* and *is* a double
> entendre; an objectionable thing, (google it up folks - it's there)
>
> AND Jim finds some language that she used objectionable,
>
> AND Jim types "[expletive deleted]" instead of the word he finds
> objectionable. in replies to her,
>

Not only types (as in: new entry) but changes something in the existing body
of the message to which he is replying.

>
> IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he shows
> for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
>
> Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to
> Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that he
> finds objectionable.
>
> Any less would be disrepectful.
>
>
> Good luck with this one.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>

Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I see it that he does just as he's accused me of doing. But, to me, I got my point across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)

Kim W5TIT

906. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 11:51:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401140351.5dd579e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85682

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<400429DE.50A5C6CA@earthlink.net>...
> Leo wrote:
>
> > - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> > assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> > too!
>
> She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>
> > - no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her
> > use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of
> > the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to
> > spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the
> > air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking
> > over your life!
>
> Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> required to respond.

I'm sure you'd rather just respond to French out-of-banders on 6M.

907. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 12:18:23 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401140418.78bd2cc7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85683

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote-
>
> < I repeat the words in 97.1a amount only to a recognition of the fact
> that we
> <do public service and encouragement to us to continue. It is not an
> < authorization to do public service. We need no authorization
> whatsoever to
> < do public service. Amateur radio operators have always participated
> in
> < public service and have done so since before those words were
> incorporated
> < into the FCC rules. There is NO mandate. There is NO authorization.
>
> You guys are engaged in picking flyshit out of the pepper pot. Since
> 97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that
> 97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.
>
> Putting it another way, if ARRL BoD at their meeting this weekend passes
> a resolution that the FCC has not authorized us to public service
> communications, and therefore hams are no longer mandated to provide it,
> our continued use of the spectrum would come to a quick end.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

We only have what we do by the grace on the FCC and Congress. There is
no part of part 95 or 97 that is a congress passed law only a rule set
up by the FCC. We only have what we do because of the possibility that
we may perform a public service. Hans is correct. No public service
equals no amateur radio. Most public service today could be carried
using Nextel or some other cell. Most PS is auto traffic or weather
and could easily be done that way.

908. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 13:35:23 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>
Source record: 85684

On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
>>>> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>> >snip
>>>> >
>>>> >So let's recap:
>>>> >
>>>> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
>>>> >lengthy and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>>>> >
>>>> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>>>> >rather than my own.
>>>> >
>>>> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>>>> >
>>>> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>>>> >inappropriate words.
>>>>
>>>> Jim,
>>>>
>>>> This is really uncharacteristic of you.
>>>
>>>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.
>>
>>Nope - not that one :)
>
>That's the one I was referring to.
>
>Or did you mean the avoidance of name-calling and use of inappropriate words?

Nope - the characteristic of always portraying gentlemanly conduct,
which is clearly missing here. As you are aware.
>>>
>>>> I am amazed that a well
>>>> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
>>>> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
>>>
>>>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote

>>>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.
>>
>>Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
>>violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
>>changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.
>
>So her wishes are more important than my standards?

Nice diversion, Jim - you know that your standards are not the issue.
>>
>>You remember that, don't you, Jim?
>>>
>>>> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
>>>
>>>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
>>>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
>>>threats at all in my actions or postings.
>>
>>Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
>>intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.
>
>Nope. Not from where I sit.

Sorry to hear that, Jim.
>
>>>> I wouldn't have thought it possible.
>>>
>>>It isn't.
>>
>>(ahem)
>>>>
>>>> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.
>>>
>>>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
>>>others said he "must" do or "should" do?
>>
>>Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
>>now did he?
>
>Some would say that's mostly what he did. He was very very "annoying", saying
>that India should be independent, that Hindus and Moslems could live together,
>making salt when it was against the law....
>
>Very annoying fellow at times.

...but totally unrelated to the issue. As you are aware.
>>
>>>> >So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
>>>> >vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>>>> >
>>>> >"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"

>>>>
>>>> No.
>>>
>>>dang. I thought you of all people would be.
>>
>>Nope. Just wondering where the high behavioural standards of which you
>>frequently speak have gotten to. That's all.
>>
>>You have read the Amateur's Code, haven't you? Courteous? Friendly?
>
>Where have I been uncourteous or unfriendly?

Really, Jim. An inane question, indeed.

>
>Those words do not mean I must hide my standards under a bushel.

Not the issue. As you are aware.
>>
>>You know.
>>
>>But hey, you beat Kim, right!
>
>Not according to Kim.

According to you - read your own post!
>
>Kim thinks she "beat" me. I disagree.
>
>So we have a situation where neither Kim nor I feels like the loser.
>
>That's perhaps the biggest achievement of the thread.

Not true at all, Jim.

Let me quote your own words from your reply to to Kim in the full
version of this post:

"....Too bad you failed, Kim. But I hope you had fun."

An interesting way to declare a draw, Jim.

>
>> That's all that matters.....
>
>Not at all. What matters is that I cannot be bullied into using a
>callsign I think is inappropriate.

Sidestepping the issue.

>
>>>> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>>>>
>>>> Brilliant.

>>>>
>>>Thank you.
>>
>>Not really :)
>
>Ever see the film "Demolition Man"? Think of Edgar Friendly.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping of the main issue under discussion. I expected better from the man who often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.

The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your responses so far.

Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are fooling no one but yourself, Jim.

"It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and the artificial." - Mark Twain

73, Leo

909. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 14:08:12 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ajha009scq2nj7tp3o34fcqc0unh5k10e7@4ax.com>
Source record: 85685

Dwight,

I did some digging on this, and I believe that you are absolutely correct - a mandate is an authorization or an approval.

In fact, the word "mandate" can be used to mean either a mandatory requirement or an authorization. The dictionary defines "mandate" as:

http://www.yourdictionary.com/ahd/m/m0073800.html
http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=mandate

1. An authoritative command or instruction.

2. A command or an authorization given by a political electorate to its representative.

http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

1. an authoritative command; especially : a formal order from a superior court or official to an inferior one

2 : an authorization to act given to a representative <accepted the mandate of the people>

Meaning #2, "authorization", would fit the wording and intent of the regs quite well.

Cross referencing to the Thesaurus, we find the following synonyms listed for the word "mandate":

http://thesaurus.reference.com/search?q=mandate

Entry: mandate
Function: noun
Definition: authority
Synonyms: authorization, behest, bidding, blank check, carte blanche, charge, command, commission, decree, dictate, directive, edict, fiat, go-ahead, green light, imperative, injunction, instruction, order, precept, sanction, warrant, word
Concept: authorization
Source: Roget's Interactive Thesaurus, First Edition (v 1.0.0)
Copyright ï¿½ 2004 by Lexico Publishing Group, LLC. All rights reserved.

Entry: approval
Function: noun
Definition: authorization
Synonyms: acquiescence, assent, bells, blessing, compliance, concurrence, confirmation, consent, countenance, endorsement, finest

kind, go-ahead, green light, leave, license, mandate, ok, OK,
permission, ratification, recommendation, sanction, support, the nod,
validation
Antonyms: denial, disapproval, refusal, rejection
Concept: authorization

Note that both dictionary definitions are represented in the list, but
that the root concept of the word is "authorization". "Mandate is
also listed as a synonym for the word "approval"

The word "mandated" , however, is much clearer - it means "to makes
something mandatory", period.. Mandate, however, is not necessarily an
imperative. These similarity between these two words (and their
interchangeable usage in common speech) may be the source of the
confusion here.

Based on these references, the reference to authorization in the regs
could well be interpreted as a mandate, using the dictionary
definition #2 from both sources, and confirmed by the thesaurus.

73, Leo

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 09:27:36 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

>"Leo" wrote:
>>
>> The belief that a mandate for amateur
>> radio to participate in public service
>> communications is quite common -
>> just did a quick search on Google,
>> and II have attached an ARRL
>> reference as well as one amateur
>> radio club, who both clearly call it a
>> "mandate".
>
>
> No, the real problem is that some simply don't understand the full meaning
>of the word "mandate." They feel there is some kind of requirement behind
>it. So, of course, they get confused when it is used in a non-required
>context. However, there is no requirements associated associated with the
>other senses of the word. For example, the president can be given a mandate
>by the voters to lower taxes, but there is no requirement to do so. Amateur
>Radio operators have a mandate to perform public service (it's in the basis
>and purpose of this radio service), but there is no requirement to do so.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

910. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 14:24:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40055126.6070501@psu.edu>
Source record: 85686

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WQ3Nb.645$iD6.289457@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>"Kim
>>>
>>>" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>
> news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
>
>>>Not a question of change. A question of how the change
>>>altered the apparent authorship.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Fact still remains that you
>>>
>>>
>>>[expletive deleted]
>>
>>Here we have a very interesting point to examine.
>>
>>IF Jim finds that Kim's callsign, which *was* and *is* a double
>>entendre; an objectionable thing, (google it up folks - it's there)
>>
>>AND Jim finds some language that she used objectionable,
>>
>>AND Jim types "[expletive deleted]" instead of the word he finds
>>objectionable. in replies to her,
>>
>
>
> Not only types (as in: new entry) but changes something in the existing body
> of the message to which he is replying.

But Kim, I was also going to point out that by eliminating the
attributes as you did, you were also making changes to the existing body
of the message!

>>IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he shows
>>for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
>>
>>Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to

>>Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that he
>>finds objectionable.
>>
>>Any less would be disrepectful.
>>
>>
>>Good luck with this one.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I see it
> that he does just as he's accused me of doing. But, to me, I got my point
> across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)

Yeah, I know you made your point. But my point is to those who insist
that Jim must post a certain way. He can omit your callsign just the
same as you can make a post without the correct attributes to make you
point. And you did a pretty good job, witness this thread.

I just applied their logic to the message at hand.

- Mike KB3EIA -

911. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 14:39:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40055492.1020607@psu.edu>
Source record: 85687

Leo wrote:
> Revision to Post:
>
> Um, operator error - looks like I started typing on the wrong line,
> just under Dee's header - this made the post look like it came from
> Dee. (It also looks like Dee is replying to Dee......that ain't right
> either :)

HOWL!!!!! Looks like the thread is not dead after all, Leo! 8^). It has just mutated into another version of the never-ending debate of Kim's callsign.

So I think that we can come to the inescapable conclusion that if Ham radio was invented today, it would consist mostly of debating the relative merits of the callsign W5TIT.

So be it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

912. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 14:53:10 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <cjla00hun4getsj31nebmm7ghgg7j697sk@4ax.com>
Source record: 85688

Hmmm - Mike, you have raised a couple of good points there :)

LOL! es 73, Leo

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 09:39:14 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> Revision to Post:
>>
>> Um, operator error - looks like I started typing on the wrong line,
>> just under Dee's header - this made the post look like it came from
>> Dee. (It also looks like Dee is replying to Dee......that ain't right
>> either :)
>
>
> HOWL!!!!! Looks like the thread is not dead after all, Leo! 8^). It has
>just mutated into another version of the never-ending debate of Kim's
>callsign.
>
> So I think that we can come to the inescapable conclusion that if Ham
>radio was invented today, it would consist mostly of debating the
>relative merits of the callsign W5TIT.
>
> So be it.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

913. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 15:49:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401140749.2042f798@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85689

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...

> Since
> 97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that
> 97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.

An order to the entire ARS, not to individual amateurs. Of course, if
no
individual amateurs do what 97.1(a) says, the ARS doesn't do it
either.

And a service which doesn't at least fulfill its B&P loses its reason
to exist.
>
> Putting it another way, if ARRL BoD at their meeting this weekend passes
> a resolution that the FCC has not authorized us to public service
> communications, and therefore hams are no longer mandated to provide it,
> our continued use of the spectrum would come to a quick end.

Fortunately, that won't ever happen.

But the following might:

Last evening I had the pleasure and honor of attending a meeting
of a large and well-known radio club. The meeting was well
attended due to the excellent program presented by Ed Hare, W1RFI,
on BPL.

In both simulation and actual measurements, BPL systems cause
interference levels that make any affected band virtually
useless for communication for amateurs and others near such systems.
Depending on the vagaries of HF propagation, amateurs and others
may experience harmful interference from systems that are not
nearby.

ARRL is doing all it can to fight the BPL threat, but there is no
guarantee they will be successful. The BPL companies are promising
inexpensive broadband access, new jobs, competition, new technology,
and all the other electropolitically and econopolitically correct
terms folks like to hear.

If this sounds like I'm stumping for support for ARRL and the fight
against BPL, yer dern right. Because if BPL gets implemented on
any sort of wide scale, issues like license tests or the
appropriateness of certain callsigns will be academic.

What does all this have to do with public service? Simple: The ARS' right to exist is seriously threatened by BPL. The companies pushing it say there are millions of people just begging for the service, more jobs, etc.. And many of the systems work within *existing* Part 15 radiated emission limits.

So in some ways it comes down to 'which is more important - this newbroadband technology or ham radio?' Do you want to defend the existence of amateur
radio based purely on it being "a fun hobby" with no reference to public
service? If it comes down to that, we'll lose. Big time.

Some might say "BPL isn't my problem; I don't work those bands". Trouble
is, you may have to deal with BPL harmonics. And a precedent that it's OK for an unlicensed unintentional radiator to wipe out hams on HF and low VHF sets
up a very grim future for any ham band.

Hans is right - take away the public service aspect, and the ARS' reason
to exist is radically reduced, if not totally eliminated. Which may be exactly why some nonhams find it necessary to deny that amateur radio provides any public service, and to describe amateur radio as purely "a fun hobby".

73 de Jim, N2EY

914. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 16:26:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40056D99.6020702@psu.edu>
Source record: 85690

N2EY wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>
>>Since
>>97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that
>>97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.
>
>
> An order to the entire ARS, not to individual amateurs. Of course, if
> no
> individual amateurs do what 97.1(a) says, the ARS doesn't do it
> either.
>
> And a service which doesn't at least fulfill its B&P loses its reason
> to exist.
>
>>Putting it another way, if ARRL BoD at their meeting this weekend passes
>>a resolution that the FCC has not authorized us to public service
>>communications, and therefore hams are no longer mandated to provide it,
>>our continued use of the spectrum would come to a quick end.
>
>
> Fortunately, that won't ever happen.
>
> But the following might:
>
> Last evening I had the pleasure and honor of attending a meeting
> of a large and well-known radio club. The meeting was well
> attended due to the excellent program presented by Ed Hare, W1RFI,
> on BPL.
>
> In both simulation and actual measurements, BPL systems cause
> interference levels that make any affected band virtually
> useless for communication for amateurs and others near such systems.
> Depending on the vagaries of HF propagation, amateurs and others
> may experience harmful interference from systems that are not
> nearby.
>
> ARRL is doing all it can to fight the BPL threat, but there is no
> guarantee they will be successful. The BPL companies are promising
> inexpensive broadband access, new jobs, competition, new technology,
> and all the other electropolitically and econopolitically correct

> terms folks like to hear.
>
> If this sounds like I'm stumping for support for ARRL and the fight
> against BPL, yer dern right. Because if BPL gets implemented on
> any sort of wide scale, issues like license tests or the
> appropriateness of certain callsigns will be academic.
>
> What does all this have to do with public service? Simple: The ARS'
> right to exist is seriously threatened by BPL. The companies
> pushing it say there are millions of people just begging for the
> service, more jobs, etc.. And many of the systems work within
> *existing* Part 15 radiated emission limits.
>
> So in some ways it comes down to 'which is more important - this
> newbroadband technology or ham radio?' Do you want to defend the
> existence of amateur
> radio based purely on it being "a fun hobby" with no reference to
> public
> service? If it comes down to that, we'll lose. Big time.
>
> Some might say "BPL isn't my problem; I don't work those bands".
> Trouble
> is, you may have to deal with BPL harmonics. And a precedent that it's
> OK for an unlicensed unintentional radiator to wipe out hams on HF and
> low VHF sets
> up a very grim future for any ham band.
>
> Hans is right - take away the public service aspect, and the ARS'
> reason
> to exist is radically reduced, if not totally eliminated. Which may be
> exactly why some nonhams find it necessary to deny that amateur radio
> provides any public service, and to describe amateur radio as purely
> "a fun hobby".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I fully support the fight against BPL, and suggest that everyone send
support to ARRL either through their clubs or personally.

I do however think that while we must remain vigilant, that BPL will
end up on the trash heap of technology. We need to avoid the near panic
that came out when the abomination was first proposed.

Too many powerful interests are aligning in opposition to it. ARRL,
FEMA, and I believe a Broadcaster's association. The FCC has now
"clarified their "broadband Nirvana" statements.

Austria terminating a BPL test after the pilot project provided
free major interference with A Red Cross Emergency drill adds fuel to the
BPL pyre. This was even after they were considering such fixes as a
buffer zone around amateurs houses.

Finally, it is obvious that the technology DOES NOT WORK! The apparent need to increase power levels, the fact that a HF radio would have to operate on QRP levels to not shut down a BPL signal, and that normal levels of HF signals have been able to shut down BPL over a surprisingly large range.

And before we take a ARS-centric view of the whole thing, remember that there are plenty of other users of HF beside us.

Soooooo, if the rules are changed so that BPL gets priority use of the HF spectrum, reversing the radio universe in that part 15 devices will tolerate no interference from other devices, and that the other devices are forced to tolerate interference from the part 15 device, and *every* other user of the HF spectrum is forced off the air, then maybe, just maybe, BPL will work....kinda.

- Mike KB3EIA -

915. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 16:27:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40056DE0.5090601@psu.edu>
Source record: 85691

```
Leo wrote:
> Hmmm - Mike, you have raised a couple of good points there :)
>
> LOL! es 73, Leo

Good one, Leo!

- Mike KB3EIA -

>
> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 09:39:14 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>
>>>Revision to Post:
>>>
>>>Um, operator error - looks like I started typing on the wrong line,
>>>just under Dee's header - this made the post look like it came from
>>>Dee. (It also looks like Dee is replying to Dee......that ain't right
>>>either :)
>>
>>
>> HOWL!!!!! Looks like the thread is not dead after all, Leo! 8^). It has
>>just mutated into another version of the never-ending debate of Kim's
>>callsign.
>>
>> So I think that we can come to the inescapable conclusion that if Ham
>>radio was invented today, it would consist mostly of debating the
>>relative merits of the callsign W5TIT.
>>
>> So be it.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
```

916. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 20:13:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85692

```
"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> >> element 1 is abolished.
> >>
> >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep
> > in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for
> > General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF
> > privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a
> > year from now seems rather iffy.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.

Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the time
that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government programs at
times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than the speeding
bullet pace.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
```

917. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 20:20:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JwhNb.29946$P%1.24486395@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85693

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:aA7Nb.6912$q4.3596@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) We need no authorization whatsoever
> > to do public service. (snip) There is NO
> > mandate. There is NO authorization.
>
>
> How can you sit there and say that, Dee? Again, if you're going to do
> public service with a Ham radio, you're only allowed to do public service
> which is authorized. You may not do it for profit. You may not do it for a
> for-profit business or organization unless it serves the public only, not
> the for-profit entity. You may not do it for a non-profit entity if it can
> be used for profit (status reports for a walk-a-thon, for example). You
may
> do it only on the frequencies authorized. And so on. There are rules
across
> the board as to what is and isn't authorized.
>

The FCC does not authorize any particular form of public service that we do. By the way whether or not ham radio is involved, public service is by definition not for profit. If it is for profit, it's not public service. I can do public service anytime I want to using ham radio. The club I belong happens to focus especially on public service. We do the diabetes walk-a-thons, the MS walk-a-thons and a plethora of others. I do not need the FCC's authorization or permission to do so. I don't even have to be a member of a club. I can do public service as an individual if I so choose. Nowhere does the FCC state what public service I may or may not do using ham radio. I can use any ham radio frequency that I am licensed for. There are no special frequencies set aside for public service.

The not for profit clause (and it's exceptions) applies to all ham radio activities and are not specific to public service.

The frequency privileges/restrictions are apply to all ham radio actitivies and are not specific to public service.

The FCC regulations in Part 97 apply to all ham radio activities and are not specific to public service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

918. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 20:25:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <iBhNb.29948$P%1.24487926@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85694

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:qJ7Nb.6914$q4.2052@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > But that is not the context in which you used
> > it. There is nothing in Part 97 authorizing us
> > to do public service. (snip)
>
>
> Okay, lets try a different tact, Dee. If you use your radio for public
> service, what types of public service are you authorized to do? What
> frequencies are you authorized to use? What types of transmissions are you
> authorized to make? What messages are you authorized to transmit? Are you
> honestly going to say nothing to each of these questions?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

I can do any public service that I choose to do. I can use any frequencies that I'm authorized to do. I can make any type of non-profit communications. I can transmit any type of non-profit messages. These rules apply to all ham radio activities. There are no special requirements that apply to public service that are any different than the ham rules.

I am authorized to operate as an amateur radio operator. That is all that is needed. How or if I perform public service is entirely up to me.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

919. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 20:27:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DChNb.29950$P%1.24488177@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85695

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:cY7Nb.6920$q4.664@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Leo" wrote:
> >
> > The belief that a mandate for amateur
> > radio to participate in public service
> > communications is quite common -
> > just did a quick search on Google,
> > and II have attached an ARRL
> > reference as well as one amateur
> > radio club, who both clearly call it a
> > "mandate".
>
>
> No, the real problem is that some simply don't understand the full
meaning
> of the word "mandate." They feel there is some kind of requirement behind
> it. So, of course, they get confused when it is used in a non-required
> context. However, there is no requirements associated associated with the
> other senses of the word. For example, the president can be given a
mandate
> by the voters to lower taxes, but there is no requirement to do so.
Amateur
> Radio operators have a mandate to perform public service (it's in the
basis
> and purpose of this radio service), but there is no requirement to do so.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

And you seem to be unaware of the political fluff that is tossed around by
politicians and lobbyists to "prove" their point. You've got to read the
rules for any activity. The FCC rules give no mandate or authorization or
assignment of public service to the ham operator.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

920. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 20:31:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FGhNb.29951$P%1.24488838@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85696

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:y98Nb.6922$q4.1786@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > There is no authorization from the FCC
> > required to do public service. (snip)
>
>
> I give up, Dee. You simply cannot get past the word "required." Again,
> there is no "required" associated with "mandate" or "authorization" in the
> sense used.
>

I'm quite aware that authorization does not imply required. However there
is nothing in Part 97 that authorizes it either.

>
> > You have just demonstrated how little
> > you know about ARES and RACES.
>
>
> I've said nothing in the message you replied to about ARES or RACES
other
> than "the FCC has set rules on what is and isn't authorized in that
> situation." Please explain how that demonstrates how little I know about
> them?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

And I pointed out that Part 97 does not mention ARES at all and that RACES
is a very limited and specialized activity and is really the field of
general public service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

921. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:02:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <W7iNb.29958$P%1.24493373@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85697

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0401140418.78bd2cc7@posting.google.com...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote-
> >
> > < I repeat the words in 97.1a amount only to a recognition of the fact
> > that we
> > <do public service and encouragement to us to continue. It is not an
> > < authorization to do public service. We need no authorization
> > whatsoever to
> > < do public service. Amateur radio operators have always participated
> > in
> > < public service and have done so since before those words were
> > incorporated
> > < into the FCC rules. There is NO mandate. There is NO authorization.
> >
> > You guys are engaged in picking flyshit out of the pepper pot. Since
> > 97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that
> > 97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.
> >
> > Putting it another way, if ARRL BoD at their meeting this weekend passes
> > a resolution that the FCC has not authorized us to public service
> > communications, and therefore hams are no longer mandated to provide it,
> > our continued use of the spectrum would come to a quick end.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> We only have what we do by the grace on the FCC and Congress. There is
> no part of part 95 or 97 that is a congress passed law only a rule set
> up by the FCC. We only have what we do because of the possibility that
> we may perform a public service. Hans is correct. No public service
> equals no amateur radio. Most public service today could be carried
> using Nextel or some other cell. Most PS is auto traffic or weather
> and could easily be done that way.

While it is true that public service is one of the stronger justifications
for hams being allocated frequencies, it is not the only justification. And
a justification for our existence is not the same as having a mandate or
authorization to do public service. It is entirely up to the ham community
as to how diligently we want to pursue public service and how strong we want
this justification to do. Remember it is only ONE of several
justifications. Perhaps we need to focus on some of the others. It looks
to me like we are falling very short in the technical development area for

example.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

922. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:05:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <QaiNb.29959$P%1.24493960@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85698

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:ajha009scq2nj7tp3o34fcqc0unh5k10e7@4ax.com...
> Dwight,
>
> I did some digging on this, and I believe that you are absolutely
> correct - a mandate is an authorization or an approval.
>
> In fact, the word "mandate" can be used to mean either a mandatory
> requirement or an authorization. The dictionary defines "mandate" as:
>

Except that the FCC rules do not grant any authority in anyway to do public service nor do they establish any requirement to do public service. In any sense of the word mandate, there is none in the FCC Part 97.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

923. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:07:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5ciNb.29960$P%1.24494143@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85699

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:ajha009scq2nj7tp3o34fcqc0unh5k10e7@4ax.com...
> Based on these references, the reference to authorization in the regs
> could well be interpreted as a mandate, using the dictionary
> definition #2 from both sources, and confirmed by the thesaurus.

The regs have no reference to authorization in them. So the usage of mandate
is still incorrect.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

924. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:14:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4jiNb.29962$P%1.24495023@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85700

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401140749.2042f798@posting.google.com...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
> > Since
> > 97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that
> > 97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.
>
> An order to the entire ARS, not to individual amateurs. Of course, if
> no
> individual amateurs do what 97.1(a) says, the ARS doesn't do it
> either.
>
> And a service which doesn't at least fulfill its B&P loses its reason
> to exist.

I strongly support public service. Yet the Basis and Purpose statement speaks of encouragement and enhancement of what we already do. It is not granting us any special authorization or mandate to do what we already do.

>
>[snip] Hans is right - take away the public service aspect, and the ARS'
> reason
> to exist is radically reduced, if not totally eliminated. Which may be
> exactly why some nonhams find it necessary to deny that amateur radio
> provides any public service, and to describe amateur radio as purely
> "a fun hobby".
>

I have many times in many forums objected to the phrase "it's just a hobby" for this very reason. I strongly believe in public service. I strongly believe that it is one of, but not the only, justification for our existence. However if we are going to put so much emphasis on this particular element we have to face the fact that we are very remiss addressing the other elements listed under Basis and Purpose. But again a justification to exist is neither a requirement nor an authorization.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

925. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:25:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005B3D6.358B6EAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85601

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > > Those who use "killfiles" are merely burrowing their heads in the
> > > sand, refusing to look at other opinions.
>
> > Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
> > lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
> > Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
> > decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
> > to view the landfill.
> >
> > In this scenario, you are the landfill.
>
> Ka....BOOM! On the head, Dave...nice one!~

Thank you. Sometimes the words seem to write themselves.

Dave K8MN

926. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:33:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005B5C5.2805A005@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85602

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Sadly, some people attempt to forge
> > a tie between the terms "polite" and
> > "political correctness". There is no
> > link between them. Jim didn't treat
> > Kim's callsign badly; he didn't use it
> > at all. After all, it could be easily
> > argued that Kim didn't treat amateur
> > radio with respect in choosing her
> > call. A number of us believe that her
> > choice was tacky and tactless. (snip)
>
> So, because Kim did something, it gave Jim the right to do something?
> Isn't that a two wrongs don't make a right situation, Dave?

Jim has every "right" not to use Kim's callsign whether she does
something or not. Kim has no power to force him to use her callsign or
make him give approval to her choice.

> Regardless, lets get to the basics of this issue. What is wrong with the
> word "tit?" My dictionary defines it as a noun meaning "either of two soft
> fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman." Seem rather
> innocuous to me. I assume Kim, like most women, has those "soft fleshy
> milk-secreting glandular organs." So why would so many be offended by her
> very mention of that fact? It's not like she's refering to the sexual organs
> or something.

Thanks for the detailed definition, Dwight. The term is vulgar slang
and you have, I'm sure, seen Kim's most recent explanation for having
chosen her call. Kim's choice is simply another of her several ways of
thumbing her nose at the world. Maybe you're the kind of fellow who
would be proud to have his wife, mother or daughter choose a similar
call. I'm not.

> > It might say something about their
> > character but it doesn't say anything
> > negative about it. The FCC looks
> > the other way with regard to language
> > used in prime time television these
> > days. (snip)
>
> So you're comparing a woman's breasts to the filthy or offensive language

> on television? Isn't that somewhat prudish, Dave?

No, Dwight. I'm comparing tasteless and tacky with tasteless and tacky.

Dave K8MN

927. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:37:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005B697.A2591512@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85603

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WQ3Nb.645$iD6.289457@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > "Kim
> > >
> > > " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
> >
> > > Not a question of change. A question of how the change
> > > altered the apparent authorship.
> > >
> > >
> > >>Fact still remains that you
> > >
> > >
> > > [expletive deleted]
> >
> > Here we have a very interesting point to examine.
> >
> > IF Jim finds that Kim's callsign, which *was* and *is* a double
> > entendre; an objectionable thing, (google it up folks - it's there)
> >
> > AND Jim finds some language that she used objectionable,
> >
> > AND Jim types "[expletive deleted]" instead of the word he finds
> > objectionable. in replies to her,
> >
>
> Not only types (as in: new entry) but changes something in the existing body
> of the message to which he is replying.

Actually, you still don't understand what you did. Jim did not change
what you wrote. His actions/comments were clearly his. You changed an
attribution. Jim did not.

> >
> > IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he shows
> > for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
> >
> > Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to
> > Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that he
> > finds objectionable.
> >

> > Any less would be disrepectful.
> >
> >
> > Good luck with this one.

> Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I see it
> that he does just as he's accused me of doing.

No, he hasn't. I presented you with two illustrative example of what
you did. Jim did not do the same as you did at all.

> But, to me, I got my point
> across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)

It's hard for you to get your "point" across when you still don't
understand what you did.

Dave K8MN

928. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:39:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005B6FE.FE1120D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85604

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<400429DE.50A5C6CA@earthlink.net>...
> > Leo wrote:
> >
> > > - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> > > assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> > > too!
> >
> > She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
> >
> > > - no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her
> > > use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of
> > > the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to
> > > spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the
> > > air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking
> > > over your life!
> >
> > Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> > the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> > required to respond.
>
> I'm sure you'd rather just respond to French out-of-banders on 6M.

How could you be sure of that, Brian? Did you have a point about Kim's
callsign?

Dave K8MN

929. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:49:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005B958.5EB70995@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85605

Leo wrote:

> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
> of the main issue under discussion.

...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward something which we find in poor taste.

> I expected better from the man who
> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.

Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.

> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
> a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
> her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
> responses so far.

What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of calls.
Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a *chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.

> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.

> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
> the artificial." - Mark Twain

So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to defend bad taste.

Dave K8MN

930. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:51:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005B9CB.F3C7643E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85606

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> "Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

I remember that one well. It is simply another fine example of Len's
civil debate on the elimination of morse testing in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

931. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 21:53:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85607

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> >> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> >> > simulation.
> >> >
> >> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
> >> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
> >>
> >> Also Made In USA.
> >>
> >Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?
> >
> Nope. That's a Heath HW-2036. Only has one meter - analog.

I'm getting confoozed! Your two meter rig is a one meter rig?

I remember the '2036 and used to own one. I spent a lot of time
fiddling with those VCO coils in the thing. It belongs to a Lebanese
ham in Sierra Leone now. He's probably cursing me every time he has to
fiddle with those coils.

> But my shack clock is digital. It's a Tymeter 24-hour one, made from
> the parts of three junkers more than 15 years ago.

Those things are developing some nostalgia value these days.

Dave K8MN

932. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 22:05:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005BD45.6309B0FF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85608

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0401130927.21d6469f@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim
> >
> > " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0401121002.3c510145@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<bts9q8$frt@library1.airnews.net>...

> > > For each and every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction.
> > >
> > Only in certain physics problems. Otherwise, there are all sorts of
> > situations.
> >
>
> Metaphysically and philosophically speaking, for each and every action,
> there is an equal and opposite reaction. It is not so metaphysical or
> philosophical, though, that evidence of the statement cannot be found.

Metaphysically and philosophically, I don't think you know what you're
talking about, Kim.

> > Sometimes actions are ignored.
> >
>
> And, for that, there will be a reaction--somewhere, sometime, there will be
> a reaction. That reaction will be of equal and opposite significance.

Show your work.

> > > Although, the implication of you being a leg
> > > man--and stating so in such a way as to imply something sexual about it,
> > > also defeats your whole stance of removing inappropriate things from
> posts
> > > you take part in.
> >
> > The subject under discussion was baked chicken, Kim. See the
> > original post - the poster was talking about dinner in the
> > oven. And it's a fact that I prefer thighs and drumsticks
> > to wings and [other chicken parts].
> >
> >

> > With one exception: genuine Buffalo wings - but they're not baked.
> >
>
> Thinly veiled, but nice try.

What "thinly veiled"? Why can't you admit that you either took it out
of context or hadn't bothered to digest what was written?

> > If there's anything sexual about my baked-chicken preferences, that's
> > in *your* mind, not in my post.
> >
>
> And, equally, I say if there is anything sexual about my callsign, that's in
> *your* mind and in the mind of others. I simply have it because I have big
> tits. Ask N5BIG why he has that callsign. He's a friend, tell 'im I sent
> ya.

I don't recall anyone saying anything about your call being "sexual". I
remember "tasteless", "tacky" and "inappropriate" being used. I recall
seeing the word "vulgar". Your latest reason for choosing your call
pretty much says it all.

> > > As I said, you've been changing my original posts for over a year now
> (by
> > > deleting my callsign from them--by the way, that was just pointed out to
> me
> > > by someone else a bit of time ago--I've been "watching" since) so if you
> > > want to get offended, upset, etc., about changing posts then be upset at
> > > yourself first.
> >
> > Not the same thing at all. You're equating my editing
> > with your own improper attribution.
> >
>
> One man's junk is another man's treasure, etc.

That's not so at all. You either still don't understand what you did or
you're simply refusing to acknowledge what you did.

Dave K8MN

933. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 22:09:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005BE0A.A625B48C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85609

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:40042153.14C35E30@earthlink.net...
> > Kim wrote:
> >
> > > Ahem...at least he hasn't said he's going to "pray for you" yet. I love
> it
> > > when someone says that to me with that certain "tone of voice" LOL
> >
> > I'll bet you get that a lot. However, why should I do all of the work
> > for you?
> > Are you too busy to pray for yourself?

> Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?

Sure it has, Kim. Why should I pray for you if you're not even going to
tackle it yourself? After all, If I prayed for you and told you so,
you'd simply think I was someone with that "certain tone of voice".

Dave K8MN

934. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 22:10:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005BE74.8E024072@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85610

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:40041FB4.9A4CABFD@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Mike, how in the Hell is anyone going to alter a post to make it appear
> like
> > > someone else's, when the post is listed as "Sent" by whomever it is that
> > > actually sent it? The "art" of making it look like someone else had
> sent it
> > > would only be evidenced as deviant behavior IF (and I did not) I had
> also
> > > changed the Header information to look like it had been sent by Jim.
> >
> > Here's an example for you, Kim, just for purposes of illustration:
> >
> > > I know that I often post before taking the time to think things out and
> have often > been guilty of acting from emotion before or instead of taking
> the time to gather > the facts.
> >
> > Now the above was written by me but it has been made to look as if you
> > wrote it.
> >
> > > That Dave Heil is so damned bored with life that he has to concoct
> things
> > > from thin air is usual and status quo for him.
> >
> > It wasn't from thin air, Kim. It was from posts made by you. They
> > exist. They can't now be denied.
> >
> > > Don't be so quick to jump on
> > > a Dave Heil bandwagon...because those wagons don't travel far at all.
> >
> > I have a bandwagon?
> >
> > > For anyone with computer sense, it is unreasonable to even consider that
> a
> > > post could be issued under the guise of someone else--contrary to the
> > > opinion that it can be done. And, when I resubmit "The Pool" list with
> my
> > > callsign attributed to my prediction date, it is certainly weak, at
> best, to
> > > display anger and make it seem as though I was doing *anything* else but

> > > resubmitting a post an attributing my callsign to my prediction.
> >
> > That's simply incorrect.
> >
> > Let's do another example for purposes of illustration:
> >
> > > I have given some thought to my choice of callsigns and feel that I may
> have made a > mistake. My choice reflects badly on amateur radio and on me
> as an individual.
> >
> > If not for the fact that I've made clear that this is an illustration
> > added by me--if I'd simply taken out the white space and my comments,
> > I'd be adding the material to make it look as if the statements came
> > from you. Are you starting to get the picture?
> >
> > > However, if you or anyone else, is so desperate to reach for the stars
> in
> > > some display of dislike for me--then go for it.
> >
> > No, it has simply been pointed out to you that you have crossed the line
> > between what's right and what's wrong.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Live with it, Dave, live with it...

I have no problem living with it, Kim. After all, it was a factual
account of what took place. I even provided two very good illustrations
for your benefit. As to the reality that you still don't seem to get
it, I can live with that too.

Dave K8MN

935. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 22:14:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005BF5C.56C4FCAF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85611

Leo wrote:
>
> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 01:27:42 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> Good point, Dee - I'm not a contester, and was unaware of this mode of
> operation. I'm more familiar with the one-on-one ragchew session, or
> the 'net' scenario, where you identify the particular station that you
> want to speak to, and go from there.
>
> Now, if we can convince these two that Texas is DX from West Virginia,
> maybe we can get them talking! :)

Maybe on 2m SSB or CW it's DX. I've already worked Texas on 2m and can
live without a QSO with "W5 Tacky In Texas".

Dave K8MN

936. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 22:30:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4005C2FA.CCF8440E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85612

Leo wrote:
>
> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >
> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> >> too!
> >
> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>
> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.

She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should stop annoying me.

> Wouldn't it?
> You bet.

I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh in.

> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.

I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?

> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> >required to respond.
>
> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
> Amateur Radio right there..... :)

I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio. Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?

> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
> huh? Wow.

I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.

> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
> >> I have something in common - so would I!
> >
> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
> >callsign.
>
> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.

You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written by someone cause me a lack of sleep.

> Not the required thing, Dave - the courteous thing. Considerate, even
> - like the Amateur's Code says:

Kim wasn't being considerate of the views of others in choosing that particular call, was she?

> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> pleasure of others."

I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting in Usenet.

> Personally, I don't suffer from some Freudian thing that causes me to
> find call signs offensive. People can be offfensive, but not call
> signs - it's just a license number, Dave......

Actually, I have only one number in my call. The rest are letters. I have had a couple of calls which had two digits. I've never referred to any past or present calls as license numbers.

Dave K8MN

937. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 23:34:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <VMydnUKKzJVcT5jd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85613

Leo wrote:

>
> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.

Neither can good taste, as Kim proves, but we can expect it.

938. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-14 23:56:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040114185642.11022.00003495@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85614

In article <40056D99.6020702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>I fully support the fight against BPL, and suggest that everyone send
>support to ARRL either through their clubs or personally.

Also through membership and well-written comments to NOI and NPRM.
>
> I do however think that while we must remain vigilant, that BPL will
>end up on the trash heap of technology. We need to avoid the near panic
>that came out when the abomination was first proposed.

Maybe it will be trashed - but maybe not. It's not over till it's over, and even then it's not over. For example, even though Japan rejected BPL after trials, the BPL companies there are trying again, claiming "new technology".

And remember that the levels of interference at the various test sites conform to existing FCC radiated levels!
>
> Too many powerful interests are aligning in opposition to it. ARRL,
>FEMA, and I believe a Broadcaster's association. The FCC has now
>"clarified their "broadband Nirvana" statements.

Could still happen. Most of those folks don't have installations in residential neighborhoods. Most hams, OTOH...

> Austria terminating a BPL test after the pilot project provided
>free major interference with A Red Cross Emergency drill adds fuel to the
>BPL pyre. This was even after they were considering such fixes as a
>buffer zone around amateurs houses.

We're not in Austria. The EUs usually are a lot more rejecting of pollution than we are. (BPL's interference is essentially spectrum pollution, wouldn't you agree?)
>
> Finally, it is obvious that the technology DOES NOT WORK!

No, it *does* work! The demo sites are functioning.

>The apparent
>need to increase power levels, the fact that a HF radio would have to
>operate on QRP levels to not shut down a BPL signal, and that normal
>levels of HF signals have been able to shut down BPL over a surprisingly
>large range.

In some test sites. But at others, it's a different story. And even such problems are no guarantee that FCC won't allow it.

Look at Manassas.

> And before we take a ARS-centric view of the whole thing, remember
> that there are plenty of other users of HF beside us.

Sure - and hopefully the combined effect of all of them will be enough to convince FCC.

But the job isn't done till it's done.

>
> Soooooo, if the rules are changed so that BPL gets priority use of the
>HF spectrum, reversing the radio universe in that part 15 devices will
>tolerate no interference from other devices, and that the other devices
>are forced to tolerate interference from the part 15 device, and *every*
>other user of the HF spectrum is forced off the air, then maybe, just
>maybe, BPL will work....kinda.

Stranger things have happened.

Suppose you sit down for a nice bit of PSK and find the waterfall full of noise - and no signals visible. Do you think the power company is going to interrupt service so you can operate?

Or suppose you see a signal or two and open up with 100 W. And suppose you dump the system for a radius of a mile from your house....

Or suppose the local gendarmes show up, responding to complaints from many angry citizens that *you* are messing up *their* computers. Do you want to explain Part 15 and Part 97 to them, when they see you as the electronic equivalent of somebody violating the peace?

Or suppose any time someone calls the help line, the first question the help person asks is "Is there a ham radio within a mile of your house?"

These are not wild scenarios. They're updates of what used to happen when TV first came to some areas. Years ago, one ham, W4GJO, was *sued* for TVI by a nearby bar owner who couldn't get distant TV stations when 'GJO was on the air. FCC's attitude, and statements, were that the ham's rig was clean and so it was the TV owner's problem. Yes, the ham eventually won, but it took many hours and dollars.

None of this means we should panic or over react. But neithr can we think the problem is licked or that it will go away on its own.

It ain't over till...

73 de Jim, N2EY

939. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:04:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141604.477bebfe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85615

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40055126.6070501@psu.edu>...

>
> I just applied their logic to the message at hand.
>
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, the PCTA double standard defies logic.

940. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:39:23 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <uknb00tmnbr0s5g7ri15d2jm9uvdr6m7tv@4ax.com>
Source record: 85616

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>> of the main issue under discussion.
>
>...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
>taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
>something which we find in poor taste.

Not at all - you have missed the point entirely. My condolences.

>
>> I expected better from the man who
>> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>
>Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.

You think? :)
>
>> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>> a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>> her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>> responses so far.
>
>What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
>courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
>take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
>calls.

And two wrongs somehow make a right? Of course she singled herself
out with that call. So what? Does that make her a "bad person",
somehow unfit for common courtesy, Dave?

>Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
>*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.

Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
it's a fact of life. :)

>
>> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
>> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.

>
>> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>> the artificial." - Mark Twain
>
>So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
>you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
>defend bad taste.

Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
others. Plain and simple.

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

941. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:40:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu4o24$4i9@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85618

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Qv8Nb.6928$q4.1662@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Sadly, some people attempt to forge
> > a tie between the terms "polite" and
> > "political correctness". There is no
> > link between them. Jim didn't treat
> > Kim's callsign badly; he didn't use it
> > at all. After all, it could be easily
> > argued that Kim didn't treat amateur
> > radio with respect in choosing her
> > call. A number of us believe that her
> > choice was tacky and tactless. (snip)
>
> So, because Kim did something, it gave Jim the right to do something?
> Isn't that a two wrongs don't make a right situation, Dave?
>

ROFLMAO!! Know what it sounds like to me? Sounds like Dave has an agenda. The dialogue on this thread that has just been winding down the past couple of days has less to do with my callsign than it did with overall practices in newsgroups.

Yet, Dave persists in defending the topic from the angle of it having had more to do with my callsign! He's managing to achieve nothing but tripping over his own self.

Kim W5TIT

942. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:45:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu4o25$4i9@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85617

```
"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40055126.6070501@psu.edu...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:WQ3Nb.645$iD6.289457@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Kim
> >>>
> >>>" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>
> > news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
> >
> >>>Not a question of change. A question of how the change
> >>>altered the apparent authorship.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Fact still remains that you
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>[expletive deleted]
> >>
> >>Here we have a very interesting point to examine.
> >>
> >>IF Jim finds that Kim's callsign, which *was* and *is* a double
> >>entendre; an objectionable thing, (google it up folks - it's there)
> >>
> >>AND Jim finds some language that she used objectionable,
> >>
> >>AND Jim types "[expletive deleted]" instead of the word he finds
> >>objectionable. in replies to her,
> >>
> >
> >
> > Not only types (as in: new entry) but changes something in the existing
body
> > of the message to which he is replying.
>
> But Kim, I was also going to point out that by eliminating the
> attributes as you did, you were also making changes to the existing body
> of the message!
>
```

>
>
> >>IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he shows
> >>for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
> >>
> >>Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to
> >>Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that he
> >>finds objectionable.
> >>
> >>Any less would be disrepectful.
> >>
> >>
> >>Good luck with this one.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I
see it
> > that he does just as he's accused me of doing. But, to me, I got my
point
> > across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)
>
>
> Yeah, I know you made your point. But my point is to those who insist
> that Jim must post a certain way. He can omit your callsign just the
> same as you can make a post without the correct attributes to make you
> point. And you did a pretty good job, witness this thread.
>
> I just applied their logic to the message at hand.
>
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Absolutely. Uh, I think...

Kim W5TIT

943. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:54:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu4o9d$hj1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85619

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4005B697.A2591512@earthlink.net...
> >
>
> Actually, you still don't understand what you did. Jim did not change
> what you wrote. His actions/comments were clearly his. You changed an
> attribution. Jim did not.
>

And, you're still pontificating, Dave. How many times have I clearly stated: I know what I did, I know what I did trumped what Jim did (i.e., had greater impact on everyone), and I'll state now I don't think I'd change a thing about doing it--three ways--again!

To me, attributes, or deleting things such as signatures and things from tracking mechanisms, are equal. Got it? No difference in either action to be determined as "wrong." Each is an insult, each is astray from standard conventions of newsgroup submissions, and each have the same potential to mislead, or at least misdirect, the readers of that post.

> > >
> > > IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he
shows
> > > for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
> > >

I don't think the justification for the action needs to be included in the dialogue. As I stated in another post, regardless of reason, *both* are wrong. I refuse to continue to get wrapped up in this being about my callsign--it is not.

> > >
> > > Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to
> > > Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that
he
> > > finds objectionable.
> > >
> > > Any less would be disrepectful.
> > >
> > >
> > > Good luck with this one.
>
> > Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I
see it
> > that he does just as he's accused me of doing.
>

> No, he hasn't. I presented you with two illustrative example of what
> you did. Jim did not do the same as you did at all.
>

You fall way short, Dave, of being able to *present* anything.

> >
> > But, to me, I got my point
> > across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)
>
> It's hard for you to get your "point" across when you still don't
> understand what you did.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Do you practice being an asshole, Dave? You must...because you're nearly
perfect at it.

Kim W5TIT

944. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:56:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040114195631.22081.00003435@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 85621

In article <pcgIb.590$6B.23@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>I believe Jim N2EY and I have a similar viewpoint as to making
>the written into two or more specific and separate elements for
>each class. Where I would differ from your suggestion is that
>it makes no difference which element(s) are passed first as long
>as each stands on its own.

My idea was not to create separate elements but to change the marking system slightly.

Each question in the pool would be classified by certain subjects - rules and regs, safety, theory, etc. Probably only 4 subjects, not the 10 or so we had before. Rules and regs are one obvious subject, safety another, operating procedures, and theory. And each test would contain a certain number from each subject.

The difference would be that in order to pass you'd need a certain number in each subject correct, not just the total. So even though there might not be that many safety questions on a test, you could not get them all wrong or most of them wrong and still pass.

But it would only be one test and one element.

73 de Jim, N2EY

945. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:56:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu4ocr$4ct@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85620

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4005B958.5EB70995@earthlink.net...
> Leo wrote:
>
> > Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
> > diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
> > of the main issue under discussion.
>
> ...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
> taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
> something which we find in poor taste.
>
> > I expected better from the man who
> > often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>
> Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.
>
> > The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
> > a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
> > her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
> > responses so far.
>
> What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
> courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
> take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
> calls.
> Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
> *chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>

Oh puhleeze, Dave. Live with the fallout!?! It's an amateur radio
callsign! Not a GD BOD decision! ROFLMAO!!!

> > Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
> > shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
> > fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>
> > "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
> > sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
> > the artificial." - Mark Twain
>
> So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
> you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
> defend bad taste.
>

> Dave K8MN
>

Kim W5TIT

946. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 00:59:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu4oho$17s@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85622

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4005BD45.6309B0FF@earthlink.net...
>
> I don't recall anyone saying anything about your call being "sexual". I
> remember "tasteless", "tacky" and "inappropriate" being used. I recall
> seeing the word "vulgar". Your latest reason for choosing your call
> pretty much says it all.
>

Ummmm, do you change bottles of liquor at least once in a while, Dave? My "latest reason" for choosing my callsign is the same as the "earlier reasons."

Get a grip, Dave...it'll be much more enjoyable. Dare. Dare to live a little.

Kim W5TIT

947. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 01:02:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu4onk$5ot@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85623

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4005BE0A.A625B48C@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:40042153.14C35E30@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > > Ahem...at least he hasn't said he's going to "pray for you" yet. I
love
> > it
> > > > when someone says that to me with that certain "tone of voice" LOL
> > >
> > > I'll bet you get that a lot. However, why should I do all of the work
> > > for you?
> > > Are you too busy to pray for yourself?
>
> > Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?
>
> Sure it has, Kim. Why should I pray for you if you're not even going to
> tackle it yourself? After all, If I prayed for you and told you so,
> you'd simply think I was someone with that "certain tone of voice".
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Praying is of little significance to me, in communing with God, Dave. But,
you're so shallow, I'm quite sure you are completely incapable of
understanding anything like that.

Oh, and please, don't pray for me. Most people who say things like that are
saying it to be vindictive---OH, that's right!!! You are being vindictive!

Kim W5TIT

948. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 01:20:24 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <edob001sogip1jmjoauts8r92qveabe4tb@4ax.com>
Source record: 85625

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >
>> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
>> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>> >> too!
>> >
>> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>>
>> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
>> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
>> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
>> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
>
>She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
>against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
>annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
>stop annoying me.

On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.

Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?
>
>> Wouldn't it?
>> You bet.
>
>I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh
>in.

I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
to do so.
>
>> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
>
>I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?

My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
"objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.

If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
you wish to debate this point.
>
>
>> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
>> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
>> >required to respond.
>>
>> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
>> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
>
>I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
>Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?

So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.
>
>> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
>> huh? Wow.
>
>I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.

And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
of this discussion.
>
>> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
>> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
>> >> I have something in common - so would I!
>> >
>> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
>> >callsign.
>>
>> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
>> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
>> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
>> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
>
>You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
>do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not
>going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
>by someone cause me a lack of sleep.

Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
- said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)
>
>> Not the required thing, Dave - the courteous thing. Considerate, even
>> - like the Amateur's Code says:

>
>Kim wasn't being considerate of the views of others in choosing that
>particular call, was she?

I don't know, Dave. She picked a callsign, and the FCC granted it to
her. Was that inconsiderate somehow?

If she uses it in an incosiderate way, it would be. But that's not
what began this discussion. In this case, it was stated that the
callsign is "inappropriate". Which, by itself, it is not. It's
just a callsign, Dave.
>
>> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>> pleasure of others."
>
>I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
>Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
>pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
>in Usenet.

You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
not on the air? Interesting concept.....

That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>
>
>> Personally, I don't suffer from some Freudian thing that causes me to
>> find call signs offensive. People can be offfensive, but not call
>> signs - it's just a license number, Dave......
>
>
>Actually, I have only one number in my call. The rest are letters. I
>have had a couple of calls which had two digits. I've never referred to
>any past or present calls as license numbers.

I'm sorry, Dave - my error. It's a license alphanumeric. :)

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

949. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 01:36:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040114203612.15923.00003178@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 85624

In article <J_YEb.1514$Vv2.744413@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>I've though of writing an article or two for QST myself.

Do it, Mike.

>Probably wouldn't be cutting edge.

Doesn't matter.

>Most contributions I could make would be
>geared toward homebrewing, and most likely on panel layout technique,
>ergonomics and (gasp) aesthetics. If they print an article about doing
>panels in Powerpoint, the state of Amateur radio equipment layout could
>use the boost.

Yep. Or how to make nice looking dials, labels, meter scales, etc.

One ham I know has made a schematic drawing utility based on MS Paint.
The various components are essentially clipart, as I understand it.
>
> Hans would probably still make fun of it tho'! ;^)
>
So would some others, including at least one who's not even a ham. So what?

One of my articles was June, 1994, IIRC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

950. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 02:48:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040114214858.11022.00003505@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 85626

In article <4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >>
>> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
>> >> > simulation.
>> >> >
>> >> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
>> >> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>> >>
>> >> Also Made In USA.
>> >
>> >Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?
>> >
>> Nope. That's a Heath HW-2036. Only has one meter - analog.
>
>I'm getting confoozed! Your two meter rig is a one meter rig?

Affirmative.
>
>I remember the '2036 and used to own one. I spent a lot of time
>fiddling with those VCO coils in the thing. It belongs to a Lebanese
>ham in Sierra Leone now. He's probably cursing me every time he has to
>fiddle with those coils.
>
Mine may need a new mike. Ironic.

>> But my shack clock is digital. It's a Tymeter 24-hour one, made from
>> the parts of three junkers more than 15 years ago.
>
>Those things are developing some nostalgia value these days.
>
In some ways clock technology has gone backwards. I remember when almost all
clocks ran on synchronous motors, like my Tymeter. The power co. kept track of
the Hz and would keep the total number of cycles-per-year pretty dern accurate.
I found that all my motor-clocks would stay in step with WWV give or take a
second or to for as long as the power was on.

Then came "digital quartz technology" - and no two clocks read alike. Set them all to the same time and in a few months they're all over the place. The newer computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older ones...

But my Tymeter grinds on, flipping the drums.

73 de Jim, N2EY

951. Don't work the legal ones, work the bootleggers!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:23:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141923.f3b7c57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85627

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4005B6FE.FE1120D4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<400429DE.50A5C6CA@earthlink.net>...
> > > Leo wrote:
> > >
> > > > - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> > > > assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> > > > too!
> > >
> > > She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
> > >
> > > > - no one other than the FCC has the right to prevent or censor her
> > > > use of it in any way (say, this might be the first legitimate use of
> > > > the 'Free Speech' thing here on the group!) Would those who refuse to
> > > > spell out her dreaded call here in the group refuse to say it on the
> > > > air as well? Jeez, seek help, your inhibitions just might be taking
> > > > over your life!
> > >
> > > Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> > > the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> > > required to respond.
> >
> > I'm sure you'd rather just respond to French out-of-banders on 6M.
>
> How could you be sure of that, Brian?

I can be sure of that because of three of your postings.

1. You posted saying that you worked French amateurs where they have
no 6M authorizations.

2. You later stated that you would continue to do so because you have
no responsibility for where bootleg French hams want to operate.

And 3. You stated that you'd be happy to tune right by a legally
licensed American amateur because your're not required to respond.

That is how I can be sure.

Did you have a point about Kim's
> callsign?

Yes. It is legal and valid, but you show a preference for out of band
Frenchmen.

Is there anything else?

952. Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:30:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141930.3887fe29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85628

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40041FB4.9A4CABFD@earthlink.net>...

> > I have given some thought to my choice of callsigns and feel that I may have made a mistake. My choice reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual.

Or, "I have given some thought to my choice of working Frenchmen out
of band on 6M, and feel that I may have made a mistake. My choice
reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual."

Dave, do you recognize yourself in this alternative scenario?

953. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:35:36 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9470E5CC855D9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85629

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >>
>> >> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good
>> >> until element 1 is abolished.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>> >
>> > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days.
>> > Keep in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping
>> > code for General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited
>> > HF privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than
>> > a year from now seems rather iffy.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>>
>> Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.
>
> Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the
> time that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government
> programs at times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than
> the speeding bullet pace.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

However, the code test was abolished by the ITU way back on July 5th last
year. More than one year from _now_ would be more than eighteen months,
which doesn't seem likely to me, nor is that fast by any stretch.

I am down for May 1st in the pool, which is only about 10 months. That
maybe a little short, but I would be very surprised indeed if it went over
15 months, which would be this November.

As I said, you would like to think it would take longer, but that is because you don't want it to happen. Perhaps I have picked an earlier date because I take the opposite view, but I doubt if I am out by more than a few months.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

954. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:40:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141940.3dcedb2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85630

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<1tl800lng2lcnmie9onnqru6g8vmt429u8@4ax.com>...
> On 13 Jan 2004 09:54:02 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

> >I am aware that you preceive it that way. Are you aware that no disrespect
> >was intended?
>
> No.

Unfortunately, the Gutenberg press doesn't lend itself to the full
range of human vocal expression and we often infer emotion based upon
prior typed exchanges with our victims.

Mistakes in interpretation are made daily, yet are unambiguous when
the typist provides line after line of all CAPS, excessive exclamation
points (!!!), and multiple lines of
"bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha
hahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha
hahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha" maniacal laughter.

"Bend Over" is another good clue that your on-line buddy has seen too
many reruns of Deliverance and wishes you ill will.

955. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:43:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141943.4eb27e50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85631

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4005BE0A.A625B48C@earthlink.net>...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:

> > Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?
>
> Sure it has, Kim. Why should I pray for you if you're not even going to
> tackle it yourself? After all, If I prayed for you and told you so,
> you'd simply think I was someone with that "certain tone of voice".
>
> Dave K8MN

If you were to tell me that you prayed for me, I would thank you. But
I would wonder if God listened to smug prayers.

956. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:56:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141956.290952ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85632

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4005B958.5EB70995@earthlink.net>...
> Leo wrote:
>
> > Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
> > diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
> > of the main issue under discussion.
>
> ...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
> taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
> something which we find in poor taste.

Now there's a smug remark.

> > I expected better from the man who
> > often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>
> Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.

And you yours in this matter.

> > The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
> > a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
> > her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
> > responses so far.
>
> What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
> courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
> take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
> calls.
> Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
> *chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.

Similarly, you weren't being courteous to other Tanzanian amateurs by
working Frenchmen out of band on 6M when you held a Tanzanian call,
and subsequently stating that you would continue to do so because you
were within your authorization.

You give Tanzanian amateurs a bad name.

Meanwhile you state you would somehow manage to tune past a legally
issued American callsign, apparently in preference of out of band
Frenchmen on 6M.

> > Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
> > shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
> > fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>

> > "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
> > sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
> > the artificial." - Mark Twain
>
> So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
> you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
> defend bad taste.
>
> Dave K8MN

So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than
those
you've exhibited here and on the air?

It seems that you've set yourself up here and on the air to defend bad
taste.

957. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 03:58:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401141958.202945d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85633

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4005B697.A2591512@earthlink.net>...
>
> It's hard for you to get your "point" across when you still don't
> understand what you did.
>
> Dave K8MN

Kind of like working Frenchmen out of band on 6M, huh?

958. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 04:02:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401142002.66173b4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85634

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >>
> > >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> > >> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> > >> > simulation.
> > >> >
> > >> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
> > >> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
> > >>
> > >> Also Made In USA.
> > >
> > >Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?
> > >
> > Nope. That's a Heath HW-2036. Only has one meter - analog.
>
> I'm getting confoozed! Your two meter rig is a one meter rig?
>
> I remember the '2036 and used to own one. I spent a lot of time
> fiddling with those VCO coils in the thing. It belongs to a Lebanese
> ham in Sierra Leone now. He's probably cursing me every time he has to
> fiddle with those coils.

I hope he's not trying to get back at America because of you.

959. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 04:13:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401142013.6eee9835@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85635

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> > news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> >
> > >
> > > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >>
> > >> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> > >> element 1 is abolished.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> > >
> > > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep
> > > in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for
> > > General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF
> > > privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a
> > > year from now seems rather iffy.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.
>
> Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the time
> that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government programs at
> times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than the speeding
> bullet pace.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

D2, you are so incredibly wise. You immediately spotted and
understood the corruption in the N2EY/W5TIT exchanges, and knew to
stay away. You knew that Morse Code testing is healthy, wealhty, and
wise for the ARS, and must be retained under all circumstances. And
now you know the mind of the US government.

We are so incredibly lucky to have you post to RRAP. You are
practically a Shaman, and we hang on your every word as to the future
of the ARS. Thak you.

We are not worthy.

960. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 05:04:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401150509530.2664@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85636

On Tue, 13 Jan 2004, Carl Zager wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >
> > > I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> > > element 1 is abolished.
> > >
> > > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep in
> > mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for General
> > or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With the
> > speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather
> > iffy.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> And ... a code CSCE is only "good" as follows:
> 1. For upgrade to General, one year. However, once a General, then the
^^^^^^^^
NO! It's good for 365 days, which is NOT always equal to one year, especially
when a leap year is involved.

> element is part of the General package and allows upgrade to Extra
> without the one-year deadline or retaking.
> 2. Without upgrade to General/Extra, the element allows "Tech Plus"
> privileges, which were the bands and frequencies alloted to the Novice
> ticket, for as long as the holder remains a Technician.

961. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 05:17:43 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401150522110.2664@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85637

```
On Thu, 15 Jan 2004, Alun wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> >> news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >>
> >> >> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good
> >> >> until element 1 is abolished.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >> >
> >> > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days.
> >> > Keep in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping
> >> > code for General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited
> >> > HF privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than
> >> > a year from now seems rather iffy.
> >> >
> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> >
> >>
> >> Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.
> >
> > Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the
> > time that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government
> > programs at times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than
> > the speeding bullet pace.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> However, the code test was abolished by the ITU way back on July 5th last
> year. More than one year from _now_ would be more than eighteen months,
> which doesn't seem likely to me, nor is that fast by any stretch.

So? That in no way means that the U.S. Government (FCC) EVER HAS TO adopt a
completely code-free license structure at all. They could decide to keep
everything status-quo, despite what the U.S. amateur community wants.
```

What I say by this: That "it" could NEVER come.

> I am down for May 1st in the pool, which is only about 10 months. That
> maybe a little short, but I would be very surprised indeed if it went over
> 15 months, which would be this November.
>
> As I said, you would like to think it would take longer, but that is
> because you don't want it to happen. Perhaps I have picked an earlier date
> because I take the opposite view, but I doubt if I am out by more than a
> few months.

962. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 06:16:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <NeqNb.8904$i4.8498@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85638

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > Regardless, lets get to the basics of
> > this issue. What is wrong with the
> > word "tit?" My dictionary defines it as
> > a noun meaning "either of two soft
> > fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs
> > on the chest of a woman." Seem rather
> > innocuous to me. I assume Kim, like
> > most women, has those "soft fleshy
> > milk-secreting glandular organs." So
> > why would so many be offended by her
> > very mention of that fact? It's not like
> > she's refering to the sexual organs
> > or something.
>
>
> Thanks for the detailed definition, Dwight.
> The term is vulgar slang (snip)

Vulgar is very much in the eyes of the beholder, dependant on how the word is used and who uses it. But I don't really see the word itself as vulgar, especially in an innocuous radio callsign. Would you be so offended if it had been issued by the FCC at random? Would you be so offended if it had been selected by a man? In the end, it appears to me that most are complaining simply because a woman selected a callsign which highlights a unique aspect of womanhood. Perhaps these guys are jealous that woman have those "soft fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs" and they don't. Tit envy?

> Maybe you're the kind of fellow who
> would be proud to have his wife, mother
> or daughter choose a similar call. I'm not.

I wouldn't even attempt to tell my wife, mother, or adult daughter, which callsign to select for themselves. All of these women clearly have enough intelligence to select the callsign they want, whatever it might be.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

963. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 06:20:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ajqNb.8905$i4.1142@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85639

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> The FCC does not authorize any
> particular form of public service
> that we do. (snip)

Your argument is evolving as the discussion goes on. Again, I give up.
This topic just isn't worth spending anymore time on it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

964. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 07:55:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <sHrNb.8922$i4.5122@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85640

"Leo" wrote:
>
> (snip) Based on these references, the
> reference to authorization in the regs
> could well be interpreted as a mandate,
> using the dictionary definition #2 from
> both sources, and confirmed by the
> thesaurus.

Wow. Thanks for looking, and typing, all that up for us, Leo. Words are always modified by the context of the discussion. In one case, a mandate is a command. In another, it's an approval, authorization, or so on. In the context used, knowing most here should know the FCC rules (or could look them up), the sense of that word should have been obvious.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

965. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 08:01:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <xNrNb.8925$i4.3678@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85641

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Except that the FCC rules do not
> grant any authority in anyway to do
> public service nor do they establish
> any requirement to do public
> service. In any sense of the word
> mandate, there is none in the FCC
> Part 97.

Okay, now that you have accepted the authorization or approval sense of the word, and have acknowledged 97.1 and the regs relating to RACES, go back to my original statement you objected to - "there is nothing in Part 95 that mandates public service like that found in Part 97." Would you now agree there is nothing in Part 95 relating to public service that is like that found in Part 97?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

966. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 08:15:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <f_rNb.8927$i4.5746@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85642

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> I'm quite aware that authorization
> does not imply required. However
> there is nothing in Part 97 that
> authorizes it either. (snip)

This was addressed in another message. As such, I won't repeat what was
said there.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

967. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 12:46:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu6235$ec2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85643

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:uknb00tmnbr0s5g7ri15d2jm9uvdr6m7tv@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>
> >Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
> >*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>
> Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
> it's a fact of life. :)
>

Hmmmm, never thought of it that way, Leo, but your observation comes true.
I can't tell you how many times I have been given "oh jeeze" looks from
women who think I absolutely deliberately grew these things to their size!
I guess I've never paid that much attention to it; it's the equivalent of
"blaming" someone for being born any other way. :)

Kim W5TIT

968. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 12:48:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu626d$app@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85644

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0401141943.4eb27e50@posting.google.com...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4005BE0A.A625B48C@earthlink.net>...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > > Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?
> >
> > Sure it has, Kim. Why should I pray for you if you're not even going to
> > tackle it yourself? After all, If I prayed for you and told you so,
> > you'd simply think I was someone with that "certain tone of voice".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> If you were to tell me that you prayed for me, I would thank you. But
> I would wonder if God listened to smug prayers.
>

Now, I like that response, and much more to the point, Brian! And, I don't
think it'd be much wonder at all, though ;)

Kim W5TIT

969. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 12:56:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu62mk$cb7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85645

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:NeqNb.8904$i4.8498@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > > Regardless, lets get to the basics of
> > > this issue. What is wrong with the
> > > word "tit?" My dictionary defines it as
> > > a noun meaning "either of two soft
> > > fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs
> > > on the chest of a woman." Seem rather
> > > innocuous to me. I assume Kim, like
> > > most women, has those "soft fleshy
> > > milk-secreting glandular organs." So
> > > why would so many be offended by her
> > > very mention of that fact? It's not like
> > > she's refering to the sexual organs
> > > or something.
> >
> >
> > Thanks for the detailed definition, Dwight.
> > The term is vulgar slang (snip)
>
>
> Vulgar is very much in the eyes of the beholder, dependant on how the
word
> is used and who uses it. But I don't really see the word itself as vulgar,
> especially in an innocuous radio callsign. Would you be so offended if it
> had been issued by the FCC at random? Would you be so offended if it had
> been selected by a man? In the end, it appears to me that most are
> complaining simply because a woman selected a callsign which highlights a
> unique aspect of womanhood. Perhaps these guys are jealous that woman have
> those "soft fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs" and they don't. Tit
> envy?
>
>
> > Maybe you're the kind of fellow who
> > would be proud to have his wife, mother
> > or daughter choose a similar call. I'm not.
>
>
> I wouldn't even attempt to tell my wife, mother, or adult daughter,
which
> callsign to select for themselves. All of these women clearly have enough
> intelligence to select the callsign they want, whatever it might be.

>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Y'know...the thing I think that fascinates me most in all this stuff is that, when I was asked about my callsign I could have just said, "none of your business." My callsign *could* have been chosen for any number of reasons: I bring light to the man over in Florida (K2TIT) who had that callsign as a commemoration to the TET offensive and, when he was considering a call, K2TET had been taken/issued (I don't remember which Michael told me).

Anyway, I openly and honestly told the story (yeah, Dave, the earlier and the later version) of how my callsign came to be and, *that* is what has determined the approach to my callsign--nothing more! *Not* the callsign.

So, the moral of this story is that, as long as one keeps quiet about their reasons for doing something, it must remain unquestionable to those in this newsgroup who now--simply because of a story and nothing more--find themselves high and mighty (over a--good grief--ham radio callsign!).

Oh wow, I just looked the K2TIT callsign up (to try and confirm that Michael was that guy's name, but I think it was)--and it's been two years since he's given it up! Hmmmm, now I could get my preferred callsign--I'd wanted the 'K' call, not 'W'. I actually believe that having a 'W' call is offensive to many long-licensed hams; much more offensive than having a suffix of any sort. ;)

Kim W5TIT

970. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 13:12:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <400691C5.8000501@psu.edu>
Source record: 85646

```
Alun wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>
>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>>>news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>>
>>>>>I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good
>>>>>until element 1 is abolished.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>>>
>>>>Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days.
>>>>Keep in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping
>>>>code for General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited
>>>>HF privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than
>>>>a year from now seems rather iffy.
>>>>
>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>
>>>
>>>Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.
>>
>>Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the
>>time that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government
>>programs at times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than
>>the speeding bullet pace.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>
>
> However, the code test was abolished by the ITU way back on July 5th last
> year. More than one year from _now_ would be more than eighteen months,
> which doesn't seem likely to me, nor is that fast by any stretch.
```

>
> I am down for May 1st in the pool, which is only about 10 months. That
> maybe a little short, but I would be very surprised indeed if it went over
> 15 months, which would be this November.
>
> As I said, you would like to think it would take longer, but that is
> because you don't want it to happen. Perhaps I have picked an earlier date
> because I take the opposite view, but I doubt if I am out by more than a
> few>

But what does all this have to do with Kim's callsign?

- Mike KB3EIA -

971. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 13:13:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <400691F1.2050000@psu.edu>
Source record: 85647

Brian wrote:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>>
>>> news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
>>
>>>>>>I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
>>>>>>simulation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
>>>>>easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
>>>>>
>>>>>Also Made In USA.
>>>>
>>>>Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?
>>>>
>>>
>>>Nope. That's a Heath HW-2036. Only has one meter - analog.
>>
>>I'm getting confoozed! Your two meter rig is a one meter rig?
>>
>>I remember the '2036 and used to own one. I spent a lot of time
>>fiddling with those VCO coils in the thing. It belongs to a Lebanese
>>ham in Sierra Leone now. He's probably cursing me every time he has to
>>fiddle with those coils.
>
>
> I hope he's not trying to get back at America because of you.

But what does all this have to do with Kim's callsign?

- Mike KB3EIA -

972. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 13:28:42 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <814d00dvmbrmpps6ip0kjj0nvkeefucj2g@4ax.com>
Source record: 85648

On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 06:46:22 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:uknb00tmnbr0s5g7ri15d2jm9uvdr6m7tv@4ax.com...
>> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>
>> >Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
>> >*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>>
>> Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
>> it's a fact of life. :)
>>
>
>Hmmmm, never thought of it that way, Leo, but your observation comes true.
>I can't tell you how many times I have been given "oh jeeze" looks from
>women who think I absolutely deliberately grew these things to their size!
>I guess I've never paid that much attention to it; it's the equivalent of
>"blaming" someone for being born any other way. :)

Yup, people do have a natural tendency to get hung up on physical
characteristics. I've heard that from a couple of friends in the same
- um - situation...guys have trouble looking you in the eye, and the
other women (and some guys..) become insecure. Dumb and insensitive,
but it seems to be human nature.

You may want to suggest an experiment to those guys who do not
understand how this must feel. Ask them to place a large banana in
the inside front of their pants before they head off to work one
morning. Have them engage as many of their co-workers as possible in
conversation.

Then, the next day, have them go in (minus the banana :)) and see if
they can find anyone who remembers what the hell they were talking
about the day before......

That oughta learn 'em!

>
>Kim W5TIT

73, Leo

973. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 13:36:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4006975D.4030404@psu.edu>
Source record: 85649

N2EY wrote:
> In article <40056D99.6020702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>I fully support the fight against BPL, and suggest that everyone send
>>support to ARRL either through their clubs or personally.
>
>
> Also through membership and well-written comments to NOI and NPRM.
>
>> I do however think that while we must remain vigilant, that BPL will
>>end up on the trash heap of technology. We need to avoid the near panic
>>that came out when the abomination was first proposed.
>
>
> Maybe it will be trashed - but maybe not. It's not over till it's over, and
> even then it's not over. For example, even though Japan rejected BPL
> after trials, the BPL companies there are trying again, claiming "new
> technology".
>
> And remember that the levels of interference at the various test sites conform
> to existing FCC radiated levels!
>
>> Too many powerful interests are aligning in opposition to it. ARRL,
>>FEMA, and I believe a Broadcaster's association. The FCC has now
>>"clarified their "broadband Nirvana" statements.
>
>
> Could still happen. Most of those folks don't have installations in residential
> neighborhoods. Most hams, OTOH...
>
>
>> Austria terminating a BPL test after the pilot project provided
>>free major interference with A Red Cross Emergency drill adds fuel to the
>>BPL pyre. This was even after they were considering such fixes as a
>>buffer zone around amateurs houses.
>
>
> We're not in Austria. The EUs usually are a lot more rejecting of pollution
> than we are. (BPL's interference is essentially spectrum pollution, wouldn't
> you agree?)
>
>> Finally, it is obvious that the technology DOES NOT WORK!
>

>
> No, it *does* work! The demo sites are functioning.

They are a sort of laboratory condition. If the test results from ARRL
are correct, 1 ham with 100 watts can effectively turn off the service
for quite some distance around him/her. That's what I mean.

>
>>The apparent
>>need to increase power levels, the fact that a HF radio would have to
>>operate on QRP levels to not shut down a BPL signal, and that normal
>>levels of HF signals have been able to shut down BPL over a surprisingly
>>large range.
>
>
> In some test sites. But at others, it's a different story. And even such
> problems are no guarantee that FCC won't allow it.

The market will then take care of it.

> Look at Manassas.

Aww, do I have to? 8^)

>
>> And before we take a ARS-centric view of the whole thing, remember
>>that there are plenty of other users of HF beside us.
>
>
> Sure - and hopefully the combined effect of all of them will be enough to
> convince FCC.
>
> But the job isn't done till it's done.

Sure enough. Remember I'm not arguing against a stand against BPL or
the need to fight it. I just want people to not freak.

>
>> Soooooo, if the rules are changed so that BPL gets priority use of the
>>HF spectrum, reversing the radio universe in that part 15 devices will
>>tolerate no interference from other devices, and that the other devices
>>are forced to tolerate interference from the part 15 device, and *every*
>>other user of the HF spectrum is forced off the air, then maybe, just
>>maybe, BPL will work....kinda.
>
>
> Stranger things have happened.
>
> Suppose you sit down for a nice bit of PSK and find the waterfall full of noise
> - and no signals visible. Do you think the power company is going to interrupt
> service so you can operate?
>
> Or suppose you see a signal or two and open up with 100 W. And suppose you dump

> the system for a radius of a mile from your house....

Yup, keep on calling CQ. I probably wouldn't go above 50 watts tho' But even that would be enough to disrupt the BPL.

On a side note, has there been any tests on what solar storms would do to BPL?

> Or suppose the local gendarmes show up, responding to complaints from many
> angry citizens that *you* are messing up *their* computers. Do you want to
> explain Part 15 and Part 97 to them, when they see you as the electronic
> equivalent of somebody violating the peace?

> Or suppose any time someone calls the help line, the first question the
> help person asks is "Is there a ham radio within a mile of your house?"

Sure enough. All good arguments. And the best arguments for being steadfast in the fight against BPL. Even though I am certain that in practice, BPL will fall flat on it's face, that if approved, it will be a nuisance for some hams and others. But I see different levels of concern. Concern at a high level such as at the early part of the fight against BPL, when testing was needed, and arguments presented against BPL. The present situation, when it is being documented that the system is very fragile and has a track record of interference to emergency services (even if it is only a test) allows more leisurely prosecution of the problem. But prosecution has to go on.

What do you think the F.C.C's response will be when ARRL or FEMA trots out the Austrian BPL Red Cross interference data? Am I the only one that thinks that case is darn close to a show stopper?

- Mike KB3EIA -

974. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 13:39:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4006981A.5090604@psu.edu>
Source record: 85650

N2EY wrote:
> In article <J_YEb.1514$Vv2.744413@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>I've though of writing an article or two for QST myself.
>
>
> Do it, Mike.
>
>
>>Probably wouldn't be cutting edge.
>
>
> Doesn't matter.
>
>
>>Most contributions I could make would be
>>geared toward homebrewing, and most likely on panel layout technique,
>>ergonomics and (gasp) aesthetics. If they print an article about doing
>>panels in Powerpoint, the state of Amateur radio equipment layout could
>>use the boost.
>
>
> Yep. Or how to make nice looking dials, labels, meter scales, etc.
>
> One ham I know has made a schematic drawing utility based on MS Paint.
> The various components are essentially clipart, as I understand it.
>
>> Hans would probably still make fun of it tho'! ;^)
>>
>
> So would some others, including at least one who's not even a ham. So what?
>
> One of my articles was June, 1994, IIRC.

Did this post just recently make it to your server, Jim? I posted it
quite a while back. I've noticed this in a few of my posts to the group.
I just wonder where the messages go for a few weeks? 8^)

But yes, maybe I will just write something up. Maybe include ergonomics
too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

975. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 17:40:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401150940.35aeb779@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85701

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>...
> On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >>On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >>
> >>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
> >>>> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >>>> >snip
> >>>> >
> >>>> >So let's recap:
> >>>> >
> >>>> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
> >>>> >lengthy and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
> >>>> >
> >>>> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
> >>>> >rather than my own.
> >>>> >
> >>>> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
> >>>> >
> >>>> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
> >>>> >inappropriate words.
> >>>>
> >>>> Jim,
> >>>>
> >>>> This is really uncharacteristic of you.
> >>>
> >>>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.
> >>
> >>Nope - not that one :)
> >
> >That's the one I was referring to.
> >
> >Or did you mean the avoidance of name-calling and use of inappropriate words?
>
> Nope - the characteristic of always portraying gentlemanly conduct,
> which is clearly missing here.

So let me get this straight.

In order to display "gentlemanly conduct", you think I should
use Kim's callsign in my posts. Even though doing so violates
my standards. And even though it was chosen for reasons that
no gentleman would endorse.

Surreal.

> As you are aware.

I'm not aware of any ungentlemanly behavior on my part. I
am aware of some ungentlemanly behavior on the part of
others, though.

> >>>> I am amazed that a well
> >>>> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
> >>>> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
> >>>
> >>>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
> >>>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.
> >>
> >>Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
> >>violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
> >>changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.
> >
> >So her wishes are more important than my standards?
>
> Nice diversion, Jim - you know that your standards are not the issue.

Nice attempt at diversion, Leo.

My standards are *exactly* the issue.

I'm being told, again and again, that my choice not to put Kim's
callsign in my posts is "wrong", and that my standards are of lesser
importance than Kim's feelings.

So let me ask the question straight out:

Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
or Kim's feelings?

> >>You remember that, don't you, Jim?
> >>>
> >>>> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
> >>>
> >>>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
> >>>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
> >>>threats at all in my actions or postings.
> >>
> >>Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
> >>intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.
> >
> >Nope. Not from where I sit.
>

> Sorry to hear that, Jim.

Do you want me to lie about it? I won't.
> >
> >>>> I wouldn't have thought it possible.
> >>>
> >>>It isn't.
> >>
> >>(ahem)
> >>>>
> >>>> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.
> >>>
> >>>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
> >>>others said he "must" do or "should" do?
> >>
> >>Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
> >>now did he?
> >
> >Some would say that's mostly what he did. He was very very "annoying", saying
> >that India should be independent, that Hindus and Moslems could live
> >together, making salt when it was against the law....
> >
> >Very annoying fellow at times.
>
> ...but totally unrelated to the issue.

No, totally related to the issue. He was very considerate of other people's
feelings. But that consideration did not keep him from being very very
"annoying" when his standards/values/conscience required it.

My standards require that I not put Kim's call in the list - because I
think it's inappropriate. I'm sorry if someone finds that annoying.
But I'm not going to change it.

> As you are aware.

I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
two statements.

> >>>> >So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
> >>>> >vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
> >>>> >
> >>>> >"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
> >>>>
> >>>> No.
> >>>
> >>>dang. I thought you of all people would be.
> >>
> >>Nope. Just wondering where the high behavioural standards of which you
> >>frequently speak have gotten to. That's all.

> >>
> >>You have read the Amateur's Code, haven't you? Courteous? Friendly?
> >
> >Where have I been uncourteous or unfriendly?
>
> Really, Jim. An inane question, indeed.

Yet you give no examples.
>
> >Those words do not mean I must hide my standards under a bushel.
>
> Not the issue.

Exactly the issue. Why do you avoid it?

> >>You know.
> >>
> >>But hey, you beat Kim, right!
> >
> >Not according to Kim.
>
> According to you - read your own post!

Yes, according to me. Not according to Kim.

That's what I wrote.

As you are aware. ;-)

> >Kim thinks she "beat" me. I disagree.
> >
> >So we have a situation where neither Kim nor I feels like the loser.
> >
> >That's perhaps the biggest achievement of the thread.
>
> Not true at all, Jim.

I think it is.

> Let me quote your own words from your reply to to Kim in the full
> version of this post:

> "....Too bad you failed, Kim. But I hope you had fun."
>
> An interesting way to declare a draw, Jim.

Nobody is declaring a draw.

A draw is when neither side thinks they won, or can win, and so the game ends.

In this case, Kim thinks she won, and I think I won. Not a draw.
>
> >> That's all that matters.....
> >

> >Not at all. What matters is that I cannot be bullied into using a
> >callsign I think is inappropriate.
>
> Sidestepping the issue.

Yes, you are. Not me.

> >>>> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
> >>>>
> >>>> Brilliant.
> >>>>
> >>>Thank you.
> >>
> >>Not really :)
> >
> >Ever see the film "Demolition Man"? Think of Edgar Friendly.

> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
> of the main issue under discussion.

Leo, you are avoiding the central issue:

Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
or Kim's feelings?

That's the central issue, right there.

> I expected better from the man who
> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>
> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
> a list.

You mean using her name instead of her callsign.

That was done because of my standards. Using her callsign in that list
was inconsistent with my standard that it's inappropriate. So I didn't
use it. As I have said before, no disrespect, insult, or singling out
were intended.

> And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
> her. Period.

You are saying that I should ignore my standards out of courtesy to Kim.
That having her callsign included in the list, rather than her name, is
more important than any consideration of *my* feelings or standards.

That's the issue.

> An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
> responses so far.
>
Not by me. By you and others.

Say it right out, Leo. Tell me that I should ignore/hide/deny my
standards of what is appropriate in deference to
"courtesy" and Kim's feelings.

> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue?

That's all I've been doing in these posts.

> - or
> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.

How am I fooling myself?

I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
two statements.

Are you aware of what you are telling me to do?
>
> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
> the artificial." - Mark Twain

Yup.

You want me to keep my standards private, and not act on them, because
they aren't the same as yours. Well, that's just not going to happen.

btw - if Kim's callsign is "just a license number", then why
not pick a different one? Why a vanity call at all?

73 de Jim, N2EY

976. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 17:57:49 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <ovANb.200$%86.57@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85702

All of you need to take a healthy dump and get a life. There is not a
single mention of policy in this entire thread.

N2EY wrote:
> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>...
>
>>On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>
>>> news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
>>
>>>>>>On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>snip
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So let's recap:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,
>>>>>>>lengthy and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>>>>>>>rather than my own.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>>>>>>>inappropriate words.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jim,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>This is really uncharacteristic of you.
>>>>>
>>>>>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.
>>>>

>>>>Nope - not that one :)
>>>
>>>That's the one I was referring to.
>>>
>>>Or did you mean the avoidance of name-calling and use of inappropriate words?
>>
>>Nope - the characteristic of always portraying gentlemanly conduct,
>>which is clearly missing here.
>
>
> So let me get this straight.
>
> In order to display "gentlemanly conduct", you think I should
> use Kim's callsign in my posts. Even though doing so violates
> my standards. And even though it was chosen for reasons that
> no gentleman would endorse.
>
> Surreal.
>
>
>>As you are aware.
>
>
> I'm not aware of any ungentlemanly behavior on my part. I
> am aware of some ungentlemanly behavior on the part of
> others, though.
>
>
>>>>>>I am amazed that a well
>>>>>>educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
>>>>>>given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
>>>>>
>>>>>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
>>>>>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.
>>>>
>>>>Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
>>>>violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
>>>>changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.
>>>
>>>So her wishes are more important than my standards?
>>
>>Nice diversion, Jim - you know that your standards are not the issue.
>
>
> Nice attempt at diversion, Leo.
>
> My standards are *exactly* the issue.
>
> I'm being told, again and again, that my choice not to put Kim's
> callsign in my posts is "wrong", and that my standards are of lesser

> importance than Kim's feelings.
>
> So let me ask the question straight out:
>
> Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
> or Kim's feelings?
>
>
>>>>You remember that, don't you, Jim?
>>>>
>>>>>>Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
>>>>>
>>>>>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
>>>>>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
>>>>>threats at all in my actions or postings.
>>>>
>>>>Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
>>>>intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.
>>>
>>>Nope. Not from where I sit.
>>
>>Sorry to hear that, Jim.
>
>
> Do you want me to lie about it? I won't.
>
>>>>>>I wouldn't have thought it possible.
>>>>>
>>>>>It isn't.
>>>>
>>>>(ahem)
>>>>
>>>>>>That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.
>>>>>
>>>>>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
>>>>>others said he "must" do or "should" do?
>>>>
>>>>Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
>>>>now did he?
>>>
>>>Some would say that's mostly what he did. He was very very "annoying", saying
>>>that India should be independent, that Hindus and Moslems could live
>>>together, making salt when it was against the law....
>>>
>>>Very annoying fellow at times.
>>
>>...but totally unrelated to the issue.
>
>
> No, totally related to the issue. He was very considerate of other people's

> feelings. But that consideration did not keep him from being very very
> "annoying" when his standards/values/conscience required it.
>
> My standards require that I not put Kim's call in the list - because I
> think it's inappropriate. I'm sorry if someone finds that annoying.
> But I'm not going to change it.
>
>
>> As you are aware.
>
>
> I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
> I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
> I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
> two statements.
>
>
>>>>>>>So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
>>>>>>>vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>>>>>>
>>>>>>No.
>>>>>
>>>>>dang. I thought you of all people would be.
>>>>
>>>>Nope. Just wondering where the high behavioural standards of which you
>>>>frequently speak have gotten to. That's all.
>>>>
>>>>You have read the Amateur's Code, haven't you? Courteous? Friendly?
>>>
>>>Where have I been uncourteous or unfriendly?
>>
>>Really, Jim. An inane question, indeed.
>
>
> Yet you give no examples.
>
>>>Those words do not mean I must hide my standards under a bushel.
>>
>>Not the issue.
>
>
> Exactly the issue. Why do you avoid it?
>
>
>>>>You know.
>>>>
>>>>But hey, you beat Kim, right!
>>>

>>>Not according to Kim.
>>
>>According to you - read your own post!
>
>
> Yes, according to me. Not according to Kim.
>
> That's what I wrote.
>
> As you are aware. ;-)
>
>
>>>Kim thinks she "beat" me. I disagree.
>>>
>>>So we have a situation where neither Kim nor I feels like the loser.
>>>
>>>That's perhaps the biggest achievement of the thread.
>>
>>Not true at all, Jim.
>
>
> I think it is.
>
>
>>Let me quote your own words from your reply to to Kim in the full
>>version of this post:
>
>
>
>>"....Too bad you failed, Kim. But I hope you had fun."
>>
>>An interesting way to declare a draw, Jim.
>
>
> Nobody is declaring a draw.
>
> A draw is when neither side thinks they won, or can win, and so the game ends.
>
> In this case, Kim thinks she won, and I think I won. Not a draw.
>
>>>>That's all that matters.....
>>>
>>>Not at all. What matters is that I cannot be bullied into using a
>>>callsign I think is inappropriate.
>>
>>Sidestepping the issue.
>
>
> Yes, you are. Not me.
>

>
>>>>>>>73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Brilliant.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Thank you.
>>>>
>>>>Not really :)
>>>
>>>Ever see the film "Demolition Man"? Think of Edgar Friendly.
>
>
>>Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>>diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>>of the main issue under discussion.
>
>
> Leo, you are avoiding the central issue:
>
> Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
> or Kim's feelings?
>
> That's the central issue, right there.
>
>
>>I expected better from the man who
>>often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>>
>>The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>>a list.
>
>
> You mean using her name instead of her callsign.
>
> That was done because of my standards. Using her callsign in that list
> was inconsistent with my standard that it's inappropriate. So I didn't
> use it. As I have said before, no disrespect, insult, or singling out
> were intended.
>
>
>>And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>>her. Period.
>
>
> You are saying that I should ignore my standards out of courtesy to Kim.
> That having her callsign included in the list, rather than her name, is
> more important than any consideration of *my* feelings or standards.
>
> That's the issue.

>
>
>>An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>>responses so far.
>>
>
> Not by me. By you and others.
>
> Say it right out, Leo. Tell me that I should ignore/hide/deny my
> standards of what is appropriate in deference to
> "courtesy" and Kim's feelings.
>
>
>>Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue?
>
>
> That's all I've been doing in these posts.
>
>
>>- or
>>shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>>fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>
>
> How am I fooling myself?
>
> I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
> I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
> I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
> two statements.
>
> Are you aware of what you are telling me to do?
>
>>"It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>>sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>>the artificial." - Mark Twain
>
>
> Yup.
>
> You want me to keep my standards private, and not act on them, because
> they aren't the same as yours. Well, that's just not going to happen.
>
> btw - if Kim's callsign is "just a license number", then why
> not pick a different one? Why a vanity call at all?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

977. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 19:22:48 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc0dq95.d5l.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 85703

In article <ovANb.200$%86.57@bignews4.bellsouth.net>, Arf! Arf! wrote:
> All of you need to take a healthy dump and get a life. There is not a
> single mention of policy in this entire thread.

Agreed...

FWIW I have been following this thread for a while, and have been very amused by it. Recently I downloaded a copy of the FCC amateur database to use in some club research, just for the heck of it, I did a few queries on the database tables...

There are a total of 8 hams who are proud of their TIT's, and another 42 who wear a BRA, there are no hams with the call of N0BRA (perhaps she is among the 50 who SAG).

There are a total of 11 hams who are an ASS and 37 FCK'rs, but no FUK'rs or FUC'rs. 9 are DUM, and a surprising 43 are full of SHT.

There are 47 NIT's to go along with the 56 WIT's.

The FCC has 72 hams, but has been getting careless with what they give calls to, as there are 54 DOGs, 78 CATs, 56 COWs, 25 PIGs, 87 FOXes, 51 GNU, 67 RATs, and an additional 56 with FUR. There are 63 hams living in the SEA, along with 51 EEL's and 60 COD.

A total of 47 hams LIE, while 43 are telling the TRUth.

Ham radio seems to be a family hobby as there are 68 DAD's, 73 MOM's, 45 who claim to be SIS, 38 BROs, 68 KIDs , and 57 BOYs.

There are 49 hams who like to YAK, while 54 each prefer PSK or FSK, an additional 70 are SSB users and 50 use a VOX. This greatly outnumbers the 65 who use a KEY and 67 BUG users.

Figuring out the genders of hams is a bit confusing, as there are 59 GUY's, 54 GAL's, 52 MEN, and another 36 MAN. This count also includes W0MEN, W0MAN, N0MAN, and N0MEN.

Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX, but only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be GAY.

Baldness is also common among hams, as there are 56 who wear a HAT, another 66 CAP wearers, and 39 who have WIG. I did not include N0HAT, N0CAP and N0WIG in those counts. There are also 49 with a TIE, and one with N0TIE.

Age does not seem to matter to hams either as there are almost equal numbers of OLD (59) and NEW (58) hams.

An additional 19 think they are GOD, perhaps while they are on the AIR (81) with the 16 LID's, the 67 who are HOT, and the 62 who are BAD. There is a single ham who claims to be K1NG, and another who admits to having N0CLU.

There are 56 who like to EAT, 52 TEA drinkers, 54 GIN drinkers, and 51 GUM chewers. With all of this eating going on, there are 49 who are FAT, (including N0FAT), and another 61 who are BIG.

There are 37 who eat LOX. Oddly enough there are only 5 JEW's (perhaps because ham is not Kosher??) and 1 Atheist (N0GOD).

As for personality traits there are 49 who are ODD, 53 who are SHY and 52 who are SLY. There are 54 who are SAD, and 60 who are MAD.

54 hams have their heads stuck in the MUD, while another 68 are in the SKY

There are 55 amateurs who are PRO's, while 96 are content to be HAMs.

61 operators think they are number ONE, while 56 are in second place (TWO). There are 62 hams in TENth place, and a whopping 72 in SIXth.

VHF (74) seems to be a bit more popular than UHF (63). The low number of VLF'ers (44) is not surprising, as we do not have a 135 kHZ allocation in the US.

There are 49 with a RIG and one poor ham with N0RIG.

Alex / AB2RC

978. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 19:40:28 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>
Source record: 85704

Jim,

For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the core "issue" that began our discourse. Perhaps I haven't stated it clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become clouded.

I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.

I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign inappropriate. No issue there - that is entirely your right. I also understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts. Again, no issue there - I respect that.

For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:

Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was unfair, as it singled her out. I agree. Would finding a compromise whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants - have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?

That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim. Your rights and standards are not at question here.

73, Leo

On 15 Jan 2004 09:40:58 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>...
>> On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >>On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>> news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
>> >>>> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>> >>>> >snip
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >So let's recap:
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,

>> >>>> >lengthy and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code testing.
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>> >>>> >rather than my own.
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>> >>>> >inappropriate words.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Jim,
>> >>>>
>> >>>> This is really uncharacteristic of you.
>> >>>
>> >>>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.
>> >>
>> >>Nope - not that one :)
>> >
>> >That's the one I was referring to.
>> >
>> >Or did you mean the avoidance of name-calling and use of inappropriate words?
>>
>> Nope - the characteristic of always portraying gentlemanly conduct,
>> which is clearly missing here.
>
>So let me get this straight.
>
>In order to display "gentlemanly conduct", you think I should
>use Kim's callsign in my posts. Even though doing so violates
>my standards. And even though it was chosen for reasons that
>no gentleman would endorse.
>
Not at all - I'm saying that you have omitted all of the calls so as
not to single her out. Neither compromising your standards nor
offending her.

As you are aware.

>Surreal.

No, diversionary, Jim. I have stated the issue many times. You
choose to ignore it.
>
>> As you are aware.
>
>I'm not aware of any ungentlemanly behavior on my part. I
>am aware of some ungentlemanly behavior on the part of
>others, though.

That is indeed unfortunate, Jim.

>
>> >>>> I am amazed that a well
>> >>>> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
>> >>>> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
>> >>>
>> >>>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
>> >>>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.
>> >>
>> >>Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
>> >>violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
>> >>changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.
>> >
>> >So her wishes are more important than my standards?
>>
>> Nice diversion, Jim - you know that your standards are not the issue.
>
>Nice attempt at diversion, Leo.

Not at all :) - you are fixated on her callsign being the issue. The
real issue is the manner in which you chose to single her out! As she
told you herself.

Instead, you choose to make a moralistic issue out of it. It is not.

>
>My standards are *exactly* the issue.

No.

Your handling of the situation is the issue. As stated many times. Not
your standards.

>
>I'm being told, again and again, that my choice not to put Kim's
>callsign in my posts is "wrong", and that my standards are of lesser
>importance than Kim's feelings.

Incorrect - that is not what you are being "told" at all. Please
reread my previous comments.

As for your standards being more important, they are not - they are of
equal importance. Hers and yours. Unless you are more important than
kim, that is.
>
>So let me ask the question straight out:
>
>Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
>or Kim's feelings?

Both are equally important, Jim. Unless you are somehow more
important, as started above...

>
>> >>You remember that, don't you, Jim?

>> >>>
>> >>>> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
>> >>>
>> >>>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
>> >>>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
>> >>>threats at all in my actions or postings.
>> >>
>> >>Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
>> >>intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.
>> >
>> >Nope. Not from where I sit.
>>
>> Sorry to hear that, Jim.
>
>Do you want me to lie about it? I won't.

Perhaps, then, there was no attempt to bully Kim. I stand corrected,
Gladiator :)

>> >
>> >>>> I wouldn't have thought it possible.
>> >>>
>> >>>It isn't.
>> >>
>> >>(ahem)
>> >>>>
>> >>>> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.
>> >>>
>> >>>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
>> >>>others said he "must" do or "should" do?
>> >>
>> >>Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
>> >>now did he?
>> >
>> >Some would say that's mostly what he did. He was very very "annoying", saying
>> >that India should be independent, that Hindus and Moslems could live
>> >together, making salt when it was against the law....
>> >
>> >Very annoying fellow at times.
>>
>> ...but totally unrelated to the issue.
>
>No, totally related to the issue. He was very considerate of other people's
>feelings. But that consideration did not keep him from being very very
>"annoying" when his standards/values/conscience required it.
>
>My standards require that I not put Kim's call in the list - because I
>think it's inappropriate. I'm sorry if someone finds that annoying.
>But I'm not going to change it.

No problem - but you could have left them all out, couldn't you? As stated many times. A compromise indeed - but not a compromise of your standards at all.
>
>> As you are aware.
>
>I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
>I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
>I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
>two statements.

No arguement with the first two points at all Jim - it is your omitting just one callsign (hers) from your post that is the issue. I have said repeatedly, as has Kim, that you should have used no one's call in your post if the situation bothered you that much. That would have solved the problem without compromising your standards, wouldn't it? Who would have a reason to complain about that? She would have been treated equally to everyone else (her complaint), and her callsign would not have appeared in your post (your complaint). Is there a problem with this?

If you believe that her call is inappropriate, and you do not wish to use it in a post, those are your standards and are deserving of the respect of everyone. But, that is not the central issue of my posts to you - the above paragraph is.

>
>> >>>> >So I quote Maximus in the arena, surrounded by those he has
>> >>>> >vanquished, as he says to the crowd:
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!"
>> >>>>
>> >>>> No.
>> >>>
>> >>>dang. I thought you of all people would be.
>> >>
>> >>Nope. Just wondering where the high behavioural standards of which you
>> >>frequently speak have gotten to. That's all.
>> >>
>> >>You have read the Amateur's Code, haven't you? Courteous? Friendly?
>> >
>> >Where have I been uncourteous or unfriendly?
>>
>> Really, Jim. An inane question, indeed.
>
>Yet you give no examples.

You consider singling someone out and against their wishes courteous and friendly?

I don't.

>>
>> >Those words do not mean I must hide my standards under a bushel.
>>
>> Not the issue.
>
>Exactly the issue. Why do you avoid it?

I don't - that is not the issue at all.

Your standards do not allow you to use her callsign in a post. No
problem there at all, Jim. Omitting just hers was unfair, though -
that is the issue. As stated many times.

That is the issue that I am discussing. Not you, though - you are
trying to shift it to a position defensable by your standards.

>
>> >>You know.
>> >>
>> >>But hey, you beat Kim, right!
>> >
>> >Not according to Kim.
>>
>> According to you - read your own post!
>
>Yes, according to me. Not according to Kim.
>
>That's what I wrote.
>
>As you are aware. ;-)

I refer exactly to what you wrote. Not what Kim wrote.

But hey, you beat Kim, right?
>
>> >Kim thinks she "beat" me. I disagree.
>> >
>> >So we have a situation where neither Kim nor I feels like the loser.
>> >
>> >That's perhaps the biggest achievement of the thread.
>>
>> Not true at all, Jim.
>
>I think it is.

Your opinion.

>
>> Let me quote your own words from your reply to to Kim in the full
>> version of this post:
>
>> "....Too bad you failed, Kim. But I hope you had fun."
>>
>> An interesting way to declare a draw, Jim.

>
>Nobody is declaring a draw.
>
>A draw is when neither side thinks they won, or can win, and so the game ends.
>
>In this case, Kim thinks she won, and I think I won. Not a draw.

Rhetorical, Jim - ...perhaps a tie?

An interesting way to declare a tie, Jim.

>>
>> >> That's all that matters.....
>> >
>> >Not at all. What matters is that I cannot be bullied into using a
>> >callsign I think is inappropriate.
>>
>> Sidestepping the issue.
>
>Yes, you are. Not me.

Nope. Not the issue.

>
>> >>>> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Brilliant.
>> >>>>
>> >>>Thank you.
>> >>
>> >>Not really :)
>> >
>> >Ever see the film "Demolition Man"? Think of Edgar Friendly.
>
>> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>> of the main issue under discussion.
>
>Leo, you are avoiding the central issue:

No. Not at all. Please reread my comments carefully! You are arguing
a different issue.
>
>Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
>or Kim's feelings?
>
>That's the central issue, right there.

Nope. Not the issue at all, Jim. As stated many times.

Regarding which is more important, though - both. There was a way to
handle this without compromising either. As has been stated many
times.

Or are you saying that you are more important, Jim?
>
>> I expected better from the man who
>> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>>
>> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>> a list.
>
>You mean using her name instead of her callsign.

No.

Not the issue, as you are aware (or should be?). Omitting just her
call in the list is the issue. Just that one call - no others.
>
>That was done because of my standards. Using her callsign in that list
>was inconsistent with my standard that it's inappropriate. So I didn't
>use it. As I have said before, no disrespect, insult, or singling out
>were intended.
>
>> And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>> her. Period.
>
>You are saying that I should ignore my standards out of courtesy to Kim.
>That having her callsign included in the list, rather than her name, is
>more important than any consideration of *my* feelings or standards.
>
>That's the issue.

Nope. As stated above, and many times. And as you are aware.
>
>> An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>> responses so far.
>>
>Not by me. By you and others.

Nope. The issue has been stated many times.
>
>Say it right out, Leo. Tell me that I should ignore/hide/deny my
>standards of what is appropriate in deference to
>"courtesy" and Kim's feelings.

Nope. Compromise was possible, without impacting your standards. As
you are aware.
>
>> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue?
>
>That's all I've been doing in these posts.

Nope - you're facing up to a different issue. One that you can
justify with your standards. Please reread my comments carefully.

>
>> - or
>> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>
>How am I fooling myself?
>
>I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
>I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
>I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
>two statements.

Nope.
Nope.
Nope.

Not the issue at all. As has been stated many times.
>
>Are you aware of what you are telling me to do?

Yup - deal with the issue at hand. Not the one that you keep falling
back on.

>>
>> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>> the artificial." - Mark Twain
>
>Yup.
>
>You want me to keep my standards private, and not act on them, because
>they aren't the same as yours. Well, that's just not going to happen.

Nope. Please reread Mr. Twain's statement.
>
>btw - if Kim's callsign is "just a license number", then why
>not pick a different one? Why a vanity call at all?

Guess because it's her choice, Jim. I sure wouldn't want that call
assigned to me, but Kim does. Her way of poking a finger in the eye
of those who judge her by appearance alone, perhaps. Her own personal
reasons, though. And she has every right to have it - it's up to her.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

979. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 20:01:55 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2jrd009mkiego4ihp62j16aa25ontc6hmp@4ax.com>
Source record: 85705

ROTFLMAO!

Thanks, Alex, for taking the time to look all of these up! I had no idea how many sly folks there were in this hobby!

I wonder if Riley has seen some of these.....'W5TIT' is pretty tame by comparison to N0BRA or N0SEX . (Those ones DO send a pretty clear message all by themselves :))

73, Leo

...who almost blew a gasket when he read this!

LOL

On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:22:48 GMT, Alex Flinsch
<alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote:

>In article <ovANb.200$%86.57@bignews4.bellsouth.net>, Arf! Arf! wrote:
>> All of you need to take a healthy dump and get a life. There is not a
>> single mention of policy in this entire thread.
>
>Agreed...
>
>FWIW I have been following this thread for a while, and have been very
>amused by it. Recently I downloaded a copy of the FCC amateur database to
>use in some club research, just for the heck of it, I did a few queries on
>the database tables...
>
>There are a total of 8 hams who are proud of their TIT's, and another 42 who
>wear a BRA, there are no hams with the call of N0BRA (perhaps she is among
>the 50 who SAG).
>
>There are a total of 11 hams who are an ASS and 37 FCK'rs, but no FUK'rs or
>FUC'rs. 9 are DUM, and a surprising 43 are full of SHT.
>
>There are 47 NIT's to go along with the 56 WIT's.
>
>The FCC has 72 hams, but has been getting careless with what they give calls
>to, as there are 54 DOGs, 78 CATs, 56 COWs, 25 PIGs, 87 FOXes, 51 GNU, 67
>RATs, and an additional 56 with FUR. There are 63 hams living in the SEA,
>along with 51 EEL's and 60 COD.
>
>A total of 47 hams LIE, while 43 are telling the TRUth.
>
>Ham radio seems to be a family hobby as there are 68 DAD's, 73 MOM's, 45 who

>claim to be SIS, 38 BROs, 68 KIDs , and 57 BOYs.
>
>There are 49 hams who like to YAK, while 54 each prefer PSK or FSK, an
>additional 70 are SSB users and 50 use a VOX. This greatly outnumbers the 65
>who use a KEY and 67 BUG users.
>
>Figuring out the genders of hams is a bit confusing, as there are 59 GUY's,
>54 GAL's, 52 MEN, and another 36 MAN. This count also includes W0MEN, W0MAN,
>N0MAN, and N0MEN.
>
>Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX, but
>only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be GAY.
>
>Baldness is also common among hams, as there are 56 who wear a HAT, another
>66 CAP wearers, and 39 who have WIG. I did not include N0HAT, N0CAP and
>N0WIG in those counts. There are also 49 with a TIE, and one with N0TIE.
>
>Age does not seem to matter to hams either as there are almost equal numbers
>of OLD (59) and NEW (58) hams.
>
>An additional 19 think they are GOD, perhaps while they are on the AIR (81)
>with the 16 LID's, the 67 who are HOT, and the 62 who are BAD. There is a
>single ham who claims to be K1NG, and another who admits to having N0CLU.
>
>There are 56 who like to EAT, 52 TEA drinkers, 54 GIN drinkers, and 51 GUM
>chewers. With all of this eating going on, there are 49 who are FAT,
>(including N0FAT), and another 61 who are BIG.
>
>There are 37 who eat LOX. Oddly enough there are only 5 JEW's (perhaps
>because ham is not Kosher??) and 1 Atheist (N0GOD).
>
>As for personality traits there are 49 who are ODD, 53 who are SHY and 52
>who are SLY. There are 54 who are SAD, and 60 who are MAD.
>
>54 hams have their heads stuck in the MUD, while another 68 are in the SKY
>
>There are 55 amateurs who are PRO's, while 96 are content to be HAMs.
>
>61 operators think they are number ONE, while 56 are in second place (TWO).
>There are 62 hams in TENth place, and a whopping 72 in SIXth.
>
>VHF (74) seems to be a bit more popular than UHF (63). The low number of
>VLF'ers (44) is not surprising, as we do not have a 135 kHZ allocation in
>the US.
>
>There are 49 with a RIG and one poor ham with N0RIG.
>
>
>Alex / AB2RC

980. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 21:47:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40070A6F.9050505@psu.edu>
Source record: 85706

D. Stussy wrote:
> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004, Carl Zager wrote:
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>>
>>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>
>>>>I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
>>>>element 1 is abolished.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>>
>>>Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep in
>>>mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for General
>>>or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With the
>>>speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather
>>>iffy.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>And ... a code CSCE is only "good" as follows:
>>1. For upgrade to General, one year. However, once a General, then the
>
> ^^^^^^^^
> NO! It's good for 365 days, which is NOT always equal to one year, especially
> when a leap year is involved.

Are leap seconds taken into account?

- Mike KB3EIA -

981. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 22:01:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <y4ENb.11153$1e.10674@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85707

"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote

< Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX,
but
< only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be
GAY.

And K0FC has N0OKY in the house.

73, de Hans, K0HB

982. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 22:37:02 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <pn3e0095ounk1hhb33evkt08evi7snojhe@4ax.com>
Source record: 85708

...not to mention N0LUV - N0HUG, N0KIS, nothing. That's certainly
N0FUN. N0MAN should be treated like that.

Is there N0END to these callsigns?

That's it - I can't take N0MOE....N0WAY, N0HOW.....

73, Leo

...who has discovered an unexplored world

On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 22:01:02 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>
>"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote
>
>< Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX,
>but
>< only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be
>GAY.
>
>And K0FC has N0OKY in the house.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

983. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 22:50:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401151450.38cfa426@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85709

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<2jrd009mkiego4ihp62j16aa25ontc6hmp@4ax.com>...
> ROTFLMAO!
>
> Thanks, Alex, for taking the time to look all of these up! I had no
> idea how many sly folks there were in this hobby!
>
> I wonder if Riley has seen some of these.....'W5TIT' is pretty tame by
> comparison to N0BRA or N0SEX . (Those ones DO send a pretty clear
> message all by themselves :))
>
> 73, Leo
>
> ...who almost blew a gasket when he read this!
>
> LOL
>
>
>
> On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:22:48 GMT, Alex Flinsch
> <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote:
>
> >In article <ovANb.200$%86.57@bignews4.bellsouth.net>, Arf! Arf! wrote:
> >> All of you need to take a healthy dump and get a life. There is not a
> >> single mention of policy in this entire thread.
> >
> >Agreed...
> >
> >FWIW I have been following this thread for a while, and have been very
> >amused by it. Recently I downloaded a copy of the FCC amateur database to
> >use in some club research, just for the heck of it, I did a few queries on
> >the database tables...
> >
> >There are a total of 8 hams who are proud of their TIT's, and another 42 who
> >wear a BRA, there are no hams with the call of N0BRA (perhaps she is among
> >the 50 who SAG).
> >
> >There are a total of 11 hams who are an ASS and 37 FCK'rs, but no FUK'rs or
> >FUC'rs. 9 are DUM, and a surprising 43 are full of SHT.
> >
> >There are 47 NIT's to go along with the 56 WIT's.
> >
> >The FCC has 72 hams, but has been getting careless with what they give calls
> >to, as there are 54 DOGs, 78 CATs, 56 COWs, 25 PIGs, 87 FOXes, 51 GNU, 67

> >RATs, and an additional 56 with FUR. There are 63 hams living in the SEA,
> >along with 51 EEL's and 60 COD.
> >
> >A total of 47 hams LIE, while 43 are telling the TRUth.
> >
> >Ham radio seems to be a family hobby as there are 68 DAD's, 73 MOM's, 45 who
> >claim to be SIS, 38 BROs, 68 KIDs , and 57 BOYs.
> >
> >There are 49 hams who like to YAK, while 54 each prefer PSK or FSK, an
> >additional 70 are SSB users and 50 use a VOX. This greatly outnumbers the 65
> >who use a KEY and 67 BUG users.
> >
> >Figuring out the genders of hams is a bit confusing, as there are 59 GUY's,
> >54 GAL's, 52 MEN, and another 36 MAN. This count also includes W0MEN, W0MAN,
> >N0MAN, and N0MEN.
> >
> >Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX, but
> >only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be GAY.
> >
> >Baldness is also common among hams, as there are 56 who wear a HAT, another
> >66 CAP wearers, and 39 who have WIG. I did not include N0HAT, N0CAP and
> >N0WIG in those counts. There are also 49 with a TIE, and one with N0TIE.
> >
> >Age does not seem to matter to hams either as there are almost equal numbers
> >of OLD (59) and NEW (58) hams.
> >
> >An additional 19 think they are GOD, perhaps while they are on the AIR (81)
> >with the 16 LID's, the 67 who are HOT, and the 62 who are BAD. There is a
> >single ham who claims to be K1NG, and another who admits to having N0CLU.
> >
> >There are 56 who like to EAT, 52 TEA drinkers, 54 GIN drinkers, and 51 GUM
> >chewers. With all of this eating going on, there are 49 who are FAT,
> >(including N0FAT), and another 61 who are BIG.
> >
> >There are 37 who eat LOX. Oddly enough there are only 5 JEW's (perhaps
> >because ham is not Kosher??) and 1 Atheist (N0GOD).
> >
> >As for personality traits there are 49 who are ODD, 53 who are SHY and 52
> >who are SLY. There are 54 who are SAD, and 60 who are MAD.
> >
> >54 hams have their heads stuck in the MUD, while another 68 are in the SKY
> >
> >There are 55 amateurs who are PRO's, while 96 are content to be HAMs.
> >
> >61 operators think they are number ONE, while 56 are in second place (TWO).
> >There are 62 hams in TENth place, and a whopping 72 in SIXth.
> >
> >VHF (74) seems to be a bit more popular than UHF (63). The low number of
> >VLF'ers (44) is not surprising, as we do not have a 135 kHZ allocation in
> >the US.

> >
> >There are 49 with a RIG and one poor ham with N0RIG.
> >
> >
> >Alex / AB2RC

I wonder how many have SWR and IMD. I'll bet some aren't even hams, but SWLers.

984. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 23:46:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FDFNb.30302$P%1.24722912@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85710

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0401142013.6eee9835@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> > > news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > > >>
> > > >> I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good
until
> > > >> element 1 is abolished.
> > > >>
> > > >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> > > >
> > > > Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days.
Keep
> > > > in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code
for
> > > > General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF
> > > > privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a
> > > > year from now seems rather iffy.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.
> >
> > Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the
time
> > that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government programs
at
> > times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than the speeding
> > bullet pace.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> D2, you are so incredibly wise. You immediately spotted and
> understood the corruption in the N2EY/W5TIT exchanges, and knew to
> stay away. You knew that Morse Code testing is healthy, wealhty, and

> wise for the ARS, and must be retained under all circumstances. And
> now you know the mind of the US government.
>
> We are so incredibly lucky to have you post to RRAP. You are
> practically a Shaman, and we hang on your every word as to the future
> of the ARS. Thak you.
>
> We are not worthy.

I see you've had a bad day. Afterall I was merely posting my observations
of the government inertia.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

985. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 23:53:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SJFNb.30304$P%1.24723849@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85711

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:xNrNb.8925$i4.3678@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Except that the FCC rules do not
> > grant any authority in anyway to do
> > public service nor do they establish
> > any requirement to do public
> > service. In any sense of the word
> > mandate, there is none in the FCC
> > Part 97.
>
>
> Okay, now that you have accepted the authorization or approval sense of
> the word, and have acknowledged 97.1 and the regs relating to RACES, go
back
> to my original statement you objected to - "there is nothing in Part 95
that
> mandates public service like that found in Part 97." Would you now agree
> there is nothing in Part 95 relating to public service that is like that
> found in Part 97?
>

Neither Part 97 or Part 95 mandates or authorizes public service. Part 97
however recognizes and encourages public service which Part 95 does not.
That was obvious from the beginning and I never challenged the fact that
Part 97 is altogether different than Part 95.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

986. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 23:56:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040115185648.21642.00003753@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85712

In article <4006975D.4030404@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <40056D99.6020702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>I fully support the fight against BPL, and suggest that everyone send
>>>support to ARRL either through their clubs or personally.

>> Also through membership and well-written comments to NOI and NPRM.
>>
>>> I do however think that while we must remain vigilant, that BPL will
>>>end up on the trash heap of technology. We need to avoid the near panic
>>>that came out when the abomination was first proposed.

Agreed! And as Carl, WK3C urges, we must be sure that interference really
is BPL or we will lose credibility.

>> Maybe it will be trashed - but maybe not. It's not over till it's over, and
>> even then it's not over. For example, even though Japan rejected BPL
>> after trials, the BPL companies there are trying again, claiming "new
>> technology".
>>
>> And remember that the levels of interference at the various test sites
>> conform to existing FCC radiated levels!
>>
>>> Too many powerful interests are aligning in opposition to it. ARRL,
>>>FEMA, and I believe a Broadcaster's association. The FCC has now
>>>"clarified their "broadband Nirvana" statements.

>> Could still happen. Most of those folks don't have installations in
>> residential neighborhoods. Most hams, OTOH...

>>> Austria terminating a BPL test after the pilot project provided
>>>free major interference with A Red Cross Emergency drill adds fuel to the
>>>BPL pyre. This was even after they were considering such fixes as a
>>>buffer zone around amateurs houses.
>>
>> We're not in Austria. The EUs usually are a lot more rejecting of pollution
>> than we are. (BPL's interference is essentially spectrum pollution,
>> wouldn't you agree?)
>>
>>> Finally, it is obvious that the technology DOES NOT WORK!
>>
>> No, it *does* work! The demo sites are functioning.

> They are a sort of laboratory condition.

Not really! They are actual residential and business areas, with existing power
lines of many types. While the number of customers isn't large, the technology
does work. It's just leaky.

>If the test results from ARRL
>are correct, 1 ham with 100 watts can effectively turn off the service
>for quite some distance around him/her. That's what I mean.
>
Remember that those results were for a particular kind of system. BPL isn't
one company or one technology. There are several different types competing
to be "the one".
>>
>>>The apparent
>>>need to increase power levels, the fact that a HF radio would have to
>>>operate on QRP levels to not shut down a BPL signal, and that normal
>>>levels of HF signals have been able to shut down BPL over a surprisingly
>>>large range.
>>
>> In some test sites. But at others, it's a different story. And even such
>> problems are no guarantee that FCC won't allow it.
>
>The market will then take care of it.

Hopefully. But a lot of really bad things have gotten to market.
>
>> Look at Manassas.
>
> Aww, do I have to? 8^)

The whole place is getting BPL.
>
>>> And before we take a ARS-centric view of the whole thing, remember
>>>that there are plenty of other users of HF beside us.

>> Sure - and hopefully the combined effect of all of them will be enough to
>> convince FCC.
>>
>> But the job isn't done till it's done.

> Sure enough. Remember I'm not arguing against a stand against BPL > >
or the need to fight it. I just want people to not freak.
>
Of course. But at the same time we mustn't think the job is anywhere near done.
>>
>>> Soooooo, if the rules are changed so that BPL gets priority use of the
>>>HF spectrum, reversing the radio universe in that part 15 devices will
>>>tolerate no interference from other devices, and that the other devices
>>>are forced to tolerate interference from the part 15 device, and *every*
>>>other user of the HF spectrum is forced off the air, then maybe, just
>>>maybe, BPL will work....kinda.
>>
>>
>> Stranger things have happened.

>>
>> Suppose you sit down for a nice bit of PSK and find the waterfall full of
>> noise - and no signals visible. Do you think the power company is going to
>> interrupt service so you can operate?
>>
>> Or suppose you see a signal or two and open up with 100 W. And suppose >>
you dump the system for a radius of a mile from your house....
>
> Yup, keep on calling CQ. I probably wouldn't go above 50 watts tho' But

>even that would be enough to disrupt the BPL.
>
Maybe. You want to try explaining it the police officer at your door? Or the
judge who doesn't want to be told it's not in his jursidiction?

>On a side note, has there been any tests on what solar storms would do
>to BPL?

Not that I know of. But the effect should not be much.
>
>> Or suppose the local gendarmes show up, responding to complaints from >>
many
>> angry citizens that *you* are messing up *their* computers. Do you want to
>> explain Part 15 and Part 97 to them, when they see you as the electronic
>> equivalent of somebody violating the peace?
>
>> Or suppose any time someone calls the help line, the first question the
>> help person asks is "Is there a ham radio within a mile of your house?"
>
> Sure enough. All good arguments. And the best arguments for being
>steadfast in the fight against BPL. Even though I am certain that in
>practice, BPL will fall flat on it's face, that if approved, it will be
>a nuisance for some hams and others.

More than some hams/ You think that noise won't propagate by sky wave?

>But I see different levels of
>concern. Concern at a high level such as at the early part of the fight
>against BPL, when testing was needed, and arguments presented against
>BPL. The present situation, when it is being documented that the system
>is very fragile and has a track record of interference to emergency
>services (even if it is only a test) allows more leisurely prosecution
>of the problem.

Remember that it's not "a system" but rather several competing systems using
different technologies.

And recall that the BPL folks are using all then right buzzwords. "Third pipe"
"new technologies that foster competition" "increased/smarter utilization of
existing infrastructure". Etc., etc., etc....

> But prosecution has to go on.

Agreed!

Recall too some of the experiences that hams have already encountered. When WK3C told the story to a local paper, and demonstrated it, the BPL folks claimed
'he found a neon sign'. In a residential neighborhood at midday. Right.

And despite the experiences of Austria, Japan and others, BPL advocates say "there have been no reported interference cases".

That's what we're up against. Make no mistake.
>
> What do you think the F.C.C's response will be when ARRL or FEMA >trots out the Austrian BPL Red Cross interference data?

I don't know. Could be that it was an isolated incident. Or that the Austrian system
was "different". Never mind that Austrian radiated noise limits are lower than ours...

>Am I the only one that thinks that case is darn close to a show stopper?

I'm not counting on anything yet wrt BPL except that it needs to be fought.

Heck, it doesn't take an EE to see that the whole concept is badly flawed but the trials are being allowed to progress anyway.

"Hope for the best. Prepare for the worst."

73 de Jim, N2EY

987. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-15 23:59:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XPFNb.30305$P%1.24724940@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85713

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4006975D.4030404@psu.edu...
>
> On a side note, has there been any tests on what solar storms would do
> to BPL?
>

Unshielded lines probably means their going to be knocked off line rather easily. On one of the space weather sites, there is a reference to the solar storm equivalent of the "Perfect Storm". This occurred in the mid 1800s and knocked out landline telegraphy and the induced currents on the lines leading to shorts in equipment that started several fires. Wish I still had that URL.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

988. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 00:56:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040115195642.13960.00000044@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85714

In article <4006981A.5090604@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <J_YEb.1514$Vv2.744413@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>I've though of writing an article or two for QST myself.
>>
>>
>> Do it, Mike.
>>
>>
>>>Probably wouldn't be cutting edge.
>>
>>
>> Doesn't matter.
>>
>>
>>>Most contributions I could make would be
>>>geared toward homebrewing, and most likely on panel layout technique,
>>>ergonomics and (gasp) aesthetics. If they print an article about doing
>>>panels in Powerpoint, the state of Amateur radio equipment layout could
>>>use the boost.
>>
>>
>> Yep. Or how to make nice looking dials, labels, meter scales, etc.
>>
>> One ham I know has made a schematic drawing utility based on MS Paint.
>> The various components are essentially clipart, as I understand it.
>>
>>> Hans would probably still make fun of it tho'! ;^)
>>>
>>
>> So would some others, including at least one who's not even a ham. So what?
>>
>> One of my articles was June, 1994, IIRC.
>
>
> Did this post just recently make it to your server, Jim? I posted it
>quite a while back. I've noticed this in a few of my posts to the group.
>I just wonder where the messages go for a few weeks? 8^)

I use AutoAol and write my replies offline. Sometimes I don't see or reply to a
post right away.

>
> But yes, maybe I will just write something up. Maybe include
> ergonomics too.
>
Maybe we could collaborate on something like that. I have a number of ideas about ergonomics in hamshack and equipment layout, going back years before I ever heard the word. Built all my own shack furniture for the past 35 years or so because conventional stuff isn't well suited to ham use. (A basement shack gives one a lot of leeway).

Have also used CAD to make a really neat custom dial drum for the Southgate Type 7.

Or if ya just want a proofreader...

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

989. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 01:21:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu7ea2$avh@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85715

Alex? You really, really should send this in to the ARRL for submission to QST. I'd leave the "taking a healthy dump" part out, though!

Kim W5TIT

"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message news:slrnc0dq95.d5l.alex@homer.linux1.lan...
> In article <ovANb.200$%86.57@bignews4.bellsouth.net>, Arf! Arf! wrote:
> > All of you need to take a healthy dump and get a life. There is not a
> > single mention of policy in this entire thread.
>
> Agreed...
>
> FWIW I have been following this thread for a while, and have been very
> amused by it. Recently I downloaded a copy of the FCC amateur database to
> use in some club research, just for the heck of it, I did a few queries on
> the database tables...
>
> There are a total of 8 hams who are proud of their TIT's, and another 42 who
> wear a BRA, there are no hams with the call of N0BRA (perhaps she is among
> the 50 who SAG).
>
> There are a total of 11 hams who are an ASS and 37 FCK'rs, but no FUK'rs or
> FUC'rs. 9 are DUM, and a surprising 43 are full of SHT.
>
> There are 47 NIT's to go along with the 56 WIT's.
>
> The FCC has 72 hams, but has been getting careless with what they give calls
> to, as there are 54 DOGs, 78 CATs, 56 COWs, 25 PIGs, 87 FOXes, 51 GNU, 67
> RATs, and an additional 56 with FUR. There are 63 hams living in the SEA,
> along with 51 EEL's and 60 COD.
>
> A total of 47 hams LIE, while 43 are telling the TRUth.
>
> Ham radio seems to be a family hobby as there are 68 DAD's, 73 MOM's, 45 who
> claim to be SIS, 38 BROs, 68 KIDs , and 57 BOYs.
>
> There are 49 hams who like to YAK, while 54 each prefer PSK or FSK, an
> additional 70 are SSB users and 50 use a VOX. This greatly outnumbers the 65
> who use a KEY and 67 BUG users.

>
> Figuring out the genders of hams is a bit confusing, as there are 59
GUY's,
> 54 GAL's, 52 MEN, and another 36 MAN. This count also includes W0MEN,
W0MAN,
> N0MAN, and N0MEN.
>
> Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX, but
> only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be GAY.
>
> Baldness is also common among hams, as there are 56 who wear a HAT,
another
> 66 CAP wearers, and 39 who have WIG. I did not include N0HAT, N0CAP and
> N0WIG in those counts. There are also 49 with a TIE, and one with N0TIE.
>
> Age does not seem to matter to hams either as there are almost equal
numbers
> of OLD (59) and NEW (58) hams.
>
> An additional 19 think they are GOD, perhaps while they are on the AIR
(81)
> with the 16 LID's, the 67 who are HOT, and the 62 who are BAD. There is a
> single ham who claims to be K1NG, and another who admits to having N0CLU.
>
> There are 56 who like to EAT, 52 TEA drinkers, 54 GIN drinkers, and 51 GUM
> chewers. With all of this eating going on, there are 49 who are FAT,
> (including N0FAT), and another 61 who are BIG.
>
> There are 37 who eat LOX. Oddly enough there are only 5 JEW's (perhaps
> because ham is not Kosher??) and 1 Atheist (N0GOD).
>
> As for personality traits there are 49 who are ODD, 53 who are SHY and 52
> who are SLY. There are 54 who are SAD, and 60 who are MAD.
>
> 54 hams have their heads stuck in the MUD, while another 68 are in the SKY
>
> There are 55 amateurs who are PRO's, while 96 are content to be HAMs.
>
> 61 operators think they are number ONE, while 56 are in second place
(TWO).
> There are 62 hams in TENth place, and a whopping 72 in SIXth.
>
> VHF (74) seems to be a bit more popular than UHF (63). The low number of
> VLF'ers (44) is not surprising, as we do not have a 135 kHZ allocation in
> the US.
>
> There are 49 with a RIG and one poor ham with N0RIG.
>
>
> Alex / AB2RC

990. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 01:27:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu7elq$8v1@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85716

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com...
> Jim,
>
> For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the
> core "issue" that began our discourse. Perhaps I haven't stated it
> clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
> clouded.
>
> I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
> continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.
>
> I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
> inappropriate. No issue there - that is entirely your right. I also
> understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.
> Again, no issue there - I respect that.
>
> For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:
>
> Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
> unfair, as it singled her out. I agree. Would finding a compromise
> whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
> all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
> have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?
>

It's much easier for the entire issue, to do what I have done. I requested that Jim refrain from having my name in the list. Jim has said he'll do that.

The unfortunate thing is that I suppose I'll have to quit responding to his posts also, if I am to uphold to my *own* set of standards--because I think it is totally wrong for him to remove my callsign from an original post of mine. It is most unfortunate that his ambition to be "correct" is stronger than his ambition to dialogue.

>
> That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim. Your rights and
> standards are not at question here.
>
> 73, Leo
>

Kim W5TIT

991. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 01:28:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu7eoo$fq7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85717

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:pn3e0095ounk1hhb33evkt08evi7snojhe@4ax.com...
>
> ...not to mention N0LUV - N0HUG, N0KIS, nothing. That's certainly
> N0FUN. N0MAN should be treated like that.
>
> Is there N0END to these callsigns?
>
> That's it - I can't take N0MOE....N0WAY, N0HOW.....
>
> 73, Leo
>
> ...who has discovered an unexplored world
>

VANITY!!! That is why is a VANITY callsign! One can be creative and
individualistic with the program!

Kim W5TIT

992. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 04:01:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040115230117.29660.00002478@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 85718

In article <btu2d5$476@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> A Real Amateur Radio Operator -- which Kim would not recognize if one
>> landed right on her punkin' haid
>>
>>
>
>You are, by no means, a real amateur radio operator. I've got more
>potential amateur radio operator in my little finger than you have in all
>your years as an amateur radio operator...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

OIC. Well, then, why not uncork some of that "potential" and turn it into
some sort of action? BTW -- in order to exceed my own capabilities as
a ham radio operator, you'll have to be able to operate CW at 20 WPM --
at least! Better get started...

73 de Larry, K3LT

993. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 04:06:11 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <39oe00pq4gdr95t42ijbmgnutd24hpmpqr@4ax.com>
Source record: 85719

Unfortunately, it's very unlikely that the ARRL would publish this
list (and it's excellent humour!) withour some serious re-editing...-
QST is a pretty - um, formal - magazine.

But they should - Definitely first-class material!

73, Leo

On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:21:00 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Alex? You really, really should send this in to the ARRL for submission to
>QST. I'd leave the "taking a healthy dump" part out, though!
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>snip

994. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 05:23:15 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94723E76842Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85720

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:400691C5.8000501@psu.edu:

> Alun wrote:
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:ZphNb.29944$P%1.24485712@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>>
>>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Xns94707E6BD0C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>
>>>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>>>>news:nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good
>>>>>>until element 1 is abolished.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>>>>
>>>>>Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days.
>>>>>Keep in mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping
>>>>>code for General or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited
>>>>>HF privileges. With the speed with the FCC is not moving, less than
>>>>>a year from now seems rather iffy.
>>>>>
>>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Well, you'd like to think so, I'm sure.
>>>
>>>Regardless of my wishes or your wishes, the government will take the
>>>time that it deems appropriate. Having dealt with a few government
>>>programs at times in my life, the snail's pace seems more typical than
>>>the speeding bullet pace.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> However, the code test was abolished by the ITU way back on July 5th

>> last year. More than one year from _now_ would be more than eighteen
>> months, which doesn't seem likely to me, nor is that fast by any
>> stretch.
>>
>> I am down for May 1st in the pool, which is only about 10 months. That
>> maybe a little short, but I would be very surprised indeed if it went
>> over 15 months, which would be this November.
>>
>> As I said, you would like to think it would take longer, but that is
>> because you don't want it to happen. Perhaps I have picked an earlier
>> date because I take the opposite view, but I doubt if I am out by more
>> than a few>
>
>
> But what does all this have to do with Kim's callsign?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Not much. There again, there does seem to be a correlation between pro-code testing and anti-t*ts! Put me down as anti-code testing and pro-t*ts!!!

995. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 10:21:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bu8dr3$jr1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85721

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:39oe00pq4gdr95t42ijbmgnutd24hpmpqr@4ax.com...
> Unfortunately, it's very unlikely that the ARRL would publish this
> list (and it's excellent humour!) withour some serious re-editing...-
> QST is a pretty - um, formal - magazine.
>
> But they should - Definitely first-class material!
>
> 73, Leo
>
> On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:21:00 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Alex? You really, really should send this in to the ARRL for submission
to
> >QST. I'd leave the "taking a healthy dump" part out, though!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >

Hmmm, well. Does that mean that if anyone of the "seriously needs editing"
callsigns wrote something in to QST that, no matter how technical, pertinent
or informative the item might be, it would not get published?

Hmmm,

Kim W5TIT :-o

996. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 12:01:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IoQNb.9669$q4.5340@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85722

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Y'know...the thing I think that fascinates
> me most in all this stuff is that, when I
> was asked about my callsign I could
> have just said, "none of your business."
> My callsign *could* have (snip)

As I'm sure you've figured out, some in this newsgroup can (and will) pick a fight over anything. And they'll make it sound like the end of the world. Your callsign is an easy target. But, if you had another callsign, they'd find something else to fight about.

> I actually believe that having a 'W' call is
> offensive to many long-licensed hams; much
> more offensive than having a suffix of any
> sort. ;)

A friend, a very long time ham with a "W" call, suggested my callsign. He liked the "W5" part (same as a call he had years ago, I think) and thought the "net" part was cute because of my long computer experience (I was helping him with his computer at the time).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

997. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 12:19:34 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <tllf00502754jj7v49qq0hjk78dm87stn9@4ax.com>
Source record: 85724

Excellent question!

73, Leo

On Fri, 16 Jan 2004 04:21:02 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:39oe00pq4gdr95t42ijbmgnutd24hpmpqr@4ax.com...
>> Unfortunately, it's very unlikely that the ARRL would publish this
>> list (and it's excellent humour!) withour some serious re-editing...-
>> QST is a pretty - um, formal - magazine.
>>
>> But they should - Definitely first-class material!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>> On Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:21:00 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Alex? You really, really should send this in to the ARRL for submission
>to
>> >QST. I'd leave the "taking a healthy dump" part out, though!
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>> >
>
>Hmmm, well. Does that mean that if anyone of the "seriously needs editing"
>callsigns wrote something in to QST that, no matter how technical, pertinent
>or informative the item might be, it would not get published?
>
>Hmmm,
>
>Kim W5TIT :-o
>

998. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 12:20:08 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <oDQNb.8584$R85.3091@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85723

All this from an idiot whose primary radio is an ht. How pathetic.

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
>>Y'know...the thing I think that fascinates
>>me most in all this stuff is that, when I
>>was asked about my callsign I could
>>have just said, "none of your business."
>>My callsign *could* have (snip)
>
>
>
> As I'm sure you've figured out, some in this newsgroup can (and will) pick
> a fight over anything. And they'll make it sound like the end of the world.
> Your callsign is an easy target. But, if you had another callsign, they'd
> find something else to fight about.
>
>
>
>>I actually believe that having a 'W' call is
>>offensive to many long-licensed hams; much
>>more offensive than having a suffix of any
>>sort. ;)
>
>
>
> A friend, a very long time ham with a "W" call, suggested my callsign. He
> liked the "W5" part (same as a call he had years ago, I think) and thought
> the "net" part was cute because of my long computer experience (I was
> helping him with his computer at the time).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

999. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 12:23:03 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <8GQNb.8627$R85.7847@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85725

Nice!

Alex Flinsch wrote:

> In article <ovANb.200$%86.57@bignews4.bellsouth.net>, Arf! Arf! wrote:
>
>>All of you need to take a healthy dump and get a life. There is not a
>>single mention of policy in this entire thread.
>
>
> Agreed...
>
> FWIW I have been following this thread for a while, and have been very
> amused by it. Recently I downloaded a copy of the FCC amateur database to
> use in some club research, just for the heck of it, I did a few queries on
> the database tables...
>
> There are a total of 8 hams who are proud of their TIT's, and another 42 who
> wear a BRA, there are no hams with the call of N0BRA (perhaps she is among
> the 50 who SAG).
>
> There are a total of 11 hams who are an ASS and 37 FCK'rs, but no FUK'rs or
> FUC'rs. 9 are DUM, and a surprising 43 are full of SHT.
>
> There are 47 NIT's to go along with the 56 WIT's.
>
> The FCC has 72 hams, but has been getting careless with what they give calls
> to, as there are 54 DOGs, 78 CATs, 56 COWs, 25 PIGs, 87 FOXes, 51 GNU, 67
> RATs, and an additional 56 with FUR. There are 63 hams living in the SEA,
> along with 51 EEL's and 60 COD.
>
> A total of 47 hams LIE, while 43 are telling the TRUth.
>
> Ham radio seems to be a family hobby as there are 68 DAD's, 73 MOM's, 45 who
> claim to be SIS, 38 BROs, 68 KIDs , and 57 BOYs.
>
> There are 49 hams who like to YAK, while 54 each prefer PSK or FSK, an
> additional 70 are SSB users and 50 use a VOX. This greatly outnumbers the 65
> who use a KEY and 67 BUG users.
>
> Figuring out the genders of hams is a bit confusing, as there are 59 GUY's,
> 54 GAL's, 52 MEN, and another 36 MAN. This count also includes W0MEN, W0MAN,
> N0MAN, and N0MEN.
>
> Sexual orientation is also difficult to determine as 24 hams have SEX, but

> only one with N0SEX There are 8 who are FAGs, while 10 claim to be GAY.
>
> Baldness is also common among hams, as there are 56 who wear a HAT, another
> 66 CAP wearers, and 39 who have WIG. I did not include N0HAT, N0CAP and
> N0WIG in those counts. There are also 49 with a TIE, and one with N0TIE.
>
> Age does not seem to matter to hams either as there are almost equal numbers
> of OLD (59) and NEW (58) hams.
>
> An additional 19 think they are GOD, perhaps while they are on the AIR (81)
> with the 16 LID's, the 67 who are HOT, and the 62 who are BAD. There is a
> single ham who claims to be K1NG, and another who admits to having N0CLU.
>
> There are 56 who like to EAT, 52 TEA drinkers, 54 GIN drinkers, and 51 GUM
> chewers. With all of this eating going on, there are 49 who are FAT,
> (including N0FAT), and another 61 who are BIG.
>
> There are 37 who eat LOX. Oddly enough there are only 5 JEW's (perhaps
> because ham is not Kosher??) and 1 Atheist (N0GOD).
>
> As for personality traits there are 49 who are ODD, 53 who are SHY and 52
> who are SLY. There are 54 who are SAD, and 60 who are MAD.
>
> 54 hams have their heads stuck in the MUD, while another 68 are in the SKY
>
> There are 55 amateurs who are PRO's, while 96 are content to be HAMs.
>
> 61 operators think they are number ONE, while 56 are in second place (TWO).
> There are 62 hams in TENth place, and a whopping 72 in SIXth.
>
> VHF (74) seems to be a bit more popular than UHF (63). The low number of
> VLF'ers (44) is not surprising, as we do not have a 135 kHZ allocation in
> the US.
>
> There are 49 with a RIG and one poor ham with N0RIG.
>
>
> Alex / AB2RC

1000. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 12:24:52 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <rplf009hooc4rk3la3rl9698h8vjq748mu@4ax.com>
Source record: 85726

Nice one, Alun - tit for tat! :)

73, Leo

(Seated in the same fan section as Alun - oh, yeah!)

On 16 Jan 2004 05:23:15 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:400691C5.8000501@psu.edu:
>
>> But what does all this have to do with Kim's callsign?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>Not much. There again, there does seem to be a correlation between pro-code
>testing and anti-t*ts! Put me down as anti-code testing and pro-t*ts!!!

1001. A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 15:06:00 UTC
From: Scott <scott5mi@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 85727

Hi folks.

Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur radio, and also ask a few questions.

I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect score. (I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I have not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a moment.

I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.

But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led to believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham "veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.

So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to correct me.

1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society. Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby, and like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.

2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio o peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever. But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle, the satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end result itself.

3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way to save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the

future, and make it fun.

Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.

1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for the first time buyer)?

2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and whistles".

3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared to the novice.

Thanks folks.

1002. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 16:31:59 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <os2g005h51u89amjn52vminphtelaghnan@4ax.com>
Source record: 85728

Welcome to the hobby.

You are on the right track - the best way to learn is by finding someone experienced who can answer your questions as they arise. I'm sure that there are some folks at your club who would be happy to work with you - just ignore the fossils and talk to the others - there is probably someone with similar interests to yours in there somewhere (and equally tired of listening to the 'experts' - look for bored facial expressions, or snoring :))

Brief answers to your questions are below.

On Fri, 16 Jan 2004 09:06:00 -0600, "Scott"
<scott5mi@cox-internet.com> wrote:

>snip
>
>1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to
>the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
>the first time buyer)?

This depends a lot on what area of amateur radio you are interested in. 2-meter operation is quite popular - all you need is a handi-talkie and a list of local repeaters, and you're ready to go! OTOH, if your interests lie towards experimenting with the digital modes or DXing on HF (if you're studying Morse, I suspect that the prospect of shortwave operation interests you), then it gets more complex.

What would you like to do?

>
>2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy
>more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
>whistles".

I have two preferences here.

Local hamfests are my favourite place for finding used equipment - the prices can be lower than anywhere else, and you may be able to try before you buy. Caution is required, though, as there are no warranties - equipment is as-is.

Find one near you using this ARRL web site:

http://www.arrl.org/hamfests.html

Another possibility is a local ham radio store's traded-in equipment -
not cheap, but they will usually give you some warranty with it. You
can also shop by mail order or over the Web if a store isn't near you.
Most of the big shops advertise in QST or CQ - have a look, and check
out their web sites for what you need.

Online auctions such as eBay can be a good source of equipment as well
- but again, no guarantee that the equipment will work properly, and
the prices are considerably higher than at a hamfest.
>
>3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared
>to the novice.

The type and complexity of your antenna will depend heavily on what
you want to operate in the amateur spectrum - do a search on Google
for "Ham Radio Antennas", and you will find quite a few offering plans
for pretty easy-to-build ones to start with.

An example:

http://www.packetradio.com/ant.htm

>
>Thanks folks.

Good luck!

73, Leo
>
>
>

1003. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 17:41:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116124129.13960.00000066@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85729

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 15, 2004:

Novice - 32,718 (decrease of 16,611)
Technician - 259,949 (increase of 54,555)
Technician Plus - 62,714 (decrease of 66,146)
General - 141,443 (increase of 28,766)
Advanced - 81,961 (decrease of 17,821)
Extra - 104,946 (increase of 26,196)
Total - 683,731 (increase of 8,939)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1004. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 17:42:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <er-dne60Z9i5uZXdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85730

Scott wrote:

> Hi folks.
>
> Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur
> radio, and also ask a few questions.
>
> I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect score.
> (I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the
> exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I have
> not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a
> moment.

Congratulations!!

>
> I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last
> night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though
> it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am
> helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.
>
> But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
> absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led to
> believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
> this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
> equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of
> amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the
> meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham
> "veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.

Did you introduce yourself as a newcomer to ham radio? Did you seek out
any of these experienced hams for advice? Did you expect them to
automatically know you were a newbie with little experience and rush to
your assistance? I think basing your opinion of the club on only one
visit is a bit hasty. Continue to go to the meeting and get to know some
of the other hams before you pass judgment.

>
> So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
> seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
> correct me.
>
> 1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby, and

> like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to
> exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.

You haven't participated in any disasters yet have you? What happens
when all power is down, phone lines down, cell networks jammed to the
point of being totally useless for any emergency. I will give you an
example.
In 1979 a mile wide tornado ripped through Wichita Falls, Texas taking
out the main power lines serving the city. The entire city was without
power, most phone lines were down. What few circuits were working were
so overloaded it was nearly impossible to get a call into or out of the
city. Little good the internet, fax machines, would have been. If there
had been cell phones like there are now, most of the towers would have
been down or damaged and what of the cell phone network might have been
working would also have been overloaded. Hospitals were on emergency
power, filling stations could not pump gasoline, most business were
closed, the area the tornado ripped through look like a war zone. Police
and fire and other emergency services antennas were down. The major
reliable communications came from amateur radio. Clubs from around the
area brought in VHF repeaters and HF stations, powered by generators.
Two meter base stations were set up at stratigic locations, such as
hospitals, police and fire departments, and the red cross. Hams with
handhelds accompanied emergency officials to provide communications.
Until some of the public services were restored, the major traffic in
and out of the area was handled by amateur HF communications.
In the 1980's an earthquake hit San Francisco with similar results. What
phone circuits were operative were so overloaded it was next to
impossible to call in or out of the city. Amateur radio provided
communications with VHF and HF capabilities.
Ask those who participated in the 9/11 disaster and you will hear
similar stories.
So saying that the internet, fax machines, cellsphones ect., will always
be able to handle communications in any disaster is ignoring the facts.
The Office of Homeland Security recgonizes the ability of amateur radio
to emergency communications and is incorporating that into their plans.
>
> 2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of
> knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio o
> peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever.
> But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle, the
> satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end
> result itself.

And you can get a lot of help in that area from fellow hams, but don't
expect others automatically know your needs and to stumble over
themselves to rush to your aid unless you seek their help.

>
> 3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
> issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way to
> save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging

> white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
> future, and make it fun.
>
> Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.
>
> 1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to
> the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
> the first time buyer)?

Check your library, they usually have books on amateur radio and may
also have QST.
>
> 2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy
> more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
> whistles".

See the other rec.radio.amateur groups, particullarly the .swap groups.
Also check ebay.

>
> 3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared
> to the novice.

Check you library for some of the ARRL antenna books, or the Amateur
Radio Handbook.

Good luck in your new hobby.

1005. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 17:59:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FDVNb.10684$i4.450@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85731

"Scott" wrote:
>
> (snip) The Amateur Radio Service is
> not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is
> nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet
> connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar
> circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby,
> and like golf, gardening, bird watching,
> or any other hobby, it could cease to
> exist tomorrow, and nothing would
> really change. (snip)

I won't say Ham radio is essential, but you downplay it too much. Perhaps you live in an area where major disasters are fairly uncommon, or your local public service agencies are better prepared, but emergency communications (supplemental communications) is fairly important in this part of the country. During a major disaster, the normal communications systems (internet, fax, phones, and cellular) fail very quickly. Dring a recent hurricane, even the police, fire, and medical, communications system suffered major damage. The role ham radio, and ham radio operators, played during the storm was really amazing. A number were out in the middle of the night during the storm trying to repair downed antennas for the police and fire departments. Several manned local radio stations, feeding storm information from other area hams to the broadcasters. Others manned evacuation shelters. Following the storm, still others helped to repair antennas at hospitals (or set up batteries to power their communications systems). Others manned aid stations. Was any of this essential? Perhaps not, but I do think it was helpful.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1006. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 18:01:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pGVNb.10690$i4.10620@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85732

```
"Arf! Arf!" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > As I'm sure you've figured out, some in
> > this newsgroup can (and will) pick a fight
> > over anything.
>
> All this from an idiot whose primary radio is
> an ht. How pathetic.

LOL. See what I mean.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
```

1007. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 18:48:56 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <smWNb.30657$zs4.8702@fed1read01>
Source record: 85733

"Scott" <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> wrote in message
news:100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com...
> Hi folks.
> 1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. snip

As experience has shown -- oft times internet connection, fax machine, land
line
telephone, or cell phone services are dead or totally overloaded.
>
>
> 3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
> issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way
to
> save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging
> white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
> future, and make it fun.

See Ham populations at URL:
http://www.ah0a.org/FCC/Licenses.html

Shows some dips but slow growth overall. 1997 678,473 2004 681,466
>
> 1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new
to
> the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
> the first time buyer)?

Like Ford, Chevy, Dodge -- but for user reviews see URL:
http://www.eham.net/reviews/

>
> 3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is
geared
> to the novice.

Tons of antenna projects at URL:
http://ac6v.com/antprojects.htm

--
73 From The Wilderness Keyboard

1008. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 19:50:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40084089.6080006@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85734

>
>
>But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
>absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led to
>believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
>this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
>equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of
>amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the
>meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham
>"veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.
>
Hunt around for other clubs. Some will be "old boy" frats, others more
technically
minded.

>
>So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
>seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
>correct me.
>
>1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
>Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
>that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
>telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances.
>
True for some situations, but when a bigger disaster takes out the
infrastructure that
the land lines, faxes, internet and cell phones depend on, enough ham
stations usually
survive the disaster that emergency communications can still happen.
Ham radio
requires no infrastructure other than the radio, mic or code key,
antenna and a power
source (battery or a car) to function.

Cell phones work pretty well if you need to report a car accident, but
an earth
quake will likely take out the system the cell phones need to function.

1009. Re: HOW I BECAME WEALTHY WITH PAYPAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 20:22:01 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <safg009cpdgifbkao34rrn8pkc6bv2sdf1@4ax.com>
Source record: 85735

Craig,

You may be getting wealthy, perhaps, but that may change soon. Please don't be surprised if your Internet access at McGill University is disconnected very shortly - pyramid schemes such as this one are in clear violation of both the University charter and Canadian law:

http://sbinfocanada.about.com/cs/marketing/g/pyramidscheme.htm

"Pyramid schemes are illegal in Canada. Pyramid schemes are regulated by the Competition Act and the Criminal Code of Canada. "Any person who participates in these schemes in any capacity may be committing an offence and could be prosecuted" (RCMP)."

"People who are convicted of contravening the multi-level marketing or pyramid selling provisions of the Competition Act can be convicted and sentenced to a fine at the discretion of the court or a prison term of up to five years, or both."

A copy of this post with full headers has been forwarded to abuse@mcgill.ca for their review and action.

Fortunately for you, Craig, McGill does have an excellent Faculty of Law - I would strongly advise discussing this issue with them as soon as possible. While you still have email access, you can contact them at probono.law@.mcgill.ca .

Have a nice weekend.

73, Leo

PS - I noticed your munged email address in the post from McGill (also in violation of their Code of Conduct) - one of these addresses isn't you, is it? :)

>POSITION # 1 PAYPAL ACCOUNT: vwgolf96@canada.com
>POSITION # 2 PAYPAL ACCOUNT: sheripy@yahoo.com
>POSITION # 3 PAYPAL ACCOUNT: phastie@rogers.com

I sure wouldn't want to be one of the other two - did they used to be friends of yours?

On Fri, 16 Jan 2004 18:55:26 GMT, Craig<anon@anon.com> wrote:

>Follow the directions below and in two weeks you'll have up to
>$20000.00 in your PayPal account. There is a very high rate of
>participation in the program because of its low investment and high
>rate of return. Just $5.00 to one person!

>
>THAT'S ALL !!!
>
>If you are a skeptic and don't think the program will work, I urge
>you to give it a try anyway! It REALLY WORKS! Why do you
>think so many people are promoting it ?
>LOOK AT IT THIS WAY: If the Program is a total failure for you and you
>never get even $1.00 in return, your total loss will
>be the $5.00! If you are not yet a paypal member, there is no risk at
>all!!! If the Program is only moderately successful for
>you, your PayPal account will have several hundred dollars deposited
>into it within the next few days! If you actively
>participate in the Program, you could have up to $20,000.00 in your
>PayPal account within two weeks!
>
>Now let me tell you the simple details.
>Getting Started!!
>
>If you're not already a user of PayPal, the very first thing you need
>to do is go to PayPal and sign up. It takes two minutes
>and Pay Pal will deposit $5.00 in your account just for becoming a
>member. That makes this program's total cost $0!!! Follow
>this link to open your PayPal account:
>
><https://www.paypal.com>
>
>Now log into your PayPal account, and send the PayPal account of the
>person listed in Position 1 $5.00 PayPal will ask you to
>select type. (Select "service" and put "$5.00 donation" for
>subject.) When person in Position 1 receives notification of your
>payment, you can simply copy this page and change the names in
>position #1 & #2 & #3 as instructed. Remember, only the person
>in Position 1 on the list gets your $5.00 donation. Send them a
>donation then remove #1PayPal account from the list. Move the
>other two accounts up & add your Paypal account to #3 position. After
>you have retyped the names in the new order,
>IMMEDIATELY send the revised message to as many people as possible.
>PROMOTE! PROMOTE! The more you promote the Program, the
>more you will receive in donations!! That's all there is to it.
>When your name reaches Position 1 (usually in less than a week) it
>will be your turn to receive the cash. $5.00 will be sent
>to your PayPal account by people just like you who are willing to send
>$5.00 donation and receive up to $20,000 in less than
>two weeks. Because there are only (3) names on the list you can
>anticipate 80% of your cash within two weeks.
>
>Anytime you find yourself short on cash just take out your $5.00
>donation program and send it to 50 prospects. Imagine if you
>sent it to 100 or even more. Most people spend more than $5 on the
>lottery every week with no real hope of ever winning.

>THIS PROGRAM WORKS - JUST TRY IT
>
>POSITION # 1 PAYPAL ACCOUNT: vwgolf96@canada.com
>POSITION # 2 PAYPAL ACCOUNT: sheripy@yahoo.com
>POSITION # 3 PAYPAL ACCOUNT: phastie@rogers.com
>
>Integrity and honesty make this plan work.
>Participants who actively promote this program will average between $8000
>and
>$12000 and receive the donations within two weeks.
>This is not a chain letter. You are simply making a donation of $5.00
>to another person. The Program does not violate title
>18 section 1302 of the Postal and lottery code.
>Remember -TIME is of the essence. YOU can choose to live
>Paycheck-to-Paycheck or live FREE from FINANCIAL BONDAGE. Become a
>part of the donation program and help people help people.
>This program is about helping each other!
>Success is a journey - Not a destination!
>Start Your Journey TODAY!!!!
>

1010. Some Stats On RM-10811?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 21:23:03 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401161323.24e82dcd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85736

Hope this is accurate.

http://www.karc.net/Statistics/RM-10811/RM-10811.htm

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1011. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 21:52:58 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <_2ZNb.72848$nt4.97441@attbi_s51>
Source record: 85737

"Scott" <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> wrote in message
news:100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com...
> Hi folks.

Hello Scott and congrats on the pass. I am always glad to see new new blood in the service. Our no-code tech course for our club started on Monday and we had 10 people sign up. Very gratifing ....

Regarding the club .... I'd go for an few more meetings just to make sure as sometimes first impressions are not true. If you are are not comfortable then turn and walk away. I have done that in the past .... there is nothing wrong with utilizing your energies as best you see fit.

Equipment .... like posterior orifices ....everybody has one and I am surely not going to bore you with mine. Talk to someone regarding you operation desires and then they can steer you the right way. I would be glad to talk to you one on one if need be via Echo-Link.

Just remember Scott that hams are a cross section of the populace .... I have known hams that approach sainthood and those that are convicted murderers. You will have plenty of stories to tell over the years via this "hobby" and thankfully the preponderance of them will be positive.

In closing Scott ....don't be afraid to give your call .... I don't think many ax murderers hang out here.

God Bless ... 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

1012. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-16 23:15:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401161515.535a8eb3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85738

"Scott" <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> wrote in message
news:<100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com>...
> Hi folks.
>
> Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur
> radio, and also ask a few questions.
>
> I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect score.
> (I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the
> exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I have
> not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a
> moment.
>
> I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last
> night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though
> it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am
> helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.
>
> But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
> absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led to
> believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
> this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
> equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of
> amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the
> meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham
> "veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.
>
> So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
> seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
> correct me.
>
> 1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby, and
> like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to
> exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.
>
> 2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of
> knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio o
> peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever.
> But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle, the
> satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end
> result itself.

>
> 3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
> issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way to
> save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging
> white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
> future, and make it fun.
>
> Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.
>
> 1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to
> the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
> the first time buyer)?
>
> 2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy
> more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
> whistles".
>
> 3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared
> to the novice.
>
> Thanks folks.

Noise level. Give it a 0.1.

Hey Bubba, trolling is obviously not one of your skills, try some other "activity".

You're welcome.

1013. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 00:14:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <p7%Nb.1300$Fp1.665432@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85739

Scott wrote:
> Hi folks.
>
> Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur
> radio, and also ask a few questions.
>
> I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect score.
> (I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the
> exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I have
> not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a
> moment.
>
> I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last
> night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though
> it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am
> helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.
>
> But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
> absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led to
> believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
> this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
> equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of
> amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the
> meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham
> "veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.
>
> So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
> seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
> correct me.
>
> 1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby, and
> like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to
> exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.
>
> 2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of
> knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio o
> peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever.
> But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle, the
> satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end
> result itself.
>

> 3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
> issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way to
> save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging
> white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
> future, and make it fun.
>
> Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.
>
> 1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to
> the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
> the first time buyer)?
>
> 2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy
> more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
> whistles".
>
> 3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared
> to the novice.

A troll perhaps?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1014. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 00:57:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116195734.25815.00006034@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 85740

In article <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the
>core "issue" that began our discourse.

There are several issues, not just one.

>Perhaps I haven't stated it
>clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
>clouded.
>
Let's see what you've got, then.

>I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
>continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.
>
>I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
>inappropriate.

That's correct. It's also an issue to some people.

> No issue there - that is entirely your right.

Some people say it isn't. Not you, but some others.

>I also
>understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.

Also correct. And also an issue to some people, who say that my deletion of
Kim's call is "wrong".

>Again, no issue there - I respect that.
>
>For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:
>
>Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
>unfair, as it singled her out. I agree.

And I disagree. Kim singled herself out by choosing that callsign. As you are
aware.

>Would finding a compromise
>whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
>all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
>have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?

No, it wouldn't.
>
>That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim.

No, it isn't, but we'll get to that later. Right now, let's discuss that issue.

It seems to me that what you're saying is that I should either include
everyone's callsign, or no one's.

Now since I don't wish to include Kim's callsign, that leaves only the option
of including no one's callsign, in order to accomodate Kim's feelings.

But what about everyone else's feelings, including mine? I want my call listed.

I would feel disrespected to be listed by name rather than callsign or name and
callsign on an amateur radio newsgroup.

Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.

Don't the feelings of everyone else count?

Note also, Kim said that if I wouldn't use her callsign, she didn't want to be
on the list..

>Your rights and
>standards are not at question here.

Yes, they are. I've been told that "it's not my place" to determine whether a
callsign is appropriate or not. I've been told that my actions are "wrong".

As you are aware.
>
>73, Leo
>
>On 15 Jan 2004 09:40:58 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:<ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>...
>>> On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>> >In article <fm0900pk0rbud8vok5b9fao8pe9g71m63v@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>> >writes:
>>> >
>>> >>On 13 Jan 2004 10:00:24 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>> >>
>>> >>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>> news:<io96009g4nc3roeimb223otsdafqk2hjjk@4ax.com>...
>>> >>>> On 12 Jan 2004 10:02:37 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>> >>>> >snip
>>> >>>> >
>>> >>>> >So let's recap:
>>> >>>> >
>>> >>>> >With just a few posts, I was able to get you and others in a long,

>>> >>>> >lengthy and involved debate that had *nothing* to do with code
>testing.
>>> >>>> >
>>> >>>> >I exposed how some folks want *me* to follow *their* standards
>>> >>>> >rather than my own.
>>> >>>> >
>>> >>>> >I even got you to admit something good about K3LT.
>>> >>>> >
>>> >>>> >And through all that I avoided any name-calling or use of
>>> >>>> >inappropriate words.
>>> >>>>
>>> >>>> Jim,
>>> >>>>
>>> >>>> This is really uncharacteristic of you.
>>> >>>
>>> >>>That's actually a characteristic of me. Be predictably unpredictable.
>>> >>
>>> >>Nope - not that one :)
>>> >
>>> >That's the one I was referring to.
>>> >
>>> >Or did you mean the avoidance of name-calling and use of inappropriate
>words?
>>>
>>> Nope - the characteristic of always portraying gentlemanly conduct,
>>> which is clearly missing here.
>>
>>So let me get this straight.
>>
>>In order to display "gentlemanly conduct", you think I should
>>use Kim's callsign in my posts. Even though doing so violates
>>my standards. And even though it was chosen for reasons that
>>no gentleman would endorse.
>>
>Not at all - I'm saying that you have omitted all of the calls so as
>not to single her out.

I think you mean "*could* have omitted". And yes, I could have.

>Neither compromising your standards nor
>offending her.

It would have compromised my standards.

>>Surreal.
>
>No, diversionary, Jim. I have stated the issue many times. You
>choose to ignore it.

No, I don't ignore. You ignore the other issues.

>>> >>>> I am amazed that a well
>>> >>>> educated man like yourself would publically take pride in the above,
>>> >>>> given the behaviour that started it off in the first place.
>>> >>>
>>> >>>You mean Kim's changing of attributions to make it look like I wrote
>>> >>>something I didn't? Water under the bridge.
>>> >>
>>> >>Nope. Kim's putting her callsign back in to your posts (agreed, in
>>> >>violation of Usenet convention) was in reaction to your intentional
>>> >>changing of it to her name in your list. Against her wishes.
>>> >
>>> >So her wishes are more important than my standards?
>>>
>>> Nice diversion, Jim - you know that your standards are not the issue.
>>
>>Nice attempt at diversion, Leo.
>
>Not at all :) - you are fixated on her callsign being the issue.

Not fixated. It's one of the issues. There would be no
problem if she chose an appropriate callsign.

> The
>real issue is the manner in which you chose to single her out! As she
>told you herself.
>
That's *her* issue and *your* issue. But it's not the *only* issue.

As you are aware.

>Instead, you choose to make a moralistic issue out of it. It is not.

It's a moralistic issue when people tell me I'm not doing "the right thing"
and that something is "not my place" to decide.

It's a moralistic issue when I'm told what I *should* do in a post.
>
>>My standards are *exactly* the issue.
>
>No.

Then what's the problem?
>
>Your handling of the situation is the issue. As stated many times. Not
>your standards.

I handled the situation in the only way my standards would allow. Therefore,
my standards are an issue.

>>I'm being told, again and again, that my choice not to put Kim's
>>callsign in my posts is "wrong", and that my standards are of lesser
>>importance than Kim's feelings.
>
>Incorrect - that is not what you are being "told" at all. Please

>reread my previous comments.

I'm referring to other posts, too.
>
>As for your standards being more important, they are not - they are of
>equal importance. Hers and yours. Unless you are more important than
>kim, that is.

Then Kim should consider my views equally with her own in choice of a callsign.
She didn't.

>>So let me ask the question straight out:
>>
>>Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
>>or Kim's feelings?
>
>Both are equally important, Jim.

Why?

>Unless you are somehow more
>important, as started above...

How does that follow?
>
>>> >>You remember that, don't you, Jim?
>>> >>>
>>> >>>> Bully-like behaviour, Jim?
>>> >>>
>>> >>>Not by me. Who have I tried to bully into doing or not doing anything?
>>> >>>Bullying is the use of force - or the threat of force. No force or
>>> >>>threats at all in my actions or postings.
>>> >>
>>> >>Wrong. Bullying also means "to treat someone in an overbearing or
>>> >>intimidating manner". Overbearing? Yup.
>>> >
>>> >Nope. Not from where I sit.
>>>
>>> Sorry to hear that, Jim.
>>
>>Do you want me to lie about it? I won't.
>
>Perhaps, then, there was no attempt to bully Kim.

Thank you.

>>> >>>> I wouldn't have thought it possible.
>>> >>>
>>> >>>It isn't.
>>> >>
>>> >>(ahem)
>>> >>>>
>>> >>>> That's some set of flexible personal standards you have there.

>>> >>>
>>> >>>Not at all. Was Ghandi a "bully" because he wouldn't do certain things
>>> >>>others said he "must" do or "should" do?
>>> >>
>>> >>Ghandi? Ghandi didn't go out of his way to intentionally annoy folks,
>>> >>now did he?
>>> >
>>> >Some would say that's mostly what he did. He was very very "annoying",
>saying
>>> >that India should be independent, that Hindus and Moslems could live
>>> >together, making salt when it was against the law....
>>> >
>>> >Very annoying fellow at times.
>>>
>>> ...but totally unrelated to the issue.
>>
>>No, totally related to the issue. He was very considerate of other people's
>>feelings. But that consideration did not keep him from being very very
>>"annoying" when his standards/values/conscience required it.
>>
>>My standards require that I not put Kim's call in the list - because I
>>think it's inappropriate. I'm sorry if someone finds that annoying.
>>But I'm not going to change it.
>
>No problem - but you could have left them all out, couldn't you?

Not without annoying others and myself.

>A compromise indeed - but not a compromise of your
>standards at all.

It would be a compromise of my standards. And why should I compromise them?

If I follow your suggested compromise to its logical conclusion, I should not
use *anyone's* callsign in *any* post - so as not to hurt Kim's feelings.

>>I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
>>I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
>>I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
>>two statements.
>
>No arguement with the first two points at all Jim - it is your
>omitting just one callsign (hers) from your post that is the issue.
>I have said repeatedly, as has Kim, that you should have used no one's
>call in your post if the situation bothered you that much.

BINGO!

You just told me what I should do. Now who's being moralistic?

>That would
>have solved the problem without compromising your standards, wouldn't
>it?

No.

>Who would have a reason to complain about that?

Anyone else who wanted their callsign included.

>She would have
>been treated equally to everyone else (her complaint), and her
>callsign would not have appeared in your post (your complaint). Is
>there a problem with this?

Yes. See above.
>
>If you believe that her call is inappropriate, and you do not wish to
>use it in a post, those are your standards and are deserving of the
>respect of everyone.

But everyone does not respect them.

>But, that is not the central issue of my posts
>to you - the above paragraph is.

There are other issues, whether you choose to see them or not.

>>> >Those words do not mean I must hide my standards under a bushel.
>>>
>>> Not the issue.
>>
>>Exactly the issue. Why do you avoid it?
>
>I don't - that is not the issue at all.

Yes, it is. To me and others.
>
>Your standards do not allow you to use her callsign in a post. No
>problem there at all, Jim. Omitting just hers was unfair, though -
>that is the issue.

It's only unfair by *your* standards and *Kim's* standars - which you are
trying to force on me.
>
>That is the issue that I am discussing. Not you, though - you are
>trying to shift it to a position defensable by your standards.

See above.

>>> >Kim thinks she "beat" me. I disagree.
>>> >
>>> >So we have a situation where neither Kim nor I feels like the loser.
>>> >
>>> >That's perhaps the biggest achievement of the thread.
>>>
>>> Not true at all, Jim.
>>
>>I think it is.

>
>Your opinion.

My perception - and that's the one that counts, remember?
>
>>> Let me quote your own words from your reply to to Kim in the full
>>> version of this post:
>>
>>> "....Too bad you failed, Kim. But I hope you had fun."
>>>
>>> An interesting way to declare a draw, Jim.
>>
>>Nobody is declaring a draw.
>>
>>A draw is when neither side thinks they won, or can win, and so the game
>>ends.
>>
>>In this case, Kim thinks she won, and I think I won. Not a draw.
>
>Rhetorical, Jim -

Accurate.

>...perhaps a tie?

Nope. A tie is when both sides agree that neither side won or lost. Not the
case here.
>
>An interesting way to declare a tie, Jim.
>
Not a tie.
>>>
>>> >> That's all that matters.....
>>> >
>>> >Not at all. What matters is that I cannot be bullied into using a
>>> >callsign I think is inappropriate.
>>>
>>> Sidestepping the issue.
>>
>>Yes, you are. Not me.
>
>Nope. Not the issue.

Exactly the issue.

>>> >>>> >73 de Jim "My name is Gladiator" N2EY
>>> >>>>
>>> >>>> Brilliant.
>>> >>>>
>>> >>>Thank you.
>>> >>
>>> >>Not really :)

>>> >
>>> >Ever see the film "Demolition Man"? Think of Edgar Friendly.
>>
>>> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>>> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>>> of the main issue under discussion.
>>
>>Leo, you are avoiding the central issue:
>
>No. Not at all. Please reread my comments carefully! You are arguing
>a different issue.

That's the issue you keep avoiding. Probaly because you know I'm right.
>>
>>Which is more important: following my standards/judgement/conscience,
>>or Kim's feelings?
>>
>>That's the central issue, right there.
>
>Nope. Not the issue at all, Jim. As stated many times.

To me it's the central issue.

>Regarding which is more important, though - both.

Sidestepping the issue.

>There was a way to
>handle this without compromising either.

Sure - have Kim change her callsign to something appropriate.
>
>Or are you saying that you are more important, Jim?

Does not follow.
>>
>>> I expected better from the man who
>>> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>>>
>>> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>>> a list.
>>
>>You mean using her name instead of her callsign.
>
>No.
>
>Not the issue, as you are aware (or should be?). Omitting just her
>call in the list is the issue. Just that one call - no others.

Omitting others would single *them* out, by your logic.
>>
>>That was done because of my standards. Using her callsign in that list
>>was inconsistent with my standard that it's inappropriate. So I didn't

>>use it. As I have said before, no disrespect, insult, or singling out
>>were intended.
>>
>>> And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>>> her. Period.
>>
>>You are saying that I should ignore my standards out of courtesy to Kim.
>>That having her callsign included in the list, rather than her name, is
>>more important than any consideration of *my* feelings or standards.
>>
>>That's the issue.
>
>Nope.

Yep.
>>
>>> An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>>> responses so far.
>>>
>>Not by me. By you and others.
>
>Nope. The issue has been stated many times.

By me.
>>
>>Say it right out, Leo. Tell me that I should ignore/hide/deny my
>>standards of what is appropriate in deference to
>>"courtesy" and Kim's feelings.
>
>Nope. Compromise was possible, without impacting your standards.

Not any compromise that has been proposed here.

>>> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue?
>>
>>That's all I've been doing in these posts.
>
>Nope - you're facing up to a different issue. One that you can
>justify with your standards. Please reread my comments carefully.

I did. And mine.

>>> - or
>>> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>>> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>>
>>How am I fooling myself?
>>
>>I'm aware that I think Kim's callsign is inappropriate for the ARS.
>>I'm aware that I won't intentionally use it in a post.
>>I'm aware that others are trying to get me to change the previous
>>two statements.

>
>Nope.
>Nope.
>Nope.

Yep.
Yep.
Yep.
>
>Not the issue at all.

>>Are you aware of what you are telling me to do?
>
>Yup - deal with the issue at hand. Not the one that you keep falling
>back on.

I'm not going to compromise my standards. Period.

>>> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>>> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>>> the artificial." - Mark Twain
>>
>>Yup.
>>
>>You want me to keep my standards private, and not act on them, because
>>they aren't the same as yours. Well, that's just not going to happen.
>
>Nope. Please reread Mr. Twain's statement.

I did. I'm not going to hide my standards.
>>
>>btw - if Kim's callsign is "just a license number", then why
>>not pick a different one? Why a vanity call at all?
>
>Guess because it's her choice, Jim.

Then respect my choice of how to post as you respect her choice of callsign.

>I sure wouldn't want that call
>assigned to me, but Kim does. Her way of poking a finger in the eye
>of those who judge her by appearance alone, perhaps. Her own personal
>reasons, though.

Sure. That does not make it appropriate to the ARS.

>And she has every right to have it - it's up to her.

I don't think FCC should issue such calls. Nor should hams choose them. They do
no good to the ARS. It wasn't the "right thing to do".

Your argument is fixated on Kim's "right" to choose such a call, and
ignores a ham's responsibility to the ARS.

Just my opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1015. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 03:00:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <k68h00droascan1472553bkms0ifrohvus@4ax.com>
Source record: 85741

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 00:14:13 GMT, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Scott wrote:
>> Hi folks.

>
>
> A troll perhaps?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

As I was reading his post, I thought that it might be....

His three points regarding what he'd seen so far were a tad
contentious, and could well fuel a flame war in this group. When I
read his three questions, though, they seemed quite legitimate, and
were in line with the things that I wanted to know right after I got
my licence. And, his radio club experience seemed pretty plausible
too.

That got me thinking that it may not be a troll after all? So, I
snipped out the contentious stuff, answered the questions, and figured
that we'll all find out soon enough...

He seemed interested enough in learning the basics - and I'm pretty
sure that he is very new to Amateur Radio, as he didn't ask a single
question about Kim's callsign :)

sorry bout that....

73, Leo

1016. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 03:21:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040116222118.08626.00002688@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 85742

In article <40049168.4079036E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>Actually, aside from a couple of Karjalainen brews in Helsinki in
>October, my yearly beer intake is about four bottles. I mostly stick to
>vodka or with Jack Daniels and branch water.
>
>Dave K8MN
>

Dave:

OK, I give up -- what the Sam Hill is "branch water?" I heard it mentioned
a few times on the old TV program "Dallas," when J.R. Ewing used to order
a "bourbon and branch" at the Ahwl (Oil) Baron's Club. Is it water that
dripped off a tree branch during the rain, or did it come from a branch
tributary of some particular river, or what? Or is it just another way of
saying "Club Soda," as I suspect?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1017. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 03:21:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040116222119.08626.00002689@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 85743

In article <SBWMb.7572$1e.129@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>< No, more like a Dodge Viper, a GE refrigerator or a Rolling Rock beer.
><
>
>If you'd drink Rolling Rock beer, then you'd probably drive an AMC
>Gremlin, wear a badge laden jumpsuit to a hamfest, and date Moms Mabley.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I drink Corona, drive an '03 Toyota Corolla LE, wear a pair of Dockers and a pullover shirt to hamfests (no badges except my ARRL OBS Call Sign Badge), date a single Mom not named "Mabley," and will probably never own an ICOM IC-7800 for the simple fact that with the 10 kilobucks I could buy an IC-746, a tower, a big antenna farm, and lots of other stuff, and still have a chunk of change left over! If I ever win the Powerball Lottery, I still don't know if I'd invest in a 7800, although there would be little reason not to under those circumstances!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1018. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:11:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <pd9h005fafcc1865drb90h9fst9o20iein@4ax.com>
Source record: 85744

On 17 Jan 2004 00:57:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the
>>core "issue" that began our discourse.
>
>There are several issues, not just one.

OK - I'm listening.

>
>>Perhaps I haven't stated it
>>clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
>>clouded.
>>
>Let's see what you've got, then.

Let's go.

>
>>I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
>>continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.
>>
>>I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
>>inappropriate.
>
>That's correct. It's also an issue to some people.

OK - fair enough. And it shouldn't be. Your personal standards are
your own - no one else's. Let's clear that one off - agreed?
>
>> No issue there - that is entirely your right.
>
>Some people say it isn't. Not you, but some others.

Others may, but who cares - it's none of their business.

>
>>I also
>>understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.
>
>Also correct. And also an issue to some people, who say that my deletion of
>Kim's call is "wrong".

Let's focus on that one, and agree that deleting her call from your post is necessary for you to due to your standards. I have no issue there at all. If you don't want to use it, OK. Let's clear this one off too - agreed?

>
>>Again, no issue there - I respect that.
>>
>>For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:
>>
>>Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
>>unfair, as it singled her out. I agree.
>
>And I disagree. Kim singled herself out by choosing that callsign. As you are
>aware.

Yes she did - and quite intentionally, too, as she has stated.

That wasn't, however, what I was saying in my statement above. Simply that Kim feels that you singled her out too, by omitting just her call from the list.

Forget the inappropriatenesss of the call for a moment....do you see where she might get that feeling?

>
>>Would finding a compromise
>>whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
>>all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
>>have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?
>
>No, it wouldn't.

Honestly, I dont agree with you on this point. It would have been an easy compromise to make, and woulld potentially have offended no one. More on this further down in the post!

>>
>>That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim.
>
>No, it isn't, but we'll get to that later. Right now, let's discuss that issue.
>
>It seems to me that what you're saying is that I should either include
>everyone's callsign, or no one's.
>
>Now since I don't wish to include Kim's callsign, that leaves only the option
>of including no one's callsign, in order to accomodate Kim's feelings.

Agreed - in order to treat everyone equally, that would be the only other option available given the situation.

>
>But what about everyone else's feelings, including mine? I want my call listed.
>

>I would feel disrespected to be listed by name rather than callsign or name and
>callsign on an amateur radio newsgroup.

Yes, and I believe that Kim feels exactly the same way, Jim. For the
same reason as you, I suppose - she is also a ham. (She does not feel
that her call is in any way wrong, remember.)

>
>Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
>callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.
>
>Don't the feelings of everyone else count?

Of course they do - but are you sure that these people world be that
upset by this? (except Dave, of course - he appears, from his recent
correspondence, to be annoyed that Kim is still breathing... :))

In fact, if it had been my post, I would have revised it to names only
immediately after Kim's original complaint. And seen what comments
came back next. If I had several legitimate complaints (without the
agendas that we have seen in several recent posts {not yours, Jim!)
which obviously relate to Kim personally rather than just her
call...), then yes there would be no other alternative than to put the
calls back - but I would have written and offered Kim the option of
going by name only or dropping out before I went ahead. At least I'd
be able to tell Kim that I tried to fix it for her, but it didn't work
out with the rest of the group.

Maybe it's just me, but I would try first to resolve her complaint if
possible, out of respect for her as a fellow amateur. I prefer
compromise whenever possible - not compromising my standards, but
finding a way to achieve a balance.

>
>Note also, Kim said that if I wouldn't use her callsign, she didn't want to be
>on the list..

True, but that was after the had become frustrated with trying to
solve this issue.

>
>>Your rights and
>>standards are not at question here.
>
>Yes, they are. I've been told that "it's not my place" to determine whether a
>callsign is appropriate or not. I've been told that my actions are "wrong".
>
>As you are aware.

I did state that it is in fact no one individual's place to determine
what is or is not appropriate for the ARS - that role belongs to the
regulators, and to the will of the majority of us, I suppose.

Each of us is however completely in charge of determining what is
appropriate for us as an individual, however. No question there.

Jim, my intent was not to criticize your standards - simply to point
out that perhaps a more amicable solution to this issue was possible
without compromising anyone's standards - finding a common ground for
all.

That's it - that's my point.

>>
>>73, Leo
>>
>>On 15 Jan 2004 09:40:58 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:<ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>...
>>>> On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>remainder of post snipped - in the hope that the above covers the outstanding issues well
enough.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo
>

1019. Re: Some Stats On RM-10811?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232341.12631.00004276@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85747

In article <b7d1465c.0401161323.24e82dcd@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>Hope this is accurate.
>
>http://www.karc.net/Statistics/RM-10811/RM-10811.htm

The "most accurate" information is on public-access Internet, direct from the FCC's own database. All the numbers on all 14 petitions.

You can even read each and every document!

Sunnavagun!

LHA / WMD

1020. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232341.12631.00004277@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85802

In article <hS0Nb.29767$P%1.24323667@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Thank you for a marvelous analogy. While we often can't change the world,
>we can beautify our own little corner of it.

More ostrich-like behavior. Imagination is wonderful. Wish you had some...

LHA / WMD

1021. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232342.12631.00004279@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85749

In article <4004343A.8C7ECE44@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len, won't you tell us again about your purpose here? You know, the
>thing about only being here for the civil debate of code test issue?
>That's such a good tale.

Why?

YOUR whole purpose in here is to spit bile at those that don't
agree with your noble elitist thoughts.

You follow that course for more than 19 out of 20 postings.

You never want to discuss any subject matter unless it involves
tossing s**t on others.

Is that what U.S. amateur radio has evolved into today?

Certainly looks like it.

LHA / WMD

1022. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232342.12631.00004278@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85750

In article <4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
>lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
>Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
>decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
>to view the landfill.
>
>In this scenario, you are the landfill.

Only in YOUR mind, Trashman.

Well, you are a fine example of U.S. amateur radio as it has evolved
up to today. The antithesis of "The Amateur's Code."

Look out for that big D-7 coming at your antenna farm, olde-tymer.

LHA / WMD

1023. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232343.12631.00004280@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85810

In article <20040114214858.11022.00003505@mb-m14.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Then came "digital quartz technology" - and no two clocks read alike.

You have to read the instructions on setting the time.

>Set them
>all to the same time and in a few months they're all over the place. The newer
>computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older ones...

Tsk, tsk, tsk...at least 30 USA firms sell "radio clocks" that check themselves agains WWVB every day. EXACT time to the second. Battery powered. They even correct for Leap Years and the Leap Second.

>But my Tymeter grinds on, flipping the drums.

Until the AC power goes out.

Do you flip your drums when the power goes out?

Or do you fire up the "emergency rig" and cueso for the "accurate time" in morse?

LHA / WMD

1024. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232344.12631.00004281@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85811

In article <40042FCA.3F2834BF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3FFCE328.1733823E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> I believe that's the beauty of the Orion, it's never "ancient." The
>latest
>> >> upgrade is just a download away. I feel for the poor slob who finally
>> >breaks
>> >> down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800 Pro or Pro II comes out.
>> >
>> >TT just keeps making it better and better. The rig is now about eight
>> >months old and I've downloaded about ten firmware releases in that time.
>>
>> "FIRMWARE releases?!?"
>
>Yes, firmware releases.
>
>> Gosh, you must be equipped with a Star Trek Transporter! :-)
>
>No, just a PC with an internet connection.
>
>> Oh, you mean SOFTWARE updates, right?
>
>No, I don't. I mean firmware updates.

Get it straight, Herr Robust.

"Firmware" is hardware.

There is NO computer system anywhere in the world that will "download
firmware."

>> Let's see, that's more than one per month.
>
>- Version 1.325 - initial release
>03/26/03 Version 1.326
>03/27/03 Version 1.327
>03/28/03 Version 1.328
>03/31/03 Version 1.329
>04/01/03 Version 1.330
>04/02/03 Version 1.331

>04/03/04 Version 1.332
>04/04/03 Version 1.333
>04/06/03 Version 1.334
>04/07/03 Version 1.335
>04/08/03 Version 1.336
>04/10/03 Version 1.337
>04/11/03 - 04/13/03 Version 1.338
>04/14/03 - 04/16/03 Version 1.339
>04/26/03-05/06/03 Version 1.340
>05/12/03-05/14/03 Version 1.341
>05/19/03-05/22/03 Version 1.342
>05/27/03 Version 1.343
>06/03/03 Version 1.344
>06/06/03 Version 1.345
>06/11/03 Version 1.346
>06/13/03 Version 1.347
>06/25/03 Version 1.348
>07/08/03 Version 1.349
>07/10/03 VERSION 1.350
>07/29/03 Version 1.351
>08/07/03 Version 1.352
>08/11/03 Version 1.353
>08/12/03 Version 1.354
>08/15/03 Version 1.355
>08/19/03 Version 1.356
>08/21/03 Version 1.357
>08/22/03 Version 1.358
>08/25/03 Version 1.359
>09/12/03 Version 1.360
>09/16/03 Version 1.361
>09/25/03 Version 1.362
>10/06/03 Version 1.363
>10/22/03 Version 1.364
>10/23/03 Version 1.365
>11/14/03 Version 1.366
>12/19/03 Version 1.367
>
>Well, it certainly looks like more than one per month, doesn't it old fellow?
>Interestingly, the manufacturer lists the above list under "Firmware
>Revision History".

All that many updates?

Tells me they didn't know what they were doing to begin with, or just
shoved software and hardware out the door before they had finished
testing the firmware and software.

>> I would think that Orion could have stabilized the programming by
>> now. No new band changes have happened in eight months... :-)
>
>Really? I seem to recall adding 60m capability to the Orion. Weren't

>you paying attention? Were you under the impression that "band changes"
>were the only things which could be modified in the Orion?

Apparently it can also TRANSPORT material things as they did on
Star Trek.

Perhaps they should have beamed up some smarts to release the
RIGHT code the first time...

>> Gosh, Orion must "not be interested in radio" if they can't get
>> their software routines stabilized by now...
>
>"Orion" isn't? It would seem that the Ten-Tec folks would show their
>lack of interest by not issuing any updates at all. You may resume your
>nap, Leonard.

Zzzzzzzzzzzzzz.

Oh, my, you drone on busy prussian bee. It's like listening to a
lecture on 1800s science...all done by amateurs.

Nothing new, same old "landfill" remarks from the prussian.

LHA / WMD

1025. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232345.12631.00004283@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85748

In article <VD0Nb.29763$P%1.24320616@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>But that is not the context in which you used it. There is nothing in Part
>97 authorizing us to do public service. Public service is briefly mentioned
>but only in recognition and encouragement. Paragraph 97.1a does not
>authorize any one to do a thing.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

There are a total of FIVE paragraphs under 97.1, double-D.

Those are ALL applicable.

Do they "not authorize" four other activities?

Good luck on this one now...

LHA / WMD

1026. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232345.12631.00004282@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85806

In article <4jiNb.29962$P%1.24495023@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>I have many times in many forums objected to the phrase "it's just a hobby"
>for this very reason.

Okay, it's "not" a hobby.

>I strongly believe in public service. I strongly
>believe that it is one of, but not the only, justification for our
>existence.

Okay, the entire justification for amateur radio is "public service."

>However if we are going to put so much emphasis on this
>particular element we have to face the fact that we are very remiss
>addressing the other elements listed under Basis and Purpose. But again a
>justification to exist is neither a requirement nor an authorization.

Okay, so its back to just a hobby again...

Gosh, all this circle chasing is getting tiring. :-)

LHA / WMD

1027. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232347.12631.00004284@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85808

In article <20040113234831.07961.00001418@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(Expletive Deleted) writes:

>In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
>>> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
>>
>>You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
>>and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.
>>
>>> I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
>>> examination. That's all.
>>
>> "Go for it, EX purchasing agent..."
>>
>> "Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
>> of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio."
>>
>> "Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York
>>TIMES."
>>
>> "MODERN HF amateur radio: 'What was good in the 1930s is still
>> good in 2000s!'"
>>
>> "Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."
>>
>> "Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
>> of a communicable disease."
>>
>> "Go get some therapy."
>>
>>Yep, it appears quite evident from the quoted material just from one of
>>your posts, Len. You just want to eliminate a code test.
>>
>Dave,
>
>Remember this gem of an example of "civil debate" from the same author as the
>above:
>
>"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

>
>(October 28, 2003)

Yes, Your Emminence, please ALSO remind others of that wonderful group of expletives from a Model Amateur Extra such as -

"PUTZ!" "Your scumminess" "Scumbag"

And other assorted hateful words of anger.

Let's not forget that other gem that seemed to "write itself," "LANDFILL."

Some elitist pro-coders are so righteous and noble that others are simply a dumping ground for their garbage?

"Civil debate."

On a scale of 0 through 10, such AMATEUR RADIO activity is good for a -20.

Please keep all that in mind as you write up the Holy Orders of the Day, your Emminence.

LHA / WMD

1028. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232348.12631.00004285@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85809

In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
>> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
>
>You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
>and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.

And you are not God...despite your claims to same...

>> I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
>> examination. That's all.
>
> "Go for it, EX purchasing agent..."
>
> "Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
> of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio."
>
> "Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York
>TIMES."
>
> "MODERN HF amateur radio: 'What was good in the 1930s is still
> good in 2000s!'"
>
> "Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."
>
> "Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
> of a communicable disease."
>
> "Go get some therapy."
>
>Yep, it appears quite evident from the quoted material just from one of
>your posts, Len. You just want to eliminate a code test.

I'd like to concentrate on the SUBJECTS instead of your incessant
prussian arrogant order-giving, Herr Robust.

If you feel that anyone you don't approve of is offensive to you,
your holiness, feel free to have their ISP get rid of their account
or at least forbid them to post in this free, open, unmoderated
newsgroup. Or just skip over the post.

Do you need to change the prescription in your monocle again, Herr Robust? You can't continue to do an impression of a modern prussian officer without it...go rent a DVD with Otto Preminger in "Stalag 17" and study it some more.

LHA / WMD

1029. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232349.12631.00004286@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85803

In article <f45722ac.0401141956.290952ad@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<4005B958.5EB70995@earthlink.net>...
>> Leo wrote:
>>
>> > Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>> > diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>> > of the main issue under discussion.
>>
>> ...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
>> taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
>> something which we find in poor taste.
>
>Now there's a smug remark.
>
>> > I expected better from the man who
>> > often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>>
>> Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.
>
>And you yours in this matter.
>
>> > The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>> > a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>> > her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>> > responses so far.
>>
>> What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
>> courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
>> take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
>> calls.
>> Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
>> *chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>
>Similarly, you weren't being courteous to other Tanzanian amateurs by
>working Frenchmen out of band on 6M when you held a Tanzanian call,
>and subsequently stating that you would continue to do so because you
>were within your authorization.
>
>You give Tanzanian amateurs a bad name.
>
>Meanwhile you state you would somehow manage to tune past a legally

>issued American callsign, apparently in preference of out of band
>Frenchmen on 6M.
>
>> > Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
>> > shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>> > fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>>
>> > "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>> > sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>> > the artificial." - Mark Twain
>>
>> So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
>> you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
>> defend bad taste.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
>you've exhibited here and on the air?

He has NO flaws, Brian...

>It seems that you've set yourself up here and on the air to defend bad
>taste.

He may have had a run-in with cannibals in an African posting and
therefore rejected. The reason was He tasted bad.

LHA / WMD

1030. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232350.12631.00004288@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85801

In article <f45722ac.0401141604.477bebfe@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40055126.6070501@psu.edu>...
>
>> I just applied their logic to the message at hand.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>Mike, the PCTA double standard defies logic.

No, Brian, it's just the Amateur Extra Special Dispensation.

Hypocrisy is practically a catechism with them.

Or catastrophism... :-)

It's in their Him book.

LHA / WMD

1031. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232350.12631.00004287@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85807

In article <bu4o9d$hj1@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:4005B697.A2591512@earthlink.net...
>> >
>>
>> Actually, you still don't understand what you did. Jim did not change
>> what you wrote. His actions/comments were clearly his. You changed an
>> attribution. Jim did not.
>>
>
>And, you're still pontificating, Dave. How many times have I clearly
>stated: I know what I did, I know what I did trumped what Jim did (i.e., had
>greater impact on everyone), and I'll state now I don't think I'd change a
>thing about doing it--three ways--again!
>
>To me, attributes, or deleting things such as signatures and things from
>tracking mechanisms, are equal. Got it? No difference in either action to
>be determined as "wrong." Each is an insult, each is astray from standard
>conventions of newsgroup submissions, and each have the same potential to
>mislead, or at least misdirect, the readers of that post.
>
>> > >
>> > > IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he
>shows
>> > > for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
>> > >
>
>I don't think the justification for the action needs to be included in the
>dialogue. As I stated in another post, regardless of reason, *both* are
>wrong. I refuse to continue to get wrapped up in this being about my
>callsign--it is not.
>
>> > >
>> > > Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to
>> > > Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that
>he
>> > > finds objectionable.
>> > >
>> > > Any less would be disrepectful.
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > Good luck with this one.

>>
>> > Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I
>see it
>> > that he does just as he's accused me of doing.
>>
>> No, he hasn't. I presented you with two illustrative example of what
>> you did. Jim did not do the same as you did at all.
>>
>
>You fall way short, Dave, of being able to *present* anything.
>
>> >
>> > But, to me, I got my point
>> > across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)
>>
>> It's hard for you to get your "point" across when you still don't
>> understand what you did.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>>
>
>Do you practice being an asshole, Dave? You must...because you're nearly
>perfect at it.

Herr Robust is without imperfection in that regard...

LHA / WMD

1032. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232352.12631.00004290@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85805

In article <bu34k6$al7@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:WQ3Nb.645$iD6.289457@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > "Kim
>> >
>> > " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<bu0ha6$ag4@library2.airnews.net>...
>>
>> > Not a question of change. A question of how the change
>> > altered the apparent authorship.
>> >
>> >
>> >>Fact still remains that you
>> >
>> >
>> > [expletive deleted]
>>
>> Here we have a very interesting point to examine.
>>
>> IF Jim finds that Kim's callsign, which *was* and *is* a double
>> entendre; an objectionable thing, (google it up folks - it's there)
>>
>> AND Jim finds some language that she used objectionable,
>>
>> AND Jim types "[expletive deleted]" instead of the word he finds
>> objectionable. in replies to her,
>>
>
>Not only types (as in: new entry) but changes something in the existing body
>of the message to which he is replying.

Never happen! Cannot be! U.S. Amateur Extras have Special
Dispensation to set standards for the "amateur community."
Ergo, what They do is perfectly okay...

LHA / WMD

1033. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232352.12631.00004289@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85812

In article <4005B958.5EB70995@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>> of the main issue under discussion.
>
>...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
>taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
>something which we find in poor taste.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you didn't capitalize the "we" fearsome leader!

You speak for the amateur community. Always. Even if the
majority of them do not agree with you...

>> I expected better from the man who
>> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>
>Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.

The [expletive deleted] Formerly Known As Reverend Jim is acting
as Judge, Jury, and Executioner in this matter.

So are you. Must be that U.S. Amateur Extra Special Dispensation
thing.

>> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>> a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>> her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>> responses so far.
>
>What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
>courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
>take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
>calls.

How does all that interfere with your life, fearless leader?

Are you on some evangelical crusade to rid the world of horrible
filthy disgusting language that You find offensive in an unmoderated
forum?

Of course you are...throwing your weight around (lots of it)...making
like a control freak on a binge.

>Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
>*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.

There shall be NO filthy offensive deragatory words in olde-tyme
hamme raddio sayeth the fearless leader. May all who mention
even remotely related to s*x rot in cb hell?

>> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
>> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>
>> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>> the artificial." - Mark Twain
>
>So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
>you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
>defend bad taste.

Leo's morals are a LOT better than the ones you exhibit in here.

A fantastic betterment of the human condition, Herr Robust, much
better than the prussian arrogance of "do like you say."

Wonderful example of olde-tyme hamme raddio you present, Herr
Robust. Makes everyone lust (oops, said an [expletive deleted])
to learn morse code and be a hamme, right? Then they, too, can
be just like You.

LHA / WMD

1034. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232357.12631.00004292@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85804

In article <40043372.CC51FEB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> ...it might have been a Preview of Coming Attractions advertising
>> a new Sermon on the Antenna Mount by Rev. Jim. :-)
>>
>> Hans is right. A bunch of sanctimonious Church Ladies trying to
>> manufacture disputes with their production lines all broken down.
>
>What have your comments to do with elimination of morse testing in the
>Amateur Radio Service (your only aim here)?

Someone shook your chains?

Are you the Moderator in here? (no, but you like to think so...)

Are you the Supreme Court (or Courtesan) of ham radio? (no, but
you act like it...)

Morse code is the heart and soul of all olde-tyme Hamme raddio
amateurs.

The olde-tyme hamme raddio peoples insist on morse code testing
forever and ever, amen.

What has morse code testing regulations to do with Herr Robust?
Not a single d**n thing.

Peas be unto you, whirled leader.

LHA / WMD

1035. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232357.12631.00004291@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85813

In article <1tl800lng2lcnmie9onnqru6g8vmt429u8@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 13 Jan 2004 09:54:02 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:<bur5001g2u88h116dg6edp4job551b8mit@4ax.com>...
>>> On 12 Jan 2004 09:15:19 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:<e0q200t2lf43asf4ojn6t3qihahbl43ums@4ax.com>...
>>> >> Jim,
>>> >>
>>> >> Personally, I feel that it is indeed unfortunate that you do not see,
>>> >> or will not admit to, your disrespectful treatment of Kim,
>>> >
>>> >[callsign deleted]
>>> >
>>> >Your opinion noted, Leo. However, after much consideration, I do not
>>> >consider my omission of Kim's callsign to be disrespectful. YMMV.
>>>
>>> As stated before, it wasn't your omission of Kim's callsign that was
>>> disrespectful, it was the context that it was done in - omitting hers,
>>> but leaving everyone else's intact. Repeatedly.
>>>
>>> As you are aware.
>>
>>I am aware that you preceive it that way. Are you aware that no disrespect
>>was intended?
>
>No.
>
>>
>>> >> Your statements in defense of your conduct are based entirely upon
>>> >> circular logic, rationalization, contradiction and denial - indicating
>>> >> that you are not prepared to accept responsibility for your actions
>>> >> towards a fellow ham here on the group.
>>> >
>>> >Basically what you are saying is that I should accept Kim's callsign
>>> >as appropriate for the ARS, and use it here, because:
>>> >
>>> >1) FCC issued it
>>> >2) She asked me to
>>> >3) *You* don't 'have a problem' with the callsign, and therefore *I*

>>> > shouldn't, either.
>>>
>>> No - I said that Kim's callsign IS a valid one, accepted by the FCC
>>> for use in the ARS.
>>
>>It's a *legal* one. No one disputes that.
>
>Thank you!
>>
>>> You can dislike it, revile it, be insulted by it
>>> - whatever you choose to do. But, you must respect the fact that it
>>> is a valid amateur callsign - because it is! Just like yours, issued
>>> officially by the FCC.
>>
>>I did not ask for this specific callsign. Kim asked for hers.
>>>
>>> Jim, you aren't the guy who gets to determine what is or is not
>>> appropriate for the ARS.
>>
>>Not true!
>>
>>We *all* have a say in what is and is not appropriate for the ARS. And that
>>includes me.
>
>That wasn't the point - I said specifically that you are not the one
>who gets to make that decision.

Oh, but the Amateur Formerly Known as Reverend Jim IS ham
radio, therefore he decides what is applicable and what is not.

[it's either that is be caught in a word blizzard of long, long, long
postings or a Sermon On The Antenna Mount]

>>> That role belongs to the regulatory authorities.
>>
>>And to all of us hams.
>
>No - we can recommend and advise, but the regulatory authorities make
>the decision. Not us.

He IS U.S. ham radio. He's said so hisself. :-)

>>> Whatever your problem is with this particular call, it
>>> is between you and the FCC - not us! If they declare that it is
>>> inappropriate, then it will be withdrawn. If not, it stays. Whatever
>>> it is - it's their decision - not yours and mine!
>>
>>That's only true as far as the issuance of a callsign. Not its use.
>
>Absolutely. But not the point.
>
>The issue is between you and the FCC. They issued it - they can

>recall it if it's "inappropriate".

He IS U.S. ham radio. Said so.

>
>>>
>>> As you are aware.
>>
>>> >As I have stated before, no disrespect was intended. But I am not
>>> >going to use Kim's callsign in my posts, because I think it is
>>> >inappropriate for the IRS.
>>>
>>> In your opinion, Jim - not necessarily the opinion of the FCC, or many
>>> members of the ARS.
>>
>>I'm not telling them not to use Kim's callsign.
>>
>>You are telling me I *must* use it.
>
>Incorrect. Not at all.
>
>That isn't the issue. I said omitting just one callsign from your
>post was wrong. No one denies your right to not use it - but you
>could have omitted all of them, to level the field. What standards
>woul that have compromised, Jim?.

The Amateur Formerly Known As Reverend Jim sets the
standards. He does not make mistakes.

>
>>
>>Not gonna happen.
>
>>
>>> However, no one is trying to say that you must
>>> use Kim's callsign in your posts - the issue is with your intentional
>>> exclusion of only her callsign from your list!
>>
>>Which is the same as saying I *must* use it!
>
>Nope - just omitting call one out of a group was wrong. Disrespectful,
>in fact - or at least perceived that way. You could have left all of
>the calls out - then it wouldn't be a problem, would it?

Cannot be!

>>>
>>> As you are aware.
>>> >
>>> >You can use it in your posts all you want. So can Kim. I won't try to
>>> >impose my standards on others, even though they try to impose their
>>> >standards on me.

>>>
>>> No one is attempting to impose standards upon you, Jim.
>>
>>Yes, they are.
>
>Nope - not at all.
>
>>
>>> The message
>>> was (quite clearly) that it is inappropriate and disrespectful to omit
>>> just this one callsign from the pool, while leaving all others intact.
>>> As you well know. And as clearly stated in previous posts.
>>>
>>> As you are aware.
>>>
>>"inappropriate and disrespectful" by whose standards?
>>
>>Answer: YOURS!
>
>Not just mine - as you are aware.
>
>> >
>>> >[Kim a licensed radio amateur]
>>> >
>>> >> told you straight up that she felt disrespected by your actions.
>>> >
>>> >I have felt disrespected by her action in choosing that callsign.
>>> >I told her that straight up a long time ago.
>>>
>>> Not sure I understand why you would feel personally disrespected by
>>> Kim's choice of callsign, Jim - I don't imagine that she did it to
>>> offend you personally.
>>
>>She didn't. But that was my perception. And to paraphrase Kim: 'that's the
>>perception that counts'
>>>
>>> You are of course free to express your opinion regarding this issue,
>>> however - but to do so in public isn't always a wise choice. Would
>>> you walk up to someone in a crowded mall and tell her exactly what you
>>> thought about their skitr being too short?
>>
>>Depends on who it was.
>
>Sidestepping the issue.

Not Him! :-)

>But, no matter who she was, would you say it in front of a crowd of
>people? Or discreetly?
>
>>

>>> Of course not - that would
>>> be impolite. And not too smart, perhaps - she might smack you! :)
>>
>>What if it was my teenage daughter? (Not saying I do or do not have one).
>
>Different scenario entirely. Parental control gives you the right to
>do so.
>
>But, would you say it in front of a crowd of people? Or discreetly?
>
>>>
>>> Some opinions are best kept to one's self :)
>>
>>And some are best expressed rather than repressed.
>
>Not in a public forum, Jim.
>
>>
>>> >> A simple apology to her would have been appropriate.
>>> >
>>> >I apologize if my posts have upset anyone. That was not the intent.
>>> >But I will not compromise my standards on this to avoid hurting
>>> >someone's feelings.
>>> >
>>> >> The right thing to do.
>>> >
>>> >In your opinion. Mine's different.
>>>
>>> Compromising standards isn't the issue, Jim. As you are aware.
>>
>>No, it's *exactly* the issue. To use Kim's call here would compromise my
>>standards.
>
>Nope - it is not the issue. The point was not that you refused to use
>it - simply that you singled her out in a list of other calls.
>Intentionally and repeatedly.

Under vows of ham priesthood He may not make use of [expletive
deleted] words.

No matter. He IS U.S. ham radio.

>>>
>>> If you had changed your poll to list everyone by their first name,
>>> would that have compromised your standards? Of course not. It would
>>> have created a Level Playing Field, and caused little fuss at all.
>>
>>It would have caused confusion because there are several people with
>>the same first name here.
>>>
>>> It would have removed the opportunity for you to try and punish Kim

>>> for her poor choice of callsign, though - say, you weren't trying to
>>> do that, were you?
>>
>>Nope.
>>
>
>Really? Didn't look that way. Say, didn't you agree with Kim that
>"perception is everything"?
>
>>> Of course not - your standards are too high for
>>> that......aren't they?
>>>
>>Yep.
>
>Of course! :)
>
>>
>>> >> Jim, you have been a frequent victim of attack and insult here
>>> >> yourself - frankly, you should know better.
>>> >
>>> >Where is the insult in not using a word or phrase I think is
>>> >inappropriate?
>>>
>>> As stated above, and in previous posts - it is a situational thing.
>>> For example, yelling "Hey, Dick!" to a friend sitting over at a bar is
>>> quite appropriate. Yelling "Hey, Dick!" to some biker sitting at the
>>> bar is not.
>>
>>What if that's the biker's name?
>
>Sidestepping the issue. And potentially suicidal :)
>
>>
>>> Same phrase - totally different intent. Context is
>>> everything!
>
>>>
>>> As you are aware.
>>
>>Yet yelling both phrases is *legal* - although not always
>>advisable or appropriate.
>
>Sidestepping the issue.
>
>>
>>And in the context of amateur radio callsigns, I think Kim's choice
>>of callsign is inadvisable and inappropriate.
>>
>>Your own logic proves it.
>

>Sidestepping the issue.
>
>>>
>>> >> Insulting a fellow amateur publically, then denying and justifying the
>>> >> act with a litany of self-serving rhetoric.
>>> >
>>> >I don't see it that way at all.
>>> >
>>> >> Do you believe that these
>>> >> actions, your actions, are in the best interest of the Amateur
>>> >> service?
>>> >
>>> >Yes. You may disagree, but I will not describe that disagreement
>>> >as "prejudice", "censorship" or "self-serving rhetoric".
>>>
>>> What part of this statement are you having trouble with, Jim?
>>
>>The words ""prejudice", "censorship" and "self-serving rhetoric", for a
>start.
>>They are inaccurate
>>>
>>> Definitions (and specific usage within the thread):
>>>
>>> Prejudice: "an opinion formed beforehand" (your opinion that the
>>> callsign
>>
>>[inappropriate callsign deleted]
>>
>>> is inappropriate to the ARS)
>>
>>It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered the
>>callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues.
>>
>>Therefore, it's not prejudice.
>
>I see. So it's not just the callsign that you find inappropriate, but
>the owner and other issues?
>
>Please elaborate!
>
>>>
>>> Censorship: "the supression of something considered objectionable"
>>> (like the intentional omission of just one callsign in a list,
>>> perhaps?)
>>
>>I use the word "inappropriate", not "objectionable". And I did not
>>"suppress" it - I just won't put it in a post of mine.
>
>Do you not also find it objectionable? Or are you playing semantics
>again? :)

>
>>
>>Therefore, it's not censorship.
>
>Disagree - see above!
>
>>>
>>> Rhetoric: skill with language - (ahem)
>>>
>>The phrase was "self-serving rhetoric", not just the word "rhetoric".
>>
>>AHEM.
>
>You mean it isn't? :) Seems to be!
>>
>>> >> I suspect that few here join you in that belief.
>>> >
>>> >Doesn't matter.
>>>
>>> It certainly should!
>>
>>So you're saying the majority opinion should rule? What if
>>the majority says it's inappropriate?
>
>Do they?
>
>>>
>>> >Your quote below is quite appropriate. At times, Dr. King
>>> >held standards and beliefs that were not popular. His adherence to those
>>> >standards and beliefs was considered "insulting" by some. Should he have
>>> >listened to them, or followed his conscience?
>>>
>>> Dr. King was a champion of equality and equal rights - a mission which
>>> cost him his life. He was dedicated to ensuring that people were
>>> treated equally, regardless of the "personal standards" of those who
>>> felt that they were not entitled to equal treatment.
>>
>>Equal rights under law. Equal opportunities. Not equal results. Not
>>an abandonment of standards.
>
>Actually, the upholding of standards...but this isn't about standards,
>Jim. It's about singling someone out intentionally. And
>disrespectfully.
>
>>>
>>> Do you treat everyone equally, Jim?
>>
>>I treat them appropriately. What is appropriate for an adult is not
>>appropriate for a child. To treat them equally could be very unsafe.
>

>Avoiding the question.
>
>>
>>> Even when you have a strong bias
>>> against some characteristic of theirs that you find objectionable? No
>>> matter what?
>>
>>The only bias I have is in my Southgate Type 7.
>
>>>
>>> I'd refrain from drawing parallels to Dr. King until you can state
>>> that unequivocally. Without prejudice.
>>
>>I state without prejudice that I don't have the bias you accuse me of.
>>I have standards that I adhere to.
>
>Your actions speak differently.
>
>>> >>
>>> >> "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of
>>> >> comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and
>>> >> controversy."
>>> >
>>> >Rev. Dr.
>>> >
>>> >> Martin Luther King, Jr.
>>> >
>>> >And at this 'time of challenge and controversy', I say that Kim's
>>> >callsign is inappropriate to the ARS, and I will not repeat it
>>> >in my posts. No insult is meant by this action. But it will not
>>> >change.
>>>
>>> Once again, no one is forcing you to use the dreaded callsign in your
>>> posts. Again, Jim, the issue is singling out one individual because
>>> there is something that you don't like personally! As you well know.
>>>
>>> One's principles and beliefs, however righteous and sacrosanct, do not
>>> convey the right to treat others disrespectfully.
>>
>>Some people said that when people organized marches and protests against
>>things that violated *their standards*, they were acting disrespectfully.
>
>True enough. Not directly related to this one single solitary isssue
>that we're discussing here, though, is it? Nope.
>
>>>
>>> To return to the quotation from Dr. King - in this time of challenge
>>> and controversy, someone might choose to admit that they was wrong in
>>> singling out one individual due to personal opinion, and revise his
>>> list to indicate equal respect for the status of all participants.

>>> Someone else might choose to twist the words and concepts around ad
>>> infinitum to justify their actions. Still another would take the moral
>>> high ground, and justify their actions based on rigorous personal
>>> standards and ideals.
>>>
>>> Which of these represents the Right Thing To Do? I know.
>>
>>And by saying you know, you are doing exactly what you describe.
>
>A puzzling response, Jim - I'm an Option 1 kind of guy myself.
>
>How about you? A bit 2, a little 3 maybe....
>
>>>
>>> So do you, Jim.
>>>
>>> >I don't use the term "friend" to describe Kim, because she reserves
>>> >that word for a very select group, and I respect that choice of hers.
>>> >
>>> >But I will say that one of the characteristics of a true friend is
>>> >telling the truth as the true friend sees it, even if it is not
>>> >what someone wants to hear, and even if a person may get their
>>> >feelings hurt or feel insulted by that truth.
>>>
>>> An excellent homily, Jim - but with a fatal flaw. True friends would
>>> conduct this level of personal information interchange only in
>>> private, and with compassion, sensitivity and dignity. A true friend
>>> would not choose to do that in a public forum, would they, Jim?
>>
>>Some would. I did. So did Kim, and so have you. And while I respect
>>Kim's use of the word "friend", I would say that the honesty and openness
>>here - even in disagreement - are the actions of "true friends".
>
>One last sidestep for the road, Jim? Honesty and openness isn't what
>your actions were about, now were they? :)
>
>Be honest. And do try to stick to the facts!

Must be an Arthur Murray dropout with all the side steps being
practiced.

He IS U.S. ham radio. One may not disagree with Him.

U.S. Amateur Extras do not make mistakes. They have Special
Dispensation for whatever they do.

LHA / WMD

1036. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232358.12631.00004293@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85745

In article <fYHMb.26243$P%1.23844114@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:rtDMb.5973$1e.5669@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>>
>> <
>> < Just do it till you need glasses, Hans.
>> <
>>
>> I'm already wearing tri-focals.
>>
>> dit dit, de Hans, K0HB
>
>I find the progressive lenses much more comfortable and useful myself.

In an effort to be convivial, double-D sounds off like she has a pair!

LHA / WMD

1037. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:23:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040116232358.12631.00004294@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85746

In article <gsDMb.5971$1e.4693@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
><
>< So let me get this straight. Newsgroup rules are cool to be broken?
><
>
>Far as I know, there are no Newsgroup rules, only habits and widely accepted
>conventions. Any one who takes exception to exceptions, is certain to
>accumulate an exceptional quantity of exceptions. If you are starting a
>collection, I have included three above.

That is SO exceptional! :-)

LHA / WMD

1038. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 04:25:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040116232551.08626.00002690@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 85814

In article <100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
<scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:

>
>Hi folks.
>
>Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur
>radio, and also ask a few questions.
>
>I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect score.
>(I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the
>exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I have
>not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a
>moment.

Scott:

Good work, keep it up.

>I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last
>night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though
>it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am
>helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.
>
>But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
>absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door.

That is not entirely unusual, and nothing to be worried about for now.

>I had been led to
>believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
>this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
>equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of
>amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the
>meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham
>"veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.

You have just described virtually every meeting of every amateur radio club
ever organized on this planet. Again, nothing unusual.

>So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
>seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
>correct me.
>
>1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.

Definitely not, but it does serve a useful purpose. After you've been a ham
for a number of years, gained some knowledge and experience, and seen
for yourself what is possible, you will realize that.

>Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
>that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
>telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances.

Not necessarily true in all cases. There have been virtually thousands of
documented cases in which, during severe emergency conditions, amateur
radio operators have been the only practical communications link to "the
outside world" available to a community experiencing a situation which
caused a widespread breakdown of primary communications resources.

>Ham Radio is a hobby, and
>like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to
>exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.

Again, not necessarily true. If amateur radio were to cease to exist tomorrow,
then, on the next day, it would have to be re-invented in order to regain the
practical backup communications capability it provides.

>2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of
>knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio o
>peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever.
>But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle, the
>satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end
>result itself.

I vehemently agree.

>3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
>issued has been declining for years.

Actually, the total number of licensed amateurs in the U.S. is growing, but at
a pitifully slow rate of approximately 0.003 percent.

>This would tell me that the best way to
>save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging
>white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
>future, and make it fun.

While I don't disagree that we need to be open to more new hams, the simple
fact of life is that the old communications technologies we "cling to with
white-
knuckles," i.e. the Morse code, RTTY, packet radio, and even Single Sideband
voice, all serve a very practical and useful purpose in carrying out our
primary
mission which is to be capable *backup* communicators under conditions where
primary communications systems become unavailable for whatever reasons.
Everything we've ever known about radio technology is always going to be
applicable to practical and effective communications, and we need to retain the
basics in order to understand and create the advances.

>Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.

"Ranting" is what this newsgroup is all about. Carry on.

>1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to
>the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
>the first time buyer)?

Yes. That club you joined, but didn't learn anything from on your first meeting.
Go back to the next meeting, and the next, and slowly get to know the people there and let them get to know you. Eventually you will find someone there who can help to steer you in the direction you want to go. However, keep in mind, that radio amateurs are essentially "self training," which means that it is primarily
up to you to dig in to the available books, magazines, web sites, and other information resources. That's what I did, that's what virtually every successful
radio amateur did. Nobody can beat you over the head with a "knowledge stick" and thus fill your head with things you didn't know a minute before. It will take an investment of time and money on your part to acquire knowledge and the equipment you need to create an effective and efficient amateur radio station. That should be your goal.

>2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy
>more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
>whistles".

Try eBay for starters. Also, check out the ARRL web site (www.arrl.org) for hamfests in your area.

>3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared
>to the novice.

I'd suggest that you invest in the ARRL Antenna Book. It has something for virtually every possible application.

Bottom line: Nobody can help you become an amateur radio operator better than you can your own good self. You need to open books and read them, then open some more books and read some more. I'd suggest some simple electronics projects you can build yourself, in order to get some basic experience with electrical theory and electronics principles. I'd also suggest that you give top priority to investing in a good HF transceiver with general-coverage receive capability. The Yaesu FT840 is around $600 brand new, and could be your main HF rig for years to come.

One more thing: Resolve to learn the Morse code and to use it on the air. Decide from the start that you are going to be a proficient CW operator, and don't give in to any of the frustrations normally associated with learning to use this uniquely practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications mode. We have all experienced them, and people from all walks of life have overcome them and become proficient CW operators. It's not that big a deal, and the only problems you'll have achieving success are those you make for yourself.

>Thanks folks.

Your welcome. You will find more good advice from other regulars in this newsgroup. Start reading; the learning process starts now.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1039. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 05:01:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4008C1A1.3E3EC6C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85815

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <40049168.4079036E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Actually, aside from a couple of Karjalainen brews in Helsinki in
> >October, my yearly beer intake is about four bottles. I mostly stick to
> >vodka or with Jack Daniels and branch water.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Dave:
>
> OK, I give up -- what the Sam Hill is "branch water?" I heard it mentioned
> a few times on the old TV program "Dallas," when J.R. Ewing used to order
> a "bourbon and branch" at the Ahwl (Oil) Baron's Club. Is it water that
> dripped off a tree branch during the rain, or did it come from a branch
> tributary of some particular river, or what? Or is it just another way of
> saying "Club Soda," as I suspect?

Oh Lord no, Larry--nothing fizzy at all. A branch is a swift-running
little stream. There's a town downstate named Jumping Branch. It is
named for a nearby stream.

Dave K8MN

1040. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 12:05:11 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bub8dj$g18@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85816

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:IoQNb.9669$q4.5340@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> A friend, a very long time ham with a "W" call, suggested my callsign.
He
> liked the "W5" part (same as a call he had years ago, I think) and thought
> the "net" part was cute because of my long computer experience (I was
> helping him with his computer at the time).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I never even realized your call was a vanity call, Dwight. And, neat that
you came up with something creative!

Kim W5TIT

1041. May we never ever forget.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 14:55:14 UTC
From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20040117095514.28443.00000152@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85817

http://members.cox.net/classicweb/email.htm

1042. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 15:33:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <xBcOb.11234$q4.9656@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85818

"Scott" <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> wrote in message
news:100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com...
> Hi folks.
>
> Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur
> radio, and also ask a few questions.
>
> I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect
score.
> (I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the
> exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I
have
> not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a
> moment.

Sounds like you're off to a great start.

> I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last
> night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though
> it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am
> helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.

Makes good sense.

> But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
> absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led
to
> believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
> this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
> equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications
of
> amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of
the
> meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8
ham
> "veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.

Sad, truly sad. In the antique car club I belong to we always introduce
new members at the meeting, we also go around the room at least once
so anyone can ask a question, offer a bit of advice, etc. That fosters
even more 1 on 1 conversations after the meeting ends.

> So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
> seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
> correct me.
>

> 1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby,
and
> like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to
> exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.

Wrong. Amateur radio can and has been the ONLY emergency
communications available in many emergencies. Think for a minute
about the scenario of an emergency. No electricity, no internet,
no fax and in many cases no landline if you don't have a plain vanilla
phone that is powered by the teephone line...and even if the
phone is line powered, many times even basic phone service is
out.

> 2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of
> knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio
o
> peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever.
> But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle,
the
> satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end
> result itself.

Different strokes for different folks. Some like the steps, some
the end result. There is no "norm" in my obinion.

> 3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
> issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way
to
> save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging
> white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
> future, and make it fun.

Not declining at all...but not growing significantly either.

> Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.
>
> 1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new
to
> the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
> the first time buyer)?

You need to tell us more about what type of on-the-air
you want to do.

> 2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather
buy
> more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
> whistles".

There's always EBAY plus the amateur magazines like QST and CQ.

> 3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is
geared
> to the novice.

Check out the ARRL web site for the books and
publications they have available.

Cheers and welcome.
Bill K2UNK

1043. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:00:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40095C3A.9B43E5D1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85819

Leo wrote:
>
> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >
> >> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
> >> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
> >> of the main issue under discussion.
> >
> >...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
> >taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
> >something which we find in poor taste.
>
> Not at all - you have missed the point entirely. My condolences.

Yes, that looks like your mode: instant expert; proposals that we accept
what we find in bad taste. Your condolences aren't needed.

> >
> >> I expected better from the man who
> >> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
> >
> >Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.
>
> You think? :)

Yes, I do. You must not think so as you "expected better" than for him
to do so.

> >> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
> >> a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
> >> her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
> >> responses so far.
> >
> >What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
> >courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
> >take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
> >calls.
>
> And two wrongs somehow make a right? Of course she singled herself
> out with that call. So what? Does that make her a "bad person",
> somehow unfit for common courtesy, Dave?
>

> >Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
> >*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>
> Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
> it's a fact of life. :)

Wink and *chuckle* on your part noted.

> >
> >> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
> >> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
> >> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
> >
> >> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
> >> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
> >> the artificial." - Mark Twain
> >
> >So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
> >you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
> >defend bad taste.
>
> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
> others. Plain and simple.

So the Mark Twain quote isn't an accurate assessment of humankind?

Dave K8MN

1044. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:07:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40095DBB.C94EB9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85820

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:Qv8Nb.6928$q4.1662@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > >
> > > Sadly, some people attempt to forge
> > > a tie between the terms "polite" and
> > > "political correctness". There is no
> > > link between them. Jim didn't treat
> > > Kim's callsign badly; he didn't use it
> > > at all. After all, it could be easily
> > > argued that Kim didn't treat amateur
> > > radio with respect in choosing her
> > > call. A number of us believe that her
> > > choice was tacky and tactless. (snip)
> > >
> > So, because Kim did something, it gave Jim the right to do something?
> > Isn't that a two wrongs don't make a right situation, Dave?
> >
>
> ROFLMAO!! Know what it sounds like to me? Sounds like Dave has an agenda.

No kidding? Do you think that putting to rest any comparitive tie
between your action and Jim's could be on my agenda. Be sure to mark
down "pointing out Kim's lack of good judgement in choosing her
callsign" as an item on my agenda.

> The dialogue on this thread that has just been winding down the past couple
> of days has less to do with my callsign than it did with overall practices
> in newsgroups.

Your callsign is linked to the matter to which you've objected: that
someone refuses to type your callsign in a newsgroup post. Your
followup was to alter one of his posts to make it appear that he'd used
your callsign.

> Yet, Dave persists in defending the topic from the angle of it having had
> more to do with my callsign!

Defending the topic? I'm not defending a topic, Kim.

> He's managing to achieve nothing but tripping
> over his own self.

Your inability to comprehend doesn't equate to my tripping over anything.

Dave K8MN

1045. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:18:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zfdOb.1545$Fp1.856119@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85835

Leo wrote:

> He seemed interested enough in learning the basics - and I'm pretty
> sure that he is very new to Amateur Radio, as he didn't ask a single
> question about Kim's callsign :)
>
> sorry bout that....

And that is unforgivable here in rec.radio.amateur.kim.callsign!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1046. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:19:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40096083.8796BBBB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85821

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:4005B697.A2591512@earthlink.net...
> > >
> >
> > Actually, you still don't understand what you did. Jim did not change
> > what you wrote. His actions/comments were clearly his. You changed an
> > attribution. Jim did not.
> >
>
> And, you're still pontificating, Dave.

Oh no, Kim. See some of Len Anderson's wordy posts for examples of
pontification.

> How many times have I clearly
> stated: I know what I did, I know what I did trumped what Jim did (i.e., had
> greater impact on everyone), and I'll state now I don't think I'd change a
> thing about doing it--three ways--again!

If you knew what you'd done, you'd not have attempted to equate your
changing of an attribution with Jim's omission of your callsign.
The rest of your talk about trumping, impact and unwillingness to change
anything you've done is simply confirmation of your thumbing your nose
at the world.

> To me, attributes, or deleting things such as signatures and things from
> tracking mechanisms, are equal. Got it?

I have it. You are simply wrong in trying to equate the two.

> No difference in either action to
> be determined as "wrong." Each is an insult, each is astray from standard
> conventions of newsgroup submissions, and each have the same potential to
> mislead, or at least misdirect, the readers of that post.

...then you simply don't understand "standard conventions" in newsgroup
posting. Nothing in what Jim did misleads anyone.

> > > >
> > > > IS NOT Jim showing the same disrespect for Kim in this case as he
> shows
> > > > for Kim in his posts where he does not type her callsign?
> > > >
>
> I don't think the justification for the action needs to be included in the

> dialogue. As I stated in another post, regardless of reason, *both* are
> wrong. I refuse to continue to get wrapped up in this being about my
> callsign--it is not.

Yes, your callsign is right square in the middle of all of this.

> > > >
> > > > Therefore IT FOLLOWS that Jim MUST *always* make *full* attributes to
> > > > Kim exactly as she typed her post, with no deletions to content that
> he
> > > > finds objectionable.
> > > >
> > > > Any less would be disrepectful.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Good luck with this one.
> >
> > > Luck has nothing to do with it. Jim sees it quite differently, and I
> see it
> > > that he does just as he's accused me of doing.
> >
> > No, he hasn't. I presented you with two illustrative example of what
> > you did. Jim did not do the same as you did at all.
> >
>
> You fall way short, Dave, of being able to *present* anything.

Why not admit that you fall short of being able to read and understand?

> > >
> > > But, to me, I got my point
> > > across and the posts get too long to continue the discussion ;)
> >
> > It's hard for you to get your "point" across when you still don't
> > understand what you did.

> Do you practice being an

[word deleted]

> , Dave? You must...because you're nearly perfect at it.

What experience qualifies you to assess such perfection, Kim?

Dave K8MN

1047. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:25:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400961FA.3D4E5A1C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85822

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:4005BE0A.A625B48C@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:40042153.14C35E30@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Ahem...at least he hasn't said he's going to "pray for you" yet. I
> love
> > > it
> > > > > when someone says that to me with that certain "tone of voice" LOL
> > > >
> > > > I'll bet you get that a lot. However, why should I do all of the work
> > > > for you?
> > > > Are you too busy to pray for yourself?
> > >
> > > Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?
> >
> > Sure it has, Kim. Why should I pray for you if you're not even going to
> > tackle it yourself? After all, If I prayed for you and told you so,
> > you'd simply think I was someone with that "certain tone of voice".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Praying is of little significance to me, in communing with God, Dave. But,
> you're so shallow, I'm quite sure you are completely incapable of
> understanding anything like that.

I might be, Kim. Why not attempt to explain it to me? How do you
commune with God without praying?

> Oh, and please, don't pray for me. Most people who say things like that are
> saying it to be vindictive---OH, that's right!!! You are being vindictive!

I didn't say I'd pray for you, Kim. I asked why I should do it if you
aren't willing to take on the task yourself?

Care to explain how I am being vindictive? I don't see you as
vindicable.

Dave K8MN

1048. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:39:29 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <3eoi009lcscsia4mastqcb2hipghtdrqjk@4ax.com>
Source record: 85823

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:00:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >
>> >> Jim, your debating style seems to be based almost entirely upon
>> >> diversion, circular logic, word games, smokescreening and sidestepping
>> >> of the main issue under discussion.
>> >
>> >...and yours seems to be to set yourself up as an expert in debate while
>> >taking the view that we're somehow obligated to be even handed toward
>> >something which we find in poor taste.
>>
>> Not at all - you have missed the point entirely. My condolences.
>
>Yes, that looks like your mode: instant expert; proposals that we accept
>what we find in bad taste. Your condolences aren't needed.

Not at all, Dave. Not an expert at all - just someone who believes in
treating people fairly, and isn't easily offended by mere words.

Keep the condolences, though.

>
>> >
>> >> I expected better from the man who
>> >> often speaks of principles and high standards of conduct in his posts.
>> >
>> >Jim is quite obviously acting on his principles in this matter.
>>
>> You think? :)
>
>Yes, I do. You must not think so as you "expected better" than for him
>to do so.

You think? :)
>
>> >> The issue, as you are quite well aware, is your singling out of Kim in
>> >> a list. And not creating a level playing field out of courtesy to
>> >> her. Period. An issue which has been carefully avoided in all of your
>> >> responses so far.

>> >
>> >What game are we playing which requires a level field? Kim wasn't being
>> >courteous to others in her choice of callsign. Perhaps you'll want to
>> >take her to task over it. She singled herself out in her choice of
>> >calls.
>>
>> And two wrongs somehow make a right? Of course she singled herself
>> out with that call. So what? Does that make her a "bad person",
>> somehow unfit for common courtesy, Dave?
>>
>> >Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
>> >*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>>
>> Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
>> it's a fact of life. :)
>
>*Wink* and *chuckle* on your part noted.

That was a smile, Dave - what wink and chuckle? Kim replied with some valuable insight on this comment - please read what she wrote in her previous post, and do your best to empathize with her reply.

>
>> >
>> >> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
>> >> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>> >> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>> >
>> >> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>> >> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>> >> the artificial." - Mark Twain
>> >
>> >So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
>> >you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
>> >defend bad taste.
>>
>> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
>> others. Plain and simple.
>
>So the Mark Twain quote isn't an accurate assessment of humankind?

It is, unfortunately. Did you read my reply, though? - I'll post it again so you can have another run at it:

>> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
>> others. Plain and simple.

Do you disagree with this concept, Dave?

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1049. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:45:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40096697.F28A0043@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85824

Leo wrote:
>
> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> >> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> >> >> too!
> >> >
> >> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
> >>
> >> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
> >> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
> >
> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
> >stop annoying me.
>
> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.

I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
air.

> Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
> you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?

You certainly wrote "annoy the holder of a call". If Kim has the
potential to be annoyed by someone's choice not to use her call, I can
certainly be annoyed by her use of it.

> >> Wouldn't it?
> >> You bet.
> >
> >I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh

> >in.
>
> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
> to do so.

The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
you're making a statement.

> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
> >
> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
>
> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.

Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.

> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
> you wish to debate this point.

Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo".

> >
> >> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> >> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> >> >required to respond.
> >>
> >> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
> >> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
> >
> >I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
> >Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?
>
> So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
> taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.

> >> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
> >> huh? Wow.
> >
> >I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.
>
> And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
> of this discussion.

Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.

> >> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
> >> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and

> >> >> I have something in common - so would I!
> >> >
> >> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
> >> >callsign.
> >>
> >> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
> >> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
> >> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
> >> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
> >
> >You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
> >do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not
> >going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
> >by someone cause me a lack of sleep.
>
> Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
> - said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)

My identity isn't hidden, "Leo". I don't know that your name is Leo. I don't know your call. I don't even know that you're a radio amateur or that you're in Canada. As far as Kim being honked at Jim's refusal to use her call in a newsgroup post, you're simply wrong.

> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> >> pleasure of others."
> >
> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
> >in Usenet.
>
> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
> not on the air? Interesting concept.....

Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the "Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That is my perogative.

> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?

You may operate or not operate. You may respond to a call by a station or not. If three stations call after a CQ, you may legally and morally discriminate by answering one over the others. You may choose to not answer all of them. That looks like a fairly flexible standard to me.

Dave K8MN

1050. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:47:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <GGdOb.31495$P%1.25079556@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85825

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:pd9h005fafcc1865drb90h9fst9o20iein@4ax.com...
> On 17 Jan 2004 00:57:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
> >callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.
> >
> >Don't the feelings of everyone else count?
>
> Of course they do - but are you sure that these people world be that
> upset by this? (except Dave, of course - he appears, from his recent
> correspondence, to be annoyed that Kim is still breathing... :))
>

Just for the record, my opinion is that it is Jim's list and he has the
right to set it up anyway he wishes, whether that is names, callsigns, or a
mix. His list, his choice.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1051. Re: Don't work the legal ones, work the bootleggers!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:53:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40096877.227C7723@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85826

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4005B6FE.FE1120D4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<400429DE.50A5C6CA@earthlink.net>...

> > > > Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> > > > the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> > > > required to respond.
> > >
> > > I'm sure you'd rather just respond to French out-of-banders on 6M.
> >
> > How could you be sure of that, Brian?
>
> I can be sure of that because of three of your postings.
>
> 1. You posted saying that you worked French amateurs where they have
> no 6M authorizations.

Not exactly correct, is it, Brian? I wrote that French amateurs had
called me and that I'd worked them below 50.200.

> 2. You later stated that you would continue to do so because you have
> no responsibility for where bootleg French hams want to operate.

I have no responsibility to ensure that any station I work is entitled
to use the piece of spectrum he occupies. The responsibility for being
where he's supposed to be lies entirely with the individual operating.
How is it that you find the concept difficult?

> And 3. You stated that you'd be happy to tune right by a legally
> licensed American amateur because your're not required to respond.

Having read and memorized Part 97, can you quote the portion requiring
us to call any station or to respond to a call from another station?

> That is how I can be sure.

You had only three things to add up. You still arrived at the wrong
answer.

> Did you have a point about Kim's
> > callsign?

> Yes. It is legal and valid, but you show a preference for out of band
> Frenchmen.

Kim's call is legal but in poor taste.

> Is there anything else?

There is much else. Keeping searching for knowledge.

Dave K8MN

1052. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:54:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400968C2.A2AD173F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85827

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40041FB4.9A4CABFD@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > I have given some thought to my choice of callsigns and feel that I may have made a
mistake. My choice reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual.
>
> Or, "I have given some thought to my choice of working Frenchmen out
> of band on 6M, and feel that I may have made a mistake. My choice
> reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual."

> Dave, do you recognize yourself in this alternative scenario?

You had a chance to use the technique I illustrated for Kim. You hosed
it up.

Dave K8MN

1053. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:57:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40096967.4ECAF021@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85828

Brian wrote:
>
> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<1tl800lng2lcnmie9onnqru6g8vmt429u8@4ax.com>...
> > On 13 Jan 2004 09:54:02 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> > >I am aware that you preceive it that way. Are you aware that no disrespect
> > >was intended?
> >
> > No.
>
> Unfortunately, the Gutenberg press doesn't lend itself to the full
> range of human vocal expression and we often infer emotion based upon
> prior typed exchanges with our victims.

Who do you know who is currently using a Gutenberg press, Brian?

Dave K8MN

1054. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 16:58:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400969C1.6726A1DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85829

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4005BE0A.A625B48C@earthlink.net>...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > > Did it ever occur to you that not everyone prays?
> >
> > Sure it has, Kim. Why should I pray for you if you're not even going to
> > tackle it yourself? After all, If I prayed for you and told you so,
> > you'd simply think I was someone with that "certain tone of voice".

> If you were to tell me that you prayed for me, I would thank you. But
> I would wonder if God listened to smug prayers.

I didn't offer, nor did I publish any of my prayers. You can wonder but
you can't know.

Dave K8MN

1055. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:05:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VXdOb.31497$P%1.25083425@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 85831

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bub8dj$g18@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:IoQNb.9669$q4.5340@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > A friend, a very long time ham with a "W" call, suggested my callsign.
> He
> > liked the "W5" part (same as a call he had years ago, I think) and
thought
> > the "net" part was cute because of my long computer experience (I was
> > helping him with his computer at the time).
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> I never even realized your call was a vanity call, Dwight. And, neat that
> you came up with something creative!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

There are sometimes easily spotted clues. For example, anyone who has received their first license after about 1994 in the contiguous 48 states and that first license was a Tech or General will have a 2x3 call unless they have a vanity call or upgraded to Advanced or Extra and got a new sequential one from those pools. The sequentially assigned 1x3s disappeared in most call areas by the end of 1994 though some areas may have had a few still available for a year or so after that.

For example, I recieved my call in 1993 and you can see that in call area 8 we were close to the end of the sequentially assigned 1x3s beginning with N. The sequentially assigned 1x3s beginning with K or W had been used up some years before that.

Or you could just look it up in the FCC database.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1056. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:06:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40096B7C.C5649E56@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85830

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > > Regardless, lets get to the basics of
> > > this issue. What is wrong with the
> > > word "tit?" My dictionary defines it as
> > > a noun meaning "either of two soft
> > > fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs
> > > on the chest of a woman." Seem rather
> > > innocuous to me. I assume Kim, like
> > > most women, has those "soft fleshy
> > > milk-secreting glandular organs." So
> > > why would so many be offended by her
> > > very mention of that fact? It's not like
> > > she's refering to the sexual organs
> > > or something.
> >
> >
> > Thanks for the detailed definition, Dwight.
> > The term is vulgar slang (snip)
>
> Vulgar is very much in the eyes of the beholder, dependant on how the word
> is used and who uses it.

How right you are. A number of beholders have deemed Kim's call vulgar.
I'm one of them.

> But I don't really see the word itself as vulgar,
> especially in an innocuous radio callsign.

That is apparent.

> Would you be so offended if it
> had been issued by the FCC at random? Would you be so offended if it had
> been selected by a man?

Yes to both.

> In the end, it appears to me that most are
> complaining simply because a woman selected a callsign which highlights a
> unique aspect of womanhood. Perhaps these guys are jealous that woman have
> those "soft fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs" and they don't. Tit
> envy?

You really think in that way? Do you think I'd approve if Kim had chosen a vulgar name for a male body part to use as the suffix of her call?

> > Maybe you're the kind of fellow who
> > would be proud to have his wife, mother
> > or daughter choose a similar call. I'm not.
>
> I wouldn't even attempt to tell my wife, mother, or adult daughter, which
> callsign to select for themselves. All of these women clearly have enough
> intelligence to select the callsign they want, whatever it might be.

Excellent dodge of the statement, Dwight. You might have a future in politics.

Dave K8MN

1057. Re: Newbie Question - 75 Watts and 2 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:22:33 UTC
From: Jack B <jb@preennewer.org>
Message-ID: <bubr0d$3hs$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

There's a guy up in Orlando, Fla. who has been running an
unlicensed station in the FM broadcast band for a while.
He claims 50 watts & a Comet vertical at 40 ft. I can
hear him on my car radio in most parts of Orland & vicinity.
I've heard him in Ocala & Sebring, which are about 60 miles
away, but that was probably temporary conditions.

Jack

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a7dee37b.0401170112.577a4bb5@posting.google.com...
> I'm assuming that the frequency chosen might have a slight effect on
> the range, but with 75 watts screaming from my mobile, what is the
> potential range with a clear line of sight? Can anyone approximate at
> all? There's repeaters galore here, but I am quite interested in
> simplex operations away from the great Dell of loomis.
>
> Any info greatly appreciated. You're a great group.
>
> 73
>
> DJM

1058. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:25:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401170925.4b117aee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85833

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4008C1A1.3E3EC6C2@earthlink.net>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <40049168.4079036E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Actually, aside from a couple of Karjalainen brews in Helsinki in
> > >October, my yearly beer intake is about four bottles. I mostly stick to
> > >vodka or with Jack Daniels and branch water.
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Dave:
> >
> > OK, I give up -- what the Sam Hill is "branch water?" I heard it mentioned
> > a few times on the old TV program "Dallas," when J.R. Ewing used to order
> > a "bourbon and branch" at the Ahwl (Oil) Baron's Club. Is it water that
> > dripped off a tree branch during the rain, or did it come from a branch
> > tributary of some particular river, or what? Or is it just another way of
> > saying "Club Soda," as I suspect?
>
> Oh Lord no, Larry--nothing fizzy at all. A branch is a swift-running
> little stream. There's a town downstate named Jumping Branch. It is
> named for a nearby stream.
>
> Dave K8MN

It's important to select the branch with the fewest cattle upstream.
Poultry and swine operations are bad news, too.

1059. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:27:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401170927.55aafb2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85834

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0401161515.535a8eb3@posting.google.com>...
>
> Noise level. Give it a 0.1.
>
> Hey Bubba, trolling is obviously not one of your skills, try some other "activity".
>
> You're welcome.

Isn't there a 10-10 contest you could go play in?

1060. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:41:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401170941.6d36fba1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85836

And beer. Reminds me of a Zappa tune.

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<rplf009hooc4rk3la3rl9698h8vjq748mu@4ax.com>...
> Nice one, Alun - tit for tat! :)
>
> 73, Leo
>
> (Seated in the same fan section as Alun - oh, yeah!)
>
> On 16 Jan 2004 05:23:15 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
> >Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:400691C5.8000501@psu.edu:
> >
> >> But what does all this have to do with Kim's callsign?
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Not much. There again, there does seem to be a correlation between pro-code
> >testing and anti-t*ts! Put me down as anti-code testing and pro-t*ts!!!

1061. Re: As The World Dumbs Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 17:44:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0401170944.6075bb4d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85837

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040115230117.29660.00002478@mb-m24.aol.com>...

> Kim:
>
> OIC. Well, then, why not uncork some of that "potential" and turn it into
> some sort of action? BTW -- in order to exceed my own capabilities as
> a ham radio operator, you'll have to be able to operate CW at 20 WPM --
> at least! Better get started...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You argument only works if one values that particular mode.

1062. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 18:28:47 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2pti00lpevmvihps41np2h8ia5devq9oi3@4ax.com>
Source record: 85838

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >>
>> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >Leo wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
>> >> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>> >> >> too!
>> >> >
>> >> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>> >>
>> >> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
>> >> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
>> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
>> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
>> >
>> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
>> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
>> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
>> >stop annoying me.
>>
>> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
>
>I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
>air.

Hoo boy.

>
>> Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
>> you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?
>
>You certainly wrote "annoy the holder of a call". If Kim has the
>potential to be annoyed by someone's choice not to use her call, I can

>certainly be annoyed by her use of it.
>
>> >> Wouldn't it?
>> >> You bet.
>> >
>> >I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh
>> >in.
>>
>> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
>> to do so.
>
>The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
>If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
>you're making a statement.

I see. Huh?

I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
Jim....that question was for him.

>
>> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
>> >
>> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
>>
>> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
>> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
>> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
>
>Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
>call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.

I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.

I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!

>
>> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
>> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
>> you wish to debate this point.
>
>Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"

No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
I :)
>
>> >
>> >> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
>> >> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
>> >> >required to respond.
>> >>

>> >> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
>> >> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
>> >
>> >I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
>> >Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?
>>
>> So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
>> taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.
>
>> >> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
>> >> huh? Wow.
>> >
>> >I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.
>>
>> And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
>> of this discussion.
>
>Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
>to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.

Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
quite what I said!

>
>> >> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
>> >> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
>> >> >> I have something in common - so would I!
>> >> >
>> >> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
>> >> >callsign.
>> >>
>> >> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
>> >> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
>> >> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
>> >> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
>> >
>> >You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
>> >do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not
>> >going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
>> >by someone cause me a lack of sleep.
>>
>> Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
>> - said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)
>
>My identity isn't hidden, "Leo". I don't know that your name is Leo. I
>don't know your call. I don't even know that you're a radio amateur or
>that you're in Canada.

Speaking of personal prerogatives - that one is mine. I don't need
you analyzing my call to see if it meets your standards of decency,
"Dave"....

Sorry to add to the list of things that you don't know.

> As far as Kim being honked at Jim's refusal to
>use her call in a newsgroup post, you're simply wrong.

You think? :)

Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.

>
>> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>> >> pleasure of others."
>> >
>> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
>> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
>> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
>> >in Usenet.
>>
>> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>
>Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
>"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
>something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
>air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
>because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
>is my perogative.

To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and
all of that goes out the window. LOL!

To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
- in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......

But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
choose not to. Duh.

>
>> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>
>You may operate or not operate. You may respond to a call by a station
>or not. If three stations call after a CQ, you may legally and morally
>discriminate by answering one over the others. You may choose to not
>answer all of them. That looks like a fairly flexible standard to me.

That ain't the standard that I referred to, Dave. Here it is again,
in case you missed it the first time:

>> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?

Flexible as in yours to choose to adhere to at your own
convenience.....

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1063. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 18:29:58 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <invi00pd7fmjhcpsl3cj7ch6eqtlgcu0pj@4ax.com>
Source record: 85839

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:18:39 GMT, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> He seemed interested enough in learning the basics - and I'm pretty
>> sure that he is very new to Amateur Radio, as he didn't ask a single
>> question about Kim's callsign :)
>>
>> sorry bout that....
>
>And that is unforgivable here in rec.radio.amateur.kim.callsign!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Awww - give the kid a break this time - he's new! :)

73, Leo

1064. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 18:34:13 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <htvi00tsd71un98f9eld1bsbv600eldsj2@4ax.com>
Source record: 85840

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:19:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>snip

>> Do you practice being an
>
>[word deleted]
>
>> , Dave? You must...because you're nearly perfect at it.
>
>What experience qualifies you to assess such perfection, Kim?

Um, one doesn't have to be a professional hockey player to appreciate
the talent of a Wayne Gretzky, do they?

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1065. Re: Some Stats On RM-10811?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 19:36:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40098EA6.6000308@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85841

Bert Craig wrote:

>Hope this is accurate.
>
>http://www.karc.net/Statistics/RM-10811/RM-10811.htm
>
>73 de Bert
>WA2SI
>
>
The FCC doesn't always go with what a popularity contest yields.
One "good" argument can trump many "me too's".

The FCC may just decide to do nothing, leaving things as they are.
In which case, just learn the damm code. I did it years ago, and
I'm not that good at those sorts of things. Might as well study for
and take the general written, so there's no keeping the CSCE around
proving you did 5wpm forever issues. I upgraded to extra partly to
"lock in" my old style tech plus (5wpm and general written) credit.
And HF is fun.

1066. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 19:42:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4009900B.70002@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 85842

>
>
>
>He seemed interested enough in learning the basics - and I'm pretty
>sure that he is very new to Amateur Radio, as he didn't ask a single
>question about Kim's callsign :)
>
>
>
He mentioned birdwatching in the orginial post, so he likely figured that
Kim was abird watcher. A tit is a kind of small bird, if you thought
of something else, well.... ;-)

1067. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 20:02:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401171202.5de3f41e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85843

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040114214858.11022.00003505@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40042872.BB08EFC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3FFC991C.B16CF583@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > I also like my real analog meter better than a digital
> >> >> > simulation.
> >> >> >
> >> >> My Southgate Type 7 has *two* real analog meters. Nice
> >> >> easy-to-read round 3-1/2 inch ones.
> >> >>
> >> >> Also Made In USA.
> >> >
> >> >Do you refer to it as your (get ready for it) two meter rig?
> >> >
> >> Nope. That's a Heath HW-2036. Only has one meter - analog.
> >
> >I'm getting confoozed! Your two meter rig is a one meter rig?
>
> Affirmative.
> >
> >I remember the '2036 and used to own one. I spent a lot of time
> >fiddling with those VCO coils in the thing. It belongs to a Lebanese
> >ham in Sierra Leone now. He's probably cursing me every time he has to
> >fiddle with those coils.
> >
> Mine may need a new mike. Ironic.
>
> >> But my shack clock is digital. It's a Tymeter 24-hour one, made from
> >> the parts of three junkers more than 15 years ago.
> >
> >Those things are developing some nostalgia value these days.
> >
> In some ways clock technology has gone backwards. I remember when almost all
> clocks ran on synchronous motors, like my Tymeter. The power co. kept track of

> the Hz and would keep the total number of cycles-per-year pretty dern accurate.
> I found that all my motor-clocks would stay in step with WWV give or take a
> second or to for as long as the power was on.
>
> Then came "digital quartz technology" - and no two clocks read alike. Set them
> all to the same time and in a few months they're all over the place. The newer
> computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older ones...
>
> But my Tymeter grinds on, flipping the drums.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

> all to the same time and in a few months they're all over the place. The newer
> computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older ones...
>
> But my Tymeter grinds on, flipping the drums.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

My artifact Tymeter crapper landed in the dumpster. I guess ya missed
it when you surfed my dumpster pile. Sorry dude.

The stupid thing was bigger than my whole 100W HF TS-50 mobile xcvr
fer chrissake. Off to the landfill with it!

It's replacement:

http://www.sk3bg.se/contest/download.htm

Grab Fastenow's freebie UTCClock file and load it, can't miss.

>The newer computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older
ones

I wuz in the McDade Mall parking lot doing some Xmas sorts of things a
month ago when I noticed that my $100 wrist clock had died. I was in
no mood to screw around with changing the battery so I popped into the
K-Mart to pick up any cheap crapper watch which would get me thru the
holidays. Found one. JA-made analog quartz movement, water resistant,
time and date, and except for the ten cent strap it's a very solid
readable no-nonsense watch and it's dual-clibrated, 12/24 hours.
$4.95. That's less than a battery costs for my "good" watch. Ponder
that. I bought two of 'em.

I set watch #2 five hours ahead of our local time, bingo, UTC
time/date without a computer or the mains. I'll use it when I'm on the
air and not using the 'puter. About a month later both my $4.95 K-Mart
wrist clocks are 2-3 seconds ahead. A P5 is not gonna QSL because any
of my clocks are three seconds off??

The BA issue of QST really was a bit much. You tube-huggers need to
nag the ARRL into launching another of their specialized magazines
like the NCJ and QEX so that you people can wallow in yer ARC-5s and

DX-60s without loading QST with it.

w3rv

1068. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 20:20:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401171220.47b8dada@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85844

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040114214858.11022.00003505@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> N2EY wrote:

> The newer
> computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older ones...

Not an issue. When the 'puter clock here is noticeably off time vs.
WWV I simply ping NIST and let them reset it. My tax dollars at work.
YMMV.

http://www.boulder.nist.gov/timefreq/service/time-computer.html

> But my Tymeter grinds on, flipping the drums.

. . groan . . !
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1069. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 22:18:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <4fcj005flk6dhth2r0uiq7mfh8jugfem8i@4ax.com>
Source record: 85845

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 19:42:03 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>>He seemed interested enough in learning the basics - and I'm pretty
>>sure that he is very new to Amateur Radio, as he didn't ask a single
>>question about Kim's callsign :)
>>
>>
>>
>He mentioned birdwatching in the orginial post, so he likely figured that
>Kim was abird watcher. A tit is a kind of small bird, if you thought
>of something else, well.... ;-)

Hmmm - he did, didn't he!

LOL es 73, Leo

1070. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 23:07:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <DejOb.12430$q4.2315@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85846

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I never even realized your call was
> a vanity call, Dwight. (snip)

I wanted a callsign that said something about me, not just a number with a random group of letters. It's also easier for others (and me on bad days) to remember. Anyway, as Dee noted, it's fairly easy to spot a vanity call once you know what to look for.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1071. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 23:15:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401171515.74f02863@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85847

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401170927.55aafb2c@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0401161515.535a8eb3@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > Noise level. Give it a 0.1.
> >
> > Hey Bubba, trolling is obviously not one of your skills, try some other "activity".
> >
> > You're welcome.
>
>
> Isn't there a 10-10 contest you could go play in?

At least I have that option antennaless one.

1072. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-17 23:25:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hvjOb.12442$q4.10208@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85848

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> You really think in that way? Do
> you think I'd approve if Kim had
> chosen a vulgar name for a male
> body part to use as the suffix of
> her call?

Luckily, we have fewer "vulgar" body parts to worry about. Men have chests too, but that somehow escaped being vulgar. As my wife would say, perhaps because men mostly decided what is vulgar over the years. As a result, chests with protrusions are vulgar (with special little names like "tits"), while those without protrusions are not.

> Excellent dodge of the statement,
> Dwight. You might have a future
> in politics.

No, I'm a little too opinionated for that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1073. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 00:23:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401171623.1d9af7a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85849

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40096967.4ECAF021@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<1tl800lng2lcnmie9onnqru6g8vmt429u8@4ax.com>...
> > > On 13 Jan 2004 09:54:02 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> > > >I am aware that you preceive it that way. Are you aware that no disrespect
> > > >was intended?
> > >
> > > No.
> >
> > Unfortunately, the Gutenberg press doesn't lend itself to the full
> > range of human vocal expression and we often infer emotion based upon
> > prior typed exchanges with our victims.
>
> Who do you know who is currently using a Gutenberg press, Brian?
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, why does your communication present itself in font format? Are
you using a Gootenburg press?

1074. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 00:31:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401171631.8cde63@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85850

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40096083.8796BBBB@earthlink.net>...
>
> Why not admit that you fall short of being able to read and understand?

At the end of the day, we learn that only Dave has understanding and
everyone else has problems.

Why is that so laughable?

1075. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 00:40:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401171640.44305ba3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85751

```
Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<2pti00lpevmvihps41np2h8ia5devq9oi3@4ax.com>...
> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> >> >> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> >> >> >> too!
> >> >> >
> >> >> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
> >> >>
> >> >> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
> >> >> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
> >> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> >> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> >> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
> >> >
> >> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
> >> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
> >> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
> >> >stop annoying me.
> >>
> >> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
> >
> >I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
> >air.
>
> Hoo boy.

Dave was under no obligation to work those out of band French hams, but he did.

> >> Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
> >> you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?
```

> >
> >You certainly wrote "annoy the holder of a call". If Kim has the
> >potential to be annoyed by someone's choice not to use her call, I can
> >certainly be annoyed by her use of it.
> >
> >> >> Wouldn't it?
> >> >> You bet.
> >> >
> >> >I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh
> >> >in.
> >> >
> >> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
> >> to do so.
> >>
> >The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
> >If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
> >you're making a statement.
>
> I see. Huh?
>
> I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
> Jim....that question was for him.
>
> >
> >> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
> >> >
> >> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
> >> >
> >> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
> >> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
> >> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
> >>
> >Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
> >call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
>
> I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
> vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
>
> I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!
>
> >
> >> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
> >> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
> >> you wish to debate this point.
> >>
> >Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
>
> No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
> I :)
> >

> >> >
> >> >> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> >> >> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> >> >> >required to respond.
> >> >>
> >> >> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
> >> >> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
> >> >
> >> >I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
> >> >Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?
> >>
> >> So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
> >> taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.
>
> >> >> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
> >> >> huh? Wow.
> >> >
> >> >I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.
> >>
> >> And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
> >> of this discussion.
> >
> >Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
> >to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.
>
> Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
> quite what I said!
>
> >
> >> >> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
> >> >> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
> >> >> >> I have something in common - so would I!
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
> >> >> >callsign.
> >> >>
> >> >> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
> >> >> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
> >> >> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
> >> >> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
> >> >
> >> >You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
> >> >do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not
> >> >going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
> >> >by someone cause me a lack of sleep.
> >>
> >> Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
> >> - said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)
> >
> >My identity isn't hidden, "Leo". I don't know that your name is Leo. I

> >don't know your call. I don't even know that you're a radio amateur or
> >that you're in Canada.
>
> Speaking of personal prerogatives - that one is mine. I don't need
> you analyzing my call to see if it meets your standards of decency,
> "Dave"....
>
> Sorry to add to the list of things that you don't know.
>
>
> > As far as Kim being honked at Jim's refusal to
> >use her call in a newsgroup post, you're simply wrong.
>
> You think? :)
>
> Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.
>
> >
> >> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> >> >> pleasure of others."
> >> >
> >> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
> >> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
> >> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
> >> >in Usenet.
> >>
> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
> >
> >Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
> >"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
> >something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
> >air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
> >because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
> >is my perogative.
>
> To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
> ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and
> all of that goes out the window. LOL!
>
> To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
> - in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......
>
> But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
> choose not to. Duh.

Except that those out of band French hams were soooooo irresistable.

> >> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
> >

> >You may operate or not operate. You may respond to a call by a station
> >or not. If three stations call after a CQ, you may legally and morally
> >discriminate by answering one over the others. You may choose to not
> >answer all of them. That looks like a fairly flexible standard to me.
>
> That ain't the standard that I referred to, Dave. Here it is again,
> in case you missed it the first time:
>
> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
> >> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>
> Flexible as in yours to choose to adhere to at your own
> convenience........

Like working out of band French hams...

1076. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 00:58:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401171658.4910284@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85752

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<400968C2.A2AD173F@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40041FB4.9A4CABFD@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > > I have given some thought to my choice of callsigns and feel that I may have made a
mistake. My choice reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual.
> >
> > Or, "I have given some thought to my choice of working Frenchmen out
> > of band on 6M, and feel that I may have made a mistake. My choice
> > reflects badly on amateur radio and on me as an individual."
>
> > Dave, do you recognize yourself in this alternative scenario?
>
> You had a chance to use the technique I illustrated for Kim. You hosed
> it up.
>
> Dave K8MN

You also had the opportunity to use this technique. You smugged it up.

1077. Re: Don't work the legal ones, work the bootleggers!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:04:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401171704.268ce0d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85753

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40096877.227C7723@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4005B6FE.FE1120D4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<400429DE.50A5C6CA@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> > > > > the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> > > > > required to respond.
> > > >
> > > > I'm sure you'd rather just respond to French out-of-banders on 6M.
> > >
> > > How could you be sure of that, Brian?
> >
> > I can be sure of that because of three of your postings.
> >
> > 1. You posted saying that you worked French amateurs where they have
> > no 6M authorizations.
>
> Not exactly correct, is it, Brian? I wrote that French amateurs had
> called me and that I'd worked them below 50.200.

Dave, I've googled it up before. Your turn.

> > 2. You later stated that you would continue to do so because you have
> > no responsibility for where bootleg French hams want to operate.
>
> I have no responsibility to ensure that any station I work is entitled
> to use the piece of spectrum he occupies. The responsibility for being
> where he's supposed to be lies entirely with the individual operating.
> How is it that you find the concept difficult?

Unrepentant sinner.

> > And 3. You stated that you'd be happy to tune right by a legally
> > licensed American amateur because your're not required to respond.
>
> Having read and memorized Part 97, can you quote the portion requiring
> us to call any station or to respond to a call from another station?

Such as the possibility of ignoring out of band Frenchmen?

> > That is how I can be sure.
>
> You had only three things to add up. You still arrived at the wrong
> answer.

Nope.

> > Did you have a point about Kim's
> > > callsign?
>
> > Yes. It is legal and valid, but you show a preference for out of band
> > Frenchmen.
>
> Kim's call is legal but in poor taste.

In much better taste than working out of band Frenchmen.

> > Is there anything else?
>
> There is much else. Keeping searching for knowledge.

I know about you, Dave.

Sayonara.

1078. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:26:14 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bucnbg$4kf@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85754

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:VXdOb.31497$P%1.25083425@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bub8dj$g18@library2.airnews.net...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:IoQNb.9669$q4.5340@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > A friend, a very long time ham with a "W" call, suggested my
callsign.
> > He
> > > liked the "W5" part (same as a call he had years ago, I think) and
> thought
> > > the "net" part was cute because of my long computer experience (I was
> > > helping him with his computer at the time).
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> >
> > I never even realized your call was a vanity call, Dwight. And, neat
that
> > you came up with something creative!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> There are sometimes easily spotted clues. For example, anyone who has
> received their first license after about 1994 in the contiguous 48 states
> and that first license was a Tech or General will have a 2x3 call unless
> they have a vanity call or upgraded to Advanced or Extra and got a new
> sequential one from those pools. The sequentially assigned 1x3s
disappeared
> in most call areas by the end of 1994 though some areas may have had a few
> still available for a year or so after that.
>
> For example, I recieved my call in 1993 and you can see that in call area
8
> we were close to the end of the sequentially assigned 1x3s beginning with
N.
> The sequentially assigned 1x3s beginning with K or W had been used up some

> years before that.
>
> Or you could just look it up in the FCC database.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Precisely. But, I generally don't give second thoughts to the age, origination, or type of call someone has... Dwight shared that his is a vanity callsign. I think his choice is neat, but haven't been inspired to "lookup" someone's call to glean information about it.

But, good information...

Kim W5TIT

1079. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:28:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bucner$8sn@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85755

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40096B7C.C5649E56@earthlink.net...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
>
> > > Maybe you're the kind of fellow who
> > > would be proud to have his wife, mother
> > > or daughter choose a similar call. I'm not.
> >
> > I wouldn't even attempt to tell my wife, mother, or adult daughter,
which
> > callsign to select for themselves. All of these women clearly have
enough
> > intelligence to select the callsign they want, whatever it might be.
>
> Excellent dodge of the statement, Dwight. You might have a future in
> politics.
>
> Dave K8MN

Only Dave Heil could see a direct response to a statement as a "dodge."
Hilarious...

Kim W5TIT

1080. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:43:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040117204341.05957.00000016@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 85758

In article <2pti00lpevmvihps41np2h8ia5devq9oi3@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>>
>>> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>> >Leo wrote:
>>> >>
>>> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> >> wrote:
>>> >>
>>> >> >Leo wrote:
>>> >> >
>>> >> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses -
>I
>>> >> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>>> >> >> too!
>>> >> >
>>> >> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>>> >>
>>> >> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
>>> >> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
>>> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
>>> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>>> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
>>> >
>>> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
>>> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
>>> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
>>> >stop annoying me.
>>>
>>> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
>>
>>I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
>>air.
>
>Hoo boy.

Big Dave Sets The Standards!

>>> Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
>>> you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?
>>
>>You certainly wrote "annoy the holder of a call". If Kim has the
>>potential to be annoyed by someone's choice not to use her call, I can
>>certainly be annoyed by her use of it.
>>
>>> >> Wouldn't it?
>>> >> You bet.
>>> >
>>> >I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh
>>> >in.
>>>
>>> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
>>> to do so.
>>
>>The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
>>If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
>>you're making a statement.
>
>I see. Huh?
>
>I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
>Jim....that question was for him.

Pro-code Extras stick together. Morse must be a Crazy Glue.

>>> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
>>> >
>>> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
>>>
>>> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
>>> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
>>> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
>>
>>Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
>>call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
>
>I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
>vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
>
>I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!

No link is required. Big Dave sets the Standards.

That's IT. Period.

>>> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
>>> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
>>> you wish to debate this point.
>>
>>Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
>

>No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
>I :)

Big Dave is defending the Virtue of ham radio. He IS ham radio.
Anything resembling a "slight" against ham radio calls Him to
Action...

>>> >> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
>>> >> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
>>> >> >required to respond.
>>> >>
>>> >> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
>>> >> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
>>> >
>>> >I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
>>> >Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?
>>>
>>> So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
>>> taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.
>>
>>> >> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
>>> >> huh? Wow.
>>> >
>>> >I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.
>>>
>>> And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
>>> of this discussion.
>>
>>Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
>>to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.
>
>Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
>quite what I said!

Irrelevant, Leo. If Big Dave thinks so, it IS. No arguments.

>>> >> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
>>> >> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she
>and
>>> >> >> I have something in common - so would I!
>>> >> >
>>> >> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
>>> >> >callsign.
>>> >>
>>> >> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
>>> >> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
>>> >> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
>>> >> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
>>> >
>>> >You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
>>> >do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not

>>> >going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
>>> >by someone cause me a lack of sleep.
>>>
>>> Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
>>> - said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)
>>
>>My identity isn't hidden, "Leo". I don't know that your name is Leo. I
>>don't know your call. I don't even know that you're a radio amateur or
>>that you're in Canada.
>
>Speaking of personal prerogatives - that one is mine. I don't need
>you analyzing my call to see if it meets your standards of decency,
>"Dave"....
>
>Sorry to add to the list of things that you don't know.

Dave was with the Government...He's here to help...

>> As far as Kim being honked at Jim's refusal to
>>use her call in a newsgroup post, you're simply wrong.
>
>You think? :)
>
>Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.

Please don't ask Dave such things. That only means a
continuation of ORDERS from high above and many more
posts condemning us ordinary mortals to vulgar and tacky
status.

>>> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>>> >> pleasure of others."
>>> >
>>> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
>>> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
>>> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
>>> >in Usenet.
>>>
>>> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>>> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>>> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>>
>>Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
>>"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
>>something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
>>air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
>>because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
>>is my perogative.
>
>To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
>ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and

>all of that goes out the window. LOL!
>
>To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
>- in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......
>
>But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
>choose not to. Duh.

Choosy mothers choose Jif...

>>> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>>
>>You may operate or not operate. You may respond to a call by a station
>>or not. If three stations call after a CQ, you may legally and morally
>>discriminate by answering one over the others. You may choose to not
>>answer all of them. That looks like a fairly flexible standard to me.
>
>That ain't the standard that I referred to, Dave. Here it is again,
>in case you missed it the first time:
>
>>> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>>> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>>> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>>> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>
>Flexible as in yours to choose to adhere to at your own
>convenience........

I don't think anyone is allowed to be "flexible." In the USA all
amateurs must adhere to a Rigid, Inflexible Way Of Amateur Life.
Dave tells everyone what connotes "flexiblity." [very little]

Rubber is a flexible substance. We cannot use rubber. Rubber is
a vulgar and tacky term, one of many not allowed in ham raddio.

Ergo, "flexibility" is not allowed. All must remain Rigid, Inflexible.

Ooops..."rigid" is a vulgar and tacky term. Cancel "rigid."

No one can "erect" an antenna either, let alone "raise it up."
Vulgar. Tacky. Tasteless.

LHA / WMD

1081. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:43:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040117204342.05957.00000017@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 85756

In article <20040116232551.08626.00002690@mb-m27.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>One more thing: Resolve to learn the Morse code and to use it on the air.
>Decide from the start that you are going to be a proficient CW operator, and
>don't give in to any of the frustrations normally associated with learning to
>use this uniquely practical, effective, efficient, and universal
>communications mode.

Absolutely! Morse code is at the heart and soul of U.S. amateur radio!

Morse is so #$%^!!! good that every other radio service continues to use it for communications! [Larry thinks...without having any experience in any of them]

Without proficiency in morse code, amateurs are not really amateurs.

Those who cannot do morse code or care to do morse code are not recipients of Larrah's Blessings.

>We have all experienced them, and people from all walks of life have
>overcome them and become proficient CW operators.

Vital, important, mandatory for amateur radio.

Forget everything else and concentrate solely on morse code.

That is all that is needed to be a "good" amateur.

>It's not that big a deal,
>and the only problems you'll have achieving success are those you make
>for yourself.

Yes, failure to become proficient in morse code will result in a continuing repost of Larrah's skills, nobility, and accomplishments in the field of radio communications... resulting in endless peans of self-praise for his unswerving loyalty to the Beliefs of Hiram.

See the hoops. Jump through the hoops, Larrah. That's a good boy!

Sit.

LHA / WMD

1082. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:43:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040117204342.05957.00000018@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 85757

In article <htvi00tsd71un98f9eld1bsbv600eldsj2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:19:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>snip
>
>>> Do you practice being an
>>
>>[word deleted]
>>
>>> , Dave? You must...because you're nearly perfect at it.
>>
>>What experience qualifies you to assess such perfection, Kim?
>
>Um, one doesn't have to be a professional hockey player to appreciate
>the talent of a Wayne Gretzky, do they?

Big Dave has a curious set of "qualifications" on almost
everything.

For example, Dave thinks "interest in radio" is manifest by learning
and using morse code. He will accept NO other "interest," not
even those who got into electronics and radio as a professional
career.

If Big Dave thinks something is "tasteless and tacky," then ALL
must think so...or be judged inferior, themselves without taste
or morals.

Big Dave's standard of excellence in everything is Big Dave. He
sets himself up as the Role Model in all things. There shall be
No Variation. Everything prim and proper, sexless in fact.

Big Dave isn't into electronic homebrewing. If he was, he would
have to handle "nuts" and "screws" and other [expletive deleted]
fasteners. He couldn't bear to think of using a "screw driver" or
a wire cutter ("dikes" - yikes). Insulated wire cannot be
"stripped." Such is tasteless and tacky.

Hiram forbid that any of his equipment pops fuses. He
couldn't bear to think of "blowing" a fuse! [that's tasteless and
tacky, if not obscene]

LHA / WMD

1083. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 01:54:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <mrSdnbNRbty1cZTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85759

Dave Heil wrote:

>>
>> I wouldn't even attempt to tell my wife, mother, or adult daughter, which
>>callsign to select for themselves. All of these women clearly have enough
>>intelligence to select the callsign they want, whatever it might be.
>
>
> Excellent dodge of the statement, Dwight. You might have a future in
> politics.

LOL!! My wife, who seldom makes any comment on anything pretaining to amature radio, just walked into the room, looked over my shoulder and upon seeing kim's call sign displayed in the newsgroup header said, "who would be issued a call sign like that?" After explaining it was a vanity call sign and the person requested it, her comment was, "what kind of idiot would ever choose such a call sign?"
I ask her if she thought it was vulgar. "Not really vulgar, just suggestive and totally lacking in taste, I suppose some people have to get attention anyway they can".

1084. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 12:39:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401180439.11a3ee12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85761

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0401171515.74f02863@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0401170927.55aafb2c@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0401161515.535a8eb3@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > Noise level. Give it a 0.1.
> > >
> > > Hey Bubba, trolling is obviously not one of your skills, try some other "activity".
> > >
> > > You're welcome.
> >
> >
> > Isn't there a 10-10 contest you could go play in?
>
> At least I have that option antennaless one.

Then you should take it.

1085. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 15:06:09 UTC
From: Scott <scott5mi@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 85762

A heart felt thank you to all that replied.

I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.

Re-reading my origanal post, I seem to have come off as a bit of an idiot. I think maybe I should have taken things a little slower.

And once again, thanks for the gerat advice.

1086. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 15:52:44 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <0h8l00p6o7eat933ddat7vrv0id97fphfn@4ax.com>
Source record: 85766

On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 09:06:09 -0600, "Scott"
<scott5mi@cox-internet.com> wrote:

>A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
>
>I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
>in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
>me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.
>
>Re-reading my origanal post, I seem to have come off as a bit of an idiot. I
>think maybe I should have taken things a little slower.

Not at all, Scott. There was absolutely nothing wrong with any of
your comments or the way that you said them. Anyone new tends to be
viewed somewhat suspciously in this group - until their intentions are
clear. No big deal!

The unsociable amateurs that you met at the club are the idiots!

In fact, it's good for some of the long time hams here to see what the
views and impressions are of those who are new to the amateur radio -
it shows where improvements are needed to generate more interest in
the hobby. Your club, for example, could use someone in charge of
meeting with new members or visitors and introducing them around -
making them feel welcome.
>
>And once again, thanks for the gerat advice.
>
Keep asking questions, Scott! When you get on the air for the first
time, you will meet lots of hams who will patiently guide you through
the mechanics of communicating with them - that's where the real fun
(and learning) begins! An example:

My first QSO on HF was with an informal net on 40 meters that I had
been listening to for a few days - and learning how it worked.
Finally, I got up the courage to push the button and say "Contact"
(like I'd heard the others do). The net controller invited me to call
in, I identified myself and told them that this was my first HF
contact since I passed my Morse Code test - and was promptly welcomed
in personally by over 20 other hams, several over 1000 miles away!
Best contact that I have ever had, and the friendliest bunch of people
that I have ever met. Still talk to most of them whenever I have the
chance.

Good luck, and have fun!

73, Leo

1087. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 15:55:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400AAC4F.BFF8705B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85763

```
Leo wrote:
>
> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
> >> >> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
> >> >> >> too!
> >> >> >
> >> >> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
> >> >>
> >> >> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
> >> >> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
> >> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> >> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> >> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
> >> >
> >> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
> >> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
> >> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
> >> >stop annoying me.
> >>
> >> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
> >
> >I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
> >air.
>
> Hoo boy.

Hoo boy indeed. Are you in disagreement with my statement?

> >> Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
> >> you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?
```

> >
> >You certainly wrote "annoy the holder of a call". If Kim has the
> >potential to be annoyed by someone's choice not to use her call, I can
> >certainly be annoyed by her use of it.
> >
> >> >> Wouldn't it?
> >> >> You bet.
> >> >
> >> >I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh
> >> >in.
> >> >
> >> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
> >> to do so.
> >>
> >The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
> >If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
> >you're making a statement.
>
> I see. Huh?

Raisin or bran muffin? Bran.

There's a question for you along with the answer. No input on your part
is necessary.

> I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
> Jim....that question was for him.

Then when did you start calling him "Dave"? I think you're beginning to
get tangled in your own words. Maybe you'd like to take another look at
your post.

> >
> >> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
> >> >
> >> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
> >> >
> >> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
> >> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
> >> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
> >>
> >Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
> >call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
>
> I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
> vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.

"Vulgar" works for me. From the Random House College Dictionary:
"vulgar adj. 1. characterized by ignorance of or lack of good breeding
or taste; unrefined; crude.

I also like "tacky" and "tasteless". There have been a number of other
words used to describe it.

> I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!

I have.

> >> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
> >> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
> >> you wish to debate this point.
> >
> >Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
>
> No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
> I :)

Smiley aside, you did suggest that I start another thread.

> >> >> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
> >> >> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
> >> >> >required to respond.
> >> >>
> >> >> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
> >> >> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
> >> >
> >> >I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
> >> >Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?
> >>
> >> So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
> >> taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.
> >
> >> >> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
> >> >> huh? Wow.
> >> >
> >> >I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.
> >>
> >> And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
> >> of this discussion.

Then why do you continue to make comments on that particular issue?

> >Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
> >to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.
>
> Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
> quite what I said!

In essence, "Leo", that is your point, that Jim should avoid hurting
Kim's feelings by not using her call, the call that he finds
objectionable.

> >> >> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from
> >> >> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
> >> >> >> I have something in common - so would I!

> >> >> >
> >> >> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
> >> >> >callsign.
> >> >>
> >> >> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
> >> >> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
> >> >> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
> >> >> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
> >> >
> >> >You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
> >> >do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not
> >> >going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
> >> >by someone cause me a lack of sleep.
> >>
> >> Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
> >> - said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)
> >
> >My identity isn't hidden, "Leo". I don't know that your name is Leo. I
> >don't know your call. I don't even know that you're a radio amateur or
> >that you're in Canada.
>
> Speaking of personal prerogatives - that one is mine. I don't need
> you analyzing my call to see if it meets your standards of decency,
> "Dave"....

You don't need?

> Sorry to add to the list of things that you don't know.

There are many things unknown to me, "Leo". Not knowing your call, your
location or your name aren't things high on my list.

> > As far as Kim being honked at Jim's refusal to
> >use her call in a newsgroup post, you're simply wrong.
>
> You think? :)

Quite often :)

> Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.

Just tell us how you interpreted it and we'll proceed from there.

> >> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> >> >> pleasure of others."
> >> >
> >> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
> >> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
> >> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
> >> >in Usenet.
> >>
> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is

> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
> >
> >Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
> >"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
> >something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
> >air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
> >because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
> >is my perogative.
>
> To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
> ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and
> all of that goes out the window. LOL!

I use microphones, keyboards and keys on the air, "Leo". I don't don't use any of them in my amateur radio operations to lessen the pleasure of others.

> To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
> - in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......

Thousands? I think you vastly overestimate the readership of this newsgroup--and this isn't "on the air", Leo. Usenet isn't amateur radio.

> But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
> choose not to. Duh.

I don't know what the "Duh" signifies, "Leo". You seemed to have problems understanding my lack of obligation to use Kim's vulgar callsign. Nothing requires me to use it anywhere.

> >> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
> >
> >You may operate or not operate. You may respond to a call by a station
> >or not. If three stations call after a CQ, you may legally and morally
> >discriminate by answering one over the others. You may choose to not
> >answer all of them. That looks like a fairly flexible standard to me.
>
> That ain't the standard that I referred to, Dave. Here it is again,
> in case you missed it the first time:
>
> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
> >> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>
> Flexible as in yours to choose to adhere to at your own
> convenience........

Let's see. I don't approve of Kim's callsign here. I don't approve of Kim's callsign on the air. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a car license plate. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a cap. What

you'd like to do is take an item from Paul Segal's code, an item which is very specific and change it to suit your argument. It can't be done. It very clearly says "operates". Now I'm quite confident that "operates" doesn't mean "operates heavy equipment", "operates a computer connected to the internet", "operates a convenience store" or "operates on a patient".

You persist in calling my views inconsiderate. I don't agree. I've considered. Now you're a "Leo"-come-lately so you've apparently not been exposed to Kim's views on proper social behavior. If you like, you can hit the Google archives and check them out. I happen to view Kim's choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio. It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her nose at the world.

Dave K8MN

1088. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 16:04:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400AAEA3.EB375D4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85764

Leo wrote:
>
> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:00:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:

> >> >Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
> >> >*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
> >>
> >> Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
> >> it's a fact of life. :)
> >>
> >*Wink* and *chuckle* on your part noted.
>
> That was a smile, Dave - what wink and chuckle? Kim replied with some
> valuable insight on this comment - please read what she wrote in her
> previous post, and do your best to empathize with her reply.

Given a choice between voicing disapproval and the *wink* and *chuckle*,
your choice has been obvious.

> >> >> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
> >> >> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
> >> >> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
> >> >
> >> >> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
> >> >> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
> >> >> the artificial." - Mark Twain
> >> >
> >> >So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
> >> >you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
> >> >defend bad taste.
> >>
> >> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
> >> others. Plain and simple.
> >>
> >So the Mark Twain quote isn't an accurate assessment of humankind?
>
> It is, unfortunately. Did you read my reply, though? - I'll post it
> again so you can have another run at it:

So your private morals must be at odds with your public morals.

> >> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
> >> others. Plain and simple.
>
> Do you disagree with this concept, Dave?

Yes, I'll have to disagree with it. "Bill" is a good neighbor. "Pete" lives on the other side of me. "Pete" has a dog which he allows to roam freely. "Pete" refuses to control the dog and laughs when I tell him that I object to his dog's use of my lawn for a toilet.

"Bill" asks if he can borrow my lawn mower. I lend it to him. A month later, "Pete" asks if he might borrow the mower. I tell him "no". I've not treated these individuals equally. It is my view that I'm not bound to do so.

Get real, "Leo".

Dave K8MN

1089. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 16:10:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bueb59$1b0@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85765

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:mrSdnbNRbty1cZTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >>
> >> I wouldn't even attempt to tell my wife, mother, or adult daughter,
which
> >>callsign to select for themselves. All of these women clearly have
enough
> >>intelligence to select the callsign they want, whatever it might be.
> >
> >
> > Excellent dodge of the statement, Dwight. You might have a future in
> > politics.
>
> LOL!! My wife, who seldom makes any comment on anything pretaining to
> amature radio, just walked into the room, looked over my shoulder and
> upon seeing kim's call sign displayed in the newsgroup header said, "who
> would be issued a call sign like that?" After explaining it was a vanity
> call sign and the person requested it, her comment was, "what kind of
> idiot would ever choose such a call sign?"
> I ask her if she thought it was vulgar. "Not really vulgar, just
> suggestive and totally lacking in taste, I suppose some people have to
> get attention anyway they can".
>

You, your wife, Larry Roll, my good friends here in this area who enjoy the fun of my callsign--anyone--has the right to believe and think as they do; and the opinion of my callsign is an absolutely correct one--for each and everyone who has one.

And, for me, and those who either think nothing of my callsign, think it's fun, wouldn't have selected it but don't see it is a main distraction, we are just as correct.

Your wife, JJ, probably also has the opinion that people who dance for a living; who are in magazines like Hustler, Playboy and Playgirl; who lead a risque life, etc., are all "totally lacking in taste." I don't and I am certainly not in any minority.

The difference between people like "us" and people like "you" is that we don't expect anyone to live up to anyone else's expectations or standards. I have no problem at all with your opinion, the opinion of Larry Roll, the opinion of your wife. I do, however, take great exception to crossing the line and deciding that it's quite OK for sneering, resorting to desperate

other measures trying to make someone feel embarrassed, etc. Whether you or anyone else realizes it, there are people--such as myself--who have risen way above letting the opinions of others get in the way of living life beautifully. But, it takes a lot of work and self-reflection to get there. And, there are more people who won't ever get there than who are there--and it is for those people that each and every time someone acts like an asshole toward another, I will have no problem mimicking the behavior right back at them.

So, tell your wife that I totally respect her opinion--but that is as far as it goes. I don't "need" the attention of anyone. I am well liked, love people, work every day to help people succeed and make the best of themselves, and pick up in a second for the underdog in any situation. And, I don't know what she thinks I might be suggesting, since it is singly my husband that I love and he needs no suggestion. Do you?

Kim W5TIT

1090. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 16:19:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buebm8$c6a@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85768

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:400AAC4F.BFF8705B@earthlink.net...
>
> I happen to view Kim's
> choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio.
> It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her
> nose at the world.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

You keep mentioning this "thumbing my nose at the world" Dave. And, you are absolutely correct in that assessment of me. I am probably not able to be pinned into any particular mold. And, sorry you have a problem with that, but the greatest minds and achievers in this world saw through your "mold" concept.

I almost deliberately depart from tradition and mundane ways of doing things. I thoroughly immerse myself in the doings and thoughts of others, and I am truly, truly excited by the potential I see in nearly everyone. I also thoroughly enjoy approaching people like yourself with such vague attitude that you can't help but get offended. That is my mission for you--to offend you. Because at least it breaks up your boring and mundane day...

Kim W5TIT

1091. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 16:19:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400AB223.1E96EF29@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85767

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <2pti00lpevmvihps41np2h8ia5devq9oi3@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >wrote:
> >
> >>Leo wrote:
> >>>
> >>> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> wrote:
> >>>
> >>> >Leo wrote:
> >>> >>
> >>> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> >> wrote:
> >>> >>
> >>> >> >Leo wrote:

> >>> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
> >>> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
> >>> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
> >>> >
> >>> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
> >>> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
> >>> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
> >>> >stop annoying me.
> >>>
> >>> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
> >>
> >>I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
> >>air.
> >
> >Hoo boy.
>
> Big Dave Sets The Standards!

Big Dave certainly sets Big Dave's standards, Little Leonard.

> >>> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
> >>> >
> >>> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
> >>>
> >>> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be

> >>> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
> >>> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
> >>
> >>Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
> >>call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
> >
> >I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
> >vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
> >
> >I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!
>
> No link is required. Big Dave sets the Standards.
>
> That's IT. Period.

More civil debate of the elimination or morse testing, Little Leonard?
That's where you attempt to set the standards for something in which you
are not at all involved.

> >>> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
> >>> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
> >>> you wish to debate this point.
> >>
> >>Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
> >
> >No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
> >I :)
>
> Big Dave is defending the Virtue of ham radio. He IS ham radio.
> Anything resembling a "slight" against ham radio calls Him to
> Action...

Why, Little Leonard, I am certainly a part of amateur radio. You
aren't.

Please continue with your civil debate of the elimination of morse
testing.

Dave K8MN

1092. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 16:33:20 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0401180833.5e75fb3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85769

Part 97 does not assign me any responsibility to ensure that a frenchman is operating inside his frequency allocations, only that I am operating inside mine.

If a frenchman calls me on 6-meters I will certainly answer him since F is a new band-country for me on 6.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1093. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 17:23:59 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ggbl009snpjs3t62hb4inca8t0nit7n3im@4ax.com>
Source record: 85770

Dave, have a nice life and do try not to be too upset by

On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 15:55:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >>
>> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >Leo wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Leo wrote:
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> - she deserves to be addressed by her call sign if she so chooses - I
>> >> >> >> assume that in Texas, she may have it on her vehicle licence plate
>> >> >> >> too!
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >She can use it any time she likes. I'm not required to use it.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Absolutely not. But she still deserves to be addressed by it if she
>> >> >> so chooses (it would be kinda hard to QSO with Kim without using it!)
>> >> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but it
>> >> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>> >> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
>> >> >
>> >> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am discriminating
>> >> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
>> >> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She should
>> >> >stop annoying me.
>> >>
>> >> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
>> >
>> >I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
>> >air.
>>
>> Hoo boy.

>
>Hoo boy indeed. Are you in disagreement with my statement?

Not at all. Just amazed that you are so adamant about it, Dave.
>
>> >> Sorry, I don't understand this one at all, Dave - how is Kim annoying
>> >> you? By simply existing, or by having a "bad taste" callsign. or ?
>> >
>> >You certainly wrote "annoy the holder of a call". If Kim has the
>> >potential to be annoyed by someone's choice not to use her call, I can
>> >certainly be annoyed by her use of it.
>> >
>> >> >> Wouldn't it?
>> >> >> You bet.
>> >> >
>> >> >I see you already have an answer for your question so I needn't weigh
>> >> >in.
>> >>
>> >> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
>> >> to do so.
>> >
>> >The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
>> >If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
>> >you're making a statement.
>>
>> I see. Huh?
>
>Raisin or bran muffin? Bran.
>
>There's a question for you along with the answer. No input on your part
>is necessary.
>
>> I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
>> Jim....that question was for him.

Oops - my error, Dave.

Do you want to answer the question? Please feel free to do so!

>
>Then when did you start calling him "Dave"? I think you're beginning to
>get tangled in your own words. Maybe you'd like to take another look at
>your post.
>
>> >
>> >> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
>> >> >
>> >> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
>> >>
>> >> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
>> >> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own

>> >> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
>> >
>> >Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
>> >call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
>>
>> I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
>> vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
>
>"Vulgar" works for me. From the Random House College Dictionary:
>"vulgar adj. 1. characterized by ignorance of or lack of good breeding
>or taste; unrefined; crude.

That's one meaning, Dave - here are all of 'em:

1. Crudely indecent.

2. Deficient in taste, delicacy, or refinement.
3. Marked by a lack of good breeding; boorish. See Synonyms at common.
4. Offensively excessive in self-display or expenditure; ostentatious:
the huge vulgar houses and cars of the newly rich.
5. Spoken by or expressed in language spoken by the common people;
vernacular: the technical and vulgar names for an animal species.
6. Of or associated with the great masses of people; common.

>
>I also like "tacky" and "tasteless". There have been a number of other
>words used to describe it.

Tacky and tasteless are indeed synonyms - vulgar can be different.
Might just mean 'common'. Or 'ostentatious'.
>
>> I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!
>
>I have.

Sort of. They can be different concepts.

Tasteless could mean 'inappropriate'.

Vulgar can too, or could mean 'objectionable'. Or something else. Not
all at the same time, though.

Which is it - inappropriate or objectionable? Or ostentatious - I
like that one best :)

>
>> >> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
>> >> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
>> >> you wish to debate this point.
>> >
>> >Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
>>
>> No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than

>> I :)
>
>Smiley aside, you did suggest that I start another thread.

Yup - I sure did!

>
>> >> >> >Sure, I'd be happy not to use Kim's call on the air. If I hear Kim on
>> >> >> >the air, I'll be happy to tune right by. If she calls me, I'm not
>> >> >> >required to respond.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Now that's a friendly and considerate thing to do! The True Spirit Of
>> >> >> Amateur Radio right there..... :)
>> >> >
>> >> >I don't find Kim's call to be in the true spirit of amateur radio.
>> >> >Where's my obligation to reward bad taste?
>> >>
>> >> So long as the callsign is used only as a callsign, where is the bad
>> >> taste? It's a callsign, Dave. Letters and numbers. W5TIT.
>> >
>> >> >> And all because of a call sign? Really. That's one scary call sign,
>> >> >> huh? Wow.
>> >> >
>> >> >I'm not afraid of Kim's callsign. I disapprove of it.
>> >>
>> >> And no one is denying your right to do so, Dave. That isn't the point
>> >> of this discussion.
>
>Then why do you continue to make comments on that particular issue?

???

Read on, Dave...

>
>> >Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
>> >to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.
>>
>> Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
>> quite what I said!
>
>In essence, "Leo", that is your point, that Jim should avoid hurting
>Kim's feelings by not using her call, the call that he finds
>objectionable.

Nope - my point is that omitting just one call in a list was not the
polite way to handle the situation, Dave. If one feels that strongly
about one "inappropriate' call, then leave 'em all out. Treats
everyone as equals, Dave.

>
>> >> >> >> - if Kim interprets the intentional omittance of her callsign from

>> >> >> >> newsgroup posts as disrespectful towards her personally, then she and
>> >> >> >> I have something in common - so would I!
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Please point out the requirement for anyone posting here to use Kim's
>> >> >> >callsign.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> The point was the omission of just W5TIT's call sign in the list of
>> >> >> all the other calls, Dave. That would not be the courteous thing to
>> >> >> do. Revising the list so that only first nams were listed, removing
>> >> >> the problem of the 'inappropriate' call, would be.
>> >> >
>> >> >You know, "Leo", Kim's choice of calls wasn't a very courteous thing to
>> >> >do, was it? Kim doesn't seem bothered by her lack of decorum. I'm not
>> >> >going to let the fact that she's honked over her call not being written
>> >> >by someone cause me a lack of sleep.
>> >>
>> >> Missed the point, "Dave". Again. That ain't what she's "honked" over
>> >> - said so herself a while back. Get some sleep :)
>> >
>> >My identity isn't hidden, "Leo". I don't know that your name is Leo. I
>> >don't know your call. I don't even know that you're a radio amateur or
>> >that you're in Canada.
>>
>> Speaking of personal prerogatives - that one is mine. I don't need
>> you analyzing my call to see if it meets your standards of decency,
>> "Dave"....
>
>You don't need?

I most assuredly do not, Dave!

>
>> Sorry to add to the list of things that you don't know.
>
>There are many things unknown to me, "Leo". Not knowing your call, your
>location or your name aren't things high on my list.

Whew! - that's a relief. I'll sleep better tonight knowing that :)

Seemed important to you earlier, though, Dave - I'm glad that you have
found peace with it.

>
>> > As far as Kim being honked at Jim's refusal to
>> >use her call in a newsgroup post, you're simply wrong.
>>
>> You think? :)
>
>Quite often :)

About what? Callsigns, and their probable hidden "dirty' meanings?
:)

>
>> Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.
>
>Just tell us how you interpreted it and we'll proceed from there.

Rather obvious, isn't it Dave? Please advise where I went wrong.

Feel free to use this quotation from Kim from the Pool thread when you reply: (helpful hint - she was writing with reference to the deletion of her callsign in the Pool posting....)

"Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur when he chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a conscious decision to participate in something he's providing for fun."

Gee, I guess that she was referring to something else.... :)

>
>> >> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>> >> >> pleasure of others."
>> >> >
>> >> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
>> >> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
>> >> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
>> >> >in Usenet.
>> >>
>> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>> >
>> >Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
>> >"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
>> >something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
>> >air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
>> >because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
>> >is my perogative.
>>
>> To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
>> ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and
>> all of that goes out the window. LOL!
>
>I use microphones, keyboards and keys on the air, "Leo". I don't don't
>use any of them in my amateur radio operations to lessen the pleasure of
>others.

OK, not on the air, then - just here, perhaps. Apparently, the medium determines the standards of appropriate behaviour: no wires, good; wires, bad.

I see.

I'll probably never know, though - I have no desire to work you on the air, as I find your attitude towards others inappropriate for Amateur

Radio :)

>
>> To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
>> - in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......
>
>Thousands? I think you vastly overestimate the readership of this
>newsgroup--and this isn't "on the air", Leo. Usenet isn't amateur
>radio.

This Usenet group is carried on thousands of servers all over the
world, Dave. And no, it isn't amateur radio - but I'll bet most of
the readers of this group are amateurs, or are at least interested in
the hobby!

BTW, part of it might be on the air, Dave - a great deal of telecom
backbone networks are carried by microwave or satellite links.. :)

>
>> But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
>> choose not to. Duh.
>
>I don't know what the "Duh" signifies, "Leo". You seemed to have
>problems understanding my lack of obligation to use Kim's vulgar
>callsign. Nothing requires me to use it anywhere.

OK, don't use it then. It's vulgar to you, perhaps. Not necessarily
to me. It's just a callsign, Dave. Worst case, it's about breasts. So
what - some of my best friends have breasts.

And, duh means duh. Duh. Somewhat synonomous with "obviously...", but
a tad more condescending in common application.
>
>> >> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>> >
>> >You may operate or not operate. You may respond to a call by a station
>> >or not. If three stations call after a CQ, you may legally and morally
>> >discriminate by answering one over the others. You may choose to not
>> >answer all of them. That looks like a fairly flexible standard to me.
>>
>> That ain't the standard that I referred to, Dave. Here it is again,
>> in case you missed it the first time:
>>
>> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>> >> That must be one of those 'flexible' standards, huh?
>>
>> Flexible as in yours to choose to adhere to at your own
>> convenience........
>
>Let's see. I don't approve of Kim's callsign here. I don't approve of

>Kim's callsign on the air. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a
>car license plate. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a cap. What
>you'd like to do is take an item from Paul Segal's code, an item which
>is very specific and change it to suit your argument. It can't be
>done. It very clearly says "operates". Now I'm quite confident that
>"operates" doesn't mean "operates heavy equipment", "operates a computer
>connected to the internet", "operates a convenience store" or "operates
>on a patient".

Say, Dave, you're beginning to sould a bit like Dr. Seuss there!

Dave, would you like W5TIT with that?

I would not, could not, on a cap,
I would not, could not, on RRAP,
I would not have it on a plate,
I would not 'cause I'd hate that plate!
I would not use it on the air,
I would not use it ANYWHERE!!!

I don't care if Katey Segal wrote the code, Dave - I interpret
"operates" in the context of my inference as "communicates to others",
Dave. It's part of the package.

Or does it simply refer to the technical side of operating - that is,
it's OK to treat someone poorly on the air so long as you use
technical accuracy in operating your station? "Sure, I told that jerk
off big time on 40 last night, but my SWR was under 1.1, my intermod
was < 60dB, and my signal was clean with no key clicks!"

And is it any different when you are at the office? "I gave that
moron in Accounting a piece of my mind - we weren't on the air, you
know!"

Or here, for that matter.

>
>You persist in calling my views inconsiderate. I don't agree. I've
>considered. Now you're a "Leo"-come-lately so you've apparently not
>been exposed to Kim's views on proper social behavior. If you like, you
>can hit the Google archives and check them out. I happen to view Kim's
>choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio.
>It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her
>nose at the world.

I see. I'm confused, though - are you saying that the callsign is
vulgar? Or the holder of the callsign? Please clarify.

You are aware that there are a whole pile of vanity calls out there
which are much more explicit than this one - it must be challenging
screening them all out before deciding to talk to 'em on the air,
Dave. 'Cause they might mean something 'bad'. In many different
languages, too!

Maybe you should hire an admin assistant for your shack!

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1094. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 17:37:27 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <4cgl005djdmgpm0jfv52fgcvqc0jv7b66l@4ax.com>
Source record: 85771

On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 16:04:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:00:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >>
>> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> wrote:
>
>> >> >Now she has to live with the fallout. Some will give her a *wink* or a
>> >> >*chuckle*. Some will voice their disapproval.
>> >>
>> >> Full figured women live with the risk of fallout every day, Dave -
>> >> it's a fact of life. :)
>> >
>> >*Wink* and *chuckle* on your part noted.
>>
>> That was a smile, Dave - what wink and chuckle? Kim replied with some
>> valuable insight on this comment - please read what she wrote in her
>> previous post, and do your best to empathize with her reply.
>
>
>Given a choice between voicing disapproval and the *wink* and *chuckle*,
>your choice has been obvious.

Really - what were you thinking of, Dave? Tsk, tsk.

>
>> >> >> Are you unable or unwilling to face up to this single issue? - or
>> >> >> shall we all continue merrily down the garden path with you? You are
>> >> >> fooling no one but yourself, Jim.
>> >> >
>> >> >> "It has always been a peculiarity of the human race that it keeps two
>> >> >> sets of morals in stock-the private and the real, and the public and
>> >> >> the artificial." - Mark Twain
>> >> >
>> >> >So we're to believe that your private, real morals are better than those
>> >> >you've exhibited here. It seems that you've set yourself up here to
>> >> >defend bad taste.
>> >>
>> >> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the

>> >> others. Plain and simple.
>> >
>> >So the Mark Twain quote isn't an accurate assessment of humankind?
>>
>> It is, unfortunately. Did you read my reply, though? - I'll post it
>> again so you can have another run at it:
>
>So your private morals must be at odds with your public morals.

Perhaps - are yours, Dave? I sincerely hope so.
>
>> >> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
>> >> others. Plain and simple.
>>
>> Do you disagree with this concept, Dave?
>
>Yes, I'll have to disagree with it. "Bill" is a good neighbor. "Pete"
>lives on the other side of me. "Pete" has a dog which he allows to roam
>freely. "Pete" refuses to control the dog and laughs when I tell him
>that I object to his dog's use of my lawn for a toilet.
>
>"Bill" asks if he can borrow my lawn mower. I lend it to him. A month
>later, "Pete" asks if he might borrow the mower. I tell him "no". I've
>not treated these individuals equally. It is my view that I'm not bound
>to do so.

No, you certainly are not.

One question, though... did you put up posters all over the
neighbourhood to let everyone know what a jerk you thought Pete is?
Do you tell everyone that you meet that he is an inconsiderate boor?
Do you go to the mall with a bucket of the dog droppings and tell
everyone within earshot how wrong Pete is?

That would be OK to do, you know - you and Pete are not on the air!
:)

>
>Get real, "Leo".

I think, therefore I am, "Dave".

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1095. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 18:56:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400AD6CC.DB8C750C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85772

Leo wrote:
>
> Dave, have a nice life and do try not to be too upset by

...the developing nuclear capabilities of North Korea? another
terrorist attack? Hilary Clinton?

I have a nice life, thanks.

> On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 15:55:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>

> >> >I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
> >> >air.
> >> >>
> >> >> Hoo boy.
> >> >>
> >> >Hoo boy indeed. Are you in disagreement with my statement?
>
> Not at all. Just amazed that you are so adamant about it, Dave.

If you aren't in disagreement, why are you amazed that I'd state it?

> >> >> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
> >> >> to do so.
> >> >>
> >> >The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
> >> >If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
> >> >you're making a statement.
> >> >>
> >> >> I see. Huh?
> >> >>

> >Raisin or bran muffin? Bran.
> >
> >There's a question for you along with the answer. No input on your part
> >is necessary.
> >
> >> I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
> >> Jim....that question was for him.
>
> Oops - my error, Dave.
>
> Do you want to answer the question? Please feel free to do so!

It seems that you already found an answer which pleases you.

> >Then when did you start calling him "Dave"? I think you're beginning to
> >get tangled in your own words. Maybe you'd like to take another look at
> >your post.

> >> >Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
> >> >call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
> >>
> >> I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
> >> vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
> >
> >"Vulgar" works for me. From the Random House College Dictionary:
> >"vulgar adj. 1. characterized by ignorance of or lack of good breeding
> >or taste; unrefined; crude.
>
> That's one meaning, Dave - here are all of 'em:
>
> 1. Crudely indecent.
>
> 2. Deficient in taste, delicacy, or refinement.
> 3. Marked by a lack of good breeding; boorish. See Synonyms at common.
> 4. Offensively excessive in self-display or expenditure; ostentatious:
> the huge vulgar houses and cars of the newly rich.
> 5. Spoken by or expressed in language spoken by the common people;
> vernacular: the technical and vulgar names for an animal species.
> 6. Of or associated with the great masses of people; common.
>
> >
> >I also like "tacky" and "tasteless". There have been a number of other
> >words used to describe it. You can add definitions 2,3 and 4 if you like. I'll go along
with them.
>
> Tacky and tasteless are indeed synonyms - vulgar can be different.
> Might just mean 'common'. Or 'ostentatious'.

I've used all of those terms in describing Kim's choice of callsigns.
Others have used additional words to convey their feelings on the
matter.

> >> I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!
> >
> >I have.
>
> Sort of. They can be different concepts.

I've used a number of terms. I meant all of them.

> Tasteless could mean 'inappropriate'.

It surely could.

> Vulgar can too, or could mean 'objectionable'. Or something else. Not
> all at the same time, though.

It surely could. Did you you believe that I meant something else,
especially after I provided you with a definition?

> Which is it - inappropriate or objectionable? Or ostentatious - I
> like that one best :)

"Inappropriate" and "objectionable" are both fine with me.

> >
> >> >> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
> >> >> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
> >> >> you wish to debate this point.
> >> >
> >> >Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
> >>
> >> No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
> >> I :)
> >
> >Smiley aside, you did suggest that I start another thread.
>
> Yup - I sure did!

Then my comment about you stepping into something and attempting to
direct stands.

> >> >Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
> >> >to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.
> >>
> >> Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
> >> quite what I said!
> >
> >In essence, "Leo", that is your point, that Jim should avoid hurting
> >Kim's feelings by not using her call, the call that he finds
> >objectionable.
>
> Nope - my point is that omitting just one call in a list was not the
> polite way to handle the situation, Dave. If one feels that strongly
> about one "inappropriate' call, then leave 'em all out. Treats
> everyone as equals, Dave.

Very touchy-feely and all-inclusive of you, "Leo". Let's all get
together and celebrate our diversity, shall we?

> >> Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.
> >
> >Just tell us how you interpreted it and we'll proceed from there.
>
> Rather obvious, isn't it Dave? Please advise where I went wrong.
>
> Feel free to use this quotation from Kim from the Pool thread when you
> reply: (helpful hint - she was writing with reference to the deletion
> of her callsign in the Pool posting....)
>
> "Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur
> when he chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a
> conscious decision to participate in something he's providing for
> fun."
>
> Gee, I guess that she was referring to something else.... :)

I see Kim indicating that her feelings were hurt; Her self-esteem took a
hit.

> >> >> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> >> >> >> pleasure of others."
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
> >> >> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
> >> >> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
> >> >> >in Usenet.
> >> >>
> >> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
> >> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
> >> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
> >> >
> >> >Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
> >> >"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
> >> >something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
> >> >air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
> >> >because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
> >> >is my perogative.
> >>
> >> To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
> >> ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and
> >> all of that goes out the window. LOL!
> >
> >I use microphones, keyboards and keys on the air, "Leo". I don't don't
> >use any of them in my amateur radio operations to lessen the pleasure of
> >others.
>
> OK, not on the air, then - just here, perhaps. Apparently, the medium
> determines the standards of appropriate behaviour: no wires, good;

> wires, bad.
>
> I see.

No, you don't. The code says what it says. You are attempting a
stretch.
You're also attempting to use that code to state that it is improper for
me to voice disapproval over Kim's choice here or to ignore her on the
air because of that disapproval. You're attempting to use that code to
tell Jim that he should either use Kim's call or not use any calls. Is
that about it?

> I'll probably never know, though - I have no desire to work you on the
> air, as I find your attitude towards others inappropriate for Amateur
> Radio :)

Now if you could only do something about the attitude of others...

> >> To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
> >> - in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......
> >
> >Thousands? I think you vastly overestimate the readership of this
> >newsgroup--and this isn't "on the air", Leo. Usenet isn't amateur
> >radio.
>
> This Usenet group is carried on thousands of servers all over the
> world, Dave. And no, it isn't amateur radio - but I'll bet most of
> the readers of this group are amateurs, or are at least interested in
> the hobby!
>
> BTW, part of it might be on the air, Dave - a great deal of telecom
> backbone networks are carried by microwave or satellite links.. :)

What call do you sign in those instances, "Leo"?

> >> But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
> >> choose not to. Duh.
> >
> >I don't know what the "Duh" signifies, "Leo". You seemed to have
> >problems understanding my lack of obligation to use Kim's vulgar
> >callsign. Nothing requires me to use it anywhere.
>
> OK, don't use it then.

I didn't require your permission.

> It's vulgar to you, perhaps.

No, I find it vulgar. There's no "perhaps" about it.

> Not necessarily
> to me. It's just a callsign, Dave. Worst case, it's about breasts. So
> what - some of my best friends have breasts.

I'm sure that you've noted that I am not the only person posting her to find Kim's choice of vanity calls objectionable.

> And, duh means duh. Duh. Somewhat synonomous with "obviously...", but
> a tad more condescending in common application.

But you seemed to voice disagreement with my statement earlier. Now you've agreed. Was the "duh" intended for yourself?

> >Let's see. I don't approve of Kim's callsign here. I don't approve of
> >Kim's callsign on the air. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a
> >car license plate. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a cap. What
> >you'd like to do is take an item from Paul Segal's code, an item which
> >is very specific and change it to suit your argument. It can't be
> >done. It very clearly says "operates". Now I'm quite confident that
> >"operates" doesn't mean "operates heavy equipment", "operates a computer
> >connected to the internet", "operates a convenience store" or "operates
> >on a patient".
>
> Say, Dave, you're beginning to sould a bit like Dr. Seuss there!

> I would not, could not, on a cap,
> I would not, could not, on RRAP,
> I would not have it on a plate,
> I would not 'cause I'd hate that plate!
> I would not use it on the air,
> I would not use it ANYWHERE!!!

> I don't care if Katey Segal wrote the code, Dave - I interpret
> "operates" in the context of my inference as "communicates to others",
> Dave. It's part of the package.

That's silly, "Leo". Are you telepathic? Can you read the thoughts I'm sending your way at this moment?

> Or does it simply refer to the technical side of operating - that is,
> it's OK to treat someone poorly on the air so long as you use
> technical accuracy in operating your station? "Sure, I told that jerk
> off big time on 40 last night, but my SWR was under 1.1, my intermod
> was < 60dB, and my signal was clean with no key clicks!"

I didn't write anything about telling Kim off on the air. Does your interpretation make any sense to you?

> And is it any different when you are at the office? "I gave that
> moron in Accounting a piece of my mind - we weren't on the air, you
> know!"

I dunno, "Leo". Is the moron in accounting even a ham? Did you lessen his operating pleasure?

> Or here, for that matter.

Has Kim's operating pleaure been lessened? Has yours?

> >You persist in calling my views inconsiderate. I don't agree. I've
> >considered. Now you're a "Leo"-come-lately so you've apparently not
> >been exposed to Kim's views on proper social behavior. If you like, you
> >can hit the Google archives and check them out. I happen to view Kim's
> >choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio.
> >It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her
> >nose at the world.
>
> I see. I'm confused, though - are you saying that the callsign is
> vulgar? Or the holder of the callsign? Please clarify.

Read some of Kim's view on what she views as proper social behavior and decide for yourself. Interesting material will include Kim's idea of proper behavior at a football game, cocktail party or when driving. You might also find Kim's comments to W4NTI, K3LT, W0EX, "JJ" or me to be of interest.

> You are aware that there are a whole pile of vanity calls out there
> which are much more explicit than this one - it must be challenging
> screening them all out before deciding to talk to 'em on the air,
> Dave. 'Cause they might mean something 'bad'. In many different
> languages, too!

I'm aware that there are other objectionable vanity calls. None of those individuals have made any posts here in the seven or eight years I've been here.

> Maybe you should hire an admin assistant for your shack!

Naw, most of my extra funds go to that engineer I keep on retainer.

Dave K8MN

1096. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 19:02:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400AD842.370B9AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85773

Leo wrote:
>
> On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 16:04:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:00:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Leo wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> wrote:
>
> >> >> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
> >> >> others. Plain and simple.
> >>
> >> Do you disagree with this concept, Dave?
> >
> >Yes, I'll have to disagree with it. "Bill" is a good neighbor. "Pete"
> >lives on the other side of me. "Pete" has a dog which he allows to roam
> >freely. "Pete" refuses to control the dog and laughs when I tell him
> >that I object to his dog's use of my lawn for a toilet.
> >
> >"Bill" asks if he can borrow my lawn mower. I lend it to him. A month
> >later, "Pete" asks if he might borrow the mower. I tell him "no". I've
> >not treated these individuals equally. It is my view that I'm not bound
> >to do so.
>
> No, you certainly are not.

Then what about your comments about folks deserving equal treatment?

> One question, though... did you put up posters all over the
> neighbourhood to let everyone know what a jerk you thought Pete is?
> Do you tell everyone that you meet that he is an inconsiderate boor?
> Do you go to the mall with a bucket of the dog droppings and tell
> everyone within earshot how wrong Pete is?

That's *three* questions, "Leo".

I've never brought up Kim's inappropriate call on the air. Both "Bill"
and "Pete" are hypotheticals.

> That would be OK to do, you know - you and Pete are not on the air!
> :)

Hypothetical Pete isn't a ham. He never heard of the Amateur's Code? I didn't lessen his operating pleasure.

Dave K8MN

1097. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 19:08:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400AD9AA.B5E7B97@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85774

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:400AAC4F.BFF8705B@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I happen to view Kim's
> > choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio.
> > It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her
> > nose at the world.

>
> You keep mentioning this "thumbing my nose at the world" Dave. And, you are
> absolutely correct in that assessment of me.

I never had any doubts, Kim.

> I am probably not able to be
> pinned into any particular mold. And, sorry you have a problem with that,
> but the greatest minds and achievers in this world saw through your "mold"
> concept.

The greatest minds and achievers in the world have been paying attention
to *my mold*? Tell us, Kim, what do THEY think? How did you come to
know them?

> I almost deliberately depart from tradition and mundane ways of doing
> things. I thoroughly immerse myself in the doings and thoughts of others,
> and I am truly, truly excited by the potential I see in nearly everyone.

I don't want you immersed in my thoughts.

> I
> also thoroughly enjoy approaching people like yourself with such vague
> attitude that you can't help but get offended.

I don't have a vague attitude, Kim. Most folks with any brain cells can
determine my attitude without difficulty.

> That is my mission for
> you--to offend you. Because at least it breaks up your boring and mundane
> day...

Well, there you have it. I hope "Leo" is paying attention.

Dave K8MN

1098. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 19:16:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400ADB68.D7B713D1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85775

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:mrSdnbNRbty1cZTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...

> > LOL!! My wife, who seldom makes any comment on anything pretaining to
> > amature radio, just walked into the room, looked over my shoulder and
> > upon seeing kim's call sign displayed in the newsgroup header said, "who
> > would be issued a call sign like that?" After explaining it was a vanity
> > call sign and the person requested it, her comment was, "what kind of
> > idiot would ever choose such a call sign?"
> > I ask her if she thought it was vulgar. "Not really vulgar, just
> > suggestive and totally lacking in taste, I suppose some people have to
> > get attention anyway they can".
> >
>
> You, your wife, Larry Roll, my good friends here in this area who enjoy the
> fun of my callsign--anyone--has the right to believe and think as they do;
> and the opinion of my callsign is an absolutely correct one--for each and
> everyone who has one.

Sort of an inclusive, "it means all of those things", huh?

> And, for me, and those who either think nothing of my callsign, think it's
> fun, wouldn't have selected it but don't see it is a main distraction, we
> are just as correct.

You're sort of a thermos bottle for amateur radio. It keeps things hot
or it keeps things cold!

> Your wife, JJ, probably also has the opinion that people who dance for a
> living;

Modern dance? Jazz? Ballet?

> who are in magazines like Hustler, Playboy and Playgirl; who lead a
> risque life, etc., are all "totally lacking in taste." I don't and I am
> certainly not in any minority.

No you aren't, Kim. You and the entire Springer Show audience are in
agreement.

> The difference between people like "us" and people like "you" is that we
> don't expect anyone to live up to anyone else's expectations or standards.

But you've already told me that my view of you thumbing your nose at the
world is correct. Wouldn't this latest position of your be at odds with

that claim?

> I have no problem at all with your opinion, the opinion of Larry Roll, the
> opinion of your wife. I do, however, take great exception to crossing the
> line and deciding that it's quite OK for sneering, resorting to desperate
> other measures trying to make someone feel embarrassed, etc. Whether you or
> anyone else realizes it, there are people--such as myself--who have risen
> way above letting the opinions of others get in the way of living life
> beautifully. But, it takes a lot of work and self-reflection to get there.
> And, there are more people who won't ever get there than who are there--and
> it is for those people that each and every time someone acts like an asshole
> toward another, I will have no problem mimicking the behavior right back at
> them.

...but you have no objections at all to offending folks who believe your
choice of vanity callsign is tasteless and offensive.

> So, tell your wife that I totally respect her opinion--but that is as far as
> it goes. I don't "need" the attention of anyone.

Your post on thumbing your nose at the world indicates otherwise. So
does your choice of callsigns.

Dave K8MN

1099. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 19:25:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <k4BOb.14018$i4.5564@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85776

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0401180833.5e75fb3d@posting.google.com...
> Part 97 does not assign me any responsibility to ensure that a
> frenchman is operating inside his frequency allocations, only that I
> am operating inside mine.
>
> If a frenchman calls me on 6-meters I will certainly answer him since
> F is a new band-country for me on 6.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

So would I. There's no way I can be responsible for knowing, much
less keeping track of, operating privileges for other countries.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1100. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL - More to like than to dislike

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:20:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118152058.12501.00005626@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85777

In article <4jiNb.29962$P%1.24495023@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0401140749.2042f798@posting.google.com...
>> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<fr3Nb.8228$1e.1897@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>
>> > Since
>> > 97.1 is headlined "Basis and Purpose", we can pretty much accept that
>> > 97.1(a) is the equivalent of a direct order.
>>
>> An order to the entire ARS, not to individual amateurs. Of course, if
>> no individual amateurs do what 97.1(a) says, the ARS doesn't do it
>> either.
>>
>> And a service which doesn't at least fulfill its B&P loses its reason
>> to exist.
>
>I strongly support public service. Yet the Basis and Purpose statement
>speaks of encouragement and enhancement of what we already do. It is not
>granting us any special authorization or mandate to do what we already do.

Maybe. Did you know that the B&P boilerplate was only added in 1951?

To me, the B&P is essentially a sort of expectation of what FCC wants the ARS to be doing "as a whole". Doesn't mean any particular ham has to do it, but that
if we as a group don't do those things, eventually there will be no need for an ARS
to exist.
>
>>[snip] Hans is right - take away the public service aspect, and the ARS'
>> reason
>> to exist is radically reduced, if not totally eliminated. Which may be
>> exactly why some nonhams find it necessary to deny that amateur radio
>> provides any public service, and to describe amateur radio as purely
>> "a fun hobby".
>
>I have many times in many forums objected to the phrase "it's just a hobby"
>for this very reason.

Well said!

>I strongly believe in public service. I strongly
>believe that it is one of, but not the only, justification for our

>existence. However if we are going to put so much emphasis on this
>particular element we have to face the fact that we are very remiss
>addressing the other elements listed under Basis and Purpose. But again a
>justification to exist is neither a requirement nor an authorization.

I agree 100% - I'd use the word "expectation".

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1101. If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:34:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118153405.12501.00005627@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85778

Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -

1. There would be NO ARRL to provide "guidance" and direction. That expired before St. Hiram expired. [in this alternative universe] Newington, CT, would have no museum.

2. There would be NO morse code test since no other radio service except Maritime Radio used morse code. There would be NO need to keep a "pool of trained morse radio operators" for any national need.

3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings because there would be no old-timers left to tell the tales...only pretenders who longed for a simpler (mythical) life way back before they were born.

4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway and several movies made about that tragedy. "Independence Day" would have been made anyway as a comic science-fiction vehicle for Will Smith who would later wear black suits and shades.

5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone belly-up anyway. Collins Radio would have continued on into the military and commercial radio market without making any overpriced fancy amateur radios. Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom would still have been successful in the commercial and government market. SGC might still exist but in the personal sailing market. Ten-Tec might not exist.

6. Radio broadcasting would have become successful and tele-vision broadcasting even more so. "Overseas radiotelephone" would still exist via the first HF SSB radios in the 1930s. The first VHF FM mobiles would still be tested by various police departments in the late 1930s. The military would still be the first HT user courtesy of Galvin (later Motorola)...and the back-pack radio ("walkie-talkie" again from Galvin)...and the radio relay (WW2) and VHF repeater (Korean War) uses...and single-channel HF SSB (USAF, post WW2)...and aircraft VHF AM (WW2). HF RTTY circuits would have been formed before WW2 and continued on in wide-bandwidth HF SSB, later to have much higher data rates from transferrence of modem and information theory techniques. Cross-country microwave radio relay would still exist for hundreds of telephone circuits and many TV circuits on a single link. Government and business would still have tens of thousands of HT and mobile radios courtesy of the military WW2 legacy and the invention of

transistors and integrated circuits. Communications satellites would still exist as soon as rockets could put them up there (first published paper on that by an up-coming science fiction writer named Arthur C. Clarke, then a "boffin" in the RAF right after WW2). All sorts of watercraft would have VHF radios in harbors due to the success of small land VHF radios. Radio-sondes by the hundreds of thousands would be used up annually using simple one-tube (pencil triode in a sheet metal cavity) transmitters in low microwave frequencies. The cellular telephone (past legal age in our universe) would still exist by the millions, morphed into a single-hand package with built-in video capability. There would still be "headphone radio" receivers for personal use, sometimes merged with CD players. "Wireless" would take on a new meaning as hundreds of thousands of data transceivers linked computers without wires. "Shortwave" broadcasting would still be trying out digital sound and finding out that it works despite dire warnings of impossibility. The U.S. military would still be using digital VHF manpack radios with encryption for voice and data for a total of a quarter million sets. None of the preceding required any "ham radio pioneering."

7. Arthur Godfrey would still get his TV show cancelled. Barry Goldwater would still unsuccessfully run for U.S. President. [the fate of Julius LaRosa is unknown in this universe]

8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on approximately the same scale and still trying to privatize commercial operator testing to save money. Radio use by non-hams after 1934 grew sufficiently large to require the agency to continue.

9. "CB" would have been created anyway, a fore-runner of the license-free personal radio wave of the future. [it is 46 years old in our universe which already has FRS, R-C, cordless telephones and wireless gizmos of all kinds]

10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent. Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign behind their names to show how good and expert they were in "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).

LHA / WMD

1102. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:34:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118153407.12501.00005629@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85779

In article <4cgl005djdmgpm0jfv52fgcvqc0jv7b66l@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>>Get real, "Leo".
>
>I think, therefore I am, "Dave".

True enough.

"Dave" put Descartes before de horse...

:-)

LHA / WMD

1103. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:34:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118153407.12501.00005628@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85782

In article <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
<scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:

>A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
>
>I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
>in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
>me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.

Only in THIS venue, Scott.

In THIS venue, all the pro-code newsgroupies require all to think,
act, do, behave, and moralize as they do.

To them, amateur radio is NOT a hobby, not a normal recreation.

It is a Way of Life. Comes complete with a rigid moral code.

Pro-coders RULE amateur radio (in here).

All who deviate from an inflexible code of ethics established in 1928
shall be punished (in here) by contant, unremitting pejorative
pummeling by the pro-coders for even daring to say one unkind
word about the Sacred Olde Ways of amateurdom.

Not only are they rigid and inflexible while marching in unified ranks,
they are generally without humor since they are near-absolute
literalists who demand (if not dictate) all following their Orders.

I've been trying to get a word in on the SUBJECT of morse code
testing and have been a constant target of character assassination
by these pro-code newsgroupies. No "civil debate" possible in that
cacophony of code.

Never mind that I got into big-time HF communications at a young
age (much more so than any other in here) and that led to a
career choice of electronics engineering (a decided major change
in education).

No matter. Heil says that is not enough "interest in radio," I must
learn morse code and become an amateur (NOT a professional) to
"show interest in radio."

The resident gunnery nurse spits on professionalism AND night
classes in EE, arming his slingshot with slimy spit and trying to
get down and give him 20 for talking against "superiors." Weird.

An olde-tymer of 48 going on 84 who lives in the past keeps
saying I am always "mistaken" and "incorrect" in another ploy of
perverse character assassination.

This is NOT anywhere close to a venue for "discussion of issues"
in amateur radio. It is a place for newsgroupies to gather and try
to turn into some kind of ARRL-south, to stir stock myths and
old ideas into a stew of meaty morse just like what HAD to be
done in the 1920s and 1930s.

Rigid, inflexible, all march to the same drumbeep.

>Re-reading my origanal post, I seem to have come off as a bit of an idiot. I
>think maybe I should have taken things a little slower.

No. I don't agree.

If any "error" was committed it was merely in underestimating the
vehemence of the pro-code Life Stylers, the worshippers of the
Church of St. Hiram, the Believers who take all their Life Guidance
from a single membership organization.

In Their view of ham radio, They say what "fun" is in The Service.

>And once again, thanks for the gerat advice.

Amateur radio is an interesting, fascinating hobby, a recreational
pursuit involving an intriguing technology.

I'm coming up on my 51st anniversary of putting a 1 KW transmitter
on the air trans-Pacific. Radio and electronics is still fascinating
to me and I've explored a lot of it in the course of a half century.
Been in lots more of the EM spectrum than nearly all of these
rigid pure moralists in here. Never used morse code in all that time,
never had to. Used many more modes and modulations than are
allowed to amateurs. That's not enough!

According to all the pro-code newsgroupies in here, none of that is
"good enough for them." All must do as they did, learn morse code
and pass a morse test, for "morse code gets through when nothing
else will" (expletive deleted).

There can be NO talk or even a hint about changing the morse code
test regulation. Morse code testing MUST remain in the USA for
all radio amateurs. That is the only way to "real" U.S. ham radio.
Those who do not follow the dictates of the moral majority of
pro-code newsgroupies shall be banished from human society!

If the pro-coders had to do it, by darn, EVERYONE has to!

That's what it boils down to...a battle of newsgroup wills.

Those who haven't made out their "will" properly are to be
destroyed. [by any means possible...]

Hang in there, Scott. Pander to the would-be "authority wanna-bes"
if you have to...but GO YOUR OWN WAY. Be your own man, not
a puppet of those who dictate what you can do, what you shall
enjoy, what you must do to please them.

Independent thought is GOOD!

Leonard H. Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1104. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:34:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118153408.12501.00005630@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85780

In article <ggbl009snpjs3t62hb4inca8t0nit7n3im@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Say, Dave, you're beginning to sould a bit like Dr. Seuss there!
>
>Dave, would you like W5TIT with that?
>
>I would not, could not, on a cap,
>I would not, could not, on RRAP,
>I would not have it on a plate,
>I would not 'cause I'd hate that plate!
>I would not use it on the air,
>I would not use it ANYWHERE!!!
>
>I don't care if Katey Segal wrote the code, Dave - I interpret
>"operates" in the context of my inference as "communicates to others",
>Dave. It's part of the package.

"Katey Segal?" :-)

Big Dave thinks he is Steven Segal ! :-)

LHA / WMD

1105. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:34:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118153409.12501.00005631@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85781

In article <400AB223.1E96EF29@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <2pti00lpevmvihps41np2h8ia5devq9oi3@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >wrote:
>> >
>> >>Leo wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >>> wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>> >Leo wrote:
>> >>> >>
>> >>> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >>> >> wrote:
>> >>> >>
>> >>> >> >Leo wrote:
>>
>> >>> >> You are of course free to refrain from using it if you choose - but
>it
>> >>> >> would be rude to do so in a manner that is intentionally designed to
>> >>> >> discriminate against or annoy the holder of the call.
>> >>> >
>> >>> >She deserves? On what basis? If Kim believes that I am
>discriminating
>> >>> >against her because I disapprove of her callsign, she's right. If it
>> >>> >annoys her--well, I find Kim's callsign to be inappropriate. She
>should
>> >>> >stop annoying me.
>> >>>
>> >>> On the basis that it is her legal callsign, Dave.
>> >>
>> >>I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
>> >>air.
>> >
>> >Hoo boy.
>>
>> Big Dave Sets The Standards!

>
>Big Dave certainly sets Big Dave's standards, Little Leonard.

Big Dave doesn't know when to stop.

ALL must follow and obey Big Dave's likes and dislikes.

Those that do not follow are subjected to the Wrath of Big Dave.

Woe be unto those receiving Wrath. :-)

>> >>> >> Common courtesy cannot be mandated, Dave. Just expected.
>> >>> >
>> >>> >I think Kim owes amateur radio a little common courtesy. Don't you?
>> >>>
>> >>> My point (again...) was that the callsign itself cannot possibly be
>> >>> "objectionable" - it's a callsign. If dirty thoughts enter your own
>> >>> mind whever you see it, that ain't Kim's problem.
>> >>
>> >>Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
>> >>call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
>> >
>> >I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as
>> >vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
>> >
>> >I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!
>>
>> No link is required. Big Dave sets the Standards.
>>
>> That's IT. Period.
>
>More civil debate of the elimination or morse testing, Little Leonard?
>That's where you attempt to set the standards for something in which you
>are not at all involved.

Morse code TESTING involves GETTING INTO amateur radio in
the United States.

Since Big Dave has been in amateur radio sooooo long, He has
no business trying to dictate what constitutes GETTING INTO
amateur radio, does He?

Big Dave is very confused (He really needs his monocle prescription
changed). Times have changed. OLD laws aren't applicable any
more. There is NO need to have any morse code test for GETTING
INTO amateur radio.

Big Dave wants to DICTATE who should do what and where.

Dictatorial behavior is not civil.

Dictatorial behavior is that of despots and would-be authorities.

Big Dave is not an authority.

Dictatorial behavior is uncivil, perverse, vulgar, tasteless and tacky.

[let it dry long enough and it won't be tacky...]

>
>> >>> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
>> >>> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
>> >>> you wish to debate this point.
>> >>
>> >>Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
>> >
>> >No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
>> >I :)
>>
>> Big Dave is defending the Virtue of ham radio. He IS ham radio.
>> Anything resembling a "slight" against ham radio calls Him to
>> Action...
>
>Why, Little Leonard, I am certainly a part of amateur radio. You
>aren't.

Yes, Big Dave, you are certainly a part of the despotic dictatorship
trying to keep everything just the way it was when you jumped
through the hoops.

Inflexible. Unable to bend with the times.

Big Dave tries to create the impression of an Authority Figure. At
best all he can do is press his prussian uniform and impress by
image. Image, not substance.

All Big Dave can do in "discussing" the morse code test issue is
mouth off badness against those against the test. Attempts at
character assassination are his only "discussion" tools.

Very "civil" behavior for a despot, a dictator...in their vulgar,
tasteless, and tacky way.

Is that what happens when amateurs become olde-tymers in
hamme raddio? Not a nice hobby in that case...

>Please continue with your civil debate of the elimination of morse
>testing.

Why?

There will be NO discussion of any issues.

All there is is a lot of personal pejoratives thrown at the no-code-
test-advocates. Pro-code-test-advocates do not seem to have
any valid arguments in favor of retention. All the pro-coders can
do is trot out a lot of standard boilerplate phrasing that boils down
to "olde-tymers had to test for morse so everyone has to!"

Not a good argument.

LHA / WMD

"Give a man an inch and he thinks he is a ruler..."

1106. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:57:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <c2rl00h0vpphjbkftui5vucgtcoaefioo8@4ax.com>
Source record: 85783

The plot thins:

On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 19:02:39 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 16:04:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >>
>> >> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:00:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >Leo wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 21:49:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >> Nope - just the right of one individual to be treated equally by the
>> >> >> others. Plain and simple.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Do you disagree with this concept, Dave?
>> >> >
>> >> >Yes, I'll have to disagree with it. "Bill" is a good neighbor. "Pete"
>> >> >lives on the other side of me. "Pete" has a dog which he allows to roam
>> >> >freely. "Pete" refuses to control the dog and laughs when I tell him
>> >> >that I object to his dog's use of my lawn for a toilet.
>> >> >
>> >> >"Bill" asks if he can borrow my lawn mower. I lend it to him. A month
>> >> >later, "Pete" asks if he might borrow the mower. I tell him "no". I've
>> >> >not treated these individuals equally. It is my view that I'm not bound
>> >> >to do so.
>> >>
>> >> No, you certainly are not.
>> >
>> >Then what about your comments about folks deserving equal treatment?
>>
>> Dave, you are jumping to confusions here :)
>>
>> My next paragraph focusses on this statement further:
>>
>> >
>> >> One question, though... did you put up posters all over the
>> >> neighbourhood to let everyone know what a jerk you thought Pete is?

>> Do you tell everyone that you meet that he is an inconsiderate boor?
>> Do you go to the mall with a bucket of the dog droppings and tell
>> everyone within earshot how wrong Pete is?
>
>That's *three* questions, "Leo".

Oh - you're right! Thanks, "Dave" :)

Care to answer them?

>
>I've never brought up Kim's inappropriate call on the air. Both "Bill"
>and "Pete" are hypotheticals.

Oh - I forgot - real life is different than on the air. You only need
to act in a friendly and courteous manner when you are on the air,
right? Not here, for example. Who could possibly be listening here?

Got it.

>
>> That would be OK to do, you know - you and Pete are not on the air!
>> :)
>
>Hypothetical Pete isn't a ham. He never heard of the Amateur's Code? I
>didn't lessen his operating pleasure.

This is funny. Maybe he has a hypothetical Extra ticket? Maybe he's
just ignoring you on the air cause you hate his hypothetical dog,
Dave.

But Hey, you didn't answer any of my questions yet, Dave! Bummer!

Betcha thought I wouldn't notice, huh?

BTW, speaking of questions, you accidentally cut one of my questions
out of your reply, Dave - just to help out, I listed it below.
preceeded by your comments:

Regarding:

Full figured women dealing with fallout as a fact of life...

Dave said:

Given a choice between voicing disapproval and the *wink* and
chuckle, your choice has been obvious.

And Leo asked:

Really - what were you thinking of, Dave? Tsk, tsk.

BTW, I can do a "smiley" OK, but what is the graphic symbol for a
"chuckle"?? And doesn't a "wink" have a semicolon in it, like this ;)
?

LOL.

>
>Dave K8MN

Dave, you're a funny guy! Please be careful not to step in any of the
hypothetical dog poop next time you cut your lawn!

And next time you see Hypo Pete, tell him that Leo says he should
think about moving to a new neighbourhood!

73, Leo

Alpha Mike Foxtrot

1107. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 20:59:51 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <1qsl00hv43a914pr7dvss8gt93ln4bbss9@4ax.com>
Source record: 85784

On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 19:08:38 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:400AAC4F.BFF8705B@earthlink.net...
>> >
>> > I happen to view Kim's
>> > choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio.
>> > It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her
>> > nose at the world.
>
>>
>> You keep mentioning this "thumbing my nose at the world" Dave. And, you are
>> absolutely correct in that assessment of me.
>
>I never had any doubts, Kim.
>
>> I am probably not able to be
>> pinned into any particular mold. And, sorry you have a problem with that,
>> but the greatest minds and achievers in this world saw through your "mold"
>> concept.
>
>The greatest minds and achievers in the world have been paying attention
>to *my mold*? Tell us, Kim, what do THEY think? How did you come to
>know them?
>
>> I almost deliberately depart from tradition and mundane ways of doing
>> things. I thoroughly immerse myself in the doings and thoughts of others,
>> and I am truly, truly excited by the potential I see in nearly everyone.
>
>I don't want you immersed in my thoughts.
>
>> I
>> also thoroughly enjoy approaching people like yourself with such vague
>> attitude that you can't help but get offended.
>
>I don't have a vague attitude, Kim. Most folks with any brain cells can
>determine my attitude without difficulty.
>
>> That is my mission for
>> you--to offend you. Because at least it breaks up your boring and mundane
>> day...

>
>Well, there you have it. I hope "Leo" is paying attention.

Yup - certainly no one could fault you for taking offense to this - as
it is intended to be an offense.

But that wasn't what I ws writing about, was it? This just happened
now, I theenk...
>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1108. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1379 – January 16, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 21:35:11 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040118163511.23011.00000268@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85785

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1379 – January 16, 2004

The following is a closed circuit advisory for Amateur Radio Newsline bulletin stations. It is not necessarily for broadcast.

According to Support Fund Administrator Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Amateur Radio Newsline has only received enough funding of late to keep the service going for another month or so. In other words, the bills from last November have been paid , but now money has to be raised to keep from loosing the phones and e-mail service from bills accrued in December.

Andy says that Newsline continues to exist hand to mouth on a week to week basis. He says that It is up to you and the listeners to make sure that it is funded so that it can continue to provide this vital service. Otherwise he may soon be forced to pull the plug.

Please help us to keep The Amateur Radio Newsline on the air. Our address is the Amateur Radio Newsline Support Fund, Post Office Box 660937 in Arcadia California. The Zipcode is 91066. Again and as always, we thank you.

That ends the closed circuit advisory with Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1379 with a release date of Friday, January 16, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The ARRL Board meets to discuss the future of ham radio and lots of news on the B-P-L front. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1379 coming
your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: ARRL BOD MEETS IN CT JAN 16-17 TO DISCUSS WRC-03

Look for some major changes in the structure of the United States Amateur Radio service to be proposed or at least put open to study. This as the American Radio Relay Leagues Board of Directors holds its first annual meeting of 2004 as this newscast goes to air. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, reports:

--

What’s to come under the ARRL Board of Directors scrutiny? The ARRL Letter points to the big item being the implementation of changes in US Amateur Radio rules. This, in the wake of World Radiocommunication Conference of 2003.

Among other significant changes, W-R-C 03 delegates agreed last summer to leave up to individual countries whether to require a Morse code test for access to

amateur high-frequency allocations. Several nations have already dropped the code testing requirement for High Frequency access. In the United States, the FCC last year invited public comments on 14 Morse-related petitions for rule making, but it has not yet acted on the issue. When it meets, the ARRL Board is expected to discuss in detail recommendations in response to W-R-C 03 that were developed during last November's meeting of the ARRL Executive Committee.

Most observers generally believe that there will not be any major action by the FCC to implement W-R-C 03 changes until it hears from the League. This Board meeting is expected to generate an ARRL position that will be transmitted to the regulatory agency, but you will have to wait until the meeting is over and the League issues its own statement to find out what that position is. We suggest you keep an eye on www.arrl.org the next few days for any breaking news on ARRL Board decisions.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, in New Jersey.

--

Among other actions, the Board also will elect members to the Executive Committee and appoint three directors to the ARRL Foundation Board. The Board also will elect officers for the next two years. Incumbent President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, has indicated that he plans to run for a third term. (ARRL Letter, others)

**

RESTRUCTURING: IARU REGION 1 TO MEET IN FEB

Meantime the International Amateur Radio Union will be holding its next regional conference in a few weeks. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is here with that story:

--

The Twelfth Regional Conference Is being held from February 16 - 20, 2004 in Taipei, Taiwan. There are Working Groups, where most if not all the business is discussed and these run parallel to one another. A wealth of information is exchanged on the floor at these Working Groups.

There are formal discussion times and of course many informal discussions and gatherings such as over meals and receptions and so on. Contacts made at these conferences assist when an issue comes up back home, help can be sought on a first name basis.

There will be workshops on two important topics. The first is a Workshop on WRC 2003. It will include a detailed discussion on the new Article 25. To facilitate the discussion, a paper by Michael Owen VK3KI is being circulated with the Conference papers so that all societies will be able to make an advance study and brief their delegation on issues to raise and matters for seeking clarification.

The other Workshop will be on The Society's IARU Liaison Officer. The Workshop will help gain a better appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of the

Liaison Officer and hopefully lead to greater satisfaction from the work carried out by Liaison Officers.

Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reporting.
--

More information on this upcoming conference can be found on-line at the Japan Amateur Radio Leagues website at www.jarl.or.jp/iaru-r3 (Q-News)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: AUSTRIA TURNS OFF ITS BPL

And a big win overseas on the B-P-L front as reported by the ARRL Letter. The Austrian Amateur Transmitter Federation says that a Broadband over Power Line field test in the city of Linz has been cut short as a result of excessive radio interference. According to the national ham radio society, the Government Ministry for Commerce, Innovation and Technology closed down Linz Power Company's B-P-L pilot project because it was generating interference on the HF bands.

Shortwave broadcaster Radio Austria says the case that brought the issue to a head was a Red Cross report. One that documented that emergency services radio traffic during a disaster response drill last May was the victim of massive B-P-L interference. According to the broadcaster, measurements were said to have indicated that radiation from the B-P-L system exceeded permissible field strength levels by a factor of 10,000.

Last fall, Linz amateurs and their national leaders got together with power company representatives in an effort to resolve BPL's incompatibility with High Frequency ham radio operation. The meetings followed news reports of interference to emergency service communications and QRM complaints from several area hams.

The Commerce Ministry Order not only means the end of the Linz B-P-L pilot project. It also perminently curtails any future the deployment of this technology in Austria. (ARRL)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Garland Amateur Radio Clubs repeater serving the city of Garland Texas.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: PANASONIC TO INTRODUCE HOME BPL SYSTEM

A form of Broadband Over Powerline may be coming to a house near you. This as Matsushita Electric announces that it has developed a high-speed home power line IP networking technology capable of high-definition video transmission.

Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW has more:

--

Best known for its Panasonic-brand products, a newly developed Matsushita Electric technology will make it possible to provide broadband connectivity to every room in a house via existing home power lines. This, using an Panasonic branded adapter about the size of an audiocassette that the company says cannot be interfere with by radio amateurs.

The adapter contains a power plug, power supply, LAN connector and an L-S-I chipset that converts broadband data into signals that can travel over a power line. The unit connects a broadband Internet link such as D-S-L or optical fiber lines to the existing power lines in the home. According to Panasonic, a user simply plugs the P-L-C adapter into any AC power outlet to create a home broadband networking without installing new cabling.

The most interersting claim being made by Panasonic is that the new technology it calls H-D P-L-C resists interference from other signals such as those from ham radio that the company says often use the same frequencies as wired communications. In order to realize this capability, Panasonic claims that it combined Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing and Wavelet technology to reduce the noise caused by the interference down to one-fifth of typical noise levels. This the company says creates a proprietary interference-resistant and ultra-high-speed modulation-demodulation method without use of additional filter circuitry that eliminates the frequencies where interference is likely to occur. What impact that this new technology will have on over-the-air radio reception by hams and other spectrum users is not addressed.

Panasonic expects to introduce P-L-C adapters for both consumer and office use by the end of 2004 providing that the HomePlug Powerline Alliance determines a final specification in the summer of 2004. An L-S-I chipset will also become commercially available at the same time.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

Matsushita Electric and its Panasonic subsidiary exhibited this new Powerline Communications technology at 2004 International CES held last week in Las Vegas. Both companies are members of the HomePlug Alliance which has been working with the ARRL to notch out amateur frequencies from its powerline communications signals. (ARNewsline(tm), CQ -- from news releases)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: W1RFI SPEAKS IN PA

Meantime, one of the leading experts in the area of Broadband Over Powerline interference has made his thoughts known. Speaking at Frankford Radio Club meeting on in Philadelphia last Tuesday night, Ed Hare, W1RFI, said that B-P-L is not good news for the radio spectrum. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Mark Abramovich, N-T-3-V, was there and has this report:

--

When Ed Hare talks, amateurs and others listen.

During an hour-long presentation at the FRC's meeting on the University of Sciences campus here in Philadelphia, Hare made the case that Broadband Over Power Lines is a threat to the future of the hobby.

"If these B-P-L systems came to my neighborhood, HF Amateur Radio as I know it would be over," he explains. "I mean S-9 on multiple bands would seriously cripple me.

Oh, we've had more serious threats when Amateur Radio was shut down after the world wars, but this ranks up there with it in terms of the potential to cause harm to the types of Amateur Radio that many of us enjoy doing."

The reason: Hare says B-P-L field tests by a handful of electric utilities use power line systems to carry high-frequency or HF signals to homes and businesses to give them connections to the internet.

"My neighbor's computer system is a local interference problem," he says. "I'm not going to hear the one three blocks up the street.

But Broadband over Power Line, they're going to intentially conduct those signals onto the overhead lines that will run through my house and then they're going to build this as big as an entire neighborhood. Clearly it has a different interference potential."

Hare says he's charted the interference on 20-meters, calculating it on a national and worldwide scale should B-P-L be rolled out.

"The ability of HF to sustain worldwide communication if you have 30-microvolts per meter of noise will not exist," Hare says.

He says the interference potential goes beyond the ham bands.

"This will affect military spectrum, this will affect international broadcasting spectrum, this will affect other government spectrum," Hare says. "This will affect commercial HF spectrum and as I tune outside the ham bands, you know what? That's not a radio wasteland, there's a lot of stuff there."

And, Hare notes, there's serious concern about medical-diagnostic devices.

"I go to my doctor's office, it's a house in a residential neighborhood," Hare says. "And he's going to hook me up to the E-K-G machine to find out whether I'm going to die before the end of the day. And, if that thing's interfered with, maybe I'll get a false positive or a false negative."

Finally, Hare says the amateur community is not alone.

"I'm very pleased to see groups like FEMA, NTIA and others getting involved with this saying essentially the same things ARRL is doing based on their work," Hare says.

"They, too, see a serious inteference potential to HF that needs to be addressed before B-P-L could ever be considered in any way."

For Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz NT3V in Philadelphia.

--

More on the fight to stop B-P-L in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESCUE RADIO: NIUE DEVASTATION REPORTED BY HAM RADIO

From the rescue radio file, word that radio amateurs became a lifeline when tropical cyclone Heta ripped through the tiny island republic of Niue two weeks ago. The storm left the tropical paradise with no regular means of communicating with the outside world and summoning much needed relief aid. Enter ham radio.

According to news reports, a radio operator on the island put out a a call for help which was answered by Steve McCully, W7TZ/ZF2CQ, in the California community of Oak Hills. In fact, it was McCully who phoned the New Zealand Consul General in Los Angeles and provided that government with its first notification that Niue had been ravaged by 186 mile per hour winds.

More is on-line at http://www.vvdailypress.com/cgi-bin/newspro/viewnews.cgi?newsid1073499379, 43275, http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/SYD184348.htm and http://www.lonelyplanet.com/destinations/pacific/niue/ (CGC, WA6MCL)

**

RADIO ALLOCATIONS: RULES FOR 5.9 GHZ INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION ADOPTED

The FCC has adopted service and licensing rules for the 5.9 GHz Band for Dedicated Short Range Communications or D-S-R-C. This, from 5.850 to 5.925 Ghz in the Intelligent Transportation Systems Radio Service.

According to the Commission, DSRC systems will provide a limited-range, wireless link to transfer information between vehicles traveling at high speeds and roadside units or other vehicles. Some examples include intersection collision avoidance, work zone warnings, road condition warnings, electronic toll collections, and electronic payment for gas, fast food, or parking.

More is on the web at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-242309A1.doc (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: 10 METERS NON-HAMS IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

Three new non ham radio intruders to the 10 meter band have been monitored down-under by Wayne Featherstone VK4ZRT. All appear to be Asian in location and all operate the A3E mode at around 0700 U-T-C. Listen for them on 28.215, 28.225 decimal 25 and on 28.285 Mhz. (Q-News)

**

ENFORCEMENT: $5.4 MILLION DOLLAR FAX FINE

Some good news for anyone who is sick and tired of getting unsolicited junk faxes. Federal regulators approved a record $5.4 million fine against a company for faxing unsolicited
advertisements to consumers.

The five-member commission unanimously approved the penalty on Wednesday, December 31st but did not announce its decision until Monday, January 5th. The FCC said Fax.com accrued the penalty because it violated the rules 489 separate times incurring an $11,000 fine for each instance. In affirming the fine the commission rejected arguments from Fax.com that the ban on unsolicited faxes was unconstitutional and that the fine was excessive.

The Federal Communications Commission said the fine given to Fax.com, Inc. was the largest ever for violating do-not-fax rules that went into effect in 1992. Fax.com sends faxes on behalf of clients that pay a fee. Its website claims that the company offers the industry's largest fax number database of more than 30 million numbers. Company officials did not immediately respond to a requests from the media for comment. (FCC)

**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW: BLAME THE COMPUTER

Prosecutors looking to throw the book at accused computer hackers have come across a legal defense. In four words, “the computer did it.” And in this era of hijacked PCs and laptops, jury’s are believing it.

In one case in the U-K, nineteen year old Aaron Caffrey was recently acquitted on charges of hacking into the computer system of the Houston Pilots back in 2001. Houston Pilots is an independent contractor for the Port of Houston.

Caffrey had been charged with breaking into the system and crippling the server that provides scheduling information for all ships entering the world's sixth-largest port. Although authorities traced the hack back to Caffrey's computer, he claimed that someone must have remotely planted a "trojan program" onto it. That it was the trojan and not him that did the hacking. (Published reports)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: THE 44TH MIAMI TROPICAL HAMBOREE

Turning to the hamfest and convention scene, the 2004 season really kicks off the weekend of February 7th and 8th. This, when the doors of the Miami Dade County Fair Expo Center in Florida swing open to welcome the 44th Tropical

Hamboree.

This years Hamboree has a long list of great programs with speakers that include such notables as ARRL President Haynie W5JPB, FCC chief rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth K4ZDH, IARU President Larry Price W4RA, CQ Communications' Rich Moseson W2VU and Radio School's Gordon West WB6NOA. They will take part in a free form round-table discussion of the future of the Amateur Radio service. Moseson and West will later join Florida’s own Sherri Bower, W4STB, in the conventions Public Relations Forum.

Attendees will also get to hear the latest DXpedition Adventures presented by South Florida DX Association and learn about Amateur Radio at the National Hurricane Center. There will be lots of vendors and all the other niceties that make the Miami Tropical Hamboree a must attend on the convention circuit. The event is sponsored by the Dade Radio Club of Miami, Inc. More information is on-line at www.hamboree.org (Tropical Hamboree)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: CHARLOTTE COUNTY HAMFEST

Meantime, March 6th is the date for the Charlotte County Hamfest in Englewood, Minnesota. Sponsored by the Englewood Amateur Radio Society, the event will feature swap tables, tailgating and overnight hookups for those bringing a recreational vehicle. The venue is the Charlotte County Fairgrounds and you can find out more in cyberspace at www.earsradioclub.org (Worldradio)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AIR LEAK ON ISS LEADS TO CONTACT CANCELLATION

A small air leak on board the International Space Station forced cancellation of the Monday, January 12th scheduled contact with the Armstrong Middle School in Flint, Michigan. The I-S-S recently began experiencing the slight loss of air pressure, which the crew had to locate and repair. This meant that they had to devote all their time to resolving this issue using special ultrasonic monitoring. The leak was located and repaired late the same day. Contacts missed are in the process of being rescheduled. (ARISS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: UPDATE ON OPERATIONS FROM ARISS

We also have an update on what’s happening with the new radio gear on board the International Space Station and why hams on the ground heard un proto packets for a while. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, is here with the details:

--
Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, is the Chairman of ARISS. Amateur Radio on the International Space Station. And Bauer says that he has been sifting through the many e-mails he has received over the past few days regarding ham radio operations from the orbiting outpost.

Bauer says that the new Kenwood D 700 radio recently delivered to the ISS is still in what he terms as its "raw" form. In other words, the ARISS team has not yet run a formal engineering checkout of the new hardware and the ISS crew has not gotten the operations procedures uplinked to them.

According to Bauer, at this point in time the Kenwood radio system is not properly configured for digital operations. A reconfiguration change occurred after it was brought on line which has led to this issue. So, what hams see in the way of packets coming from the station right now will probably not be what they will see in the future.

As to the signal fading problem Bauer says that its probably due to the antenna that’s currently in use. The astro-hams are now using the new antenna system located on the Service Module and is a single, bottom mounted unit. Since the structure of ISS is very large, it is quite possible that the ham radio signals are getting some blockage.

Bauer says that ARISS will continue to evaluate the antenna system performance. He notes that there are now 4 antenna systems that can support 2 meter and 70 cm operation. This says Bauer gives a lot of possibilities with the antennas, including signal splitting, if need be.

As to the packet signals heard during a recent school contact? Those who heard it heard history being made. The first ever multiple radio operations from the International Space Station. While the older Ericsson radio system was doing the school contact, the new Kenwood radio system was active doing packet. It was also -- perhaps -- the first man made Q-R-M from space.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m David Black, KB4KCH

--

Bauer says that the astro-hams kind of surprised everyone on the ground by getting the radio system installed much earlier than they had anticipated. As a result, the Amateur Radio on the International Spasce Station team has been working feverishly with the space agencies to get the procedures uplinked and engineering checkouts scheduled. (ARISS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - INDIA: HAM RADIO AT THE CHILDREN’S SCIENCE CONGRESS

On the international scene, ham radio was a part of India’s 11th National Children Science Congress. Organized by the an educational group in the city of Lucknow the event ran from the 27th to the 31st December with more than 2000 students, teachers and science promoters from various parts of that nation taking part.

According to VU2DCT, Lucknow hams were also called by program organizers to give the demonstration on Amateur Radio for the benefit of participants. Most of attendees were astonished to listen a live QSO between VU2WAP and a ham in Columbia, South America. During their presentation the hams emphasized the role of Amateur Radio in disaster situations. (Q-News)

**

INTERNATIONAL - SOUTH KOREA: HOMEGROWN SOFTWARE IS BEST

South Korea is considering requiring mobile phone operators to use locally developed software for downloading music and games. According to news reports, that nations Information and Communication Ministry is pushing for the compulsory use of in-country developed software for downloading on new mobile phones in order to standardize the wireless Internet platform.

South Korea is Asia's third largest mobile market and one of the fastest-growing wireless Internet markets. As of the beginning of 2004 there are 33.44 million mobile phone subscribers, or about 70 percent of the country's 48 million population. (Science Today)

**

DX

In D-X, word that the Five Star DX’ers Association has announced plans for a very large-scale DXpedition to Rodrigues Island in March and April next year. The callsign will be 3B9C. An international team of nearly 30 will operate no fewer than 15 separate stations will take to the air on virtually every band and mode possible. The Five Star DX’ers Association is the same group that organized the very successful operation from the Spratly Islands in 1998 and the subsequent record breaking D68C DXpedition to the Comoros in February 2001. (IRTS)

Also, word that DJ4KW and D-K-9-G-G will be active from Belize until the end of February. Callsigns being used are V31YN on CW and V31GW on RTTY. Activity is on 160 through 10 meters. Please QSL as directed on the air. (OPDX)

And for those of you who perfer your D-X and D-X awards a bit higher in frequency, Peter Heins, N6ZE says that he will be able to conduct VUCC field checking in Springfield, Massachusettes several times during the next few weeks. You must be a current ARRL member to avail yourself of this service. Those wanting to take advantage of Pete’s offer should e-mail him as soon as possible to n6ze@aol.com (N6ZE)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE POTTY MOUTH AND THE VURGER

And finally this weeek, customers at a Troy, Michigan Burger King are getting something extra with their orders that’s a little harder to swallow than a hamburger and fries. And its coming by radio. Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, is here with a complete menu on this one:

--
The Detroit News is reporting that police in nearby Troy are looking for the person who has found a way to broadcast on the same frequency as a local Burger King drive-through radio system. The jammer has interrupted business transactions with obscene remarks on several occasions that have startled customers.

The most recent incident took place on January 8th. It happened when the manager went outside to apologize to customers and look for the source of the

salty talk. Suddenly a voice boomed from the speaker and said -- quote: “There’s nothing you or the police can do about this, so get your fat -- err -- lets say posterior -- take your fat posterior back inside and take your goons with you.”

Police suspect the calls are being made by a mobile radio transmitter or walkie-talkie in the vacinity of the restaurant. Illegal use of any telecommunications device is a misdemeanor in the city of Troy. And as we all know, its also a serious violation of Federal law.

Heading out the door for some fast food, I’m Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

Hey -- can you make that a double cheeseburger and a double order of rings. Yeah and hold the mayo....

--

Sounds as if the story made Rick a bit hungry. And oh yes. Troy police say that they have the FCC for assistance to track down this all beef potty-mouth with a mustard laced tongue. (ARNewsline(tm) from vasrious sources)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, in Scottsdale Arizona saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

1109. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 22:24:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <evsl00hr9oksoio59c7ps9k1ruhbcidp1e@4ax.com>
Source record: 85786

On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 18:56:26 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> Dave, have a nice life and do try not to be too upset by
>
>...the developing nuclear capabilities of North Korea? another
>terrorist attack? Hilary Clinton?

it is refreshing to see that there are other issues which command your
attention, Dave - but this statement refers to the issue being
discussed, Dave. All of the text that follows that statement,
actually.

Sorry I forgot the colon at the end of the sentence - I'll try to
remember it for you next time!

>
>I have a nice life, thanks.

Idyllic, in fact, save for a lawn full of hypothetical dog
droppings....glad to hear it!

>
>> On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 15:55:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >>
>> >> On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:45:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >Leo wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:30:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Leo wrote:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> On Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>
>> >> >I'm under no obligation to use Kim's legal callsign here or even on the
>> >> >air.
>> >>
>> >> Hoo boy.

>> >
>> >Hoo boy indeed. Are you in disagreement with my statement?
>>
>> Not at all. Just amazed that you are so adamant about it, Dave.
>
>If you aren't in disagreement, why are you amazed that I'd state it?

Because it's obvious, Dave. Like jumping up in a crowded movie
theater and exclaiming "Hey! I'm in a movie theater!"

See also "duh!"

Similar to "No (expletive deleted) !" (which is, unfortunately, more
than you can say for your hypothetical lawn!)

>
>> >> >> I'm glad that we agree on this point, Dave - it would indeed be rude
>> >> >> to do so.
>> >> >
>> >> >The only point we've agreed on is that you answered your own question.
>> >> >If you already had an answer you liked, you aren't asking me a question,
>> >> >you're making a statement.
>> >>
>> >> I see. Huh?
>> >
>> >Raisin or bran muffin? Bran.
>> >
>> >There's a question for you along with the answer. No input on your part
>> >is necessary.
>> >
>> >> I wasn't asking you anything, Dave - you jumped in on a post to
>> >> Jim....that question was for him.
>>
>> Oops - my error, Dave.
>>
>> Do you want to answer the question? Please feel free to do so!
>
>It seems that you already found an answer which pleases you.

I have. How about you?

Or are you still looking for a question which pleases you?

>
>> >Then when did you start calling him "Dave"? I think you're beginning to
>> >get tangled in your own words. Maybe you'd like to take another look at
>> >your post.
>
>> >> >Naw, "Leo", that won't wash. I don't have dirty thoughts about Kim's
>> >> >call. I just think "tacky" when I see Kim's call.
>> >>
>> >> I'm sorry, Dave - in ayour post to Dwight you refer to Kim's call as

>> >> vulgar. Here, though, you are saying that it's tacky.
>> >
>> >"Vulgar" works for me. From the Random House College Dictionary:
>> >"vulgar adj. 1. characterized by ignorance of or lack of good breeding
>> >or taste; unrefined; crude.
>>
>> That's one meaning, Dave - here are all of 'em:
>>
>> 1. Crudely indecent.
>>
>> 2. Deficient in taste, delicacy, or refinement.
>> 3. Marked by a lack of good breeding; boorish. See Synonyms at common.
>> 4. Offensively excessive in self-display or expenditure; ostentatious:
>> the huge vulgar houses and cars of the newly rich.
>> 5. Spoken by or expressed in language spoken by the common people;
>> vernacular: the technical and vulgar names for an animal species.
>> 6. Of or associated with the great masses of people; common.
>>
>> >
>> >I also like "tacky" and "tasteless". There have been a number of other
>> >words used to describe it. You can add definitions 2,3 and 4 if you like. I'll go along
with them.
>>
>> Tacky and tasteless are indeed synonyms - vulgar can be different.
>> Might just mean 'common'. Or 'ostentatious'.
>
>I've used all of those terms in describing Kim's choice of callsigns.
>Others have used additional words to convey their feelings on the
>matter.
>

Good for you!

>> >> I don't see the link between tacky and vulgar. Dave - please clarify!
>> >
>> >I have.
>>
>> Sort of. They can be different concepts.
>
>I've used a number of terms. I meant all of them.

Dictionaries are funny things, Dave - kinda like restaurant menus.
When you are provided with multiple choices (or definitions, in the
case of the dictionary), it is indeed unusual to choose 'all of them'.

But, hey go for it - you really hate that callsign, right! After all,
it's a Big Issue!

Pick 'em all.
>
>> Tasteless could mean 'inappropriate'.
>

>It surely could.

Absolutely. It could mean a Big Mac, too.

>
>> Vulgar can too, or could mean 'objectionable'. Or something else. Not
>> all at the same time, though.
>
>It surely could. Did you you believe that I meant something else,
>especially after I provided you with a definition?

Just asking...you provided me with a whole whack of definitions, I was
just trying to see which one fir best!

>
>> Which is it - inappropriate or objectionable? Or ostentatious - I
>> like that one best :)
>
>"Inappropriate" and "objectionable" are both fine with me.

Well, you're the first one to step up and call it objectionable - good
for you.

Now if you can just find some way to convince the Government that you
should be the successor to Mr. Powell, you could impose that belief
upon the FCC, and actually do something about it!

Until then, it's OK. Nice and legal. Like all of the others.

>
>> >
>> >> >> If Kim chooses to use her call in an objectionable manner, that would
>> >> >> be a different issue. Please feel free to start your own thread if
>> >> >> you wish to debate this point.
>> >> >
>> >> >Feel free to step in the middle of something and start directing, "Leo"
>> >>
>> >> No thanks, I'll leave that to you, "Dave". Your much better at it than
>> >> I :)
>> >
>> >Smiley aside, you did suggest that I start another thread.
>>
>> Yup - I sure did!
>
>Then my comment about you stepping into something and attempting to
>direct stands.

Say - didn't you just jump in a while ago? :)

>
>> >> >Certainly it is, "Leo". You've already told Jim that he should use it
>> >> >to avoid damaging Kim's self esteem.
>> >>

>> >> Do take the time to reread my comments carefully, Dave - that ain't
>> >> quite what I said!
>> >
>> >In essence, "Leo", that is your point, that Jim should avoid hurting
>> >Kim's feelings by not using her call, the call that he finds
>> >objectionable.
>>
>> Nope - my point is that omitting just one call in a list was not the
>> polite way to handle the situation, Dave. If one feels that strongly
>> about one "inappropriate' call, then leave 'em all out. Treats
>> everyone as equals, Dave.
>
>Very touchy-feely and all-inclusive of you, "Leo". Let's all get
>together and celebrate our diversity, shall we?

That's a great idea, Dave - it might help you to understand others a
bit better, and socialize a bit? Unless of course you don't like
diversity - is that it, Dave?
>
>> >> Perhaps I misinterpreted her objection, Dave - please clarify.
>> >
>> >Just tell us how you interpreted it and we'll proceed from there.
>>
>> Rather obvious, isn't it Dave? Please advise where I went wrong.
>>
>> Feel free to use this quotation from Kim from the Pool thread when you
>> reply: (helpful hint - she was writing with reference to the deletion
>> of her callsign in the Pool posting....)
>>
>> "Jim is disrespectful to me to make it look like I am not an amateur
>> when he chooses not to associate me as an amateur when I've made a
>> conscious decision to participate in something he's providing for
>> fun."
>>
>> Gee, I guess that she was referring to something else.... :)
>
>I see Kim indicating that her feelings were hurt; Her self-esteem took a
>hit.

Oh - sorry, I thought that there might be a connection between the
two. My mistake :)

>
>> >> >> >> "CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>> >> >> >> pleasure of others."
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >I have news for you, "Leo". I'm living up to that line from the
>> >> >> >Amateur's Code. I'm not operating in such a way as to lessen the
>> >> >> >pleasure of others. Right now, I'm not operating at all. I'm posting
>> >> >> >in Usenet.
>> >> >>

>> >> >> You mean you consider it appropriate for an amateur to behave
>> >> >> inconsiderately or in an unfriendly manner when so long as he/she is
>> >> >> not on the air? Interesting concept.....
>> >> >
>> >> >Wanna talk about interesting concepts? How about using part of the
>> >> >"Amateur's Code" which says "never knowingly operates" to discuss
>> >> >something where we're not operating? If I'm talking to someone on the
>> >> >air, I shall to be friendly. I'm not obligated to work any station just
>> >> >because that station calls me. I won't be working Kim on the air. That
>> >> >is my perogative.
>> >>
>> >> To the first point - that's just funny, Dave. You are a paragon of
>> >> ham virtue with a microphone in your hand, but give you a keyboard and
>> >> all of that goes out the window. LOL!
>> >
>> >I use microphones, keyboards and keys on the air, "Leo". I don't don't
>> >use any of them in my amateur radio operations to lessen the pleasure of
>> >others.
>>
>> OK, not on the air, then - just here, perhaps. Apparently, the medium
>> determines the standards of appropriate behaviour: no wires, good;
>> wires, bad.
>>
>> I see.
>
>No, you don't. The code says what it says. You are attempting a
>stretch.
>You're also attempting to use that code to state that it is improper for
>me to voice disapproval over Kim's choice here or to ignore her on the
>air because of that disapproval. You're attempting to use that code to
>tell Jim that he should either use Kim's call or not use any calls. Is
>that about it?

I'm suggesting that blathering your negative opinion of Kim, and her
callsign, in a public forum is boorish behaviour, Dave. (say, that
would be vulgar behaviour, from the definition of vulgar, wouldn't
it?)

I'm attempting to draw a parallel between the standards of good
behaviour and conduct detailed in that code to the real world, Dave.
You know, being a good neighbour and citizen and stuff.

I'm so glad I could help to clear that one up for you.

>
>> I'll probably never know, though - I have no desire to work you on the
>> air, as I find your attitude towards others inappropriate for Amateur
>> Radio :)
>
>Now if you could only do something about the attitude of others...

One at a time, Dave - one at a time....

>
>> >> To the second - you sure have no problem working her here, Dave....:)
>> >> - in front of thousands of fellow amateurs, world wide......
>> >
>> >Thousands? I think you vastly overestimate the readership of this
>> >newsgroup--and this isn't "on the air", Leo. Usenet isn't amateur
>> >radio.
>>
>> This Usenet group is carried on thousands of servers all over the
>> world, Dave. And no, it isn't amateur radio - but I'll bet most of
>> the readers of this group are amateurs, or are at least interested in
>> the hobby!
>>
>> BTW, part of it might be on the air, Dave - a great deal of telecom
>> backbone networks are carried by microwave or satellite links.. :)
>
>What call do you sign in those instances, "Leo"?

Well, "Dave", I didn't say it was "amateur radio" - just that you
might be "on the air". You know, EM radiation and stuff?

My apologies - I'll try to keep it simpler for you in future.

>
>> >> But it is indeed your prerogative to not work any station that you
>> >> choose not to. Duh.
>> >
>> >I don't know what the "Duh" signifies, "Leo". You seemed to have
>> >problems understanding my lack of obligation to use Kim's vulgar
>> >callsign. Nothing requires me to use it anywhere.
>>
>> OK, don't use it then.
>
>I didn't require your permission.

You most certainly did not.

But you have it, all the same.

>
>> It's vulgar to you, perhaps.
>
>No, I find it vulgar. There's no "perhaps" about it.

Good for you, Dave.

>
>> Not necessarily
>> to me. It's just a callsign, Dave. Worst case, it's about breasts. So
>> what - some of my best friends have breasts.
>
>I'm sure that you've noted that I am not the only person posting her to
>find Kim's choice of vanity calls objectionable.
>

So what? It ain't up to you to set the standards for public decency,
Dave. Just in your own world. Not mine.Jot everybody else's.

Yours.

>> And, duh means duh. Duh. Somewhat synonomous with "obviously...", but
>> a tad more condescending in common application.
>
>But you seemed to voice disagreement with my statement earlier. Now
>you've agreed. Was the "duh" intended for yourself?

Not at all, Dave.

This duh's for you!

>
>> >Let's see. I don't approve of Kim's callsign here. I don't approve of
>> >Kim's callsign on the air. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a
>> >car license plate. I wouldn't approve of Kim's callsign on a cap. What
>> >you'd like to do is take an item from Paul Segal's code, an item which
>> >is very specific and change it to suit your argument. It can't be
>> >done. It very clearly says "operates". Now I'm quite confident that
>> >"operates" doesn't mean "operates heavy equipment", "operates a computer
>> >connected to the internet", "operates a convenience store" or "operates
>> >on a patient".
>>
>> Say, Dave, you're beginning to sould a bit like Dr. Seuss there!
>
>> I would not, could not, on a cap,
>> I would not, could not, on RRAP,
>> I would not have it on a plate,
>> I would not 'cause I'd hate that plate!
>> I would not use it on the air,
>> I would not use it ANYWHERE!!!
>
>> I don't care if Katey Segal wrote the code, Dave - I interpret
>> "operates" in the context of my inference as "communicates to others",
>> Dave. It's part of the package.
>
>That's silly, "Leo".

I thought so too, "Dave"! Except for my definition of "operates" -
that is. That one's a good one.

>Are you telepathic? Can you read the thoughts I'm
>sending your way at this moment?

Yes. You are wondering where you left your garage door opener.

It's on the table next to the stairs, Dave. Right next to your keys.

<receiving transmission>

You're welcome, Dave.

>
>> Or does it simply refer to the technical side of operating - that is,
>> it's OK to treat someone poorly on the air so long as you use
>> technical accuracy in operating your station? "Sure, I told that jerk
>> off big time on 40 last night, but my SWR was under 1.1, my intermod
>> was < 60dB, and my signal was clean with no key clicks!"
>
>I didn't write anything about telling Kim off on the air. Does your
>interpretation make any sense to you?

That's quite the fixation that you have on Kim, Dave. Probably
unhealthy, too.

No, everything does not center on Kim.

Sure does. It questions how you interpret the concept of 'operating',
as stated in the code. From a technical or human interaction
perspective, or both.

>
>> And is it any different when you are at the office? "I gave that
>> moron in Accounting a piece of my mind - we weren't on the air, you
>> know!"
>
>I dunno, "Leo". Is the moron in accounting even a ham? Did you lessen
>his operating pleasure?

That's silly, Dave.

For the purposes of this question, it's your office - please answer
the question. (hint: it's a hypothetical office).

Or, simplified for you, do you feel that you only have to act in a
civil manner on the air - and nowhere else?

Or - It's OK for someone to be an Amateur Extra on the air, and Alpha
Hotel anywhere else?

Say it ain't so, Joe! Say it ain't so! (that's a reference to
Shoeless Joe, Dave - not Joe the amateur - or Kim)

>
>> Or here, for that matter.
>
>Has Kim's operating pleaure been lessened? Has yours?

In this group - yes, she stated something to that effect.

Mine - naw.

Not by you!

>
>> >You persist in calling my views inconsiderate. I don't agree. I've
>> >considered. Now you're a "Leo"-come-lately so you've apparently not
>> >been exposed to Kim's views on proper social behavior. If you like, you

>> >can hit the Google archives and check them out. I happen to view Kim's
>> >choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur radio.
>> >It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs her
>> >nose at the world.
>>
>> I see. I'm confused, though - are you saying that the callsign is
>> vulgar? Or the holder of the callsign? Please clarify.
>
>Read some of Kim's view on what she views as proper social behavior and
>decide for yourself. Interesting material will include Kim's idea of
>proper behavior at a football game, cocktail party or when driving. You
>might also find Kim's comments to W4NTI, K3LT, W0EX, "JJ" or me to be of
>interest.

I did not start out discussing all of the issues that you point out,
Dave. When I wrote to Jim, he explained that it was only the callsign
that he had an issue with, and not the individual. That is why my
discussion focusses on the callsign issue only.

You sound like you find more than just the callsign vulgar, though -
sorry I can't help you with that! That ain't my issue.

Like I said earlier, if you want to discuss a different issue, start a
new thread.

>
>> You are aware that there are a whole pile of vanity calls out there
>> which are much more explicit than this one - it must be challenging
>> screening them all out before deciding to talk to 'em on the air,
>> Dave. 'Cause they might mean something 'bad'. In many different
>> languages, too!
>
>I'm aware that there are other objectionable vanity calls. None of
>those individuals have made any posts here in the seven or eight years
>I've been here.

Doesn't matter, Dave - they exist.

Must be hard to keep up....so much evil, so little time....

>
>> Maybe you should hire an admin assistant for your shack!
>
>Naw, most of my extra funds go to that engineer I keep on retainer.
>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

PS - are you using the two new Q-signals yet?

QKS (as a question) - Please do not send Kim's callsign. Please?
QKS (as a reply) - OK, I will not send Kim's callsign.

LOL!

1110. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 22:33:02 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <d82m001emsmut88cf7o6j20d0htsum3k0f@4ax.com>
Source record: 85787

On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:07 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <4cgl005djdmgpm0jfv52fgcvqc0jv7b66l@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>>Get real, "Leo".
>>
>>I think, therefore I am, "Dave".
>
> True enough.
>
> "Dave" put Descartes before de horse...
>
> :-)

Len, that's a good one! LOL!
>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1111. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 23:11:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401181511.34ea508c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85788

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<k4BOb.14018$i4.5564@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0401180833.5e75fb3d@posting.google.com...
> > Part 97 does not assign me any responsibility to ensure that a
> > frenchman is operating inside his frequency allocations, only that I
> > am operating inside mine.
> >
> > If a frenchman calls me on 6-meters I will certainly answer him since
> > F is a new band-country for me on 6.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> So would I. There's no way I can be responsible for knowing, much
> less keeping track of, operating privileges for other countries.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Hans, Bill, would you do so even after you knew their 6M authorizations?

1112. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-18 23:21:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401181521.3512121@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85789

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040117204342.05957.00000018@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <htvi00tsd71un98f9eld1bsbv600eldsj2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 16:19:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >wrote:
> >
> >>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>snip
>
> >>> Do you practice being an
> >>
> >>[word deleted]
> >>
> >>> , Dave? You must...because you're nearly perfect at it.
> >>
> >>What experience qualifies you to assess such perfection, Kim?
> >
> >Um, one doesn't have to be a professional hockey player to appreciate
> >the talent of a Wayne Gretzky, do they?
>
> Big Dave has a curious set of "qualifications" on almost
> everything.
>
> For example, Dave thinks "interest in radio" is manifest by learning
> and using morse code. He will accept NO other "interest," not
> even those who got into electronics and radio as a professional
> career.

Well he's right.

That's why Sam Morse invented the code - because he had an interest in radio.

1113. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 00:10:36 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <408m00phec9o64o57ivjgq4ijh703j917n@4ax.com>
Source record: 85790

On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:08 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <ggbl009snpjs3t62hb4inca8t0nit7n3im@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>Say, Dave, you're beginning to sould a bit like Dr. Seuss there!
>>
>>Dave, would you like W5TIT with that?
>>
>>I would not, could not, on a cap,
>>I would not, could not, on RRAP,
>>I would not have it on a plate,
>>I would not 'cause I'd hate that plate!
>>I would not use it on the air,
>>I would not use it ANYWHERE!!!
>>
>>I don't care if Katey Segal wrote the code, Dave - I interpret
>>"operates" in the context of my inference as "communicates to others",
>>Dave. It's part of the package.
>
> "Katey Segal?" :-)
>
> Big Dave thinks he is Steven Segal ! :-)

Steven Segal....an interesting combunation of technical excellence and
bad acting.

Hmmm.........

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1114. Re: Pirate SSTV on 6925

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 00:45:07 UTC
From: P N P <jck54@mcmedia.com.au>
Message-ID: <400a0e9d$1@news.leadingedgeinternet.net.au>
Source record: 85760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
You need MMSSTV ( it's free )
"Z1" <z1@zappo.com> wrote in message
news:KigLb.73092$BA6.1483316@news20.bellglobal.com...
> What type of software do you need to see this? Can you download any from
the
> Internet?
>
>
> Z1
> "Bigali" <bigali@hotfreqnews.net> wrote in message
> news:btk026$s7f$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "No Name" <noname@nohost.com> wrote in message
> > news:vvpiqv2sk3ff9f@news.supernews.com...
> > > Check out 6925usb in the evenings for Pirate SSTV.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > That guy has been broadcasting some interesting stuff for quite
> > a while. Says he's located in the Ozark Mountains.
> >
> > Bigali
> >
> >
> >
>
>
```

1115. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 00:55:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buf9t1$8ik@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85791

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:1qsl00hv43a914pr7dvss8gt93ln4bbss9@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 19:08:38 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> news:400AAC4F.BFF8705B@earthlink.net...
> >> >
> >> > I happen to view Kim's
> >> > choice of callsigns as inconsiderate toward the whole of amateur
radio.
> >> > It is simply another in a series on Kim's part, in which she thumbs
her
> >> > nose at the world.
> >>
> >>
> >> You keep mentioning this "thumbing my nose at the world" Dave. And,
you are
> >> absolutely correct in that assessment of me.
> >>
> >I never had any doubts, Kim.
> >
> >> I am probably not able to be
> >> pinned into any particular mold. And, sorry you have a problem with
that,
> >> but the greatest minds and achievers in this world saw through your
"mold"
> >> concept.
> >>
> >The greatest minds and achievers in the world have been paying attention
> >to *my mold*? Tell us, Kim, what do THEY think? How did you come to
> >know them?
> >
> >> I almost deliberately depart from tradition and mundane ways of doing
> >> things. I thoroughly immerse myself in the doings and thoughts of
others,
> >> and I am truly, truly excited by the potential I see in nearly
everyone.
> >>
> >I don't want you immersed in my thoughts.
> >
> >> I

> >> also thoroughly enjoy approaching people like yourself with such vague
> >> attitude that you can't help but get offended.
> >
> >I don't have a vague attitude, Kim. Most folks with any brain cells can
> >determine my attitude without difficulty.
> >
> >> That is my mission for
> >> you--to offend you. Because at least it breaks up your boring and
mundane
> >> day...
> >
> >Well, there you have it. I hope "Leo" is paying attention.
>
> Yup - certainly no one could fault you for taking offense to this - as
> it is intended to be an offense.
>
> But that wasn't what I ws writing about, was it? This just happened
> now, I theenk...
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> 73, Leo
>

It was designed to convince Dave that he is absolutely correct--I have nothing else to do but thumb my nose to him and the world, look for attention and offend people. ;) Yyyyeeeahhhh....rrrrright!

Kim W5TIT--Gotta git busy, it's a very large world out there :o

1116. "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 03:13:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040118221314.21232.00003613@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 85792

In article <bueb59$1b0@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>The difference between people like "us" and people like "you" is that we
>don't expect anyone to live up to anyone else's expectations or standards.

Kim:

That's right, because living up to other people's expectations or standards
is what normal, intelligent, polite, and socially acceptable people do. You
have given more than adequate evidence to the fact that you are none of
the above.

>I have no problem at all with your opinion, the opinion of Larry Roll, the
>opinion of your wife.

Which is where you fall down, Kim. Anyone with a conscience would
care very much what people like JJ, Mrs. JJ, and I think of them.

>I do, however, take great exception to crossing the
>line and deciding that it's quite OK for sneering, resorting to desperate
>other measures trying to make someone feel embarrassed, etc. Whether you or
>anyone else realizes it, there are people--such as myself--who have risen
>way above letting the opinions of others get in the way of living life
>beautifully.

I would hardly refer to what Riley Hollingsworth so elequently stated as
bringing the ARS "...one step closer to extinction" as "living life
beautifully."
That is the perverted construct of an equally perverted mind.

>But, it takes a lot of work and self-reflection to get there.

I don't think the request of a sexually-suggestive and clearly offensive
amateur radio callsign requires much work or self-reflection. All it requires
is a bad attitude and a willingness to cheapen one's self and all other
amateur radio operators -- particularly YL's. Obviously you are up to that
particular challenge, but it doesn't reflect anything positive about your
personality or character.

>And, there are more people who won't ever get there than who are there--and
>it is for those people that each and every time someone acts like an asshole
>toward another, I will have no problem mimicking the behavior right back at
>them.

On the contrary, Kim, I'd say that you have behaving like an asshole down
to an art.

>So, tell your wife that I totally respect her opinion--but that is as far as
>it goes.

JJ's XYL doesn't require your respect, and I'm sure she doesn't expect it.
Moreover, the fact that you offer it may even offend her.

>I don't "need" the attention of anyone.

In spite of all of the evidence to the contrary.

>I am well liked, love
>people, work every day to help people succeed and make the best of
>themselves, and pick up in a second for the underdog in any situation.

And I'm sure all of this exists primarily in your own mind. It would be
very interesting to have a private conversation with your close acquaintences
and co-workers. I'm sure that they would be quite ready to paint an entirely
different picture of one Kim Walker, W5TIT.

>And,
>I don't know what she thinks I might be suggesting, since it is singly my
>husband that I love and he needs no suggestion. Do you?

All I can say is, your husband is either a saint, or a wretchedly desperate
person who can not do any better than to be involved with a totally self-
absorbed, selfish, and inconsiderate person such as you appear to be.
After all, even after having your choice of a call sign condemned by one
of the FCC's top officials, you still refuse to "take the hint" and change it
to something more acceptable. Therefore, one can only draw the
conclusion that you think that you are a law onto yourself, and that you
have every right to do as you please, when you please -- even if it means
giving an unfavorable image to 750,000-plus U.S. radio amateurs. And
the fact that you have done so willingly and by your own request only
makes you look all the worse.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1117. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 03:42:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KKKdnfPJmrwFzpbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85793

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Your wife, JJ, probably also has the opinion that people who dance for a
> living;

I assume you mean those who dance is sleeazy bars, where you can often
be found. Not dancers who have class.

>who are in magazines like Hustler, Playboy and Playgirl; who lead a
> risque life, etc., are all "totally lacking in taste."

You mean women who pose naked with legs spread wide? Yes she does and I
do as well.

> I don't

Why does that not supprise me?

> The difference between people like "us" and people like "you" is that we
> don't expect anyone to live up to anyone else's expectations or standards.

People like "us" have standards, whereas you obviously don't have any
standards to live up to.

> I have no problem at all with your opinion, the opinion of Larry Roll, the
> opinion of your wife. I do, however, take great exception to crossing the
> line and deciding that it's quite OK for sneering, resorting to desperate
> other measures trying to make someone feel embarrassed, etc.

People who do such things would be embarrased if they had any taste,
class or standards.

> Whether you or
> anyone else realizes it, there are people--such as myself--who have risen
> way above letting the opinions of others get in the way of living life
> beautifully. But, it takes a lot of work and self-reflection to get there.
> And, there are more people who won't ever get there than who are there--and
> it is for those people that each and every time someone acts like an asshole
> toward another, I will have no problem mimicking the behavior right back at
> them.

It is easy to stay in the gutter and just make excuses.

> So, tell your wife that I totally respect her opinion--but that is as far as
> it goes. I don't "need" the attention of anyone. I am well liked, love
> people, work every day to help people succeed and make the best of
> themselves, and pick up in a second for the underdog in any situation. And,
> I don't know what she thinks I might be suggesting, since it is singly my

> husband that I love and he needs no suggestion. Do you?

I guess he likes short and dumpy.

1118. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 04:02:20 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <pMCdnYl-mId0xZbdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85795

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> The Texas TWIT wrote:
>>I have no problem at all with your opinion, the opinion of Larry Roll, the
>>opinion of your wife.
>
>
> Which is where you fall down, Kim. Anyone with a conscience would
> care very much what people like JJ, Mrs. JJ, and I think of them.

Larry, this a major problem with our society today, people like kim who
don't care what anyone else thinks. Just as long as they can do whatever
they want and get what they want.

>
> JJ's XYL doesn't require your respect, and I'm sure she doesn't expect it.
> Moreover, the fact that you offer it may even offend her.

You got that right!

> All I can say is, your husband is either a saint, or a wretchedly desperate
> person who can not do any better than to be involved with a totally self-
> absorbed, selfish, and inconsiderate person such as you appear to be.
> After all, even after having your choice of a call sign condemned by one
> of the FCC's top officials, you still refuse to "take the hint" and change it
> to something more acceptable.

People of kim's status, never seem to "take the hint", it completely
escapes them.

1119. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 04:04:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WGIOb.14718$i4.10564@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85794

"JJ" wrote:
>
> LOL!! My wife, who seldom makes
> any comment on anything pretaining to
> amature radio, just walked into the
> room, looked over my shoulder and
> upon seeing kim's call sign displayed
> in the newsgroup header said, "who
> would be issued a call sign like that?"
> After explaining it was a vanity call
> sign and the person requested it, her
> comment was, "what kind of idiot
> would ever choose such a call sign?"
> I ask her if she thought it was vulgar.
> "Not really vulgar, just suggestive
> and totally lacking in taste, I suppose
> some people have to get attention
> anyway they can".

My wife's consistent response to the ongoing debate about Kim's callsign is, "who cares?" In short, with all the things going on in the world today, she thinks it is absolutely amazing that so many would waste time discussing a trivial issue like this.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1120. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 04:13:00 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401190420050.3244@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 85796

On Thu, 15 Jan 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> D. Stussy wrote:
> > On Tue, 13 Jan 2004, Carl Zager wrote:
> >
> >>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<nKHMb.26231$P%1.23836427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >>
> >>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:Xns946DE729575EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>>
> >>>>I'm guessing that code CSCEs issued now will turn out to be good until
> >>>>element 1 is abolished.
> >>>>
> >>>>73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >>>
> >>>Only if the code requirement is abolished in less than 365 days. Keep in
> >>>mind that some of the petitions filed do call for keeping code for General
> >>>or Extra while letting the Techs have some limited HF privileges. With the
> >>>speed with the FCC is not moving, less than a year from now seems rather
> >>>iffy.
> >>>
> >>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >>And ... a code CSCE is only "good" as follows:
> >>1. For upgrade to General, one year. However, once a General, then the
> >
> > ^^^^^^^^
> > NO! It's good for 365 days, which is NOT always equal to one year, especially
> > when a leap year is involved.
>
>
> Are leap seconds taken into account?

Since the TIME of the examination is not recorded on the CSCE, it is not
possible nor relevent to determine the expiration of a CSCE to the nearest
second.

1121. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 05:08:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400B6656.527431@earthlink.net>
Source record: 85797

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>
> 1. There would be NO ARRL...

> 2. There would be NO morse code test...
>
> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings ...

> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway ...
>
> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
> belly-up anyway...

> 6. Radio broadcasting would have become successful ...
>
> 7. Arthur Godfrey would still get his TV show cancelled...

> 8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on
> approximately the same scale...
>
> 9. "CB" would have been created anyway...
>
> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
> bereft of Title

11. Leonard H. Anderson would still be on the outside looking in.

Dave K8MN

1122. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 05:12:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <FGJOb.18918$zj7.1724@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85798

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

< Hans, Bill, would you do so even after you knew their 6M
authorizations?

They're responsible for observing their band limits. I'm responsible
for observing mine.

WFWL.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: For more info on your namesake, Little Billy Beeper, go here.
http://www.handiham.org//article.php?sid=160

(You're welcome!)

1123. KE4TEW and his family of convicts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 09:26:41 UTC
From: Dumb Dimmy <dimmydale@jail.com>
Message-ID: <_nNOb.8596$%86.2530@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
retest? Looks like corruption to me.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

1124. Re: KE4TEW and his family of convicts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 10:12:44 UTC
From: Melissa <Sweetie@YourPlace.com?>
Message-ID: <bugais$3uv$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85800
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Dumb Dimmy" <dimmydale@jail.com> wrote in message
news:_nNOb.8596$%86.2530@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
retest? Looks like corruption to me.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

Why did YOU keep your license after two Felony charges? Huh? Selling Pot was
not bad enough, was it?
You done turned around and did another fuckup and got yerself another
felony.
How dumb is that?
Talk about a moron.
2 felonies...one more and it is up the river for you.
How do YOU keep your license, Felon?

1125. Re: KE4TEW and his family of convicts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 10:15:21 UTC
From: Melissa <Sweetie@YourPlace.com?>
Message-ID: <buganp$490$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 85901
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Dumb Dimmy" <dimmydale@jail.com> wrote in message
news:_nNOb.8596$%86.2530@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
retest? Looks like corruption to me.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

It is License, bozo. Not "liscense "
Those twisties getting the better of you?

1126. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 10:51:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401190251.aef28dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85902

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0401180833.5e75fb3d@posting.google.com>...
> Part 97 does not assign me any responsibility to ensure that a
> frenchman is operating inside his frequency allocations, only that I
> am operating inside mine.
>
> If a frenchman calls me on 6-meters I will certainly answer him since
> F is a new band-country for me on 6.

Ditto.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1127. Re: KE4TEW and his family of convicts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 11:14:23 UTC
From: joe <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <IXOOb.34295$R85.30213@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85903
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Damn! I thought Dimmy Dale only had one felony!

N9PGE wrote:

> "Dumb Dimmy" <dimmydale@jail.com> wrote in message
> news:_nNOb.8596$%86.2530@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679
>
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>
> Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
> retest? Looks like corruption to me.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>
>
> Why did YOU keep your license after two Felony charges? Huh? Selling Pot was
> not bad enough, was it?
> You done turned around and did another fuckup and got yerself another
> felony.
> How dumb is that?
> Talk about a moron.
> 2 felonies...one more and it is up the river for you.
> How do YOU keep your license, Felon?
>
>

1128. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 11:30:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85904

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040118153407.12501.00005628@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
> <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:
>
> >A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
> >
> >I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
> >in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
> >me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.
>
> Only in THIS venue, Scott.
>
> In THIS venue, all the pro-code newsgroupies require all to think,
> act, do, behave, and moralize as they do.

A blatant lie from someone who finds it easy to lie.

> I've been trying to get a word in on the SUBJECT of morse code
> testing and have been a constant target of character assassination
> by these pro-code newsgroupies. No "civil debate" possible in that
> cacophony of code.

Another lie. The subject has been "debated", discussed and
dissected until all are nauseous of the topic anymore.

That Lennie has nothing else to discuss as it pertains to Amateur
Radio should be a clue to those new to this forum that would be swayed
by his "debating style".

You've taken grand liberty with the term "literary license" and
have grossly abused any sense of social propriety so many times that
your name is synonomous with "liar" and "antagonist".

That is NOT "civil debate".

> No matter. Heil says that is not enough "interest in radio," I must
> learn morse code and become an amateur (NOT a professional) to
> "show interest in radio."

AMATEUR Radio, Lennie...You have exactly zero-point-zero minutes
of experience in AMATEUR Radio. No one, repeat NO one in this forum
denies that the technology and propagation of radio waves is any
different in any other radio service.

It's the PRACTICE and the APPLICATION of the technology that
makes the difference.

> The resident gunnery nurse spits on professionalism AND night
> classes in EE, arming his slingshot with slimy spit and trying to
> get down and give him 20 for talking against "superiors." Weird.

The "wierd" one here is someone who enters a forum for which he
has expressed absolutely NO interest in being an active part of then
trying to tell those who ARE involved how to go about thier business.

And I do not spit on "professionalism" Lennie.

That assertion is yet ANOTHER lie from somone whio finds it EASY
to lie. I have nothing but the highest regard for professionals in ANY
field...It's just that I have absolutely ZERO respect for YOU since
you've made such a mockery of the title.

> An olde-tymer of 48 going on 84 who lives in the past keeps
> saying I am always "mistaken" and "incorrect" in another ploy of
> perverse character assassination.

Well, Lennie, if you weren't always "mistaken" or "incorrect", I
wouldn't have any room to maneuver, now would I?

As for "going on 84", I will gladly jog around the block a few
times with you or see how well you do carrying a full field pack on
the rescue team. NOW who is involved in another "ploy of pervase
character assassination"...?!?!

> This is NOT anywhere close to a venue for "discussion of issues"
> in amateur radio. It is a place for newsgroupies to gather and try
> to turn into some kind of ARRL-south, to stir stock myths and
> old ideas into a stew of meaty morse just like what HAD to be
> done in the 1920s and 1930s.

Since YOU seem to be the only one who deems it important to
interject arguments about Morse Code into threads that don't even
adress it, I'd say the fixation is yours, Oh Putzy One.

> Rigid, inflexible, all march to the same drumbeep.

That's what YOU would have us doing...One license...everyone the
same...no challenge, skill or functionality...Just a corral of lambs,
beying to the Word of Lennie the Professional.

> I'm coming up on my 51st anniversary of putting a 1 KW transmitter
> on the air trans-Pacific.

It wasn't YOUR station, Lennie...It was a facility of the United
States Army. They could have just as easily made you a diesel
mechanic...Perhaps then you would have been harrassing the
professional truck drivers.

Army manuals and a Senior NCO told you what to do and how to do
it. They gave you an FM or TM (or the equivelent of the period) and
said "do this".

Biggie wow. We are soooooooooo impressed that YOU were able to
follow instructions "putting a 1KW transmitter on the air
trans-Pacific".

> Radio and electronics is still fascinating
> to me and I've explored a lot of it in the course of a half century.
> Been in lots more of the EM spectrum than nearly all of these
> rigid pure moralists in here. Never used morse code in all that time,
> never had to. Used many more modes and modulations than are
> allowed to amateurs. That's not enough!

Your "exploration" has been as a paid employee, never being
allowed to use the "radio" as AMATEURS use thiers.

That you never used Morse Code is not germane. Millions of other
radio users never use it either. So what?

> Hang in there, Scott. Pander to the would-be "authority wanna-bes"
> if you have to...but GO YOUR OWN WAY. Be your own man, not
> a puppet of those who dictate what you can do, what you shall
> enjoy, what you must do to please them.
>
> Independent thought is GOOD!

Independent thought IS good, as long as it is LENNIE'S
independent thought. The "regulars" of this forum are, for the most
part, life long Amateur Radio operators with the experience in AMATEUR
RADIO to know of which they speak.

> Leonard H. Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

Leonard H. Anderson, retired from regular hours engineer, is a
known pathological liar and newsgroup antagonist.

That he felt compelled to post this "defense" of HIS "career" in
this forum without having actually been a part of the thread is only
further evidence of his own self-appreciating, "me first" personality
and his total arrogance towards the very CONCEPT of Amateur Radio and
those who praticipate in it.

Steve, K4YZ

1129. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 11:38:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401190338.b7b3c41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85905

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040117204342.05957.00000017@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <20040116232551.08626.00002690@mb-m27.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >One more thing: Resolve to learn the Morse code and to use it on the air.
> >Decide from the start that you are going to be a proficient CW operator, and
> >don't give in to any of the frustrations normally associated with learning to
> >use this uniquely practical, effective, efficient, and universal
> >communications mode.
>
> Absolutely! Morse code is at the heart and soul of U.S. amateur
> radio!
>
> Morse is so #$%^!!! good that every other radio service continues
> to use it for communications! [Larry thinks...without having any
> experience in any of them]

This forum, as YOU have pointed out, Lennie, is about AMATEUR
RADIO...

NOT PLMRS...

NOT military communications...

NOT EMS, Fire or Public Safety...

NOT Broadcast....

That OTHER "radio services" have discontinued it's regular use is
NOT germane to AMATEUR RADIO, Lennie.

And just for the PUBLIC RECORD, Lennie, PLEASE educate the
non-Amateur Radio (or recently joining this forum) public as to how
long YOU have been a licensed Amateur, what programs and organizations
you belong to, and what you have accomplished IN and FOR AMATEUR
RADIO, Lennie...

I am sure they will be as equally impressed with your Amateur
Radio experiences and credentials as WE are...

Please...go ahead...tell us....

Steve, K4YZ

1130. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 12:26:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bugie1$bbg@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85906

Keep deluding yourself in your grandeur, Larry! ROFLMAO!

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040118221314.21232.00003613@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <bueb59$1b0@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >The difference between people like "us" and people like "you" is that we
> >don't expect anyone to live up to anyone else's expectations or
standards.
>
> Kim:
>
> That's right, because living up to other people's expectations or
standards
> is what normal, intelligent, polite, and socially acceptable people do.
You
> have given more than adequate evidence to the fact that you are none of
> the above.
>
> >I have no problem at all with your opinion, the opinion of Larry Roll,
the
> >opinion of your wife.
>
> Which is where you fall down, Kim. Anyone with a conscience would
> care very much what people like JJ, Mrs. JJ, and I think of them.
>
> >I do, however, take great exception to crossing the
> >line and deciding that it's quite OK for sneering, resorting to desperate
> >other measures trying to make someone feel embarrassed, etc. Whether you
or
> >anyone else realizes it, there are people--such as myself--who have risen
> >way above letting the opinions of others get in the way of living life
> >beautifully.
>
> I would hardly refer to what Riley Hollingsworth so elequently stated as
> bringing the ARS "...one step closer to extinction" as "living life
> beautifully."
> That is the perverted construct of an equally perverted mind.
>
> >But, it takes a lot of work and self-reflection to get there.
>

> I don't think the request of a sexually-suggestive and clearly offensive
> amateur radio callsign requires much work or self-reflection. All it
requires
> is a bad attitude and a willingness to cheapen one's self and all other
> amateur radio operators -- particularly YL's. Obviously you are up to
that
> particular challenge, but it doesn't reflect anything positive about your
> personality or character.
>
> >And, there are more people who won't ever get there than who are
there--and
> >it is for those people that each and every time someone acts like an
asshole
> >toward another, I will have no problem mimicking the behavior right back
at
> >them.
>
> On the contrary, Kim, I'd say that you have behaving like an asshole down
> to an art.
>
> >So, tell your wife that I totally respect her opinion--but that is as far
as
> >it goes.
>
> JJ's XYL doesn't require your respect, and I'm sure she doesn't expect it.
> Moreover, the fact that you offer it may even offend her.
>
> >I don't "need" the attention of anyone.
>
> In spite of all of the evidence to the contrary.
>
> >I am well liked, love
> >people, work every day to help people succeed and make the best of
> >themselves, and pick up in a second for the underdog in any situation.
>
> And I'm sure all of this exists primarily in your own mind. It would be
> very interesting to have a private conversation with your close
acquaintences
> and co-workers. I'm sure that they would be quite ready to paint an
entirely
> different picture of one Kim Walker, W5TIT.
>
> >And,
> >I don't know what she thinks I might be suggesting, since it is singly my
> >husband that I love and he needs no suggestion. Do you?
>
> All I can say is, your husband is either a saint, or a wretchedly
desperate
> person who can not do any better than to be involved with a totally self-
> absorbed, selfish, and inconsiderate person such as you appear to be.

> After all, even after having your choice of a call sign condemned by one
> of the FCC's top officials, you still refuse to "take the hint" and change
it
> to something more acceptable. Therefore, one can only draw the
> conclusion that you think that you are a law onto yourself, and that you
> have every right to do as you please, when you please -- even if it means
> giving an unfavorable image to 750,000-plus U.S. radio amateurs. And
> the fact that you have done so willingly and by your own request only
> makes you look all the worse.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

1131. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 12:33:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bugirb$241@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85907

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:WGIOb.14718$i4.10564@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "JJ" wrote:
> >
> > LOL!! My wife, who seldom makes
> > any comment on anything pretaining to
> > amature radio, just walked into the
> > room, looked over my shoulder and
> > upon seeing kim's call sign displayed
> > in the newsgroup header said, "who
> > would be issued a call sign like that?"
> > After explaining it was a vanity call
> > sign and the person requested it, her
> > comment was, "what kind of idiot
> > would ever choose such a call sign?"
> > I ask her if she thought it was vulgar.
> > "Not really vulgar, just suggestive
> > and totally lacking in taste, I suppose
> > some people have to get attention
> > anyway they can".
>
>
> My wife's consistent response to the ongoing debate about Kim's callsign
> is, "who cares?" In short, with all the things going on in the world
today,
> she thinks it is absolutely amazing that so many would waste time
discussing
> a trivial issue like this.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Actually, Dwight, the only "place" that my callsign gets so much discussion
is right here in this newsgroup. I have been involved in a lot of stuff
since I've had this callsign--on the air, off the air, women and men, served
agencies, hundreds of other amateurs. No where, once, did my callsign ever
get discussed, and there was plenty of opportunity.

I am a in-your-face kind of person. It's obvious there's folks in this
newsgroup who can't handle that. My callsign is but one aspect of my
character and personality--both of which are unquestionable in matters that
count. I have that opinion of myself because I believe in myself due to the

encouragement, respect, appreciation, thoughtfulness and even admiration of people in my life and all around my life.

Oh, wait, there was *one* time when I got an email from a club president who made a comment to the negative about my callsign--*after* I'd withdrawn as a member for pointing out that he was not abiding by club bylaws and would not even discuss the matter. He'd had no problem with me, my rabble rousing, or my money and time donations for two years previous...

Kim W5TIT

1132. Principality of Sealand Ops? (Was: Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 13:19:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <PPQOb.17648$OM2.3992245@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85908

."Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0401190251.aef28dd@posting.google.com...
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0401180833.5e75fb3d@posting.google.com>...
> > Part 97 does not assign me any responsibility to ensure that a
> > frenchman is operating inside his frequency allocations, only that I
> > am operating inside mine.
> >
> > If a frenchman calls me on 6-meters I will certainly answer him since
> > F is a new band-country for me on 6.

Did any of you work the "Principality of Sealand" a few years back? (1SL
prefix)

http://hamgallery.com/qsl/Unverified/s1ad.htm

Pretty interesting story and kinda fun to watch the debate on eHAm and QRZ
rekindled a few years back. (Although it was the first time I'd ever heard
of it.) One camp refused to recognize them as a sovereign entity (Mostly
British) while the other camp's motto was WFWL. (Work First Worry Later) The
British govt. actually forbid their licensees to contact TPoS.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1133. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 13:54:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119085428.26465.00000339@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 85909

Hey TIT how they hangin?

1134. Re: May we never ever forget.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 14:34:14 UTC
From: tad danley <nospam@atsbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <400BEAE9.7040400@atsbcglobal.net>
Source record: 85910

NIW wrote:
> http://members.cox.net/classicweb/email.htm

Thank you for the reminder ...

73,
--
* Do NOT use Reply *

Reply to K3TD via contesting dot com

Tad, K3TD

1135. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 14:50:41 UTC
From: tad danley <nospam@atsbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <400BEEC4.9000800@atsbcglobal.net>
Source record: 85911

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
>
>>I feel for the poor slob who finally breaks
>>down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800
>>Pro or Pro II comes out.
>
>
> First of all, I don't think he'd be poor, and why are you calling me a slob?
>
> I'm placing my order.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Good for you, Hans! I hope to join you some day! I remember some time
ago two different friends of mine telling me that ICOM sold almost 10
times as many IC-781s as they had forecast when it was being designed.
Both were in a position to know -- one was a former ICOM National
Service Manager and the other was the owner of a large amateur radio
store.

73,

--
* Do NOT use Reply *

Reply to K3TD via contesting dot com

Tad, K3TD

1136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 16:43:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZOTOb.15116$q4.3370@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85912

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Larry, this a major problem with
> our society today, people like kim
> who don't care what anyone else
> thinks. Just as long as they can do
> whatever they want and get what
> they want. (snip)

Excuse me, JJ. When did a lack of conformity become a "major problem" in this country? Our forefathers, with their relatively strange political and social ideas, were hardly conformists.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1137. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 16:49:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OUTOb.15130$q4.8824@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85913

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Actually, Dwight, the only "place"
> that my callsign gets so much
> discussion is right here in this
> newsgroup. I have been involved
> in a lot of stuff since I've had this
> callsign--on the air, off the air,
> women and men, served agencies,
> hundreds of other amateurs. No
> where, once, did my callsign ever
> get discussed, and there was plenty
> of opportunity. (snip)

I don't doubt that, Kim. The debate here only points to how far some in
this newsgroup are out of touch with reality.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1138. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 16:54:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85914

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) I would hardly refer to what
> Riley Hollingsworth so elequently
> stated as bringing the ARS "...one
> step closer to extinction" as "living
> life beautifully." That is the perverted
> construct of an equally perverted
> mind. (snip)

Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth, Larry?
If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it before,
but that was some time ago.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1139. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 17:01:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401190901.452343@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85915

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0401171220.47b8dada@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040114214858.11022.00003505@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> > In article <4005BA72.24FF3109@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
>
> > The newer
> > computers actually seem to keep worse time than the older ones...
>
> Not an issue. When the 'puter clock here is noticeably off time vs.
> WWV I simply ping NIST and let them reset it. My tax dollars at work.
> YMMV.
>
> http://www.boulder.nist.gov/timefreq/service/time-computer.html

KEWL!

Of course there are also clocks an watches that "listen" to WWVB
and reset themselves as needed.

> > But my Tymeter grinds on, flipping the drums.
>
> . . groan . . !

It works! The battery-operated clock above it in the pictures (you
saw my shack pix, I presume) is the backup and local timekeeper.
The Tymeter just keeps doing its job. Simple technology - watta
concept.

Every so often I tune in WWV on the '342 just for a check. Usually
the Tymeter is dead on.

Did I ever show ya the pix of my trip to Boulder NIST and Fort
Collins?
A few years back - got shots of the then-standard atomic clocks and
the transmitter site. Plus me standing by the transmitter site sign.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1140. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 17:50:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401190950.4d04a0e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85916

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>...

> those who praticipate in it.

Ooooops. Made a new word!

Steve

1141. New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 18:08:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85917

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1

Summary:

3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra

5 wpm code test retained for Extra only

Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General

'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly

Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440

Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
evaluation

Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1142. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 18:32:40 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <cpVOb.21018$OM2.5050772@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 85918

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> Summary:
>
> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra

Ok, so far so good.

> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only

I personally would like to see existing Tech, Tech+, and Novice licensees
upgraded to the new Novice ticket. (Tech+ privies.)

> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra

Sounds reasonable.

> , Techs
> and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General

Nope.

> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly

Depends on one's interpretation of "slightly," I suppose.

> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
> privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440

Ok.

> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> evaluation

Also reasonable.

> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics"

Surely, they jest?!

> , General to be
> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.

Ok.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Thanks for the synopsis, Jim. This scenario certainly beats a blank.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1143. New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 19:11:59 UTC
From: Tom Winston <address.masked@for.no.spam>
Message-ID: <8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 85919
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...

That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test. Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.

Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met higher standards than the current crop of Extras.

So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make that decision.

Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.

1144. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 19:31:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401191131.3032a700@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85920

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040118153405.12501.00005627@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms

Majority of silliness snipped.

> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
> bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent.
> Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign
> behind their names to show how good and expert they were in
> "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more
> fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).

But the fact is that Amateur Radio DID evolve the way it did, and
you are STILL not a licensee in it. Millions of Americans have had no
problem being involved at one time or another, but you, the
"electronics professional", can't seem to get past the front door.
Some professional.

You are still a pathological liar. That is archived and beyond
your Orwellian desires to rewrite history.

You still spend countelss hours trolling for arguments that you
subsequently try to turn into a defensable "it's character
assassination" rants. Still doesn't work.

In the end, you are still more "outside" radio than a motivated
CBer, and never likely to understand why it is your infinite wisdom is
avoided like the plague.

Sucks to be you, Lennie. Wake up and join humanity before Mrs
Putz has to plant you.

Steve, K4YZ

1145. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 19:35:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401191135.4190703e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85921

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040116232348.12631.00004285@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
> >> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
> >
> >You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
> >and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.
>
> And you are not God...despite your claims to same...

You will, of course, present the post in which he made this
claim?

Failure to do so will only further validate your status as
"Pathological Liar"

Of course we all know that that request will go unfulfilled, so
we will just "call a spade a spade", or in this case, a LIAR a LIAR.

Leonard H. Anderson...Pathological Liar...Again...

Steve, K4YZ

1146. Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 20:21:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <b%WOb.19566$zj7.10115@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is proposing!

A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice, General, and Extra.

Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room temperature.

Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.

General just like today except without Morse.

Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!

But there's more.....

A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.

All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to Advanced.

That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to the next higher license without testing for that grade.

And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra', not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.

C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision for the future.

Nasty letter to follow.

Love always,

de Hans, K0HB

I >AM< THE ARRL!!!

1147. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 20:33:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191233.2236e15d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85923

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<FGJOb.18918$zj7.1724@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> < Hans, Bill, would you do so even after you knew their 6M
> authorizations?
>
> They're responsible for observing their band limits. I'm responsible
> for observing mine.
>
> WFWL.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: For more info on your namesake, Little Billy Beeper, go here.
> http://www.handiham.org//article.php?sid=160
>
> (You're welcome!)

I understand that you would -knowingly- work a ham out of band.

If I got it wrong, please correct me.

1148. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 20:33:44 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <IaXOb.19578$zj7.4455@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

```
<
< All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
Advanced.
<

Make that a free pass to EXTRA.
```

1149. Re: Dave prefers out of band Frenchmen!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 20:34:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191234.6ef3e1d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85925

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401190251.aef28dd@posting.google.com>...
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0401180833.5e75fb3d@posting.google.com>...
> > Part 97 does not assign me any responsibility to ensure that a
> > frenchman is operating inside his frequency allocations, only that I
> > am operating inside mine.
> >
> > If a frenchman calls me on 6-meters I will certainly answer him since
> > F is a new band-country for me on 6.
>
> Ditto.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I understand that you would -knowingly- work a ham out of band.

Please correct me if I got it wrong.

Thanks.

1150. Little Billy Beeper seems confused

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 20:46:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fmXOb.19588$zj7.18688@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85926

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

<
< I understand that you would -knowingly- work a ham out of band.
<

Dear Little Billy Beeper,

Does Captain Code know you're working us here? (Go to
http://www.handiham.org/local/blind/beeper.txt for details.)

I will not go out of my band allocation to work anyone, but I will work
anyone with an amateur radio callsign who calls me inside my band
allocations.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1151. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 20:57:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119155717.20507.00000160@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 85927

>If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
>four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
>proposing!

Isnt the ARRL wonderful, my guess is that Membership and Book Sales must be slipping.

1152. Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 21:12:40 UTC
From: Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us>
Message-ID: <cLXOb.5393$5M.135136@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 85928

ARRL comes up with a new idea.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1

No code Techs get free upgrade to General.

Newbies get 100W on HF phone via 25 multiple-guess test.

CW (5 WPM) only required for Extra Class.

CW/data sub bands shrink.

Still too hard? Hey, just wait another year. They'll make it even easier.

Art Harris, N2AH
Extra Class since 1971

1153. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 21:13:44 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85929

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
@posting.google.com:

> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> Summary:
>
> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra

The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it would reintroduce a free licence class. Provided the new class that happened to be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that

>
> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>

Predictably, I do have a problem with that. Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be dumped. Moreover, it can be now, since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.

> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,

OK

>Techs
> and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General

Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above

>
> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly

Good. Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?

>
> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
> privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>

See above

> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> evaluation
>

OK

> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",

Not OK

> General to be
> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't say
here.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1154. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 21:15:28 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9475A55578F4Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85930
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Tom Winston" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in
news:8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net:

> On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>>
>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>
> That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
> passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
> Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
> -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.
>
> Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
> higher standards than the current crop of Extras.
>
> So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make
> that decision.
>
> Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.
>

Truly weird. As a 20wpm Extra I don't see you as having a higher licence
than me, oddly enough.

1155. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 21:17:49 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9475A5BC12861elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85931

Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us> wrote in news:cLXOb.5393
$5M.135136@dfw-read.news.verio.net:

> ARRL comes up with a new idea.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> No code Techs get free upgrade to General.
>
> Newbies get 100W on HF phone via 25 multiple-guess test.
>
> CW (5 WPM) only required for Extra Class.
>
> CW/data sub bands shrink.
>
> Still too hard? Hey, just wait another year. They'll make it even easier.
>
> Art Harris, N2AH
> Extra Class since 1971
>

Sounds awful. Luckily, I think the FCC will just abolish Element 1, tidy up
a few loose ends, and leave it at that. Not a perfect licence system, but
better than the league's version.

1156. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 22:10:06 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <nalo001qmehipadksjdrujjff9c5d7hve9@4ax.com>
Source record: 85933

On 19 Jan 2004 21:17:49 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us> wrote in news:cLXOb.5393
>$5M.135136@dfw-read.news.verio.net:
>
>> ARRL comes up with a new idea.
>>
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>
>> No code Techs get free upgrade to General.
>>
>> Newbies get 100W on HF phone via 25 multiple-guess test.
>>
>> CW (5 WPM) only required for Extra Class.
>>
>> CW/data sub bands shrink.
>>
>> Still too hard? Hey, just wait another year. They'll make it even easier.
>>
>> Art Harris, N2AH
>> Extra Class since 1971
>>
>
>Sounds awful. Luckily, I think the FCC will just abolish Element 1, tidy up
>a few loose ends, and leave it at that. Not a perfect licence system, but
>better than the league's version.

That makes more sense to me, Alun - I don't see why the ARRL would
propose moving almost 400,000 people to a higher licence class just
because the ITU made morse code testing optional.

73, Leo

1157. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 22:10:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119171020.22937.00000363@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85932

>ARRL comes up with a new idea.
>
>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
>No code Techs get free upgrade to General.
>
>Newbies get 100W on HF phone via 25 multiple-guess test.
>
>CW (5 WPM) only required for Extra Class.
>
>CW/data sub bands shrink.
>
>Still too hard? Hey, just wait another year. They'll make it even easier.
>
>Art Harris, N2AH
>Extra Class since 1971
>
What did you expect, the ARRL could care less

1158. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 22:26:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401191426.7be1051b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85934
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Tom Winston" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>
> That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade.

Incorrect!

> Advanced class licensees
> passed the Extra class written exam,

No, they did not. There have always been different written exams
for the two license classes. Until the 2000 restructuring, an Extra
required passing both the 50 question Advanced written *and* the 40
question Extra.

> and passed a 13 wpm code test.

Only until 1990. After that time, code waivers were available.

Extra required 20 wpm in the same time frame.

> Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam

again, incorrect!

> -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.

No argument there.
>
> Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
> higher standards than the current crop of Extras.

> So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make
> that decision.
>
> Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1159. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 22:34:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401191434.6de66abd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85935

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<cpVOb.21018$OM2.5050772@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com...
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >
> > Summary:
> >
> > 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
> Ok, so far so good.

I'm against free upgrades.
>
> > 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
> I personally would like to see existing Tech, Tech+, and Novice licensees
> upgraded to the new Novice ticket. (Tech+ privies.)

It's not that simple.

The proposed Novice would have a lot more HF modes and spectrum than
current Novice/Tech+ - but a lot *less* VHF/UHF.
>
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra
>
> Sounds reasonable.

I disagree. All it takes to go from Advanced to Extra is a single
written test. Been that way for almost 4 years.
>
> > , Techs
> > and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
> Nope.

Same as above.
>
> > 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
> Depends on one's interpretation of "slightly," I suppose.

25 kHz or so.
>
> > Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> > and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get

> > privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>
> Ok.
>
> > Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> > evaluation
>
> Also reasonable.
>
> > Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics"
>
> Surely, they jest?!

Not at all. The old Novice was only 20-25 questions, back in the
bad old days (before about 1972).

Of course all the old Novice allowed was 80, 40 and 15 CW, plus
145-147 MHz meter CW and AM. And the AM was eliminated about 1967. 75
watts max input, xtal control only.

> > , General to be
> > derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
> Ok.
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Thanks for the synopsis, Jim. This scenario certainly beats a blank.

Read the entire proposal on the website.

Some good ideas, some not so hot ones.

Better than the "21st Century" paper proposes, anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1160. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 22:43:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <v4ZOb.15556$q4.13434@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85936

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040119171020.22937.00000363@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >ARRL comes up with a new idea.
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >
> >No code Techs get free upgrade to General.
> >
> >Newbies get 100W on HF phone via 25 multiple-guess test.
> >
> >CW (5 WPM) only required for Extra Class.
> >
> >CW/data sub bands shrink.
> >
> >Still too hard? Hey, just wait another year. They'll make it even easier.
> >
> >Art Harris, N2AH
> >Extra Class since 1971
> >
> What did you expect, the ARRL could care less

I am starting to believe you now Bruce.

Dan/W4NTI

1161. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 22:48:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <s9ZOb.15564$q4.13048@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85937

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040119155717.20507.00000160@mb-m21.aol.com...
> >If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
> >four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
> >proposing!
>
> Isnt the ARRL wonderful, my guess is that Membership and Book Sales must
be
> slipping.

Can't wait till they show up on the top end of 75 meters. 100w and a
G5RV.....yeah buddy.

Dan/W4NTI

1162. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:01:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119180111.28383.00000322@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85938

>I am starting to believe you now Bruce.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan its what I have been saying all along. I cant see how anyone in there right mind could say the ARRL is trying to help Ham Radio.

1163. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:03:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119180303.28383.00000323@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85939

>Can't wait till they show up on the top end of 75 meters. 100w and a
>G5RV.....yeah buddy.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Do you think the ARRL will Print 10 Codes in QST? Maybe they could have an article on the correct use of Echo Mikes.

1164. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:08:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <tIednSUFyJk7-5HdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85941

Bert Craig wrote:

>
>
>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra
>
>
> Sounds reasonable.

Oh great, I get to be an Extra by default. I had rather keep my
Advanced, advanced even sounds more advanced than Extra does.

1165. ARRL should change

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:11:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119181146.28383.00000325@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85940

there statement on QST, to represent there true fellings. Instead of, QST devoted entirely to Amateur Radio, it should read, QST devoted entirely to CBAmateur Radio. At least it would be more correct.

1166. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182450.06226.00002475@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85943

In article <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth, Larry?
>If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it before,
>but that was some time ago.

As I recall it, there was NO PROOF that Larrah's "Hollingsworth letter" was the real thing.

We all have to take Larrah's typed-in words as "truth."

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAH!

LHA / WMD

I am learning how to laugh maniacially through mail-order lessons of how to be a gunnery nurse. :-)

1167. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182450.06226.00002474@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85948

In article <c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) "summarized" what is publicly referencible
and pretends to write "news:"

>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
>Summary:
>
>3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra

Only the name of "Technician" changed to "Novice" in order to preserve
the lesser class (in the BoD's mind). Otherwise the present regulations
have only THREE classes of new licensees NOW.

>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only

One small step for the BoD, not a giant leap for newbies.

>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
>and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General

ARRL needs membership revenue...they have to pander to just about
all of the lesser classes! :-)

>'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly

Grudging acceptance of present-day practices. :-)

>Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
>privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>
>Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
>evaluation
>
>Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
>derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.

Okay, so the BoD is slowly, painstakingly "advancing" to the
present day. They ought to be about in the 1970s by now.

Hiram forbid that anyone EVER remove the code test requirement!

Such a thing is unheard of! Sacrilege to old T.O.M.!

Now is the time for all the League syncophants to chant and do
their mantra for the "forward-looking League doing its best for what
is best for U.S. amateur radio." They can do no wrong.

Gotta love it!

LHA / WMD

1168. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182451.06226.00002477@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85942

In article <5c01b95b.0401190950.4d04a0e9@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>...
>
>> those who praticipate in it.
>
> Oooooops. Made a new word!

...and a mess on the newsgroup floor. Bad doggie. Go sit in corner.

LHA / WMD

1169. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182451.06226.00002476@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85946

In article <400B6656.527431@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes after catching PMS from the gunnery nurse:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>>
>> 1. There would be NO ARRL...
>
>> 2. There would be NO morse code test...
>>
>> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings ...
>
>> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway ...
>>
>> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
>> belly-up anyway...
>
>> 6. Radio broadcasting would have become successful ...
>>
>> 7. Arthur Godfrey would still get his TV show cancelled...
>
>> 8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on
>> approximately the same scale...
>>
>> 9. "CB" would have been created anyway...
>>
>> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
>> bereft of Title
>
> 11. Leonard H. Anderson would still be on the outside looking in.

Only for AMATEUR radio.

There's a MUCH LARGER commercial and military world of radio,
Herr Robust. You've only seen a small part of it while in "the
foreign service."

Let's all hear it for those olde-tyme raddio hammes who've been
in ham radio forever and want to make everyone jump through the
same hoops they had to!

Good luck on that one, now...

LHA / WMD

1170. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182453.06226.00002478@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85950

In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040118153407.12501.00005628@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
>> <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:
>>
>> >A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
>> >
>> >I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
>> >in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
>> >me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.
>>
>> Only in THIS venue, Scott.
>>
>> In THIS venue, all the pro-code newsgroupies require all to think,
>> act, do, behave, and moralize as they do.

>> Radio and electronics is still fascinating
>> to me and I've explored a lot of it in the course of a half century.
>> Been in lots more of the EM spectrum than nearly all of these
>> rigid pure moralists in here. Never used morse code in all that time,
>> never had to. Used many more modes and modulations than are
>> allowed to amateurs. That's not enough!
>
> Your "exploration" has been as a paid employee, never being
>allowed to use the "radio" as AMATEURS use thiers.

That's the way it is done in professional work. :-)

However, for casual "ragchews," I've used CB...perfectly legal to
do so without any morse knowledge or needing a ham license.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Stebe, with all the wealth of "engineering
experience" as a paid employee (purchasing agent, less than
half a year total) thinks that "exploration" at work (usuall
known as R&D or Research and Development) is not really any
"exploration." That may be because all of his vaunted amateur
experience has used modes and modulations and equpment
already done? :-)

> That you never used Morse Code is not germane. Millions of other
>radio users never use it either. So what?

Test element 1 is still present in the U.S. amateur radio license examination regulations. That requires demonstration of morse code proficiency.

>> Hang in there, Scott. Pander to the would-be "authority wanna-bes"
>> if you have to...but GO YOUR OWN WAY. Be your own man, not
>> a puppet of those who dictate what you can do, what you shall
>> enjoy, what you must do to please them.
>>
>> Independent thought is GOOD!
>
> Independent thought IS good, as long as it is LENNIE'S
>independent thought.

Incorrect. When I said "independent," I meant it in the complete sense, not some inappropriate, semantically-incorrect, emotionally-loaded form by Stebe the wonder marine.

>The "regulars" of this forum are, for the most
>part, life long Amateur Radio operators with the experience in AMATEUR
>RADIO to know of which they speak.

Yes, all must do as those olde-tymers say. They ARE the "amateur community" and run it, morals and all. :-)

All of them got into amateur radio so long ago that only anthropologists can find the applicable radio regulations of their day. :-)

> Leonard H. Anderson, retired from regular hours engineer, is a
>known pathological liar and newsgroup antagonist.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Stebe froths at the mouth and does the personal-insult bit again. :-)

His rage and anger might qualify as one of the wonders of the world!

Perhaps in Stebe's never-never fantasyland, his "medicine" defines "pathology" as the study of a "disease" and that anyone who does not think as Dr. Killgore thinks is thus suffering a disease? Must be.

Here in the present reality, there are differing OPINIONS, not "lies."

I don't have to lie about anything in my electronics-radio career. It's all open and referencible (except for things covered by industrial trade secrets and non-disclosure agreements). I actually worked IN HF communications beginning nearly 51 years ago...and have been in communications with another member of my Battalion who does have a current amateur radio license. What was done in HF comm a half century ago is still being done today.

> That he felt compelled to post this "defense" of HIS "career" in
>this forum without having actually been a part of the thread is only
>further evidence of his own self-appreciating, "me first" personality
>and his total arrogance towards the very CONCEPT of Amateur Radio and
>those who praticipate in it.

Poor baby. Tripped on his own drool and fell down...pounding on the floor with his fists, unable to get up.

All that rage and anger and hate just from wanting to eliminate the morse code test requirement?

Strange to associate "concept of amateur radio" as being all about morse code testing.

Stebe's alternate reality must be a strange one indeed. Let's not go there.

LHA / WMD

1171. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182455.06226.00002479@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85852

In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Stebe, suffering yet another Powerful Marine Syndrome attack) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040118153407.12501.00005628@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
>> <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:
>>
>> >A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
>> >
>> >I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
>> >in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
>> >me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.
>>
>> Only in THIS venue, Scott.
>>
>> In THIS venue, all the pro-code newsgroupies require all to think,
>> act, do, behave, and moralize as they do.

>> I'm coming up on my 51st anniversary of putting a 1 KW transmitter
>> on the air trans-Pacific.
>
> It wasn't YOUR station, Lennie...It was a facility of the United
>States Army.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still sore and pished because I had the opportunity
while in my military service yet you did not?

ADA was operating in liason to the Far East Command Hq that
served all U.S. forces in the Far East of the time. Established in
1946 as the 71st Signal Service Battalion, my Army unit operated
(and was entirely responsible for) the primary communications of
the FEC. Yes, it was an ARMY station...the USMC was too small
to handle the task.

However, when the new Income Tax laws were passed to apply to
military service members, I became about as direct a taxpayer as
possible to "own" a part of that station. :-)

[Stebe is guaranteed to pick up on that paragraph and reply to it
with as much vitriol and spite that his few neurons can conjure up]

>They could have just as easily made you a diesel
>mechanic...Perhaps then you would have been harrassing the
>professional truck drivers.

No, the Army could NOT "do that as easily." I was sent to the Fort Monmouth Signal School for several months of microwave radio relay training after Basic. Diesel mechanics were trained in several other school locations.

ADA did have several "diesel mechanics" for the emergency electrical power generation (old site) and continuous electrical power generation (new site at Kashiwa). Normal for 24/7 operation.

Several of the ADA transmitter team were licensed to drive Army vehicles, myself included...Jeep, 3/4 ton truck, 2 1/2 ton truck. No problem since all those already were licensed to drive in the various states and only required familiarization courses on the military vehicles. The Battalion did emply "professional vehicle drivers," all Japanese nationals, but none to my knowledge every "harrassed them."

> Army manuals and a Senior NCO told you what to do and how to do
>it. They gave you an FM or TM (or the equivelent of the period) and
>said "do this".

"FM" is still the common term for Field Manual which covers large subjects. "TM" is still the common term for Technical Manual which goes into specific detail on equipment.

ADA had only one complete copy of the TM on the (standard pre-WW2 design) BC-339 and some reproduced schematics. That was the basic "1 KW" transmitter in RTTY service. The 339 was a sturdy machine and simple to operate, easy to maintain, even if built on "battleship style" (heavy, about 7 feet tall) with many designed-in safety features. Neither the BC-339 nor the BC-340 (10 KW amplifier and power supply for 339) nor the Press Wireless PW-15 (15 KW RTTY) nor the Western Electric LD-T2 (4 KW PEP SSB, commercial) were taught in Army Signal Schools. All of us at ADA learned "on the job" since none of the equipment was taught in any signal schools, any branch.

Yes, "senior NCOs taught us" and said "do this." This is normal in a work environment were supervisors also teach and say "do that." Somehow you find that deplorable?

> Biggie wow. We are sooooooooooo impressed that YOU were able to
>follow instructions "putting a 1KW transmitter on the air
>trans-Pacific".

Considering that none of us newbies at ADA had operated an HF transmitter at 1 KW, there was only the on-the-job-training to do and follow instructions. Took my particular newbie group about an hour of M/Sgt Ouye's time in February, 1953, including questions and answers, and review of procedures for the station.

The BC-339 was about as "complicated" as any amateur radio transmitter got in 1953 (it have been designed before 1940) and

included an antenna tuner. Not a biggie, true, but none of us needed any "license" to operate it nor did we have to know morse code. :-) It is a personal biggie when it hasn't been done before. Keeping everything operating 24/7, knowing procedures for QSYs and confirming frequencies, upping and downing circuits, confirming the TTY signal quality, setting the FSK exciters, doing maintenance on equipment, keeping the radio relay (VHF, UHF) equpment running, keeping the wireline/radio "carrier" equipment running was all part of the job...learned on-site since we could not "go to school" on it nor read about it in QST for an "education." :-)

I learned all that was required (and more) on-the-job and later became an "NCO" who said "do this (or that)." :-)

That was all before Stebe was born. It must make him very angry and furious that anyone actually did those things before his life experience began.

I've omitted any previous mention of Stebe's fury and indignance that I should ever honor the men of my Battalion. He demanded that I stop, saying it was all for personal glory in this newsgroup. Tsk, tsk.

I still honor the men and women of my Battalion, knowing the history from first unit formation to changes through today. I am proud of what I did, of my fellow signalmen for "getting the messages through." We did it. It's on record, including two Presidential Unit Citations. Callsign ADA still exists, now that of U.S. Army Pacific Headquarters at Fort Shafter, Hawaii.

LHA / WMD

1172. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182457.06226.00002480@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85949

In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Stebe Robeson, still in the throes of PMS (Powerful Marine Syndrome) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040118153407.12501.00005628@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
>> <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:
>>
>> >A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
>> >
>> >I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
>> >in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
>> >me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.
>>
>> Only in THIS venue, Scott.
>>
>> In THIS venue, all the pro-code newsgroupies require all to think,
>> act, do, behave, and moralize as they do.

> And I do not spit on "professionalism" Lennie.

Of course you do. Everyone has seen it in this free, open,
unmoderated forum.

You "knew everything about electronics engineering" after working
less than a year as a purchasing agent in a company making
set-top boxes and modems. :-)

You've consistantly tried to equate college night courses with some
kind of alliterative low-grade "night school."

You've consistantly said I was a mere "bench technician" rather
than a design engineer...yet you've never tried to check with any of
the past employers I've listed nor contacted any of the U.S. radio
amateurs I've listed as references.

> That assertion is yet ANOTHER lie from somone whio finds it EASY
>to lie. I have nothing but the highest regard for professionals in ANY
>field...It's just that I have absolutely ZERO respect for YOU since
>you've made such a mockery of the title.

"Mockery?" From the expert Dill Instructor with hardly any work
experience in ANY engineering? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...all you do is vent hatred and bile against another
because that is your nature in here...always insulting the person
who has opinions rather than tackling the subject matter...and,

when there is no possibility of a valid response to the subject, just
more heaping of insults against a person.

> As for "going on 84", I will gladly jog around the block a few
>times with you or see how well you do carrying a full field pack on
>the rescue team. NOW who is involved in another "ploy of pervase
>character assassination"...?!?!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Stebe reacting as if He were the only one mentioned.

:-)

Unless Stebe moved (again?), He does not live in Pennsylvania
nor is he a renowned amateur historian.

Stebe should pack and rescue his "team" in order to carry more
insults and pejorative phrases to the masses to avenge his
wounded psyche.

>> This is NOT anywhere close to a venue for "discussion of issues"
>> in amateur radio. It is a place for newsgroupies to gather and try
>> to turn into some kind of ARRL-south, to stir stock myths and
>> old ideas into a stew of meaty morse just like what HAD to be
>> done in the 1920s and 1930s.
>
> Since YOU seem to be the only one who deems it important to
>interject arguments about Morse Code into threads that don't even
>adress it, I'd say the fixation is yours, Oh Putzy One.

Absolutely. I interject comments about the beloved smartness of
the morse code test at any opportunity.

Contrary to your personal (weird) beliefs, just getting into U.S.
amateur radio on HF allocations requires a morse test. [see subject
title "A Newbies View On Things"]

Some of us desire to change the amateur regulations and eliminate
the morse code test. Being a "member of the amateur community"
through licensing is not required to change federal laws [see the
U.S. Constitution in regard to who may communicate with their
government].

>> Rigid, inflexible, all march to the same drumbeep.
>
> That's what YOU would have us doing...One license...everyone the
>same...no challenge, skill or functionality...Just a corral of lambs,
>beying to the Word of Lennie the Professional.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Are lambs kept in "corrals" and do they "bey?" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...once again on the "no challenge, skill or functionality"
by having a single amateur license? That's a mind-boggler but it
does explain Stebe's own claim of "skill and function" represented
solely by an amateur radio class designation.

If "challenge, skill, or functionality (?)" are achieved only by passing a CLASS test, then all Amateur Extras can "stop learning" on receiving that class grant. There's NO "challenge or skill" left for them once that has been done. :-)

All amateur learning STOPS after achieving Extra in Stebe's World.

That explains much of Stebe's output... :-)

LHA / WMD

1173. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:24:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182459.06226.00002481@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85851

In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Stebe Robeson, in his period and needing attention) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040118153407.12501.00005628@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <100l868d2j48j6a@corp.supernews.com>, "Scott"
>> <scott5mi@cox-internet.com> writes:
>>
>> >A heart felt thank you to all that replied.
>> >
>> >I guess my opinion that "Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element
>> >in our society" was incorrect. I appreciate all that took the time to show
>> >me where I was wrong. I stand corrected.
>>
>> Only in THIS venue, Scott.
>>
>> In THIS venue, all the pro-code newsgroupies require all to think,
>> act, do, behave, and moralize as they do.
>
> A blatant lie from someone who finds it easy to lie.
>
>> I've been trying to get a word in on the SUBJECT of morse code
>> testing and have been a constant target of character assassination
>> by these pro-code newsgroupies. No "civil debate" possible in that
>> cacophony of code.
>
> Another lie. The subject has been "debated", discussed and
>dissected until all are nauseous of the topic anymore.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, still the unoriginal non-debate non-technique. Such
is beyond trite and worn-out.

Stebe once more indicates intense hatred and rage against one
person. He needs Anger Management Therapy. Immediately.

Opinions not in line with Stebe's Beliefs in his fantasyland are,
in his mind, "lies." Strange stuff.

Unfortunately, there are no dictionaries published on definitions
of Stebe's unreality.

> That Lennie has nothing else to discuss as it pertains to Amateur
>Radio should be a clue to those new to this forum that would be swayed
>by his "debating style".

Tsk, tsk, tsk, still trying that old ploy, senior gunnery nurse?

A reminder: In THIS reality, this newsgroup is open, unmoderated
and there are no raddio kopps at the doorway to check for
proper credentials of amateurism. Stebe is a mighty amateur in
radio...as well as in human society.

> You've taken grand liberty with the term "literary license" and
>have grossly abused any sense of social propriety so many times that
>your name is synonomous with "liar" and "antagonist".

Tsk, tsk, tsk...there you go again, confusing your unreality with the
rest of the world.

No "literary license" is required in here, amateur or professional.
Acknowledging the existance of true reality (as opposed to your
fantasyland) is a requirement for rational discourse. You do not
exhibit rational discourse, therefore you've lost your "license."

Ergo, Stebe is just (vainly) trying to sugar-coat very ordinary
personal insults of the hatred kind. That doesn't work...except
that Stebe is too wrapped up in his personal fantasyland to
acknowledge that others think differently.

> AMATEUR Radio, Lennie...You have exactly zero-point-zero minutes
>of experience in AMATEUR Radio. No one, repeat NO one in this forum
>denies that the technology and propagation of radio waves is any
>different in any other radio service.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...in Stebe's fantasyland, those who want to get into
amateur radio must also "have experience in amateur radio?" That
would make their experience illegal. The FCC would not grant
amateur licenses to those who have done illegal radio operation.

Perhaps's Stebe thinks the amateur radio "service" is like the USMC.
One does not need to know anything as a "recruit." The Dill Sergeant
will explain all to them, spit insults in their faces, give them extra
punishment for misbehavior (such as sassing the Dill Instructor).
All to break them down first, then "rebuild" them into patriotic robots
"for the corps, God, and country."

Amateur radio is a technical hobby, a recreational pursuit (for fun)
that requires licensing due to the nature of transmission of RF
energy. It is not a military service. It is not a government service.

Reminder reprise: This newsgroup is open, unmoderated. No
authoritiy is automatically granted to the enraged, hysterical, or
upset fantasylanders attempting something like squatter's rights.
All they end up doing is squatting.

> It's the PRACTICE and the APPLICATION of the technology that
>makes the difference.

Of course it does, senior amateur gunnery nurse. Simply making
a number of legal regulations and calling it something else changes
the technology into a glorious wonderland of physics that needs
long, arduous study and much time in grade to comprehend. No.

You are exhibiting an erroneous false Belief System again. The nature of RF transmission energy requires (by law) regulation. In the USA this is done (by a law of Congress) through the FCC for civil radio. The FCC grants amateur radio licenses (not the "amateur community"). An FCC-granted amateur radio license is not an academic accreditation, not a diploma, not a certificate of some excellence in radio. A license is just a regulatory tool.

You are wrapping yourself in imaginary glory by winding that license around your personna, falsely puffing up patriotism of a federal license as somehow enobling yourself. You are not "better than non-licensees" for having an amateur license, you are simply authorized by the federal government to transmit certain RF energy at certain frequencies using certain modes and modulations all given in federal regulations.

You WANT (desperately) to be "better than others" for having that federal authorization and become enraged when others do not respect your glorious and noble achievement...forgetting that your other actions as a human being are deplorable, even despicable.

Anyone venturing into this newsgroup is as open and vulnerable to opinion attack as any other. There is no Special Dispensation for the supposed magics of a high license. You cannot negate opposite opinions by using a lot of false insults, acting the outraged bigoted bully, all in insulting the person rather than the subject.

Opposite opinions exist. They do not go away. Physical force and coercion will not stop them. They are not "lies" no matter how many times you call opposite opinions for "lies." In order to remove the self-applied-through-response despicability, you must try to concentrate on the subject, not the person making the opinion statements.

My opinion is that none of the above will have any effect on Stebe. He will continue to vent rage and fury on certain individuals because that is the only tactic available to bullies. But, it needs to be said once in a while... :-)

LHA / WMD

1174. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:25:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182500.06226.00002482@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85947

In article <OUTOb.15130$q4.8824@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>> Actually, Dwight, the only "place"
>> that my callsign gets so much
>> discussion is right here in this
>> newsgroup. I have been involved
>> in a lot of stuff since I've had this
>> callsign--on the air, off the air,
>> women and men, served agencies,
>> hundreds of other amateurs. No
>> where, once, did my callsign ever
>> get discussed, and there was plenty
>> of opportunity. (snip)
>
>
> I don't doubt that, Kim. The debate here only points to how far some in
>this newsgroup are out of touch with reality.

Dwight, that's all too common in computer-modem "communications," just as it is with morse code beeping on ham band ragchews.

No real clues on a person, no human data input, just a lot of imagination and too much concentration on the writer in a public forum. Those with an agenda, a hatred of something/somebody, living in a quasi-fantasyland, brainwashed into a different reality, are all into their own "reality of sight and sound," just like a Twilight Zone.

To those too caught up in the unreality don't have a hobby of ham radio anymore, they have a Lifestyle and Belief. Any puncturing of that fantasy will send them off into paroxysms of rage, offense at imagined slights, and the usual bigot's demands of What is Right Should Be Right.

U.S. amateur radio seems to be another center for national misogyny. It is a hobby activity engaged in largely by white males.

LHA / WMD

1175. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:25:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182501.06226.00002484@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85944

In article <evsl00hr9oksoio59c7ps9k1ruhbcidp1e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On Sun, 18 Jan 2004 18:56:26 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>>
>>> Dave, have a nice life and do try not to be too upset by
>>
>>...the developing nuclear capabilities of North Korea? another
>>terrorist attack? Hilary Clinton?
>
>it is refreshing to see that there are other issues which command your
>attention, Dave - but this statement refers to the issue being
>discussed, Dave. All of the text that follows that statement,
>actually.
>
>Sorry I forgot the colon at the end of the sentence - I'll try to
>remember it for you next time!

It is vital and important that you remember colons for Dave.

Whenever he comes into the newsgroup he develops IBS,
Irritable Bowel Syndrome...

LHA / WMD

1176. Re: RIP: The "If Ham radio were invented today....." Thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:25:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119182501.06226.00002483@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85945

In article <408m00phec9o64o57ivjgq4ijh703j917n@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:08 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <ggbl009snpjs3t62hb4inca8t0nit7n3im@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>Say, Dave, you're beginning to sould a bit like Dr. Seuss there!
>>>
>>>Dave, would you like W5TIT with that?
>>>
>>>I would not, could not, on a cap,
>>>I would not, could not, on RRAP,
>>>I would not have it on a plate,
>>>I would not 'cause I'd hate that plate!
>>>I would not use it on the air,
>>>I would not use it ANYWHERE!!!
>>>
>>>I don't care if Katey Segal wrote the code, Dave - I interpret
>>>"operates" in the context of my inference as "communicates to others",
>>>Dave. It's part of the package.
>>
>> "Katey Segal?" :-)
>>
>> Big Dave thinks he is Steven Segal ! :-)
>
>Steven Segal....an interesting combunation of technical excellence and
>bad acting.
>
>Hmmm.........

In here he has little technical excellence and very bad acting.

He gets by with Special Effects... :-)

LHA / WMD

1177. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-19 23:59:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9b_Ob.15687$i4.384@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85853

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> Summary:
>
> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra

Pretty similar to Hans's proposal on classes.

> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only

And so many folks thought they'd push for a higher speed test.

> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
> and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General

Sounds like something I suggested a couple of weeks
ago that scared a few folks.

> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
> privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>
> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> evaluation
>
> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.

Should be interesting as to how this goes down.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1178. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 00:53:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191653.3e7e12b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85854

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401191131.3032a700@posting.google.com>...
>
> Sucks to be you, Lennie. Wake up and join humanity before Mrs
> Putz has to plant you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Spoken like a true humanitarian. I'm sure your heart was in the right place.

1179. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 00:56:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191656.4f67e090@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85855
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Tom Winston" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>
> That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
> passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
> Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
> -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.
>
> Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
> higher standards than the current crop of Extras.
>
> So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make
> that decision.
>
> Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.

There's that stupid pecking order thing again.

Hey, a little studying and a code waiver and anyone could have been an Advanced.

1180. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 00:56:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119195621.00545.00003711@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 85856
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article , "Kï¿½HB"
writes:

>If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
>four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
>proposing!

The ARRL proposal is much less lame than the "Amateur Radio in the 21st
Century" paper's ideas.
>
>A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
>General, and Extra.

Good idea.
>
>Novice is still ghetto-ized

Not at all.

> and renewable until you assume room
>temperature.

Good idea.

>Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.

Good idea.
>
>General just like today except without Morse.
>
Bad idea.

>Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
>
>But there's more.....
>
>A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.

Very bad idea.
>
>All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to

Extra.

Another very bad idea.

>That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
>the next higher license without testing for that grade.

No reason given for it, either. FCC has maintained the old Advanced and
Novice classes for almost 4 years with no problems. There's no reason it would

be a problem for FCC to maintain the Advanced and Tech classes
the same way.
>
>And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
>must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
>not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
>passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.

Yep!
>
>C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
>committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
>the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
>for the future.

It's better than anything you or NCVEC has proposed. But not as good
as my proposal.

>Nasty letter to follow.

Try a little diplomacy.

>I>AM< THE ARRL!!!
>
So am I.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1181. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:00:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191700.450cc315@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85857

Cutting edge stuph, I'm sure. Let's see what they got.

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> Summary:
>
> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
> and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
> privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>
> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> evaluation
>
> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Pretty much just a consolidation of existing license classes. But a
move in the right direction.

1182. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:05:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191705.1aed7c5a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85858

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<cpVOb.21018$OM2.5050772@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com...
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >
> > Summary:
> >
> > 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
> Ok, so far so good.
>
> > 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
> I personally would like to see existing Tech, Tech+, and Novice licensees
> upgraded to the new Novice ticket. (Tech+ privies.)
>
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra
>
> Sounds reasonable.
>
> > , Techs
> > and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
> Nope.
>
> > 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
> Depends on one's interpretation of "slightly," I suppose.
>
> > Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> > and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
> > privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>
> Ok.
>
> > Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> > evaluation
>
> Also reasonable.
>
> > Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics"
>
> Surely, they jest?!

>
> > , General to be
> > derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
> Ok.
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Thanks for the synopsis, Jim. This scenario certainly beats a blank.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

A blank like last time?

Bert, WHY OH WHY couldn't the ARRL have come up with this a decade ago???

The FCC was not only receptive, but even a little pushy about restructuring back then. Instead the ARRL chose to sit on their collective thumbs.

1183. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:08:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191708.6b616800@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85859

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401190950.4d04a0e9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>...
>
> > those who praticipate in it.
>
> Oooooops. Made a new word!
>
> Steve

Looks like you've been attending "Anger Management."

1184. Read it and WEEP!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:10:02 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0401191710.6fa90e98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85860

How MANY times have I told all you old sticks in the mud, that Amateur Radio was going to HAVE to implement my plan of a NEW NOVICE class license:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1

The ARRL FINALLY took my advice... READ IT AND WEEP! And now - drop all this NEGATIVE BULLSHIT, stop wasting your time with your foot-dragging, and progress-blocking, and get on with your FREAKING LIVES! (Or are you all just a bunch of WHINERS?!)

- Stewart
(For those who don't want to wait for the new Novice license, try MURS!)
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

1185. Re: ARRL should change

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:34:28 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <bui0j4$kb2$1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 85861

WA8ULX <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> there statement on QST, to represent there true fellings. Instead of, QST
> devoted entirely to Amateur Radio, it should read, QST devoted entirely to
> CBAmateur Radio. At least it would be more correct.

The only thing that doesn't change is the illiterate, self-righteous dolts like you bemoaning the latest change to ham radio.

Been there, heard most of it; SSB replacing AM is a disaster, 11m reassigned to CB is a disaster, license restructuring (in several incantations) is a disaster, elimination of morse testing is a disaster, elimination of essay tests is a disaster...

Fortunately I missed the elimination of spark is a disaster ravings.

On and on you idiots rant and rage, yet the world doesn't end.

Opinionated morons like you is the reason I stopped going to ham clubs 35 years ago.

The real hams are the ones that help people without all the superior attitude crap you constantly spew because your only accomplishment in life is to pass a morse test.

Rave on and continue the name calling moron, I'm back to ignoring you and your life partner's postings.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

1186. Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:38:22 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <iE%Ob.85899$Rc4.333443@attbi_s54>
Source record: 85862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This proposal is a good start. However, the ultimate goal should be to align our privileges with those of the rest of the amateur radio world and REMOVE all mode restrictions.

CW US operators can operate anywhere in the US bands but US phone is restricted. A clear case of discrimination, and a "mode-ist" one at that!! Politically incorrect these days....and a major waste of sprectrum!! (Just tune the CW bands during any non contest day). A carry over from the olde days when the ARRL was clearly a CW only group of old buzzards.

I submit that US Extra class licencee's should be allowed to operate phone anywhere that the rest of the world can. Is that fair??? Or are we still destined to live in an amateur radio world surpressed by our own government?

Hey...ARRL, WAKE UP!!! If you want to keep the activity up you need to promote frequencies where we can talk to the rest of the world! How can I make this any clearer??? And provide incentives to do this!!! An extra 25KHz doesn't make it.

BTW....requiring CW should not be a requirement for HF operation. (Good move by the ARRL on this with the new Novice proposal) Time to get over it....and let the rest of the many good people get on the air!!! I say this from having slaved over getting 20 WPM done to pass my Extra test (for those measly 25 KHz of phone) and I rarely have used code since. So......don't deny folks from HF just because code is "your favorite mode" and you are proud that you have no microphone in your shack.....

73,
Chuck...K1KW

1187. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 01:57:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 85863

In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>@posting.google.com:
>
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>
>> Summary:
>>
>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it would
>reintroduce a free licence class.

Not part of the proposal as I read it.

The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the entry level
exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF privileges, but more HF
privileges.

>Provided the new class that happened to
>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the current
>Element 2 I would have no trouble with that

Why?

Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech Plus privs.
The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between above and below 30 MHz
privileges.
>
>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.

Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and receiving.

>Morse skill testing for voice
>privileges is illogical and should be dumped.

It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to use
manufactured equipment.

>Moreover, it can be now,
>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>
FCC will most probably just drop it completely.

>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>
>OK

Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as has been
done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>
>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>
Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to Extra, but not
OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to General?

What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not the other?
>>
>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
>Good.

Bad.

> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?

That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>
>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
>> privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440

>See above

Please clarify.
>
>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
>> evaluation
>
>OK

Agreed.

>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
>
>Not OK

Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and modes,
power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase) and much more.

By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.

>> General to be
>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.

>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't say
>here.

See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the work of a committee looking to give everyone something they want, but not giving anyone everything they want.

What will FCC do?

First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to attract more new hams.

Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.

Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it costs them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.

And that's probably about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

1188. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:10:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119211036.29815.00002838@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 85864

In article <20040119180303.28383.00000323@mb-m01.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

> Do you think the ARRL will Print 10 Codes in QST? Maybe they could have an >article on the correct use of Echo Mikes.

Why? Did the editors reject YOUR article on them?

LHA / WMD

1189. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:10:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119211037.29815.00002839@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 85866
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article , "Kï¿½HB"
writes:

>If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
>four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
>proposing!
>
>A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
>General, and Extra.

It DID look familiar, come to think of it... :-)

>Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room
>temperature.

Keeping the "novice" nomenclature is the BoD's wonderful way
to put the "inferiors" in their place.

Novice class numbers were falling even before 1991. Somehow
I doubt the FCC will consider restoring the rank beginner
category.

>Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
>
>General just like today except without Morse.
>
>Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
>
>But there's more.....
>
>A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.
>
>All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to Advanced.
>
>That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
>the next higher license without testing for that grade.

Hiram forbid such a Terrible thing! :-)

>And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
>must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
>not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
>passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.

I vote to make it 60 WPM...about as fast as I can cruise on a
keyboard.

Ought to be no problem for all the mighty macho morsemen!

Morse! Morse! Morse!

On-off keying CW in the new millennium!

Keep that pool of knowledgeable radio morse operators in case
them nasty aliens invade from outer space!

>C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
>committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
>the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
>for the future.

You mean...gasp...ARRL is NOT "leading U.S. amateur radio
into the new millennium?!?!?

They KNOW what is best for U.S. amateur radio, don't they?

>Nasty letter to follow.

[that's a given... :-)]

LHA / WMD

1190. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:10:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119211038.29815.00002840@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 85865

In article <5c01b95b.0401191135.4190703e@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040116232348.12631.00004285@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> >> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
>> >> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
>> >
>> >You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
>> >and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.
>>
>> And you are not God...despite your claims to same...
>
> You will, of course, present the post in which he made this
>claim?

Big Dave is NOT god? Good grief! What is the world coming to?

:-)

> Failure to do so will only further validate your status as
>"Pathological Liar"

Absolutely! May JAMA and Lancet feature this "pathology" as a
cover issue!

> Of course we all know that that request will go unfulfilled, so
>we will just "call a spade a spade", or in this case, a LIAR a LIAR.

Poor Stebe. Into another seizure. Or is that one prolonged
seizure for today?

> Leonard H. Anderson...Pathological Liar...Again...

Documented in all the medical journals and textbooks at USC
School of Medicine?

I'm sure you WISH so, gunnery nurse.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!

LHA / WMD

I'm getting better at the maniacal laughing, right? :-)

Gots to do like my favorite gunnery nurse in order to blend in!

1191. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:10:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119211040.29815.00002841@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 85867

In article <5c01b95b.0401191131.3032a700@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040118153405.12501.00005627@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>
>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms
>
> Majority of silliness snipped.

"Silly?" :-) In the eyes of a mighty macho morseman of the amateur bands (HF) who had less than a half year experience in the electronic industry, and whose radio education is derived from the League publishings, I suppose it looks "silly." :-)

No problem for the rest of the radio world. They continued to evolve, grow, advance, and discover things...and make profits on all that... without any assistance from amateur radio.

Broadcasting, telephony (cordless and cellular), teleprinting ("data"), imagery (from facsimile to JPG formats and more), modems (wired and wireless), information theory, AM-FM-PM and composite modulations all grew without any "pioneering" by amateurs.

>> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
>> bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent.
>> Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign
>> behind their names to show how good and expert they were in
>> "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more
>> fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).
>
> But the fact is that Amateur Radio DID evolve the way it did, and
>you are STILL not a licensee in it. Millions of Americans have had no
>problem being involved at one time or another, but you, the
>"electronics professional", can't seem to get past the front door.
>Some professional.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...I didn't "try" to be a purchasing agent or a truck driver either. Never tried...but I drove a deuce and a half with minimal instruction and legal permission to do so from "authorities."

Professionals make money at their activities...that's why they are called "professional." Amateurs don't...that's why they are called "amateur."

Tsk, tsk...more hypocrisy...you claim you never said anything bad about professionals yet there you go making nasty to pros again.

Sigh...think of the alternative. If I got an amateur radio license I might turn into a bullying barbarian. It wouldn't be nice to have TWO like you in the newsgroup, would it? :-)

> You are still a pathological liar. That is archived and beyond
>your Orwellian desires to rewrite history.

I didn't "rewrite history," Stebe. All the OTHER radio services I wrote about took place in OUR reality, independently, without any help from ARRL or amateur radio.

Everyone knows about AM and FM broadcasting...it's very common source of news and some entertainment. Television is and has more impact than just audio. One in three Americans has a cell phone subscription now (cell phones are little two-way radios!). Most Americans know that communications satellites exist and have seen live video from around the globe (comm sattelites have many little radios in them). AMSAT has their own satellites but didn't invent them.

Commercial communications carriers developed Single Sideband out of equipment used for long-distance wired telephony. Much much later the military sponsored single-channel SSB communications...THEN it became popular for amateur radio.

Mobile and handheld FM radio was "pioneered" by police departments and the military, respectively. In broadcasting, FM popularity is due to the pioneering of Ed Armstrong, the inventor (among many things) of the superheterodyne receiver. The rise in popularity of all is due to the manufacturers of radio equipment, the ones making it affordable.

> You still spend countelss hours trolling for arguments that you
>subsequently try to turn into a defensable "it's character
>assassination" rants. Still doesn't work.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...calling others names like "pathological liar" is rather much like character assassination to most anyone else... :-)

You are right, though, calling folks such names does NOT work well. :-)

> In the end, you are still more "outside" radio than a motivated
>CBer, and never likely to understand why it is your infinite wisdom is
>avoided like the plague.

So...telling the truth of history and experience in radio is NOT true in your alternate reality? :-)

Truth is a "plague?"

If so, may dozens of "plagues" infest your mind with truth!

Might shock the heck out of you to learn truth but you DO have access to sedatives to calm you down...

> Sucks to be you, Lennie. Wake up and join humanity before Mrs
>Putz has to plant you.

There's no "Mrs Putz" living at this address.

I've been a part of humanity for a few decades now and likely to continue
despite running across hate-filled, enraged gunnery nurses who try to
bully others on line.

Trying to insult my wife indirectly is not nice. It's your style but it
still
is not nice and doesn't work very well, does it?

LHA / WMD

1192. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:32:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bui4kj$n9g@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85870

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:OUTOb.15130$q4.8824@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Actually, Dwight, the only "place"
> > that my callsign gets so much
> > discussion is right here in this
> > newsgroup. I have been involved
> > in a lot of stuff since I've had this
> > callsign--on the air, off the air,
> > women and men, served agencies,
> > hundreds of other amateurs. No
> > where, once, did my callsign ever
> > get discussed, and there was plenty
> > of opportunity. (snip)
>
>
> I don't doubt that, Kim. The debate here only points to how far some in
> this newsgroup are out of touch with reality.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Someone came up with a great analogy today, and I don't know why I've never thought of it before. In fact, maybe y'all won't see this--but I sure do. Relating the callsign I have to the type of person I am, makes as much sense as relating the authorship of Stephen King to him being a mass murderer; or the character of Andy Sipowitz to being the same person as that actor; or Al Pacino being the exact persons he depicts in his characters (remember the tirade he goes off on in the movie "Devil's Advocate").

While amateur radio is not an acting venue, it is a hobby/avocation/distraction/extracurricular activity. The callsign of an individual in amateur radio, and even the way they act within that venue, may have nothing at all to do with who or what they are. In fact, many times when I meet amateurs face-to-face, they are not the person they "depict" on the air.

Anyway, I liked the scenario...that's my story and I'm sticking to it... ;o

Kim W5TIT

1193. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:35:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bui4kk$n9g@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85869

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I would hardly refer to what
> > Riley Hollingsworth so elequently
> > stated as bringing the ARS "...one
> > step closer to extinction" as "living
> > life beautifully." That is the perverted
> > construct of an equally perverted
> > mind. (snip)
>
>
> Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth,
Larry?
> If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it
before,
> but that was some time ago.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Man, I wish I had it...I just looked and I don't. I had intereviewed Riley for a local amateur newsletter and I think the issue of my callsign came up on this newsgroup about a month or two later. I had posted the entire email I'd sent to him, and his entire response. Maybe it can be searched on Google...don't know.

Kim W5TIT

1194. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:38:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bui4kl$n9g@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85868

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040119182450.06226.00002475@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth,
Larry?
> >If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it
before,
> >but that was some time ago.
>
> As I recall it, there was NO PROOF that Larrah's "Hollingsworth letter"
> was the real thing.
>
> We all have to take Larrah's typed-in words as "truth."
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAH!
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>

The words Larry posts are a direct quote from part of Riley Hollingsworth's
response to an email from me.

Kim W5TIT

1195. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:48:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040119214857.12501.00005663@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85871

In article <20040119180111.28383.00000322@mb-m01.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>
>>I am starting to believe you now Bruce.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
>Dan its what I have been saying all along. I cant see how anyone in there
>right
>mind could say the ARRL is trying to help Ham Radio.

Dan/Bruce:

The ARRL is obviously trying to help itself with their new proposal. I'm convinced that it is their belief that the new proposal serves two critical objectives:

1.) It gives away enough operating privileges to the know-nothing, do-nothing, lazy, no-coder whiners to make them happy,

and, by keeping the 5 WPM code test for Extra,

2.) It hopefully won't offend the likes of the withered, feeble, FISTS-member geezers who are daily trashing the CW subbands with their numbers games and their sloppy, indecipherable sending with mal-adjusted bugs.

Don't expect the "Gang of Fifteen" to be very willing to listen to any of the membership for adjustments to the proposal, particularly the notion of increasing the Extra-class code speed to 12, 13, or 20 WPM.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1196. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:48:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040119214858.12501.00005664@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85872

In article <c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
>Summary:
>
>3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
>and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
>'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
>Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
>privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>
>Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
>evaluation
>
>Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
>derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

This new ARRL Proposal is pretty much what I would expect to come out of Newington these days. And that doesn't mean that I won't support it. However, I don't see the FCC as being favorably disposed toward adding a new license class to the ARS licensing structure. A better idea would have been to simply incorporate the "New Novice" HF phone privileges with the current Technician-class license, keeping General and Extra as they are in the new proposal.

I don't see why the Extra-class code test requirement needs to be set at the current 5 WPM level. A 12-wpm code test would be a better idea, and anyone interested enough in achieving Extra could go from nothing to that level in a matter of weeks. However, since Extra is already dumbed-down to 5 WPM, I guess there's no putting the toothpaste back in the tube.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1197. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:48:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040119214859.12501.00005665@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85873

In article <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
> Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth, Larry?
>If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it before,
>but that was some time ago.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Axe and ye shall receive:

Subject: Riley sez Kim taking the ARS "One step closer to extinction"
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
Date: 08 Jun 2000 14:37:47 GMT

In article <59B7203A07395FF0.50F2CC864D4ED7FE.54A4CB093D32584C@lp.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>Probably more a thoughtful wish of the prefix I wish I'd been able to get.

Kim:

Huh? This was even harder to decipher than your usually indecipherable writing. Anyone who has survived elementary school grammar should know it's best not to use a word like "wish" more than once in a sentence -- particularly if it can be used as either a noun or a verb. This causes confusion. However, since confusion seems to be your normal state, I guess you think you can get away with it!

[THIS IS THE PART WHERE KIM QUOTES THE PART OF RILEY'S E-MAIL WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS THREAD:]

>Speaking of callsigns, here's Riley's response after I wrote and told him I
>was sorry for bothering him, since the FCC had already spoken on callsigns
>at the Dayton Hamfest (the rest of the email is also with it):
>
>While that's true, just because a person has a right to do something doesn't
>mean it's right to do it on every occasion. While the call sign may fit the
>constitution, for every instance where a parent or uncle or grandparent
>doesn't want a young person to get involved in Ham Radio because of
>something they hear on the bands, then you have taken the ARS one step
>closer to extinction. Then we can sit around and debate what happened to

>all those Amateur frequencies that industry bought at auction---debating, of
>course, on the internet and cellular because that'll be all we have left.
>The first amendment will still be alive and well, just as it is now, tho, if
>that's any consolation.

Interesting. Sooo, Kim -- are you going to change your call sign
voluntarily, or are you going to, as Riley said, continue to take the ARS
"one step closer to extinction?" Think about it!

Years ago, I would have fought tooth and nail to preserve every single
kiloHertz of ham radio spectrum. However, because of the proliferation of
so-called "hams" like you, Kim, I now support the concept of wholesale
re-allocation of amateur radio spectrum to commercial broadcasting
and utility communications services which can make much more
productive, profitable, and socially beneficial use of it! As hams, we've
blown it -- big time -- and you, your attitude, and your callsign are the
best and most readily available example of every bad thing ham radio
has become!

Sooo -- enjoy your callsign. The FCC won't force you to change it --
that is something that can only come from you -- should you decide
to become a Real Ham and stop giving the rest of us a bad image!
I have complete confidence that you can change if you want to -- but
the action to do so must come out of your decision to do what's
right for people other than yourself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1198. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 02:55:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <VKGdnXu6prKpAJHd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85875

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Someone came up with a great analogy today, and I don't know why I've never
> thought of it before. In fact, maybe y'all won't see this--but I sure do.
> Relating the callsign I have to the type of person I am, makes as much sense
> as relating the authorship of Stephen King to him being a mass murderer; or
> the character of Andy Sipowitz to being the same person as that actor; or Al
> Pacino being the exact persons he depicts in his characters (remember the
> tirade he goes off on in the movie "Devil's Advocate").

Spin it anyway you wish, the choice of that callsign shows a complete
lack of taste.

1199. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 03:07:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191907.78e15793@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85874

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
> @posting.google.com:
>
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >
> > Summary:
> >
> > 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
> The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it would
> reintroduce a free licence class. Provided the new class that happened to
> be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the current
> Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>
> >
> > 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
> >
>
> Predictably, I do have a problem with that. Morse skill testing for voice
> privileges is illogical and should be dumped. Moreover, it can be now,
> since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>
> OK
>
> >Techs
> > and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
> Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>
> >
> > 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>
> Good. Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>
> >
> > Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> > and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
> > privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
> >
>

> See above
>
> > Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> > evaluation
> >
>
> OK
>
> > Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
>
> Not OK
>
> > General to be
> > derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't say
> here.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Alun, when we had 7 license classes, The Amateur Formerly Known As
Rev. Jim told me that the ARS needed more license classes, not fewer.

1200. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 03:16:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401191916.2d55657b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85876

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fmXOb.19588$zj7.18688@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> <
> < I understand that you would -knowingly- work a ham out of band.
> <
>
> Dear Little Billy Beeper,
>
> I will not go out of my band allocation to work anyone, but I will work
> anyone with an amateur radio callsign who calls me inside my band
> allocations.

Even when you know -they- are out of band?

1201. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 03:36:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119223624.22762.00000160@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85877

>Don't expect the "Gang of Fifteen" to be very willing to listen to any of the
>membership for adjustments to the proposal, particularly the notion of
>increasing the Extra-class code speed to 12, 13, or 20 WPM.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

I dont expect anything from them, except more Dumbing Down

1202. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 03:57:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119225731.12501.00005669@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85879

In article <1e4e3692.0401191653.3e7e12b4@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401191131.3032a700@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> Sucks to be you, Lennie. Wake up and join humanity before Mrs
>> Putz has to plant you.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Spoken like a true humanitarian. I'm sure your heart was in the right place.

Yes...in a jar...

LHA / WMD

1203. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 03:57:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119225731.12501.00005668@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85880

In article <20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>What will FCC do?
>
>First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to attract more
>new hams.

Why? The FCC doesn't have ANY tasking to "attract more new hams."

That's for the League.

The FCC has only to regulate what radio amateurs still exist.

>Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.

Why would you possibly think that? :-)

>Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it costs them
>little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.

Somebody said that ham licenses would be available in cereal boxes. Is that true? [I don't think Rev. Jimmie said that...]

>And that's probably about it.

And that's probably NOT all. Wait until the NPRM. :-)

>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

LHA / WMD

LHA / WMD

1204. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 03:57:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119225732.12501.00005670@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 85878

In article <1e4e3692.0401191708.6b616800@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401190950.4d04a0e9@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > those who praticipate in it.
>>
>> Ooooops. Made a new word!
>>
>> Steve
>
>Looks like you've been attending "Anger Management."

Only one class. After a few minutes the therapist gave up in
disgust.

:-)

LHA / WMD

1205. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:03:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <UL6dnVdaIpkKMJHdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 85882

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> I happen not to believe
> that my callsign shows a lack of taste.

To someone with no taste I imagine it wouldn't. You really should think
about operating on CB, you're their kid of gal.

1206. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:17:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buia5d$psi@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85881

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:VKGdnXu6prKpAJHd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> >
> > Someone came up with a great analogy today, and I don't know why I've
never
> > thought of it before. In fact, maybe y'all won't see this--but I sure
do.
> > Relating the callsign I have to the type of person I am, makes as much
sense
> > as relating the authorship of Stephen King to him being a mass murderer;
or
> > the character of Andy Sipowitz to being the same person as that actor;
or Al
> > Pacino being the exact persons he depicts in his characters (remember
the
> > tirade he goes off on in the movie "Devil's Advocate").
>
> Spin it anyway you wish, the choice of that callsign shows a complete
> lack of taste.
>

JJ, are you *really* that desperate? No spin at all, I happen to agree with the analogy. If you don't, that's your preference. I happen not to believe that my callsign shows a lack of taste. If you do, that's your preference. Either way, it's my call, I like it, you don't have to, and that's all there is to it.

Now, if it's such an issue for you, to continue looking at it, dealing with it, in any way thinking about it is your choice to stay upset about it. That's your choice too, 'magine dat!

Kim W5TIT

1207. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:25:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <K42Pb.20158$zj7.19759@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85883

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

<
< Pretty similar to Hans's proposal on classes.
<

Bill, you must be on drugs, or you have a severe disability regarding
comprehension of the English language.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1208. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:27:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buiamu$o7c@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85884

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:UL6dnVdaIpkKMJHdRVn-gw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > I happen not to believe
> > that my callsign shows a lack of taste.
>
> To someone with no taste I imagine it wouldn't. You really should think
> about operating on CB, you're their kid of gal.
>

OK, I see, you are that desperate...and you're also obsessed. Oh well.
Have a really happy life, JJ, or at least try to!

Kim W5TIT

1209. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:37:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040119233724.01692.00000117@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 85885

In article <bui4kl$n9g@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040119182450.06226.00002475@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> > Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth,
Larry?
>> >If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it
before,
>> >but that was some time ago.
>>
>> As I recall it, there was NO PROOF that Larrah's "Hollingsworth letter"
>> was the real thing.
>>
>> We all have to take Larrah's typed-in words as "truth."
>>
>> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAH!
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>The words Larry posts are a direct quote from part of Riley Hollingsworth's
>response to an email from me.

Thank you, Kim. Correction noted.

I'm still chuckling at the thought that Larrah had some correspondence
with the FCC about another's callsign. [at least I'm not laughing
maniacially anymore...today...:-)]

BWahaha...oops... [sorry, that one slipped out...]

LHA / WMD

1210. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:38:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nh2Pb.20212$zj7.84@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85886

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

< Even when you know -they- are out of band?

Simple Billy Beeper,

Since I don't read French I don't have a clue what the French allocations look like. I trust that the French guys and gals can read French and will comply with their regulations. I am beholden to Part 97, and it doesn't direct me to learn the allocations of other administrations. Therefore, if a French station calls me on 6 meters I will answer them.

Pretty simple concept, really..... I'm surprised you haven't understood my previous messages on the topic.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1211. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 04:56:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buicds$5m6@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 85887

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040119233724.01692.00000117@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <bui4kl$n9g@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040119182450.06226.00002475@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> In article <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> >> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
> >>
> >> > Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth,
> Larry?
> >> >If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it
> before,
> >> >but that was some time ago.
> >>
> >> As I recall it, there was NO PROOF that Larrah's "Hollingsworth
letter"
> >> was the real thing.
> >>
> >> We all have to take Larrah's typed-in words as "truth."
> >>
> >> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAH!
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >The words Larry posts are a direct quote from part of Riley
Hollingsworth's
> >response to an email from me.
>
> Thank you, Kim. Correction noted.
>
> I'm still chuckling at the thought that Larrah had some correspondence
> with the FCC about another's callsign. [at least I'm not laughing
> maniacially anymore...today...:-)]
>
> BWahaha...oops... [sorry, that one slipped out...]
>
> LHA / WMD
>

Oh, I don't know that he had any correspondence with the FCC; in fact I highly doubt it. The Riley Hollingsworth email was a direct response from him to me, and Larry has treasured it ever since :)

Kim W5TIT

1212. Ham Radio needs a REAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 05:02:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120000218.27149.00000286@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85888

Group to support them, it sure as hell isnt the ARRL.

1213. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 05:03:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <AE2Pb.20257$zj7.2467@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85889

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

<
< Try a little diplomacy.
<

"The art of life is to show your hand. There is no diplomacy like
candor. You may lose by it now and then, but it will be a loss well
gained if you do. Nothing is so boring as having to keep up a
deception."
-- Edward Verall Lucas

1214. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 05:05:43 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <HG2Pb.89209$5V2.165673@attbi_s53>
Source record: 85890

What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring out how to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your rig properly, ect. You can get all the answers correct on today's exam and still fail in the real world.

In fact, there have been "hams" here locally that tried for over a year to "get out" and learned more in that process than they ever learned by memorizing today's exam questions.

I submit that these IMPROVEMENTS recommended by the ARRL are a good start and will have more people LEARNING how to get on HF. A GOOD thing. The bands are FAR less busy than they were 30 years ago. Unless we get more people into this great hobby, it's gone...

And to really improve HF operations on ham radio...we must get rid of the archaic mode divisions on each band. I would like to see us have the same privileges as the rest of the world's amateurs enjoy....or are we not good enough???

73,
Chuck...K1KW

1215. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 05:07:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <MI2Pb.2881$Fp1.1772453@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85891

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> < Even when you know -they- are out of band?
>
> Simple Billy Beeper,
>
> Since I don't read French I don't have a clue what the French
> allocations look like. I trust that the French guys and gals can read
> French and will comply with their regulations. I am beholden to Part
> 97, and it doesn't direct me to learn the allocations of other
> administrations. Therefore, if a French station calls me on 6 meters I
> will answer them.
>
> Pretty simple concept, really..... I'm surprised you haven't understood
> my previous messages on the topic.

Perhaps William *always* checks to see if the DX he works is always in band for that country? ;^) Hopefully he also check to make sure that the domestic Amateurs he works are not Deadbeat Dads (or Moms). All reasons for license revocations.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1216. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 05:29:07 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0401192129.3986856d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85892
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote

> Until the 2000 restructuring, an Extra
> required passing both the 50 question
> Advanced written *and* the 40 question Extra.

You must be new around here.

Many Extra's (me, for an example) never took the Advanced written
exam, and my Extra exam had 75 questions, not 40.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1217. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 10:24:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120052438.06226.00002494@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 85893

In article <iE%Ob.85899$Rc4.333443@attbi_s54>, "Chuck...K1KW"
<cdoneal@comcast.net> writes:

>This proposal is a good start.

I disagree. It has a few good points and several bad points.

>However, the ultimate goal should be to
>align our privileges with those of the rest of the amateur radio world and
>REMOVE all mode restrictions.

Why?
>
>CW US operators can operate anywhere in the US bands but US phone is
>restricted.

How much actual CW operation do you hear in the 'phone subbands?

>A clear case of discrimination, and a "mode-ist" one at that!!
>Politically incorrect these days....and a major waste of sprectrum!!

A CW or digital signal uses about 1/10 the spectrum space of a 'phone
signal. The waste of spectrum is in clinging to modes that use so much
spectrum when much narrower options are available.

>(Just
>tune the CW bands during any non contest day).

And?

>A carry over from the olde
>days when the ARRL was clearly a CW only group of old buzzards.

ARRL doesn't make the rules and never has. FCC does.
>
>I submit that US Extra class licencee's should be allowed to operate phone
>anywhere that the rest of the world can. Is that fair???

No. It's not a good idea. Narrow and wide modes don't share spectrum well.

>Or are we still
>destined to live in an amateur radio world surpressed by our own government?

Check out how much of the amateur bands from 160 through 10 is available to
analog 'phone.
>
>Hey...ARRL, WAKE UP!!! If you want to keep the activity up you need to
>promote frequencies where we can talk to the rest of the world! How can I
>make this any clearer??? And provide incentives to do this!!! An extra

>25KHz doesn't make it.

Why should we promote 'phone over more spectrum-efficient modes?
>
>BTW....requiring CW should not be a requirement for HF operation.

Why not?

How about requiring theory knowledge to use manufactured equipment?

>(Good
>move by the ARRL on this with the new Novice proposal)

They would also permit General with no code test, too.

>Time to get over
>it....and let the rest of the many good people get on the air!!! I say this
>from having slaved over getting 20 WPM done to pass my Extra test (for those
>measly 25 KHz of phone) and I rarely have used code since.

How about the written test?

>So......don't
>deny folks from HF just because code is "your favorite mode" and you are
>proud that you have no microphone in your shack.....
>
No one is denied. The code test has been 5 wpm for almost 4 years.

Is 5 wpm really too much to ask?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1218. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 10:35:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120053547.07155.00000134@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85895

In article <20040119214858.12501.00005664@mb-m04.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>
>>Summary:
>>
>>3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>>
>>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>>
>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
>>and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>>
>>'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>>
>>Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>>and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get
>>privs on 6, 2, 222, and 440
>>
>>Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
>>evaluation
>>
>>Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
>>derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>>
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>This new ARRL Proposal is pretty much what I would expect to come out of
>Newington these days.

Except it didn't come out of Newington - it's the result of the BoD's vote. And the BoD are from all over the country, elected by the members.

>And that doesn't mean that I won't support it.

I support parts of it.

>However,
>I don't see the FCC as being favorably disposed toward adding a new license

>class to the ARS licensing structure.

Just a name change. They'd reopen Novice to new issues and close off Tech to new issues so there would still be only three levels avaialble for new issues.

>A better idea would have been to
>simply
>incorporate the "New Novice" HF phone privileges with the current
>Technician-class license, keeping General and Extra as they are in the new
>proposal.

Maybe they'll do just that.
>
>I don't see why the Extra-class code test requirement needs to be set at the
>current 5 WPM level.

It's a bone throne to those who support code testing. And if you look at the comments to the various proposals submitted to FCC, those folks are in the majority.

>A 12-wpm code test would be a better idea, and anyone
>interested enough in achieving Extra could go from nothing to that level in a
>matter of weeks.

Of course.

>However, since Extra is already dumbed-down to 5 WPM, I
>guess there's no putting the toothpaste back in the tube.

Worth a try, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1219. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 10:35:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120053548.07155.00000135@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85894

In article <5ee63311.0401192129.3986856d@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
>> Until the 2000 restructuring, an Extra
>> required passing both the 50 question
>> Advanced written *and* the 40 question Extra.
>
>You must be new around here.

Yep - only been an Extra for about 34 years.
>
>Many Extra's (me, for an example) never took the Advanced written
>exam, and my Extra exam had 75 questions, not 40.

"Many"?

There were fewer than 5000 Extras in the mid 1960s. Today there are well over
100,000.

And yes, for time, (1953-1967) there was only one written test to go from
General to Extra - because FCC wasn't giving out Advanceds in that time period.

So what you're telling us, Hans, is that you only had to take a single written
test to go from General to Extra, while most of the rest of us had to take two
written tests.

Moral: Pays to get there early.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1220. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:14:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buj2hu$rpv@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 85896

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040120053547.07155.00000134@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <20040119214858.12501.00005664@mb-m04.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Jim:
> >
> >This new ARRL Proposal is pretty much what I would expect to come out of
> >Newington these days.
>
> Except it didn't come out of Newington - it's the result of the BoD's
vote. And
> the BoD are from all over the country, elected by the members.
>

True indeed. However, it would be interesting to see how much "membership" actually participated a) in the election of the BoD and b) how much--because of that--the ARRL's decisions are actually influenced by a majority of US Amateur Radio Operators.

Nothing wrong with the concept that the BoD represents someone, but who they represent is those members of whom decide to actually be active in the goings-on of the ARRL; and I don't think many do. Any numbers on that?

1221. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:38:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200338.67a31d70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Tom Winston" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>
> That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
> passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
> Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
> -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.

Uhhhh...in what universe?

The only "Advanced" class licensees that I know of that took an
Extra written test but didn't upgrade were one's who failed the 20WPM.

And I'd like to know how getting more operating privileges is a
"downgrade"...?!?!

Would you take an airline ticket "upgrade" by moving FROM First
Class to Coach? Uh uh...It's the other way around. Same here.

> Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
> higher standards than the current crop of Extras.

Perhaps. Certainly the Advanced Class folks passed a more
stringent code test. My Advanced written was hard, but so was the
Extra. I am proud of both.

> So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make
> that decision.
>
> Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.

Yeah...how dare they offer to get you more operating privileges
without having to take any further tests...rotten scoundrels anyway...

Steve, K4YZ

1222. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:40:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200340.554cc8da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85898

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401191653.3e7e12b4@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401191131.3032a700@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > Sucks to be you, Lennie. Wake up and join humanity before Mrs
> > Putz has to plant you.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Spoken like a true humanitarian. I'm sure your heart was in the right place.

Slightly left of midline, just like everyone else's, Your Anonymousness.

Steve, K4YZ

1223. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:43:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401200343.1a83f7a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85899

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<nh2Pb.20212$zj7.84@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> < Even when you know -they- are out of band?
>
> Simple Billy Beeper,
>
> Since I don't read French I don't have a clue what the French
> allocations look like. I trust that the French guys and gals can read
> French and will comply with their regulations. I am beholden to Part
> 97, and it doesn't direct me to learn the allocations of other
> administrations. Therefore, if a French station calls me on 6 meters I
> will answer them.
>
> Pretty simple concept, really..... I'm surprised you haven't understood
> my previous messages on the topic.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hansel, you appear not to want to directly answer a simple question,
and this was your third opportunity to do so. So again I must
conclude from your answer that you would, indeed, call a station that
you knew was operating out of band.

We'll mark you down with Dave as knowingly and willingly working
stations out of band.

With several kind wishes,
William

1224. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:46:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401200346.198c0daf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85900

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<MI2Pb.2881$Fp1.1772453@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
> >
> > < Even when you know -they- are out of band?
> >
> > Simple Billy Beeper,
> >
> > Since I don't read French I don't have a clue what the French
> > allocations look like. I trust that the French guys and gals can read
> > French and will comply with their regulations. I am beholden to Part
> > 97, and it doesn't direct me to learn the allocations of other
> > administrations. Therefore, if a French station calls me on 6 meters I
> > will answer them.
> >
> > Pretty simple concept, really..... I'm surprised you haven't understood
> > my previous messages on the topic.
>
> Perhaps William *always* checks to see if the DX he works is always in
> band for that country? ;^) Hopefully he also check to make sure that the
> domestic Amateurs he works are not Deadbeat Dads (or Moms). All reasons
> for license revocations.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, axeually, I scrutinize their suffix and ponder if there are any
vulgar intentions in there. That is my acid test for working a
station or not. ;^)

Billy

1225. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:51:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401200351.7ec891f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85951

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
> >@posting.google.com:

> >
> >> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
> >
> >Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>
> Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and receiving.

Reminds me of an Aerosmith song: Dream On.

1226. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 11:52:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200352.1bfb208@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85952

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119211040.29815.00002841@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401191131.3032a700@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040118153405.12501.00005627@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms
> >
> > Majority of silliness snipped.
>
> "Silly

Yes...silly. It was a pathetic troll. No more.

> No problem for the rest of the radio world. They continued to evolve,
> grow, advance, and discover things...and make profits on all that...
> without any assistance from amateur radio.

Amateur Radio long ago gave way as a boileroom for technology.
It now serves as fertile ground for spwaning new interest in
electronics for many.

It also continues to provide a very necessary and versatile
public service.

These are facts acknowledged by everyone from Congress to
industry leaders to public officials who have had to call on Amateurs
to respond.

That is doesn't fit your lying rants is inconsequential to anyone
but you, Lennie.

> Professionals make money at their activities...that's why they are
> called "professionals".

Great. You're on the same playing field as drug dealers and
prostitutes.

> Tsk, tsk...more hypocrisy...you claim you never said anything bad
> about professionals yet there you go making nasty to pros again.

Nope...to one, ALLEGED "pro".

You keep trying to make it a plural, Lennie, insinuating that
this is my position towards ALL "pros"...

It's not...never was...JUST you...Don't you feel "special"...?!?!

> Sigh...think of the alternative. If I got an amateur radio license I
> might turn into a bullying barbarian. It wouldn't be nice to have
> TWO like you in the newsgroup, would it?

Congratualtions, Lennie...You're ALREADY a bullying
barbarian...Didn't need any federal license or 14 years of night
school to get there, either.

> I didn't "rewrite history," Stebe. All the OTHER radio services I
> wrote about took place in OUR reality, independently, without any
> help from ARRL or amateur radio.

Your OWN history, Lennie...Your OWN. Nice try to redirect, as
failed as it was...

> Everyone knows about AM and FM broadcasting...(SNIPPED)

Yes, Lennie...we don't need you to blast the NG with yet another
cut-and-pasted smoke screen for you to hide behind.

> > You still spend countelss hours trolling for arguments that you
> >subsequently try to turn into a defensable "it's character
> >assassination" rants. Still doesn't work.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...calling others names like "pathological liar" is rather
> much like character assassination to most anyone else...

It's not a "name", Your Putziness...

It's a fact.

> > Sucks to be you, Lennie. Wake up and join humanity before Mrs
> >Putz has to plant you.
>
> There's no "Mrs Putz" living at this address.

There is if there's a female person married to you residing
there.

> I've been a part of humanity for a few decades now and likely to continue
> despite running across hate-filled, enraged gunnery nurses who try to
> bully others on line.

Let's see...WHO is in this forum without any valid experience or
vested interest in the topic, Lennie?

> Trying to insult my wife indirectly is not nice. It's your style but it
> still
> is not nice and doesn't work very well, does it?

I am not insulting your wife...Just her lame husband and her
obvious lack of taste in choosing one.

Steve, K4YZ

1227. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:02:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200402.3eec8a4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85953

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119182453.06226.00002478@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > Your "exploration" has been as a paid employee, never being
> >allowed to use the "radio" as AMATEURS use thiers.
>
> That's the way it is done in professional work.

Yet you still seem to ahve a problem understanding the difference
between AMATEUR Radio and all otehr forms of radio...You continue to
think Amateur Radio should be like them, when Part 97 specifically
lays out what it wants Amateur Radio to be.

> However, for casual "ragchews," I've used CB...perfectly legal to
> do so without any morse knowledge or needing a ham license.

And considering the character and content of most "ragchews" I
ahve heard on 11 meters, I'd say that you were right in your element,
Lennie.

> > That you never used Morse Code is not germane. Millions of other
> >radio users never use it either. So what?
>
> Test element 1 is still present in the U.S. amateur radio license
> examination regulations. That requires demonstration of morse code
> proficiency.

Again...so what? You are still not a licensee in the Amateur
Radio Service, therefore it is absolutely of no consequence to you.

> >> Hang in there, Scott. Pander to the would-be "authority wanna-bes"
> >> if you have to...but GO YOUR OWN WAY. Be your own man, not
> >> a puppet of those who dictate what you can do, what you shall
> >> enjoy, what you must do to please them.
> >>
> >> Independent thought is GOOD!
> >
> > Independent thought IS good, as long as it is LENNIE'S
> >independent thought.
>
> Incorrect. When I said "independent," I meant it in the complete
> sense, not some inappropriate, semantically-incorrect, emotionally-
> loaded form by Stebe the wonder marine.

Or in other words, YOUR "independent" thought, ie your OPINIONS
are more valuable since they are contrary to someone elses...uh huh...

> > Leonard H. Anderson, retired from regular hours engineer, is a
> >known pathological liar and newsgroup antagonist.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...Stebe froths at the mouth and does the personal-
> insult bit again.

It's not an insult if it's true, Lennie.

You've been caught lying over and over.

You are knee deep in a newsgroup for which you have expressed NO
interest in being a proactive participate except to rant in this
forum...THAT makes you an antagonist.

> Here in the present reality, there are differing OPINIONS, not "lies."

When you make an assertion that is determined to not be true,
THAT is a lie.

YOU have been caught lying on MORE than one occassion.

> Strange to associate "concept of amateur radio" as being all about
> morse code testing.

No, Lennie, YOU are the one with the "morse code testing"
fixation.

You are the one who cannot discuss ANY Amateur Radio topic
without interjecting it.

Still sucks to be you, Lennie. You're still a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1228. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:20:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200420.6f9750d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85954

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119182457.06226.00002480@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stebe Robeson, still in the throes of PMS (Powerful Marine Syndrome) writes:

(Lennie exhibits yet again his "accuse OTHERS of "character
assassination, then deny, deny, deny...)

> > And I do not spit on "professionalism" Lennie.
>
> Of course you do. Everyone has seen it in this free, open,
> unmoderated forum.

What YOU represent is not what anyone that I know calls
"professionalism".

You have the tools to make a difference in Amateur Radio, yet
your only action is to antagonize, humiliate and insult in this forum.

Hardly "professional" in ANYone's definition.

> You "knew everything about electronics engineering" after working
> less than a year as a purchasing agent in a company making
> set-top boxes and modems.

You will, of course, provide the reference for the "quote" you
just cited?

> You've consistantly tried to equate college night courses with some
> kind of alliterative low-grade "night school."

No, Lennie, YOU have demonstrated that it's some kind of
allitaritive low-grade "night school" by your assertion of
"professionalism" and subsequent conduct herein.

> You've consistantly said I was a mere "bench technician" rather
> than a design engineer...yet you've never tried to check with any of
> the past employers I've listed nor contacted any of the U.S. radio
> amateurs I've listed as references.

I have yet to find any product in my home or in MY profession
that has your hand in it, Lennie.

And discussions with people who knew you placed your
"contributions" at teh bench technician level...I just picked up on
it.

> > That assertion is yet ANOTHER lie from somone whio finds it EASY
> >to lie. I have nothing but the highest regard for professionals in ANY
> >field...It's just that I have absolutely ZERO respect for YOU since
> >you've made such a mockery of the title.
>
> "Mockery?" From the expert Dill Instructor with hardly any work
> experience in ANY engineering?

This forum is NOT about "engineering", Your Scumminess. It's
about Amateur Radio.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...all you do is vent hatred and bile against another
> because that is your nature in here...always insulting the person
> who has opinions rather than tackling the subject matter...and,
> when there is no possibility of a valid response to the subject, just
> more heaping of insults against a person.

The "opinions" you express are as received as equally injurous as
YOU receive against you.

The only problem is that you seem to think you are the only one
with a valid opinion. THAT makes you arrogant.

> > As for "going on 84", I will gladly jog around the block a few
> >times with you or see how well you do carrying a full field pack on
> >the rescue team. NOW who is involved in another "ploy of pervase
> >character assassination"...?!?!
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...Stebe reacting as if He were the only one mentioned.

Well, Lennie...YOU said "48 going on 84"...

To WHOM were you refering?

And I will STILL mount up taht pack and take a jog around the
block with you...You also accused me of being "pudgy", yet evidence to
the contrary ahs been presented.

More of that Andersonian "character assassination" going on, I
see...

> Unless Stebe moved (again?), He does not live in Pennsylvania
> nor is he a renowned amateur historian.

I need to live in Pennsylvania or be a historian to make a fool
out of you...?!?!

I don't THINK so!

> > Since YOU seem to be the only one who deems it important to
> >interject arguments about Morse Code into threads that don't even
> >adress it, I'd say the fixation is yours, Oh Putzy One.
>
> Absolutely. I interject comments about the beloved smartness of
> the morse code test at any opportunity.

And when the thread is NOT about Morse Code, that makes you a
troll.

> Contrary to your personal (weird) beliefs, just getting into U.S.
> amateur radio on HF allocations requires a morse test. [see subject
> title "A Newbies View On Things"]

Sorry, Scummy One...

FEDERAL LAW requires that one know Morse Code to have access to
the Amateur HF allocations. This was based upon international
convention which has since been changed. The United States Government
is presently in the public comment phase of chainging that
requirement.

My only "belief" is that one should comply with the law as it
exists while it exisits.

You seem to think selective law compliance is OK.

> Some of us desire to change the amateur regulations and eliminate
> the morse code test. Being a "member of the amateur community"
> through licensing is not required to change federal laws [see the
> U.S. Constitution in regard to who may communicate with their
> government].

Then communicate with them. Your presence and practice here is
antagonistic and argumentitive. You long ago lost any initiative on
your "opinions" when you started in on individuals.

> All amateur learning STOPS after achieving Extra in Stebe's World.

If that's what you think, Lennie, and that's what you NEED to
believe in order to sleep at night, well, who am I to deny you a good
night's sleep. That it's not true is inconsequential to YOUR needs....

Steve, K4YZ

1229. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:23:39 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <9b7q00tpiv5puct6olhgmu09fcqdvc7rs2@4ax.com>
Source record: 85955

Jim - did I miss your reply on this one?

73, Leo

On Sat, 17 Jan 2004 04:11:37 GMT, Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:

>On 17 Jan 2004 00:57:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the
>>>core "issue" that began our discourse.
>>
>>There are several issues, not just one.
>
>OK - I'm listening.
>
>>
>>>Perhaps I haven't stated it
>>>clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
>>>clouded.
>>>
>>Let's see what you've got, then.
>
>Let's go.
>
>>
>>>I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
>>>continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.
>>>
>>>I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
>>>inappropriate.
>>
>>That's correct. It's also an issue to some people.
>
>OK - fair enough. And it shouldn't be. Your personal standards are
>your own - no one else's. Let's clear that one off - agreed?
>>
>>> No issue there - that is entirely your right.
>>
>>Some people say it isn't. Not you, but some others.
>
>Others may, but who cares - it's none of their business.
>

>>
>>>I also
>>>understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.
>>
>>Also correct. And also an issue to some people, who say that my deletion of
>>Kim's call is "wrong".
>
>Let's focus on that one, and agree that deleting her call from your
>post is necessary for you to due to your standards. I have no issue
>there at all. If you don't want to use it, OK. Let's clear this one
>off too - agreed?
>
>>
>>>Again, no issue there - I respect that.
>>>
>>>For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:
>>>
>>>Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
>>>unfair, as it singled her out. I agree.
>>
>>And I disagree. Kim singled herself out by choosing that callsign. As you are
>>aware.
>
>Yes she did - and quite intentionally, too, as she has stated.
>
>That wasn't, however, what I was saying in my statement above. Simply
>that Kim feels that you singled her out too, by omitting just her call
>from the list.
>
>Forget the inappropriatenesss of the call for a moment....do you see
>where she might get that feeling?
>
>>
>>>Would finding a compromise
>>>whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
>>>all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
>>>have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?
>>
>>No, it wouldn't.
>
>Honestly, I dont agree with you on this point. It would have been an
>easy compromise to make, and woulld potentially have offended no one.
>More on this further down in the post!
>
>>>
>>>That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim.
>>
>>No, it isn't, but we'll get to that later. Right now, let's discuss that issue.
>>
>>It seems to me that what you're saying is that I should either include

>>everyone's callsign, or no one's.
>>
>>Now since I don't wish to include Kim's callsign, that leaves only the option
>>of including no one's callsign, in order to accomodate Kim's feelings.
>
>Agreed - in order to treat everyone equally, that would be the only
>other option available given the situation.
>
>>
>>But what about everyone else's feelings, including mine? I want my call listed.
>>
>>I would feel disrespected to be listed by name rather than callsign or name and
>>callsign on an amateur radio newsgroup.
>
>Yes, and I believe that Kim feels exactly the same way, Jim. For the
>same reason as you, I suppose - she is also a ham. (She does not feel
>that her call is in any way wrong, remember.)
>
>>
>>Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
>>callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.
>>
>>Don't the feelings of everyone else count?
>
>Of course they do - but are you sure that these people world be that
>upset by this? (except Dave, of course - he appears, from his recent
>correspondence, to be annoyed that Kim is still breathing... :))
>
>In fact, if it had been my post, I would have revised it to names only
>immediately after Kim's original complaint. And seen what comments
>came back next. If I had several legitimate complaints (without the
>agendas that we have seen in several recent posts {not yours, Jim!)
>which obviously relate to Kim personally rather than just her
>call...), then yes there would be no other alternative than to put the
>calls back - but I would have written and offered Kim the option of
>going by name only or dropping out before I went ahead. At least I'd
>be able to tell Kim that I tried to fix it for her, but it didn't work
>out with the rest of the group.
>
>Maybe it's just me, but I would try first to resolve her complaint if
>possible, out of respect for her as a fellow amateur. I prefer
>compromise whenever possible - not compromising my standards, but
>finding a way to achieve a balance.
>
>>
>>Note also, Kim said that if I wouldn't use her callsign, she didn't want to be
>>on the list..
>
>True, but that was after the had become frustrated with trying to
>solve this issue.

>
>>
>>>Your rights and
>>>standards are not at question here.
>>
>>Yes, they are. I've been told that "it's not my place" to determine whether a
>>callsign is appropriate or not. I've been told that my actions are "wrong".
>>
>>As you are aware.
>
>I did state that it is in fact no one individual's place to determine
>what is or is not appropriate for the ARS - that role belongs to the
>regulators, and to the will of the majority of us, I suppose.
>
>Each of us is however completely in charge of determining what is
>appropriate for us as an individual, however. No question there.
>
>Jim, my intent was not to criticize your standards - simply to point
>out that perhaps a more amicable solution to this issue was possible
>without compromising anyone's standards - finding a common ground for
>all.
>
>That's it - that's my point.
>
>>>
>>>73, Leo
>>>
>>>On 15 Jan 2004 09:40:58 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>>news:<ctea009hl6n33e1lf6j7tn0ddmvjds8kpn@4ax.com>...
>>>>> On 14 Jan 2004 04:48:29 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>remainder of post snipped - in the hope that the above covers the outstanding issues well
enough.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>73, Leo
>>

1230. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:34:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200434.65f855e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85956

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119182455.06226.00002479@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stebe, suffering yet another Powerful Marine Syndrome attack) writes:

> > It wasn't YOUR station, Lennie...It was a facility of the United
> >States Army.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...still sore and pished because I had the opportunity
> while in my military service yet you did not?

But I did, Lennie. Had fun, too, but it still wasn't MY station
(save for being NCOIC of the facility)...It was the Marine Corps', and
they provided more than adequate instruction on how it was to be set
up and what they expected from it.

Therein lies the difference between you and I...

> ADA was...(SNIPPED)

Yadayadayada...same old drivvel.

> >They could have just as easily made you a diesel
> >mechanic...Perhaps then you would have been harrassing the
> >professional truck drivers.
>
> No, the Army could NOT "do that as easily." I was sent to the
> Fort Monmouth Signal School for several months of microwave
> radio relay training after Basic. Diesel mechanics were trained
> in several other school locations.

And the Army COULD have sent you to diesel mechanic school, jst as
easily as the USMC could have sent me to it...It's thier game.

> ADA did have several...(SNIPPED)

Yadayadayada...

More ranting on about a 1950's era event that has NO relevence to
MODERN Amateur Radio.

> Yes, "senior NCOs taught us" and said "do this." This is normal in
> a work environment were supervisors also teach and say "do that."
> Somehow you find that deplorable?

Absolutely not.

YOU do, however, since you have, on several occasions, tried to insinusate that YOU set up a "KW trans-Pacific" radio station on the Army's behalf.

> I learned all that was required (and more) on-the-job and later
> became an "NCO" who said "do this (or that)."

Congratuations.

> That was all before Stebe was born. It must make him very angry
> and furious that anyone actually did those things before his life
> experience began.

Nope. Not at all.

What I find FUNNY is that you repeatedly try to insinuate that YOU were somehow singlehandedly responsible for all of the accomplishments at ADA.

Shall we revist YOUR assertion of how you passed "1.2 million messages"...?!?!

> I still honor the men and women of my Battalion, knowing the history
> from first unit formation to changes through today. I am proud of
> what I did, of my fellow signalmen for "getting the messages
> through." We did it. It's on record, including two Presidential Unit
> Citations. Callsign ADA still exists, now that of U.S. Army Pacific
> Headquarters at Fort Shafter, Hawaii.

People do not Honor their comrades-in-arms by trying to make it appear as though THEY were the sole reason the US Army Signal Corps was able to pass HF radio traffic in the 1950's.

And people do not Honor thier comrades-in-arms by trying to garner newsgroup message points by trying to associate THIER Army "career" with the blood shed by soldiers KIA three years before they were in-theater.

Lennie...The only person you try to "honor" is yourself, and you've already proven that THAT is a waste of energy.

Steve, K4YZ

1231. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:42:20 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <lq9Pb.25785$Xq2.14841@fed1read07>
Source record: 85959

Leo wrote:

> That makes more sense to me, Alun - I don't see why the ARRL would
> propose moving almost 400,000 people to a higher licence class just
> because the ITU made morse code testing optional.

You can thank BPL for that. If we can't lick them on the
egress issue, we'll add multi-hundred-thousands of HF ops
to provide a plethora of additional ingress points and let
the BPL system ops assess their network reliability from that.

I don't think we'll be hearing any protests over this proposal
from Yaecomwood either.

Jim, K7JEB
Glendale, AZ

1232. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:42:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401200442.36aea16d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85957

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119182459.06226.00002481@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401190330.7070102@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stebe Robeson, in his period and needing attention) writes:

> Opinions not in line with Stebe's Beliefs in his fantasyland are,
> in his mind, "lies." Strange stuff.

Assertions made without validation of proof are lies.

You have been caught lying...over and over.

> A reminder: In THIS reality, this newsgroup is open, unmoderated
> and there are no raddio kopps at the doorway to check for
> proper credentials of amateurism. Stebe is a mighty amateur in
> radio...as well as in human society.

You're right about one thing...there is no validation of
credentials...save to cross reference federal databases.

As of this moment, you do not hold a station license in ANY radio
service, nor are you a licensed Amateur Radio operator.

> > AMATEUR Radio, Lennie...You have exactly zero-point-zero minutes
> >of experience in AMATEUR Radio. No one, repeat NO one in this forum
> >denies that the technology and propagation of radio waves is any
> >different in any other radio service.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...in Stebe's fantasyland, those who want to get into
> amateur radio must also "have experience in amateur radio?"

Nice try.

> Perhaps's Stebe thinks the amateur radio "service" is like the USMC.

Nope. That's YOUR scthick, Lennie.

> You WANT (desperately) to be "better than others" for having that
> federal authorization and become enraged when others do not
> respect your glorious and noble achievement...forgetting that your
> other actions as a human being are deplorable, even despicable.

In this case I AM better than YOU for having done it,
Lennie...That includes over 30+ years of experience in the topic that
we are addressing...AMATEUR Radio.

> My opinion is that none of the above will have any effect on Stebe.
> He will continue to vent rage and fury on certain individuals because

> that is the only tactic available to bullies. But, it needs to be said
> once in a while.

There is no "affect" to be had, Lennie.

I am not the one in a newsgroup of which I have no practical
experience...Nor do I pretend that some experience in another related
field somehow means I DO know more than those who ARE involved.

You are the bully here, Lennie.

A lying, antagonistic one. Sucks to be you...again.

Steve, K4YZ

1233. Re: How long is element 1 good for

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 12:45:36 UTC
From: 1awesome@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <400d22e2.83909828@news.cox.net>
Source record: 85958

http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1

On Sun, 11 Jan 2004 21:24:44 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
wrote:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:4001BE20.3040904@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> >
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>Many novices may not even have their original CSCE. The FCC would
>> >>also recognize a copy of your former Novice license as proof you passed
>> >>5 wpm.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >Yes that is true but I was addressing the case of someone who's first
>> >license was a Technician.
>> >
>> If it was a tech plus, that means that they passed a 5wpm code test.
>> Which should also
>> be good. What strangely enough happened is say someone who never passed
>> a 5wpm
>> test but passed 13 or 20, doesn't get the lifetime credit. Some FCC
>> brearucrat writing
>> the rules didn't realize that he should have written "5 WPM or faster".
>> He might have
>> thught 5 was harder than 13 or something like that...
>
>Kinda scary, eh? Should serve as a reminder to all who repeat the "but the
>FCC says..., but the FCC says..., but the FCC says..." mantra solely because
>it serves their current agenda.
>
>73 de Bert
>WA2SI
>
>

1234. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 13:00:58 UTC
From: n2ah@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <774a2c02.0401200500.6f391383@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85960

"Chuck...K1KW" wrote:

> What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for
> getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring out how
> to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your rig
> properly, ect.

It can't be that hard; after all, hundreds of thousands of CBers managed to get on 11 meters. Modern rigs don't require much "tuning" and most newbies tend to buy pre-assembled dipoles or multiband verticals. The rigs are plug and play with microphones included.

We had a pretty good license structure in the mid '60s. Most folks started with a (non-renewable) Novice ticket with very limited privileges to get their feet wet. Then they upgraded to General with full amateur privileges.

That wasn't good enough for ARRL. They insisted we needed more license classes and more exams (incentive licensing). FCC bought into it, and we all had to upgrade or lose privileges. Now, ARRL is cheapening the value of those higher class licenses they insisted we get.

I figure that in about five years we'll have only one license class, and that it will require only a single simple multiple-choice exam. Will that re-energize ham radio? I doubt it.

Art Harris N2AH

1235. Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 14:23:39 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 85961
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
This day would come, just as I said it would.

Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing you
can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.

Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
A Time Lord Always wins in the end!

1236. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 14:31:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120093103.11514.00000331@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 85962

> but I'm sure
>with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
>
>Lloyd Davies, N0VFP

Dont you mean CBRRL

1237. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 14:34:36 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>
Source record: 85963

This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented on previously, so here goes:

On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:05 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>
> 1. There would be NO ARRL to provide "guidance" and direction.
> That expired before St. Hiram expired. [in this alternative
> universe] Newington, CT, would have no museum.

True - no AR, no ARRL. Mr. Maxim would be remembered only as the inventor of the Maxim Silencer for explosive weapons, and for his work on automobile silencers (mufflers, I assume).

However, following along with the subject of the thread - the startup of a "new" Amateur Radio Service" would concievably attract a lot of people to it - an organization starting up to represent them and their interests (and take their money) seems like a given.

>
> 2. There would be NO morse code test since no other radio
> service except Maritime Radio used morse code. There
> would be NO need to keep a "pool of trained morse radio
> operators" for any national need.

True enough - if amateur radio were invented today, it's pretty unlikely that Morse Code would be a mandatory requirement or play any significant role - it's a dead technology in the commercial and military world today (just spies and some covert military ops remain professional users of morse signalling today). I believe that it would be a 'special interest' thing for people who wanted to play around with it.

I wonder, though, if in the absence of Amateur Radio, something else might have evolved to meet the need of having extra trained people available? Perhaps an auxillary (and voluntary) communications corps, mobilized by the military or local government during times of need? They might even provide the equipment and training...wouldn't be free, though - Amateur Radio doesn't cost them much (if anything) to mobilize.

>
> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings because
> there would be no old-timers left to tell the tales...only
> pretenders who longed for a simpler (mythical) life way back
> before they were born.

Well, there would still be old timers telling tales - just not ham
radio ones ;)

>
> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway and several movies made
> about that tragedy.

Unfortunately, yes. And many other unfortunate events may well have
become much disasters or have increased in magnitude, as there would
have been far less people monitoring the bands and detecting /
relaying emergency traffic if the ARS had not existed.

> "Independence Day" would have been
> made anyway as a comic science-fiction vehicle for Will Smith
> who would later wear black suits and shades.

Uh-huh...even the ARS was unable to save the world from this.

>
> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
> belly-up anyway. Collins Radio would have continued on into
> the military and commercial radio market without making any
> overpriced fancy amateur radios. Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom
> would still have been successful in the commercial and
> government market. SGC might still exist but in the personal
> sailing market. Ten-Tec might not exist.

Without the ARS, one indeed wonders how long companies like
Hallicrafters and National would have survived - after WWII, amateur
radio was a large part of their market. Could they have hung on by
just selling radio equipment to SWLs listening to foreign commercial
broadcasts?

Some companies may never have started up in the first place, as their
beginnings were entirely in amateur radio.

>
> 6. Radio broadcasting would have become successful and tele-
> vision broadcasting even more so. "Overseas radiotelephone"
> would still exist via the first HF SSB radios in the 1930s. The
> first VHF FM mobiles would still be tested by various police
> departments in the late 1930s. The military would still be the
> first HT user courtesy of Galvin (later Motorola)...and the back-
> pack radio ("walkie-talkie" again from Galvin)...and the radio
> relay (WW2) and VHF repeater (Korean War) uses...and single-
> channel HF SSB (USAF, post WW2)...and aircraft VHF AM
> (WW2). HF RTTY circuits would have been formed before WW2
> and continued on in wide-bandwidth HF SSB, later to have
> much higher data rates from transferrence of modem and
> information theory techniques. Cross-country microwave radio
> relay would still exist for hundreds of telephone circuits and
> many TV circuits on a single link. Government and business
> would still have tens of thousands of HT and mobile radios
> courtesy of the military WW2 legacy and the invention of

> transistors and integrated circuits. Communications satellites
> would still exist as soon as rockets could put them up there
> (first published paper on that by an up-coming science fiction
> writer named Arthur C. Clarke, then a "boffin" in the RAF right
> after WW2). All sorts of watercraft would have VHF radios in
> harbors due to the success of small land VHF radios. Radio-
> sondes by the hundreds of thousands would be used up
> annually using simple one-tube (pencil triode in a sheet metal
> cavity) transmitters in low microwave frequencies. The cellular
> telephone (past legal age in our universe) would still exist by
> the millions, morphed into a single-hand package with built-in
> video capability. There would still be "headphone radio"
> receivers for personal use, sometimes merged with CD players.
> "Wireless" would take on a new meaning as hundreds of
> thousands of data transceivers linked computers without wires.
> "Shortwave" broadcasting would still be trying out digital
> sound and finding out that it works despite dire warnings of
> impossibility. The U.S. military would still be using digital VHF
> manpack radios with encryption for voice and data for a total of
> a quarter million sets. None of the preceding required any
> "ham radio pioneering."

Agreed - commercial and military radiocommunications would have grown anyway. Although some developments came from amateur radio, many more did not.

A few years ago, I attended a Lucent course on their CDMA (spread spectrum, code division multiple access) cellular base station radio equipment. A Qualcomm engineer (CDMA is their patented technology) started off his presentation by asking us if we knew who invented the concept of CDMA. Bell Labs? MIT? The military? No. It was a German actress named Hedy Lamarr! She propsed it as a method of secret communications back in the 40s - obviously the technology (powerful computers) to implement it did not exist at the time. He went on to further amaze the group by informing us that she also devised the concept of frequency hopping (which I believe was used during the war - please correct me if I am wrong). Definitely a good thing that she got out of Germany prior to the war! Hedy was not an amateur, and had no interest in radio.

Good ideas come from everywhere.

A question: what would not have been invented, or delayed, had the ARS not existed?

>
> 7. Arthur Godfrey would still get his TV show cancelled. Barry
> Goldwater would still unsuccessfully run for U.S. President.
> [the fate of Julius LaRosa is unknown in this universe]

Absolutely :)

>
> 8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on
> approximately the same scale and still trying to privatize
> commercial operator testing to save money. Radio use by
> non-hams after 1934 grew sufficiently large to require the
> agency to continue.

I believe that they would, along with IC and all of the other national regulatory agencies. It's a vast spectrum, and most of their energies are directed towards management of the commercial sector.

>
> 9. "CB" would have been created anyway, a fore-runner of the
> license-free personal radio wave of the future. [it is 46 years
> old in our universe which already has FRS, R-C, cordless
> telephones and wireless gizmos of all kinds]

Probably - people love to communicate! Folks would have seen the cabbies, police and other commercial operators using 2-way radio equipment, many ex-military guys would have experienced using the technology first hand, and would have wanted the same type of system for themselves. (in the pre-cellular telephone days, anyway...). And, if there's a market, somebody would have developed it!

>
> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
> bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent.
> Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign
> behind their names to show how good and expert they were in
> "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more
> fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).

Personally, I don't view my license as a measure of my expertise in the art of radio. As my examiner told me when he shook my hand after I passed the test - it's a license to learn.

Nothing more.

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1238. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 15:28:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <36gq00hqf30ulj3fdu7b9dg2am9fhqpffi@4ax.com>
Source record: 85964

That's one way of looking at it, Jim. To me, it looks like a purely political move - that is, trying to please the greatest number of members...and voters...and customers...

400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
Drop code = some number of happy new HF - using members.
Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd, I'd say...but it does make the Extra level licence harder to get - that's what everybody wants, right?).

-and- the big one:

New entry level licence with 100W on HF phone, plus simplified test = a whole bunch of happy new potential ARRL members = lots more potential members....and voters....and customers.....

All of these proposals are good news for the manufacturers of ham equipment, and perhaps for us too - if demand is increased, production will increase and prices of HF radios might do down!

Plus, each one of the above members that got something additional added to their privileges if this proposal is accepted would have the ARRL to thank for it. In theory, anyway.

Considering that, following the ITU decision to make code optional most of the world is moving towards removing the mandatory Morse Code requirement outright, there isn't much else that they could do without looking like defenders the status quo, and annoying even more of their members....and denying them the rights being granted to their fellow amateur radio neighbours in the rest of the world.

Like, for instance, those just north of you have proposed to do - and that's likely to happen fairly soon, I expect.

73, Leo

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 05:42:20 -0700, "K7JEB"
<k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net> wrote:

>snip

>You can thank BPL for that. If we can't lick them on the
>egress issue, we'll add multi-hundred-thousands of HF ops
>to provide a plethora of additional ingress points and let
>the BPL system ops assess their network reliability from that.

>
>I don't think we'll be hearing any protests over this proposal
>from Yaecomwood either.
>
>Jim, K7JEB
>Glendale, AZ
>

1239. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 15:34:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zUbPb.20566$zj7.13000@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85965

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

> We'll mark you down with Dave as knowingly and willingly working
> stations out of band.

Dear Willy Weeper,

Mark me down as the spirit moves you. It was a dump huck trolling question from someone without the balls to even identify himself, and I delight in toying with idiots like that.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: Just to reinforce my previous answers, and to dispell your deliberate lies above, I have never operated an amateur station outside the allocations granted in Part 97. I have no knowledge of the allocations of French amateurs, so I cannot comment on whether all French stations that I've worked have obeyed the rules of their administration. For further details on this matter, see http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

1240. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 15:41:29 UTC
From: Maximus <nomail@here.com>
Message-ID: <J_bPb.18912$1e.16857@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85966
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

How many people are going to listen to you malarkey in code ??? Maybe you should pray for some Prozac.

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> This day would come, just as I said it would.
>
> Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing you
> can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
>
>

1241. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 15:53:52 UTC
From: Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us>
Message-ID: <kacPb.5408$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 85967

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:

> 400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.

Not true. Only a small percentage of licensees are ARRL members, and they tend to be the folks that have been hams a long time. The ARRL is sticking it to the folks who worked hard in the past to pass 20 wpm and the Extra Class written test. Ironically, those licensees who stand to gain the most from this proposal are the ones least likely to join the League.

> Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
> members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
> code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
> additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd

5 WPM for Extra Class is an insult, not a tip of the hat. The Extra Class ticket grants exclusive 25 kHz CW segments on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters. These are prime DX frequencies and the proposal doesn't change that. A higher speed code test for Extra would be more appropriate.

> -and- the big one:

> New entry level licence with 100W on HF phone, plus simplified test =
> a whole bunch of happy new potential ARRL members = lots more
> potential members....and voters....and customers.....

This is what the proposal is all about, saving ARRL and the jobs of its staff. But as we learned after the No-Code license was created in 1991, most new hams don't join the League.

Art Harris N2AH

1242. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:06:10 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <b0kq005pla2mc11mcd6au0nkeqbk2ho73l@4ax.com>
Source record: 85968

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 15:53:52 GMT, Harris
<aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us> wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:
>
>> 400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
>
>Not true. Only a small percentage of licensees are ARRL members, and they
>tend to be the folks that have been hams a long time. The ARRL is sticking
>it to the folks who worked hard in the past to pass 20 wpm and the Extra
>Class written test. Ironically, those licensees who stand to gain the most
>from this proposal are the ones least likely to join the League.

You're right - that should have read "potential ARRL members". As in,
400,000 folks who are so happy that the ARRL got 'em something, that
the ones who aren't already members might just join up. Perhaps that's
what they're thinking, anyway...

My error.

>
>> Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
>> members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
>> code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
>> additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd
>
>5 WPM for Extra Class is an insult, not a tip of the hat. The Extra Class
>ticket grants exclusive 25 kHz CW segments on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters.
>These are prime DX frequencies and the proposal doesn't change that. A
>higher speed code test for Extra would be more appropriate.

Oops again!

Being that the requirement was dropped fairly recently to 5 wpm, and
that other countries are dropping code altogether as a requirement,
how could the ARRL justify an increase in speed?

>
>> -and- the big one:
>
>> New entry level licence with 100W on HF phone, plus simplified test =
>> a whole bunch of happy new potential ARRL members = lots more
>> potential members....and voters....and customers.....
>
>This is what the proposal is all about, saving ARRL and the jobs of its
>staff. But as we learned after the No-Code license was created in 1991,

>most new hams don't join the League.

True, but some percentage does, and the more new hams, the more new members.

>
>Art Harris N2AH

1243. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:08:14 UTC
From: Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us>
Message-ID: <OncPb.5409$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 85969
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.policy Chuck...K1KW <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote:

> CW US operators can operate anywhere in the US bands but US phone is
> restricted. A clear case of discrimination, and a "mode-ist" one at that!!
> Politically incorrect these days....and a major waste of sprectrum!!

Hey Chuck, I didn't realize that you hi-fi AM guys were so concerned with
efficient use of spectrum.

I can just hear the phone ops screaming if someone started (legally)
operating CW in "the phone band."

> Hey...ARRL, WAKE UP!!! If you want to keep the activity up you need to
> promote frequencies where we can talk to the rest of the world! How can I
> make this any clearer??? And provide incentives to do this!!! An extra
> 25KHz doesn't make it.

So why are you trumpeting this as an "Excellent ARRL Proposal?"

Art Harris N2AH

1244. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:19:46 UTC
From: Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us>
Message-ID: <CycPb.5410$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 85970

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

> Oh great, I get to be an Extra by default. I had rather keep my
> Advanced, advanced even sounds more advanced than Extra does.

Yeah, my son is a Tech Plus. He was thinking of upgrading to General last year but didn't bother. Now he stands to get a free upgrade. The message is clear: Don't knock yourself out; be patient and eventually they'll give you everything without asking you to expend any effort.

Art Harris N2AH

1245. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:37:09 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 85971

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:

> In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>>@posting.google.com:
>>
>>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>>
>>> Summary:
>>>
>>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>>
>>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
>>would reintroduce a free licence class.
>
> Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>

As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains on
the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level licence is
called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.

No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole thing on
the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought about this
particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open and it could be
called something else.

> The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the entry
> level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF privileges, but
> more HF privileges.
>
>>Provided the new class that happened to
>>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
>>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>
> Why?

I thought the old Novice was too easy

>
> Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech Plus
> privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between above
> and below 30 MHz privileges.

So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down

>>
>>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>>
>>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>
> Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
> receiving.
>

Won't happen

>>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be
>>dumped.
>
> It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to
> use manufactured equipment.
>

Not in my opinion

>>Moreover, it can be now,
>>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>>
> FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>

I think they will too

>>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>>
>>OK
>
> Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as has
> been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?

Can't stand loose ends

>>
>>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>>
>>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>>
> Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to Extra,
> but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to General?
>
> What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not
> the other?

As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech, which is
already pretty easy

>>>
>>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly

>>
>>Good.
>
> Bad.
>
>> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>
> That space is needed for CW and digital modes.

Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful spectrum to
phone

>>
>>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on 6, 2, 222,
>>> and 440
>
>>See above
>
> Please clarify.

I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for example,
would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it would
harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.

>>
>>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure evaluation
>>
>>OK
>
> Agreed.
>
>>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
>>
>>Not OK
>
> Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
> more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and modes,
> power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase) and much
> more.
>
> By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.
>

With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure questions, but I
think the test is already easy enough.

>>> General to be
>>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
>>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't
>>say here.

>
> See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the work of
> a committee looking to give everyone something they want, but not
> giving anyone everything they want.
>
> What will FCC do?
>
> First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to
> attract more new hams.

Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under existing law. That has some appeal.

>
> Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.

Agreed

>
> Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it costs
> them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.

I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to handle 5 classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there won't be two types of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why they aren't recorded differently right now).

I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes, though. I think it is better to move on.

>
> And that's probably about it.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1246. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:43:00 UTC
From: Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us>
Message-ID: <oUcPb.5411$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 85972

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:

> Harris wrote:
> >5 WPM for Extra Class is an insult, not a tip of the hat. The Extra Class
> >ticket grants exclusive 25 kHz CW segments on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters.
> >These are prime DX frequencies and the proposal doesn't change that. A
> >higher speed code test for Extra would be more appropriate.

> Oops again!

> Being that the requirement was dropped fairly recently to 5 wpm, and
> that other countries are dropping code altogether as a requirement,
> how could the ARRL justify an increase in speed?

They probably won't. But if Extra is the top class and the only one to retain a code test, why not make it realistic one? A 5 WPM test does not demonstrate code proficiency. A 13 WPM test would be a nice "Tip of the hat." We 20 WPM Extras haven't had much to cheer about in a LONG time!

Art Harris N2AH

1247. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:44:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <HVcPb.20602$zj7.12312@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85973

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

< As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains
on
< the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level licence
is
< called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.

There is no such law.

As an incentive to stimulate interest, the ARRL VEC (maybe others)
adopted a policy of waiving the authorized charge for the Novice
examination. W5YI VEC (for one) tossed a hissy fit and tried to
convince FCC to require a fee, but the FCC declined to make it
mandatory.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1248. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 16:55:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120115539.12631.00004375@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 85974

In article <9b7q00tpiv5puct6olhgmu09fcqdvc7rs2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Jim - did I miss your reply on this one?
>
>73, Leo

I remember answering it - check google

73 de Jim, N2EY

1249. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:03:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401200903.67ccc586@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85975

>"Kim

> <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<buj2hu$rpv@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040120053547.07155.00000134@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <20040119214858.12501.00005664@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >
> > >Jim:
> > >
> > >This new ARRL Proposal is pretty much what I would expect to come out of
> > >Newington these days.
> >
> > Except it didn't come out of Newington - it's the result of the BoD's
> > vote. And
> > the BoD are from all over the country, elected by the members.
>
> True indeed. However, it would be interesting to see how much "membership"
> actually participated

>a) in the election of the BoD

Every full member gets a ballot. If they don't bother to fill it out
and send it in, it's their loss.

The requirements to run for Director are pretty simple, too.

> and b) how much--because
> of that--the ARRL's decisions are actually influenced by a majority of US
> Amateur Radio Operators.

Obviously not as much as we might like, because the majority of US hams
who bothered to express an opinion on code testing in comments to FCC
back in 98-143 times wanted at least 2 code test speeds. And the comments
to the various petitions now before the FCC on code testing (like
RM-10811) are majority-pro-code-test.

So the ARRL BoD is obviously taking some people's definition of "leadership"
(meaning do what you think is best regardless of majority opinion) in
proposing what they've proposed.

> Nothing wrong with the concept that the BoD represents someone, but who they
> represent is those members of whom decide to actually be active in the
> goings-on of the ARRL; and I don't think many do. Any numbers on that?

You can look up the various BoD election results as to who got how many votes.

--

What will be really interesting is if/when FCC gives it an RM number, and what the comments are. And what FCC will do.

I'm thinking that the free upgrade thing (which was rejected back in restructuring time) will be rejected *again*, and that the "21st Century Novice" idea will be adopted.

I recall Hans predicting a 15 wpm code test for Extra as part ot the ARRL proposal.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1250. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:04:59 UTC
From: chocolate rabbit <bunnyears3003@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <19b50$400d5fc0$d1cc7a2c$17787@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 85976
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> This day would come, just as I said it would.

My prayer to you, is that you get raped up your puckered
starfish over a chair in handcuffs, by a 6 foot tall Norwegian
dominatrix in thigh-high leather boots, with cat-o-nine tails
in hand and her 14" long green neon jelly dildo STRAP-ON ......

(Imagine foir a minute...this guy LD with a 14" long sex toy stickin
out his bunghole....bein chased by a 6' tall Norwegian chick
in leather around a dungeon someplace...bet he's love every minute
of it too...!) ....come 2 think of it, so would I...GRIN

1251. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:16:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401200916.70cec6ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85977

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<HG2Pb.89209$5V2.165673@attbi_s53>...
> What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for
> getting on HF!!!!

Who are "you folks", Chuck?

> You have to do it!!!

Exactly!

> That means really figuring out how
> to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your rig
> properly, ect.

Well, most rigs today don't require tuneup. And a lot of them have
automatic
antenna tuners.

> You can get all the answers correct on today's exam and
> still fail in the real world.

That indicates that the written tests are inadequate.
>
> In fact, there have been "hams" here locally that tried for over a year to
> "get out" and learned more in that process than they ever learned by
> memorizing today's exam questions.

A year? Good heavens, back in the bad old days, the entry-level
license was
only good for a year! And that was back when ham rigs actually had to
be
tuned up!

If it takes someone with a license and a reasonable budget of time and
money
a whole year to set up a working HF station, something's really wrong.
>
> I submit that these IMPROVEMENTS recommended by the ARRL are a good start
> and will have more people LEARNING how to get on HF.

How? There's no additional written testing proposed - in fact, a big
part
of the proposal is free upgrades. If someone doesn't know how to get
on
HF now, how will reducing the entry-level writtens and free upgrades
teach them?

>A GOOD thing.

I think the new Novice ida can be a good thing. 37 years ago, that's
how I got started. Didn't take me a year, either, even though I had
to build my transmitter, antenna, receiver...

> The
> bands are FAR less busy than they were 30 years ago.

How do you know?

We have more bands and modes than 30 years ago, so we're apt to
be spread out more.

> Unless we get more
> people into this great hobby, it's gone...

We have more hams today than ever before! 30 years ago (1974), there
were less than half as many hams as today. So the number of hams isn't
the problem at all.

>
> And to really improve HF operations on ham radio...we must get rid of the
> archaic mode divisions on each band.

Let's do this:

Lower 15-20% of each band: CW only
Middle 20-25% of each band: Mixed digital/CW (digital preferred)
Rest of the band: Analog phone/image.

80 meters, for example:

3500-3575 CW only
3575-3725 Digital/CW
3725-4000 Analog phone/image

> I would like to see us have the same
> privileges as the rest of the world's amateurs enjoy

Including their power limits and written tests?

>....or are we not good enough???

We're simply too numerous.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1252. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:22:11 UTC
From: chocolate rabbit <bunnyears3003@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <ad622$400d63d4$d1cc7a2c$17942@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 85978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

They're trying to revive a DEAD HORSE Hans.
(For as long as you've been in ham radio cannot you
realize this?)

Better face up to it, Ham Radio is DEAD.

Burt and Wayne Green are right on this one I am afraid.
Even new 2 Meter radios are going for under $200.00
at HRO and AES. Nobody's buying ham gear except
for on e-Bay where you chances of getting "E-screwed"
on that "perfect condition used radio" are better than 7 to 1.

Nobody new wants to bother with ham radio and antennas
and climbing a roof or putting up a tower when
all you need is a $300 Dell Multimedia PC and a DSL or
Cable Modem connection? I mean, let's get real here, OK?

...and please...everyone else, spare us all the tired
rehashed old comments we've *all heard already*
100 times about "when the power goes out, CW
always gets thru the QRM, my 2M HT will
still work" ...etc etc ad-nasuem

(We've all heard this schitk 20 years ago)

Ham radio is TECHNOLOGICALLY OBSOLETE and has
become *nothing more* than a venue where old retired white males
get together to kibitz on the air for an hour a day or more about the same
old tired topics they've been talking about for the past 5 Years.

Stick a fork in it, or send it off to the glue factory or Fred Sanford's
junkyard.

Jay
SWL for 26 yrs

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b%WOb.19566$zj7.10115@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
> four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
> proposing!
>
> A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
> General, and Extra.
>
> Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room

> temperature.
>
> Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
>
> General just like today except without Morse.
>
> Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
>
> But there's more.....
>
> A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.
>
> All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to Advanced.
>
> That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
> the next higher license without testing for that grade.
>
> And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
> must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
> not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
> passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.
>
> C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
> committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
> the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
> for the future.
>
> Nasty letter to follow.
>
> Love always,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> I >AM< THE ARRL!!!
>
>
>

1253. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:35:54 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <400D66FA.B34ED210@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 85979
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

chocolate rabbit wrote:

> They're trying to revive a DEAD HORSE Hans.
> (For as long as you've been in ham radio cannot you
> realize this?)
>
> Better face up to it, Ham Radio is DEAD.
>
> Burt and Wayne Green are right on this one I am afraid.
> Even new 2 Meter radios are going for under $200.00
> at HRO and AES. Nobody's buying ham gear except
> for on e-Bay where you chances of getting "E-screwed"
> on that "perfect condition used radio" are better than 7 to 1.
>
> Nobody new wants to bother with ham radio and antennas
> and climbing a roof or putting up a tower when
> all you need is a $300 Dell Multimedia PC and a DSL or
> Cable Modem connection? I mean, let's get real here, OK?
>
> ...and please...everyone else, spare us all the tired
> rehashed old comments we've *all heard already*
> 100 times about "when the power goes out, CW
> always gets thru the QRM, my 2M HT will
> still work" ...etc etc ad-nasuem
>
> (We've all heard this schitk 20 years ago)

Heard it 20 years ago, 30 years ago... and guess what? Ham radio is still
going! Amazin ain't it!

>
>
> Ham radio is TECHNOLOGICALLY OBSOLETE and has
> become *nothing more* than a venue where old retired white males
> get together to kibitz on the air for an hour a day or more about the same
> old tired topics they've been talking about for the past 5 Years.
>
> Stick a fork in it, or send it off to the glue factory or Fred Sanford's
> junkyard.
>
> Jay
> SWL for 26 yrs
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message

> news:b%WOb.19566$zj7.10115@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
> > four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
> > proposing!
> >
> > A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
> > General, and Extra.
> >
> > Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room
> > temperature.
> >
> > Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
> >
> > General just like today except without Morse.
> >
> > Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
> >
> > But there's more.....
> >
> > A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.
> >
> > All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to Advanced.
> >
> > That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
> > the next higher license without testing for that grade.
> >
> > And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
> > must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
> > not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
> > passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.
> >
> > C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
> > committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
> > the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
> > for the future.
> >
> > Nasty letter to follow.
> >
> > Love always,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > I >AM< THE ARRL!!!
> >
> >
> >

1254. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:48:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120124855.21890.00000310@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85980

>Only a small percentage of licensees are ARRL members, and they
>tend to be the folks that have been hams a long time. The ARRL is sticking
>it to the folks who worked hard in the past to pass 20 wpm and the Extra

Well I have given the CBRRL its last chance. Since they could care less about Ham Radio, and could care less about there Members. They can count on me for no renew, after 25 Years of being a Member, I can see no reason to remain a Member. So long ARRL and good luck with your new Direction

1255. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 17:57:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <c_dPb.20654$zj7.16875@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85981

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

< Let's do this:
<
< Lower 15-20% of each band: CW only

Now there's a progressive forward looking idea for the 21st Century. Or more likely TMDAIPORTM** .

Jim, if you don't like people making fun of your ideas, don't make so easy for them to do so!

73, de Hans, K0HB

** The Most Dumb Assed Idea Posted on RRAP This Month

1256. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 18:04:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120130401.21890.00000312@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 85982

>That was apparent when the "begging for dollars" started
>with the BPL issue. Not to mention the silliness of the
>"Diamond Club".
>

Yea I got that Trash also, threw in the Trash where it belongs.

1257. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 18:05:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <y5ePb.20658$zj7.4491@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85983

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

< I recall Hans predicting a 15 wpm code test for Extra as part ot the
ARRL
< proposal.....

You recall wrong. To see my actual prediction, do a google group search
on "ARRL BoD platitudes" without the quotes.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1258. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 18:13:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401201013.69b9a9a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85984

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<s9ZOb.15564$q4.13048@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> Can't wait till they show up on the top end of 75 meters. 100w and a
> G5RV.....yeah buddy.

What would be the problem, with such a setup, Dan? I've made thousands
of
excellent contacts on that band with a similar setup.

oh wait - those contacts were on 80 meter CW.

But it's the same part of the radio spectrum, right? "Radio physics"
is
the same for all modes, isn't it?

Here's a concept I read very recently that may explain the "free
upgrade"
thingie: 'Blame It On BPL'.

Giving all ~322,000 Techs and Tech Pluses a free upgrade to General
will more than triple their numbers, from ~141,000 to ~463,000. If
even 10% of the upgradees get on the HF ham bands, that's over 32,000
new sources of trouble
for BPL systems....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1259. My restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 18:24:30 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0401201024.41ecaf79@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85985

What do you think of my idea? (I'm taking bets on how many people flame my idea.)

Eliminate the 5 wpm exam but keep the rest of the exams, license structure, and privileges in place. All No-Code Techs automatically gain Tech Plus privileges. The General and Amateur Extra licenses require ONLY the written exams.

It's simple. The confusion over No-Code Technicians and Technicians with Tech Plus privileges is finally resolved. All written exam requirements remain in place. (In spite of the red herrings thrown around, the trend has been towards beefing up the written exams rather than watering them down. Since the restructuring in 2000, RF safety questions have been added to the new question pools.)

I'm surprised the ARRL didn't propose this, as it would be simpler. (Or the ARRL could have proposed the exact same thing I propose here but retain the 5 wpm exam for the Amateur Extra class as a compromise.) I think my idea would do more to simplify the FCC's work and be just a continuation of the 2000 restructuring. I'm not sure if the FCC will like the ARRL's proposal due to the added complications. Remember that the restructuring of 2000 kept the same basic license structure in place - the only real changes were eliminating the 13 wpm and 20 wpm exams, keeping the 5 classes in place, and stopping the issuance of new Novice, Tech Plus, and Advanced licenses. The FCC didn't bother to reshuffle band plans, probably because it felt that would be too much work for too little impact.

OK, OK, my idea isn't that original. No Code International essentially proposes the same thing.

I'm optimistic about the prospects of eliminating the Morse Code testing REQUIREMENT. The FCC did say in its restructuring that the ITU treaty was the main reason to keep the Morse Code requirement and repeated many of No Code International's arguments. Now that the ITU has given all nations the go-ahead to eliminate Morse Code testing requirements, the FCC has no reason to retain ANY Morse Code test. Of course, Riley Hollingsworth could change his mind on the matter, though I don't see that happening given that we're still waiting for the "General Lites" and "Extra Crispies" to overrun the HF bands with the music of the Lords of Acid. (That would be not only a violation of the ban on music but also obscene.)

I think the FCC will propose some variation of what I'm proposing. It may retain the 5 wpm for the Amateur Extra license, but this would require that Riley Hollingsworth change his mind on the Morse Code

testing issue. It's conceivable the FCC could automatically upgrade all Novices to Tech or all Advanced licensees to Amateur Extra. But I think the FCC is satisfied with the basic license structure as it stands, or it would have completely changed things in the restructuring of 2000.

I highly doubt that the FCC will expand the phone bands, and I don't think this should happen anyway. SSB is a bandwidth hog compared to the digital modes (CW, PSK-31, etc.), and there should be some incentive to develop new bandwidth-efficient digital modes rather than have SSB crowd everyone out. That's why phone is illegal on the digital bands but (with the exception of 60m) Morse Code is legal on the phone bands.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAAATTTTT jasonhsu.com

1260. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 18:30:10 UTC
From: MnMikew <MNMiikkeW@aol.com>
Message-ID: <bujs2c$hptli$1@ID-181491.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 85986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"N8KDV" <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net> wrote in message
news:400D66FA.B34ED210@nospam.iserv.net...
> Heard it 20 years ago, 30 years ago... and guess what? Ham radio is still
> going! Amazin ain't it!
>
Yep. Besides, the internet is boring.

1261. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 18:53:04 UTC
From: brun <brun@spam.no.net>
Message-ID: <kOePb.3085$Fp1.1998732@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 85987
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Most normal people should be able to casually memorize code in 10 DAYS or
less.

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> This day would come, just as I said it would.
>
> Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing
you
> can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
>
>

1262. Re: ARRL should change

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:01:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BWePb.16892$q4.10004@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85988

<jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
news:bui0j4$kb2$1@mail.specsol.com...
> WA8ULX <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> > there statement on QST, to represent there true fellings. Instead of,
QST
> > devoted entirely to Amateur Radio, it should read, QST devoted entirely
to
> > CBAmateur Radio. At least it would be more correct.
>
> The only thing that doesn't change is the illiterate, self-righteous dolts
> like you bemoaning the latest change to ham radio.
>
> Been there, heard most of it; SSB replacing AM is a disaster, 11m
reassigned
> to CB is a disaster, license restructuring (in several incantations) is a
> disaster, elimination of morse testing is a disaster, elimination of essay
> tests is a disaster...
>
> Fortunately I missed the elimination of spark is a disaster ravings.
>
> On and on you idiots rant and rage, yet the world doesn't end.
>
> Opinionated morons like you is the reason I stopped going to ham clubs
> 35 years ago.
>
> The real hams are the ones that help people without all the superior
> attitude crap you constantly spew because your only accomplishment in life
> is to pass a morse test.
>
> Rave on and continue the name calling moron, I'm back to ignoring you and
> your life partner's postings.
>
> --
> Jim Pennino
>
> Remove -spam-sux to reply.

He was going good there...until his 'real' problem came out in his last
sentence.

Dan/W4NTI

1263. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:02:22 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <apuq0091mo75nih4gmld9fdfm1aiqj14pi@4ax.com>
Source record: 85989

Just did - can't find it!

73, Leo

On 20 Jan 2004 16:55:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <9b7q00tpiv5puct6olhgmu09fcqdvc7rs2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>Jim - did I miss your reply on this one?
>>
>>73, Leo
>
>I remember answering it - check google
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

1264. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:04:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <OYePb.16896$q4.12721@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85990
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:iE%Ob.85899$Rc4.333443@attbi_s54...
> This proposal is a good start. However, the ultimate goal should be to
> align our privileges with those of the rest of the amateur radio world and
> REMOVE all mode restrictions.
>
> CW US operators can operate anywhere in the US bands but US phone is
> restricted. A clear case of discrimination, and a "mode-ist" one at
that!!
> Politically incorrect these days....and a major waste of sprectrum!!
(Just
> tune the CW bands during any non contest day). A carry over from the olde
> days when the ARRL was clearly a CW only group of old buzzards.
>
> I submit that US Extra class licencee's should be allowed to operate phone
> anywhere that the rest of the world can. Is that fair??? Or are we still
> destined to live in an amateur radio world surpressed by our own
government?
>
> Hey...ARRL, WAKE UP!!! If you want to keep the activity up you need to
> promote frequencies where we can talk to the rest of the world! How can I
> make this any clearer??? And provide incentives to do this!!! An extra
> 25KHz doesn't make it.
>
> BTW....requiring CW should not be a requirement for HF operation. (Good
> move by the ARRL on this with the new Novice proposal) Time to get over
> it....and let the rest of the many good people get on the air!!! I say
this
> from having slaved over getting 20 WPM done to pass my Extra test (for
those
> measly 25 KHz of phone) and I rarely have used code since. So......don't
> deny folks from HF just because code is "your favorite mode" and you are
> proud that you have no microphone in your shack.....
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>

Dang Chuck, you should go be a co-host on K1MAN with such a speech.
Completely assinine and appropiate to Baxters blabcast.

Dan/W4NTI

1265. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:08:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_0fPb.16899$q4.4613@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> This day would come, just as I said it would.
>
> Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing
you
> can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
>
>

Yes LLLlllloooooyyyyyddddddd, please, OH PLEASE come to HF. I'll be
waiting.

Dan/W4NTI

1266. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:09:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <a2fPb.16692$i4.5168@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85992

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Dwight, that's all too common in
> computer-modem "communications,"
> just as it is with morse code beeping
> on ham band ragchews.
>
> No real clues on a person, no human
> data input, just a lot of imagination and
> too much concentration on the writer
> in a public forum. Those with an
> agenda, a hatred of something/somebody,
> living in a quasi-fantasyland, brainwashed
> into a different reality, are all into their
> own "reality of sight and sound," just like
> a Twilight Zone.
>
> To those too caught up in the unreality
> don't have a hobby of ham radio anymore,
> they have a Lifestyle and Belief. Any
> puncturing of that fantasy will send them
> off into paroxysms of rage, offense at
> imagined slights, and the usual bigot's
> demands of What is Right Should Be
> Right. (snip)

Well said, Len. I often find it amazing to read some of the messages here after being distracted from the newsgroup for a few days. The attitudes and realities here seem far out of touch with the realities of the world.

> U.S. amateur radio seems to be another
> center for national misogyny. It is a hobby
> activity engaged in largely by white males.

I've thought about that many times and don't really see a problem with it. As long as there isn't a widespread effort to intentionally exclude, not everything in this world has to be all inclusive (to each his own). While some will obviously always want to exclude, it isn't more commonplace in Amateur Radio than elsewhere.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1267. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:13:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <65fPb.16904$q4.2065@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85993

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040119214857.12501.00005663@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <20040119180111.28383.00000322@mb-m01.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> >
> >>I am starting to believe you now Bruce.
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >
> >Dan its what I have been saying all along. I cant see how anyone in there
> >right
> >mind could say the ARRL is trying to help Ham Radio.
>
> Dan/Bruce:
>
> The ARRL is obviously trying to help itself with their new proposal. I'm
> convinced that it is their belief that the new proposal serves two
critical
> objectives:
>
> 1.) It gives away enough operating privileges to the know-nothing,
do-nothing,
> lazy, no-coder whiners to make them happy,
>
> and, by keeping the 5 WPM code test for Extra,
>
> 2.) It hopefully won't offend the likes of the withered, feeble,
FISTS-member
> geezers who are daily trashing the CW subbands with their numbers games
> and their sloppy, indecipherable sending with mal-adjusted bugs.
>
> Don't expect the "Gang of Fifteen" to be very willing to listen to any of
the
> membership for adjustments to the proposal, particularly the notion of
> increasing the Extra-class code speed to 12, 13, or 20 WPM.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I don't think the gang of fifteen to listen to a damn thing. That is
obvious by their recent proposal.

Even the local two meter, no code techs don't like it.

And the ARRL claims to be a voice for ham radio? Its not the ham radio I knew and loved. I don't know what it is anymore.

Dan/W4NTI

1268. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:15:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <q7fPb.16694$i4.2755@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85994

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Someone came up with a great
> analogy today, and I don't know
> why I've never thought of it
> before. (snip)

Not a bad analogy. People see what they want to see in others. However, I do still have doubts about Stephen King and his readers. :-)

> Anyway, I liked the scenario...
> that's my story and I'm sticking
> to it... ;o

Well, as long as you don't sing those words, I'll accept that. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1269. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:17:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <j9fPb.16911$q4.15419@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85995

"Art Harris" <n2ah@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:774a2c02.0401200500.6f391383@posting.google.com...
> "Chuck...K1KW" wrote:
>
> > What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for
> > getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring out
how
> > to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your
rig
> > properly, ect.
>
> It can't be that hard; after all, hundreds of thousands of CBers
> managed to get on 11 meters. Modern rigs don't require much "tuning"
> and most newbies tend to buy pre-assembled dipoles or multiband
> verticals. The rigs are plug and play with microphones included.
>
> We had a pretty good license structure in the mid '60s. Most folks
> started with a (non-renewable) Novice ticket with very limited
> privileges to get their feet wet. Then they upgraded to General with
> full amateur privileges.
>
> That wasn't good enough for ARRL. They insisted we needed more license
> classes and more exams (incentive licensing). FCC bought into it, and
> we all had to upgrade or lose privileges. Now, ARRL is cheapening the
> value of those higher class licenses they insisted we get.
>
> I figure that in about five years we'll have only one license class,
> and that it will require only a single simple multiple-choice exam.
> Will that re-energize ham radio? I doubt it.
>
> Art Harris N2AH

I forsee this latest debacle of the ARRL will result in further damage to
Amateur Radio. Much worse than the failed and flawed 'Incentive licensing'
garbage of the late 1960s.

Dan/W4NTI

1270. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:19:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PafPb.16697$i4.13338@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85996

"William" wrote:
>
> Looks like you've been attending
> "Anger Management."

I went to an anger management class once - the class just made me angry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:27:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <kifPb.16703$i4.15285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 85997

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> The words Larry posts are a direct
> quote from part of Riley Hollingsworth's
> response to an email from me.

Sorry about that. I was under the impression that Hollingsworth had sent the message to Larry. I read it once a long time ago, but wanted to read it again.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1272. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:28:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120142830.27149.00000321@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 85998

>And the ARRL claims to be a voice for ham radio? Its not the ham radio I
>knew and loved. I don't know what it is anymore.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I know what it is, is a Group I use to belong to. Even if there proposal doesnt come abou, there no longer getting another Penny

1273. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:41:23 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0401201141.41889167@posting.google.com>
Source record: 85999

n2ah@hotmail.com (Art Harris) wrote in message
news:<774a2c02.0401200500.6f391383@posting.google.com>...
> "Chuck...K1KW" wrote:
>
> > What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for
> > getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring out how
> > to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your rig
> > properly, ect.
>
> It can't be that hard; after all, hundreds of thousands of CBers
> managed to get on 11 meters. Modern rigs don't require much "tuning"
> and most newbies tend to buy pre-assembled dipoles or multiband
> verticals. The rigs are plug and play with microphones included.
>
> We had a pretty good license structure in the mid '60s. Most folks
> started with a (non-renewable) Novice ticket with very limited
> privileges to get their feet wet. Then they upgraded to General with
> full amateur privileges.
>
> That wasn't good enough for ARRL. They insisted we needed more license
> classes and more exams (incentive licensing). FCC bought into it, and
> we all had to upgrade or lose privileges. Now, ARRL is cheapening the
> value of those higher class licenses they insisted we get.
>
> I figure that in about five years we'll have only one license class,
> and that it will require only a single simple multiple-choice exam.
> Will that re-energize ham radio? I doubt it.
>
> Art Harris N2AH

I hope that I am not particularly out of line here, but I just passed
my technician exam by mostly memorizing the question pool. I happen
to learn best by doing, and while I've been studying morse code, and
can send okay, I cannot receive very well. How much more of a "lazy,
bum, low-brow idiot" can I be if I learn to receive and send code at a
decent speed? (5WPM is so slow, it hurts my ears, by the way. I hate
it. I like 10WPM most, in terms of copy.)

The technician license really isn't a big deal at all. I'm seeing
this SOLELY as an opportunity to get my feet wet, and if I wan't more,
I'll GET more. It only took me three days of reading the first half
of that ARRL book, and memorizing the test pool questions (though I
did miss two). I'm anxiously awaiting my license, and looking forward
to chatting with some folks on a repeater (I have an Icomv8000) And I
EXPECT to learn more and more about this hobby by association.

As soon as I get my callsign, I'm going to join the ARRL, and I'm STILL going to learn morse code, even if they drop it. I happen to think that it has practical use OUTSIDE of radio, to be honest... (Lights, etc...) and it's demise *IS* a tragedy. I jumped into this hobby at age 30, LATE in the game. The three days I've spent studying to take the test are a testament to my ability to MEMORIZE certain concepts, and while I'm proud to get to be a ham, I'm not particularly proud of the means. I will therefore conduct myself in the best manner possible at all times, and through my sincere intellectual pursuits in this regard, I will make my license mean more. Not necessarily YOUR way, I'm sure, but it's MY way.

I made a promise to myself that if I wanted an upgrade to my license, that I would fully understand all of these critical concepts before proceeding forward with this hobby. I wanted to get to know the community, learn by doing, and go from there. I figured I'd find out sooner rather than later what I wanted out of this hobby. I apologize for my digression, but I sincerely believe that there are many such as myself who are interested in learning more about ham radio, AND putting that knowledge to use. For someone to do any serious DXing, they will need some kind of help making antennas, and knowing what to do to make them work the way you want them to. You cannot help but learn a thing or two when doing this. It's not all for naught.

I would also like to add that until I bought my icom, I have NEVER touched, or personally seen a ham radio. I do not have an elmer, I have done every bit of this ALL BY MYSELF, with the help of only a few books from the ARRL. (I have until July to try and get my General, which I plan on doing, but... I digress)

I understand the sentiments of you vets out there. The instant gratification crowd, you can just hear the boom boxes of that rotten group of "kidz" who're gonna "rock da wavez"... I won't lie to you, the disrespectful punks and riffraff that are bound to come on the air and start messing things up for everybody, but they'll eventually get bored of it. Ham radio *IS* dying as-is. It needs to be energized, and while I have mixed EMOTIONAL feelings about the "dumbing down" of the tests (which does cheapen the license much as our public education system has cheapened the high school diploma, which DID mean something before...) We'll still have people wanting to participate on field day, actively mailing out QSLs, etc... And at first you may have a few idiots get on HF (For God's sake, I've heard MANY an idiot on HF!) God knows that there are plenty on 2 meters, but I digress.)

I will agree that the HF bands will be inundated, at least initially, with those that can only be described as "low-brows". But they'll need money, time, and patience setting up an HF rig, and if they have the patience to do all that they will at least do one of two things:

a.) Get bored and quit.
b.) Reform themselves, and become good hams.

I guess a provisional c. would be that they'd become a lid, and make everybody mad, but even a lid (and they're semi-rare, I think) doesn't generally be a lid on purpose. <lol>

The worst trait you can see in a ham is one that I'll admit I possess:

Impatience.

I spent a full day setting up my small rig and antenna, learning what to do, soldering for the first time in my entire life, and I haven't DARED press that transmit button. It is *KILLING* me that I can't transmit yet while I'm listening to some of these nets. There's a vast expanse of information just waiting to be unleased, and a nice, friendly community that I look very forward to joining. I look forward to the adventure. I'll do it right from here on in, and while I'm interested in morse code, I will agree that even 5WPM is a joke... It *IS* an insult, mostly because it SOUNDS TERRIBLE at 5WPM! I don't like it, in fact I hate it. 10WPM at LEAST, but I don't make the rules. I see morse ONLY as a practical thing to know. Not technologically necessary to ham radio.

We're left with the ultimate reality that this nation is being inundated with instant gratification generation X, Y, Z, and that ham radio is *DYING* in America. I wasn't even EXPOSED to ham radio until I was 25 years old. (I wish I were exposed to it MUCH earlier! I'd have loved it!). It's been exclusively a money issue that's kept me from getting a rig set up, so when the money was there, I really applied myself to pass the tech exam ASAP, and once I get my feet wet, I've decided...

1.) I'll either go forward full force.
2.) I'll quit, and possibly sell my gear.

I'm pretty sure that I'll choose #1, and to THAT end...

My ultimate goal will be to build my own radio from scratch. Not from a kit, but from parts that I will have to buy myself. From a schematic that I will design myself. It's a worthy challenge, and one that I'm really not afraid of, because the laws of electricity don't change. All you have is what you have. If something doesn't work, you have only yourself to blame. <haha>

Knowing this, though, at first, I will probably put together a kit radio to start, but my ULTIMATE goal is a homebrewed HF rig. We'll see how it goes, and I'm sure I'll be posting here from time to time.

I have a very sincere desire to learn, and I want to learn MY way. I've taken advantage of the current situation, because the situation is there, and it has enabled me that I CAN learn my way. I'll be the proudest ham in the world when I achieve my first big goal of putting my own rig together, and if, Lord willing, I can get in the shape to do some serious hill climbing and DX'ing, I'll try to win me a field day contest.

So the means to the end are how important in my case?

Am I wrong to be proud to be a ham now? It's still going to be a close-knit fraternity. The idiots who will go on the air to jam, and to make body cavity noises will still be there, but if continued interest can be generated... I don't see this as a bad thing. (God, I've only studied code a week, and can send A-Z, 0-9, and some basic punctuation marks... And that's at 15 WPM, COPYING is another story..)

Again I digress, and I blither... I hope to catch some of you on the air someday, and I hope you understand my love and interest in this hobby is sincere. The blood doesn't get much newer than this. I'm still waiting for my callsign.

With all respect, and sincere admiration to you vets out there.

73

DJM

1274. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:50:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <QDfPb.16954$q4.1054@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86000

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040119180303.28383.00000323@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >Can't wait till they show up on the top end of 75 meters. 100w and a
> >G5RV.....yeah buddy.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Do you think the ARRL will Print 10 Codes in QST? Maybe they could have
an
> article on the correct use of Echo Mikes.

I am sure they could drop some of the ham radio adds and put in some ten
codes and echo mikes to help pay the bills for the loss of so many members.

Dan/W4NTI

1275. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 19:50:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401201150.3a1c853a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86051

n2ah@hotmail.com (Art Harris) wrote in message
news:<774a2c02.0401200500.6f391383@posting.google.com>...
> "Chuck...K1KW" wrote:
>
> > What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for
> > getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring out how
> > to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your rig
> > properly, ect.
>
> It can't be that hard; after all, hundreds of thousands of CBers
> managed to get on 11 meters. Modern rigs don't require much "tuning"
> and most newbies tend to buy pre-assembled dipoles or multiband
> verticals. The rigs are plug and play with microphones included.
>
> We had a pretty good license structure in the mid '60s. Most folks
> started with a (non-renewable) Novice ticket with very limited
> privileges to get their feet wet. Then they upgraded to General with
> full amateur privileges.
>
> That wasn't good enough for ARRL. They insisted we needed more license
> classes and more exams (incentive licensing). FCC bought into it, and
> we all had to upgrade or lose privileges. Now, ARRL is cheapening the
> value of those higher class licenses they insisted we get.

Don't mean to nit-pick here but it was the FCC which dreamed up
Incentive Licensing, not the League. The FCC proposal was far more
Dracinian than was the League's response to it. In the end the FCC
bought into some of the League's arguments but imposed it's own
"vision" in other cases. If you go back thru the history of ham
regulation you'll find that it's usually been the FCC which decided
to generate the regulatory lurches, not the ARRL.

> I figure that in about five years we'll have only one license class,
> and that it will require only a single simple multiple-choice exam.
> Will that re-energize ham radio? I doubt it.
>
> Art Harris N2AH

Brian w3rv

1276. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 20:06:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120150653.13560.00000296@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86052

>I am sure they could drop some of the ham radio adds and put in some ten
>codes and echo mikes to help pay the bills for the loss of so many members.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Im sure they will. Dan I have a great Idea, since the FCC and the" CBRRL" are
HELL bent on destroying Ham Radio, I have a great way to introduce the
CBplussers to HF.
When you hear the CBplussers calling CQ, just answer them on CW, perfectly
Legal, and it will probably Piss them OFF. Thats what Im going to do.

1277. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 20:11:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ydudnQJXdfyfEZDdRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

chocolate rabbit wrote:

meaningless ranting deleted
> Jay
> SWL for 26 yrs

So you were SWL for 26 years and never could pass the test for a ham
license.

1278. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 20:17:00 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0401201217.19fe0867@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86054
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"Scott" wrote in message news:<100fve0pt3vskc4@corp.supernews.com>...
> Hi folks.
>
> Please allow me to give a "newbies" view on the current state of amateur
> radio, and also ask a few questions.
>
> I recently took my Technicians License exam and passed with a perfect score.
> (I bring up the score just to indicate that I studied hard, and took the
> exam seriously). I am now studying to take the 5wpm mores code test. I have
> not yet purchased a radio, or even been "on the air". More on this is a
> moment.
>
> I have also joined a local radio club, whose first meeting I attended last
> night. This club owns and maintains the local 2m repeater, and even though
> it is an open repeater, if nothing else, I feel as though by joining, I am
> helping to support a service which I plan on eventually using.
>
> But what disappoints me is the fact that I left this meeting knowing
> absolutely no more than I did when I walked into the door. I had been led to
> believe that one of the best ways for a new guy just becoming involved in
> this hobby to get practical advice on things like your first purchase of
> equipment, which bands are best for what, and the different applications of
> amateur radio, was to join a club. Well, unfortunately, the majority of the
> meeting I attended was, in my opinion, controlled by a group of 7 or 8 ham
> "veterans" trying to impress one another with their technical knowledge.
>
> So, I guess what I would like to do here is give my views on what I have
> seen so far, and invite anyone who is more informed on these matters to
> correct me.
>
> 1) The Amateur Radio Service is not an essential element in our society.
> Even in times of emergency, there is nothing you can do with a ham radio
> that you can't do with an internet connection, fax machine, land line
> telephone, or cell phone in similar circumstances. Ham Radio is a hobby, and
> like golf, gardening, bird watching, or any other hobby, it could cease to
> exist tomorrow, and nothing would really change.
>
> 2) To me, the most appealing aspect to Ham Radio is the gaining of
> knowledge. Learning the "in's and out's" of all that encompasses Ham Radio o
> peration is the true fun, whether it is dx'ing, satellite, CW or whatever.
> But, like building a boat in a bottle, or even doing a crossword puzzle, the
> satisfaction comes in the steps taken to accomplish the task, not the end
> result itself.

>
> 3) From all accounts that I have heard, the number of new Amateur licenses
> issued has been declining for years. This would tell me that the best way to
> save the hobby was to open new Hams with open arms, instead of clinging
> white-knuckled to the past (packet radio, morse code etc.) look to the
> future, and make it fun.
>
> Thanks for letting me rant folks. Now for some questions.
>
> 1) Can anyone point me towards any resources to assist someone brand new to
> the hobby? (Stuff like recommendations on the type of equipment to get for
> the first time buyer)?
>
> 2) Also, any sources to purchase used equipment. I think I would rather buy
> more functional used stuff, than new equipment that has less "bells and
> whistles".
>
> 3) One more thing...I am looking for information on antennas that is geared
> to the novice.
>
> Thanks folks.

I am newer than you, but I do have a rig set up, and ready to go when
my callsign is granted. What I've learned so far:

1.) Make sure you have what you'll need. If you don't operate from a
car, and you want a mobile rig, make sure you've bought your 13.8V DC
Power supply. I used up every penny getting this bugger ready to go,
and I found I needed the following:

2M Mobile Radio (I got an Icom v8000)
Diamond X-50 2M Antenna
50' 52-Guage Coax
A pair of "banana plugs"
A pair of 50 ohm Coax plugs
A soldering Iron
Solder
A mono-stereo 8 Ohm converter (for earphones)
Both ears is good. (As far as listening goes)
Coax crimper
Wire cutter/stripper

Make sure you'll know EVERYTHING you'll need. I spent $150.00 more
than I thought I'd have to getting started. Total price tag for me
was $400.00. YMMV.

2.) You'll pretty much have to get on the air and ask, but ask
PREPARED TO UNDERSTAND! KNOW what it is you want to know, and go from
there. Nothing irritates ANYONE more than someone randomly asking
unrelated questions, and not grasping what's being told to them. If
you're transmitting with hum or static, they'll let you know. I don't
speak from personal experience, but by listening to the 2M repeater.

3.) Have fun, be polite, and follow the rules of transmission and you'll learn sooner rather than later whether or not you want to move forward in this hobby.

My ultra-newbie two cents worth.

With all respects,

73

DJM

1279. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 20:36:38 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <400D9156.88B4674F@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 86055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Say Lloyd, how do I get myself one of them there Lordships?

I'd like to be Lord of something too. Like "Lord of all I survey' or 'Lord of Radio', 'Lord of Shortwave', something like that.

Who do I get in touch with? How much does it cost?

The Queen no longers speaks to me, so I need another route here to Lordship.

Steve (Hopeful future Lord of Something)
Holland, MI

Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD wrote:

> My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> This day would come, just as I said it would.
>
> Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing you
> can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> A Time Lord Always wins in the end!

1280. Re: Little Billy Beeper seems confused

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 20:50:27 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0401201250.394eceb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86056

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fmXOb.19588$zj7.18688@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> <
> < I understand that you would -knowingly- work a ham out of band.
> <
>
> Dear Little Billy Beeper,
>
> Does Captain Code know you're working us here? (Go to
> http://www.handiham.org/local/blind/beeper.txt for details.)
>
> I will not go out of my band allocation to work anyone, but I will work
> anyone with an amateur radio callsign who calls me inside my band
> allocations.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

I hope that was meant to be funny. I laughed off my hind quarters.
DJM

1281. Re: Little Billy Beeper seems confused

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 21:31:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <c7hPb.20935$zj7.15138@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86057

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote

<
< I hope that was meant to be funny. I laughed off my hind quarters.
<

Yes, it is, but William (that's formal for "Billy Beeper") is seriously
humor impaired and full of himself.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Lord High Liberator of the Electric Smoke

1282. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 21:40:22 UTC
From: K<unk>HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <afhPb.20942$zj7.9144@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86058

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote

<
< Again I digress, and I blither... I hope to catch some of you on the
< air someday, and I hope you understand my love and interest in this
< hobby is sincere. The blood doesn't get much newer than this. I'm
< still waiting for my callsign.
<

Dan,

Two things:

Thing #1) With your attitude, you're going to be an asset to the
Amateur Radio service, and Amateur Radio is going to be an asset to you.
I've been a ham for over 40 years, and it just keeps getting better.

Thing #2) Always remember that the inbred world of rrap is not Amateur
Radio, so don't get discouraged by what you may find here.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1283. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 21:45:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jkhPb.20945$zj7.6354@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86059

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote

<
< I am newer than you, but I do have a rig set up, and ready to go when
< my callsign is granted. What I've learned so far:
<

I absolutely LOVE it!!!! Dan is still waiting on his callsign, but he's
already being an Elmer!

Welcome aboard Dan. You are a breath of fresh air around here.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1284. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:16:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401201416.3d3b3ec8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<iE%Ob.85899$Rc4.333443@attbi_s54>...
> This proposal is a good start. However, the ultimate goal should be to
> align our privileges with those of the rest of the amateur radio world and
> REMOVE all mode restrictions.
>
> CW US operators can operate anywhere in the US bands but US phone is
> restricted. A clear case of discrimination, and a "mode-ist" one at that!!
> Politically incorrect these days....and a major waste of sprectrum!! (Just
> tune the CW bands during any non contest day). A carry over from the olde
> days when the ARRL was clearly a CW only group of old buzzards.

"PC" my butt.

CW is authorized "anywhere" since it is a narrow band mode
requiring only a fraction of the bandwidth of any voice mode.

The ONLY time I've ever heard CW in a "voice" allocation was a
mobile station trying to check in to a net that wasn't being heard
otherwise. It worked well.

> I submit that US Extra class licencee's should be allowed to operate phone
> anywhere that the rest of the world can. Is that fair??? Or are we still
> destined to live in an amateur radio world surpressed by our own government?

No, it's not "fair".

Most US Amateurs are allowed to run far more power than they
need, and in most cases area able to erect antenna systems that
overshadow those of many other countries. Like it or not, we owe it
to the rest of the world to restrain all that ERP.

> Hey...ARRL, WAKE UP!!! If you want to keep the activity up you need to
> promote frequencies where we can talk to the rest of the world! How can I
> make this any clearer??? And provide incentives to do this!!! An extra
> 25KHz doesn't make it.

Like it or not, not all of the world is chomping at the bit to
have US Amateurs able to pounce on them at every turn. When Podunk
Island is ready to work the pile-ups, he'll announce his intentions.
Otherwise, WHY do we need to have all that spectrum? Except on
contest weekends it's ahrd enough to strike up a QSO as it is anyway.

> BTW....requiring CW should not be a requirement for HF operation. (Good
> move by the ARRL on this with the new Novice proposal) Time to get over
> it....and let the rest of the many good people get on the air!!! I say this

> from having slaved over getting 20 WPM done to pass my Extra test (for those
> measly 25 KHz of phone) and I rarely have used code since. So......don't
> deny folks from HF just because code is "your favorite mode" and you are
> proud that you have no microphone in your shack.....

Bully for you that you did it...However Morse Code STILL,
contrary to naysayers, plays an important part in international
communication in the AMATEUR Service. That' it's been put out to
pasture by the unwilling and the boistrous is evidient. That it's a
"good thing" is yet to be seen.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1285. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:20:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401201420.34c3e485@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86061

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119211038.29815.00002840@mb-m21.aol.com>...

> Gots to do like my favorite gunnery nurse in order to blend in!

Then I'd recommend removing your cranium from your rectum and
passing an Amateur exam, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

1286. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:23:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401201423.414cabae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86062

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040116232347.12631.00004284@mb-m28.aol.com>...

> On a scale of 0 through 10, such AMATEUR RADIO activity is good
> for a -20.

I think this pretty well sums up Lennie's appreication of Amateur
Radio, and also puts holes in recent assertions in other threads in
which he says what a wonderful hobby Amateur Radio is...We never can
figure out WHICH face Lennie has on today...

Steve, K4YZ

1287. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:28:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401201428.6366ed9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86063

I thought I answered this, but apparently not. I'll try again...

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<pd9h005fafcc1865drb90h9fst9o20iein@4ax.com>...
> On 17 Jan 2004 00:57:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >>For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the
> >>core "issue" that began our discourse.
> >
> >There are several issues, not just one.
>
> OK - I'm listening.

> >>Perhaps I haven't stated it
> >>clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
> >>clouded.

> >Let's see what you've got, then.

> Let's go.

> >>I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
> >>continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.

> >>I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
> >>inappropriate.

> >That's correct. It's also an issue to some people.

> OK - fair enough. And it shouldn't be.

That's a moral judgement on your part. You're declaring what should
and should not be an issue to other people. IOW, you're telling them
what to think and what their standards should be when you say it
shouldn't be an issue.

> Your personal standards are
> your own - no one else's. Let's clear that one off - agreed?

My personal standards are shared by other people. I don't know
how many, but if there's even one other person who shares my
standards, then they're *not* "no one else's".

> >> No issue there - that is entirely your right.

> >Some people say it isn't. Not you, but some others.

> Others may, but who cares - it's none of their business.

Why not?

> >>I also
> >>understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.

> >Also correct. And also an issue to some people, who say that my deletion of
> >Kim's call is "wrong".

> Let's focus on that one, and agree that deleting her call from your
> post is necessary for you to due to your standards. I have no issue
> there at all. If you don't want to use it, OK. Let's clear this one
> off too - agreed?

I won't use it in my posts. I'm not legally required to, either.

> >>Again, no issue there - I respect that.

> >>For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:

> >>Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
> >>unfair, as it singled her out. I agree.

> >And I disagree. Kim singled herself out by choosing that callsign. As you are
> >aware.

> Yes she did - and quite intentionally, too, as she has stated.

Then she needs to accept the consequences of that action.

> That wasn't, however, what I was saying in my statement above. Simply
> that Kim feels that you singled her out too, by omitting just her call
> from the list.

She and you know exactly why her call was omitted.

> Forget the inappropriatenesss of the call for a moment....

Why? It's the cause of the omission.

> do you see where she might get that feeling?

Sure - she wants to be included in the list even though she
disregards the list's standards.

> >>Would finding a compromise
> >>whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
> >>all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
> >>have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?

> >No, it wouldn't.

> Honestly, I dont agree with you on this point. It would have been an
> easy compromise to make, and woulld potentially have offended no one.

It would have offended me and anyone who agreed with my standards.

> More on this further down in the post!

> >>That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim.

> >No, it isn't, but we'll get to that later. Right now, let's discuss that issue.
> >
> >It seems to me that what you're saying is that I should either include
> >everyone's callsign, or no one's.

> >Now since I don't wish to include Kim's callsign, that leaves only the option
> >of including no one's callsign, in order to accomodate Kim's feelings.

> Agreed - in order to treat everyone equally, that would be the only
> other option available given the situation.

That means everyone must suffer in order to avoid the possibility of
Kim's feelings being hurt.

> >But what about everyone else's feelings, including mine? I want my call listed.

> >I would feel disrespected to be listed by name rather than callsign or name and
> >callsign on an amateur radio newsgroup.
>
> Yes, and I believe that Kim feels exactly the same way, Jim.

Then let her choose an appropriate callsign.

> For the
> same reason as you, I suppose - she is also a ham. (She does not feel
> that her call is in any way wrong, remember.)

You're saying her feelings are more important than my standards and my feelings.

> >Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
> >callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.
> >
> >Don't the feelings of everyone else count?
>
> Of course they do - but are you sure that these people world be that
> upset by this?

Are you sure they aren't?

Why should the people who chose appropriate callsigns not get them
listed in order to appease those who chose inappropriate ones?

> (except Dave, of course - he appears, from his recent
> correspondence, to be annoyed that Kim is still breathing... :))

Not at all.
>
> In fact, if it had been my post, I would have revised it to names only
> immediately after Kim's original complaint.

But it wasn't your post. It was my post.

> And seen what comments
> came back next. If I had several legitimate complaints (without the
> agendas that we have seen in several recent posts {not yours, Jim!)
> which obviously relate to Kim personally rather than just her
> call...), then yes there would be no other alternative than to put the
> calls back - but I would have written and offered Kim the option of
> going by name only or dropping out before I went ahead. At least I'd
> be able to tell Kim that I tried to fix it for her, but it didn't work
> out with the rest of the group.

So you'd go through all that and wind up with the calls in the post because
some of us would complain.

> Maybe it's just me, but I would try first to resolve her complaint if
> possible, out of respect for her as a fellow amateur.

That's nice - but by doing so, you are validating her choice of
callsign. I won't do that.

> I prefer
> compromise whenever possible - not compromising my standards, but
> finding a way to achieve a balance.

My standards say that your compromise involves compromising my standards.
>
> >Note also, Kim said that if I wouldn't use her callsign, she didn't want to > >be on the
list..
>
> True, but that was after the had become frustrated with trying to
> solve this issue.

She could solve it very easily by choosing an appropriate callsign.

> >>Your rights and
> >>standards are not at question here.
> >
> >Yes, they are. I've been told that "it's not my place" to determine whether a
> >callsign is appropriate or not. I've been told that my actions are "wrong".
> >
> >As you are aware.
>
> I did state that it is in fact no one individual's place to determine
> what is or is not appropriate for the ARS - that role belongs to the
> regulators, and to the will of the majority of us, I suppose.

I recall being told it was not *MY* place to judge. And I disagree.
It's my place to judge in terms of what I will and will not validate.

> Each of us is however completely in charge of determining what is
> appropriate for us as an individual, however. No question there.
>
> Jim, my intent was not to criticize your standards

Tell it to those who used words like "prejudice" to describe
my standards.

> - simply to point
> out that perhaps a more amicable solution to this issue was possible
> without compromising anyone's standards - finding a common ground for
> all.
>
> That's it - that's my point.
>
>
That's fine. And I disagree.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1288. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:29:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401201429.6e15e8bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86064

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040110153458.01893.00002528@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> > Putz.
>
> Those aren't endearing words, little one.

It's a "word", Lennie...not plural.

And it's not meant to be "endearing"...just descriptive. In this
case it's more than adequate for the application. You have yet to do
anything to disprove my application of it, either.

> But...they are the main words of this year's poster boy for US ham
> radio.
>
> Let's all hear it for all that "goodwill" that hams have...!
>
> Goodwill industries?
>
> Are you goodwill hunting?

Not from you, Lennie. You are as heartless as anyone could be
and still have a spontaneous pulse.

Steve, K4YZ

1289. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:32:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401201432.36901d7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86065

Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us> wrote in message
news:<kacPb.5408$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net>...
> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:
>
> > 400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
>
> Not true. Only a small percentage of licensees are ARRL members, and they
> tend to be the folks that have been hams a long time.

About 25% of US hams are ARRL members. The percentage of *active* US hams who
are ARRL members is higher, of course.

> The ARRL is sticking
> it to the folks who worked hard in the past to pass 20 wpm and the Extra
> Class written test.

Not just them. What about folks who worked hard in the recent past to get
5 wpm and the General class written?

> Ironically, those licensees who stand to gain the most
> from this proposal are the ones least likely to join the League.
>
> > Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
> > members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
> > code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
> > additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd

> 5 WPM for Extra Class is an insult, not a tip of the hat. The Extra Class
> ticket grants exclusive 25 kHz CW segments on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters.
> These are prime DX frequencies and the proposal doesn't change that. A
> higher speed code test for Extra would be more appropriate.

Agreed! And *none* of the segments are CW only.
>
> > -and- the big one:
>
> > New entry level licence with 100W on HF phone, plus simplified test =
> > a whole bunch of happy new potential ARRL members = lots more
> > potential members....and voters....and customers.....

Maybe. And maybe not.

> This is what the proposal is all about, saving ARRL and the jobs of its
> staff.

I don't think ARRL is in much trouble on that account.

> But as we learned after the No-Code license was created in 1991,
> most new hams don't join the League.

Indeed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1290. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:36:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401201436.5494fd5e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86066

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<zUbPb.20566$zj7.13000@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> > We'll mark you down with Dave as knowingly and willingly working
> > stations out of band.
>
> Dear Willy Weeper,
>
> Mark me down as the spirit moves you. It was a

[expletive deleted]

> trolling
> question from someone without the

[expletive deleted]

> to even identify himself, and I
> delight in toying with idiots like that.
>
Aw, c'mon, Hans - even I could tell in the very first post
who "William" is.

Consider this plain, simple fact: Whether you toss the
coin to the monkey in the red hat, or to the organ
grinder, you will still get the same song and the
same little dance from them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1291. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 22:59:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86067

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >
> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
> >>@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >>>
> >>> Summary:
> >>>
> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
> >>
> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
> >>would reintroduce a free licence class.
> >
> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
> >
>
> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains on
> the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level licence is
> called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
>
> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole thing on
> the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought about this
> particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open and it could be
> called something else.

Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since no
new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a moot
point.

But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
>
> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the entry
> > level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF privileges, but
> > more HF privileges.
> >
> >>Provided the new class that happened to
> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
> >>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that

> >
> > Why?
>
> I thought the old Novice was too easy

Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13 was
adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first station was
homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license started me on the
path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about 3 years and BSEE in
a little over 8 years....

And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
more, isn't that just about perfect?

> > Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech Plus
> > privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between above
> > and below 30 MHz privileges.
>
> So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down

How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for
all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs
proposed for the Novice?
>
> >>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
> >>
> >>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
> >
> > Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
> > receiving.
>
> Won't happen

Probably not, but it's still a good idea.
>
> >>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be
> >>dumped.
> >
> > It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to
> > use manufactured equipment.
>
> Not in my opinion

It's the same argument used against the code test. Why *must* a ham
learn all that theory to use manufactured, approved gear with no
critical adjustments? Heck, most ham gear today won't transmit out
of band unless modified!
>
> >>Moreover, it can be now,
> >>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.

> >>
> > FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>
> I think they will too

Unfortunately
>
> >>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
> >>
> >>OK
> >
> > Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as has
> > been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>
> Can't stand loose ends

What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
1967
even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
additional
privileges at all.

> >>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
> >>
> >>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
> >>
> > Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to Extra,
> > but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to General?
> >
> > What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not
> > the other?
>
> As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech, which is
> already pretty easy

Exactly. But that doesn't answer the question. You want Advanceds to
get free upgrades to avoid ~82,000 loose ends, but not Techs and Tech
pluses, who would
amount to ~322,000 loose ends.

I don't see why one and not the other.

> >>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
> >>
> >>Good.
> >
> > Bad.
> >
> >> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
> >
> > That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>

> Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful spectrum to
> phone

Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital voice?

> >>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> >>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on 6, 2, 222,
> >>> and 440
>
> >>See above
> >
> > Please clarify.
>
> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone.

25 kHz more.

> 7075-7100, for example,
> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it would
> harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.

Hams outside Region 2 will be getting 7100-7200 anyway. Let them
harmonize with us.

> >>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure evaluation
> >>
> >>OK
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
> >>
> >>Not OK
> >
> > Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
> > more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and modes,
> > power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase) and much
> > more.
> >
> > By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.
> >
>
> With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure questions, but I
> think the test is already easy enough.

To a beginner, it's not so easy.
>
> >>> General to be
> >>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
> >>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't
> >>say here.

> >
> > See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the work of
> > a committee looking to give everyone something they want, but not
> > giving anyone everything they want.
> >
> > What will FCC do?
> >
> > First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to
> > attract more new hams.
>
> Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under existing law.
> That has some appeal.

See above about the "law".

> > Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.
>
> Agreed
>
> > Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it costs
> > them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.
>
> I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to handle 5
> classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there won't be two types
> of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why they aren't recorded
> differently right now).

Incorrect!

Before restructuring, their computers handled 6 classes of license
(Novice, Tech, Tech Plus, General, Advanced, Extra). In fact their
computers *still* handle 6 classes! So there should be no problem at
all.

And as Tech Pluses continue to be renewed as Techs, expire, and
upgrade, that class will disappear completely.
>
> I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes, though. I
> think it is better to move on.

I agree, but not at the price of giveaways just to make things look
neater.

How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams except
Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
"Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1292. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:22:11 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0401201522.2166e82e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86068

Larry, I might agree with you on this issue, and I'd hate to take a stance on something like this, because personally, I may not find it that terribly important.

I am a huge proponent of each one acting their best, etc... My only question is: Do you expect Kim to change her callsign? Especially after posting what you did? She might have considered changing it if the diplomacy had been there, but when you turn it into a war of principles, it's not likely she'd freshen her callsign up a tad. (Even though I'd like to see her do it, I wouldn't hold my breath.)

And she just may be a total sweetheart to boot. (I don't mean that sexually at all...) You can't tell with just a name. I'm new here, so I'll consider the value of my opinion limited, but I'd be more interested in stopping "bad behavior" than I would be in my passion and rhetoric admonishing it.

We don't disagree, necessarily, but I'll never show anything less than civility to Kim, here, or on the air, if it ever comes to that.

Ironically, I'm not sure I've ever seen anyone politely ask her to change it.

DJM

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message news:<20040119214859.12501.00005665@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <fZTOb.15142$q4.3171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > >
> > > Do you still have the full text of that message from Hollingsworth, Larry?
> > >If so, please post a copy so we can all see it. I know you posted it before,
> > >but that was some time ago.
> > >
> > >
> > >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > >http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> Axe and ye shall receive:
>
> Subject: Riley sez Kim taking the ARS "One step closer to extinction"
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> Date: 08 Jun 2000 14:37:47 GMT
>

> In article <59B7203A07395FF0.50F2CC864D4ED7FE.54A4CB093D32584C@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Probably more a thoughtful wish of the prefix I wish I'd been able to get.
>
> Kim:
>
> Huh? This was even harder to decipher than your usually indecipherable
> writing. Anyone who has survived elementary school grammar should
> know it's best not to use a word like "wish" more than once in a
> sentence -- particularly if it can be used as either a noun or a verb.
> This causes confusion. However, since confusion seems to be your
> normal state, I guess you think you can get away with it!
>
> [THIS IS THE PART WHERE KIM QUOTES THE PART OF RILEY'S
> E-MAIL WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS THREAD:]
>
>
> >Speaking of callsigns, here's Riley's response after I wrote and told him I
> >was sorry for bothering him, since the FCC had already spoken on callsigns
> >at the Dayton Hamfest (the rest of the email is also with it):
> >
> >While that's true, just because a person has a right to do something doesn't
> >mean it's right to do it on every occasion. While the call sign may fit the
> >constitution, for every instance where a parent or uncle or grandparent
> >doesn't want a young person to get involved in Ham Radio because of
> >something they hear on the bands, then you have taken the ARS one step
> >closer to extinction. Then we can sit around and debate what happened to
> >all those Amateur frequencies that industry bought at auction---debating, of
> >course, on the internet and cellular because that'll be all we have left.
> >The first amendment will still be alive and well, just as it is now, tho, if
> >that's any consolation.
>
> Interesting. Sooo, Kim -- are you going to change your call sign
> voluntarily, or are you going to, as Riley said, continue to take the ARS
> "one step closer to extinction?" Think about it!
>
> Years ago, I would have fought tooth and nail to preserve every single
> kiloHertz of ham radio spectrum. However, because of the proliferation of
> so-called "hams" like you, Kim, I now support the concept of wholesale
> re-allocation of amateur radio spectrum to commercial broadcasting
> and utility communications services which can make much more
> productive, profitable, and socially beneficial use of it! As hams, we've
> blown it -- big time -- and you, your attitude, and your callsign are the
> best and most readily available example of every bad thing ham radio
> has become!
>
> Sooo -- enjoy your callsign. The FCC won't force you to change it --
> that is something that can only come from you -- should you decide

> to become a Real Ham and stop giving the rest of us a bad image!
> I have complete confidence that you can change if you want to -- but
> the action to do so must come out of your decision to do what's
> right for people other than yourself.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

1293. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:23:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401201523.1e42a6da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86069

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0401201150.3a1c853a@posting.google.com>...
> n2ah@hotmail.com (Art Harris) wrote in message
news:<774a2c02.0401200500.6f391383@posting.google.com>...
> > "Chuck...K1KW" wrote:
> >
> > > What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is for
> > > getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring out how
> > > to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your rig
> > > properly, ect.
> >
> > It can't be that hard; after all, hundreds of thousands of CBers
> > managed to get on 11 meters. Modern rigs don't require much "tuning"
> > and most newbies tend to buy pre-assembled dipoles or multiband
> > verticals. The rigs are plug and play with microphones included.
> >
> > We had a pretty good license structure in the mid '60s. Most folks
> > started with a (non-renewable) Novice ticket with very limited
> > privileges to get their feet wet. Then they upgraded to General with
> > full amateur privileges.
> >
> > That wasn't good enough for ARRL. They insisted we needed more license
> > classes and more exams (incentive licensing). FCC bought into it, and
> > we all had to upgrade or lose privileges. Now, ARRL is cheapening the
> > value of those higher class licenses they insisted we get.
>
> Don't mean to nit-pick here but it was the FCC which dreamed up
> Incentive Licensing, not the League. The FCC proposal was far more
> Dracinian than was the League's response to it. In the end the FCC
> bought into some of the League's arguments but imposed it's own
> "vision" in other cases. If you go back thru the history of ham
> regulation you'll find that it's usually been the FCC which decided
> to generate the regulatory lurches, not the ARRL.

I wuz gonna post something similar but ya beat me to it.

Some details:

FCC's 1965 proposal included such doozies as:

- all Advanceds (40K of them, about 15% of US hams at the time)
DEMOTED to General class

- new "Amateur First" class license, with new written test and 16 wpm
code test, plus 1 year experience as a General.

- distinctive callsigns for all license classes so you'd know right away who was who.

- subbands that were even more restrictive (like the lower 50 kHz of the CW/data subbands being Extra only, and even more 'phone being taken away
from Generals)

And the ancient history is even more interesting. Before 1951 there were effectively only two license levels and one code test speed. FCC thought
that wasn't enough, and in '51 brought out three new levels and placed new restrictions on HF 'phone. Then in late '52 they reversed themselves and
gave all hams except Novices and Techs all operating privileges. Why the
turnabout? Nobody seems to know.

But after just 5 years (1958) of the new system, FCC was unhappy with it
and wanted changes. By 1963 they were so unhappy they said that things were going to change one way or another, and wanted proposals. ARRL's original 1963 proposal did not require any additional code testing for full privileges, and only one more written test (the old Advanced). There
were also at least ten other proposals, many from individuals, and FCC took elements from many of them.

Personally, I think FCC had a bad case of "Sputnik Fever".

> > I figure that in about five years we'll have only one license class,
> > and that it will require only a single simple multiple-choice exam.
> > Will that re-energize ham radio? I doubt it.

Oddly enough, in the years following "incentive licensing", the number of US hams grew like mad after having been flat through most of the 1960s.

Go figure - they upped the requirements and ham radio grew...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1294. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182416.07155.00000155@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86074

In article <buicds$5m6@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Oh, I don't know that he had any correspondence with the FCC; in fact I
>highly doubt it. The Riley Hollingsworth email was a direct response from
>him to me, and Larry has treasured it ever since :)

I picture him as having it laminated and taped to his dashboard.

:-)

LHA / WMD

1295. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182416.07155.00000154@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86076

In article <36gq00hqf30ulj3fdu7b9dg2am9fhqpffi@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>That's one way of looking at it, Jim. To me, it looks like a purely
>political move - that is, trying to please the greatest number of
>members...and voters...and customers...
>
>400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
>Drop code = some number of happy new HF - using members.
>Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
>members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
>code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
>additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd, I'd say...but it
>does make the Extra level licence harder to get - that's what
>everybody wants, right?).

The problem is that the 15 old men of the BoD have just
disenfranchised themselves from over 200K Technician class
licensees who will now carry the wonderful class name of
"Novice."

The ARRL has less than 170K members now. The number of
existing Tech class licensees here is greater than that now.
Those aren't likely to become members to support a group that
thinks they are all "Novices."

NOT good PR to attract membership.

>-and- the big one:
>
>New entry level licence with 100W on HF phone, plus simplified test =
>a whole bunch of happy new potential ARRL members = lots more
>potential members....and voters....and customers.....

"Customers" they already got. Membership is lagging.

ARRL is down to a measly $12 million annual budget (according
to the IRS forms).

>All of these proposals are good news for the manufacturers of ham
>equipment, and perhaps for us too - if demand is increased, production
>will increase and prices of HF radios might do down!

...and Ten-Tec Orion software might finally be completed...:-)

>Plus, each one of the above members that got something additional
>added to their privileges if this proposal is accepted would have the

>ARRL to thank for it. In theory, anyway.
>
>Considering that, following the ITU decision to make code optional
>most of the world is moving towards removing the mandatory Morse Code
>requirement outright, there isn't much else that they could do without
>looking like defenders the status quo, and annoying even more of their
>members....and denying them the rights being granted to their fellow
>amateur radio neighbours in the rest of the world.

They could have changed the Tech class name to something
they must be thinking of...like "Scum of Radio" or "Not Real
Ham" class.

When the BoD met, they must have arrived with their baggage
intact. Emotional baggage.

>Like, for instance, those just north of you have proposed to do - and
>that's likely to happen fairly soon, I expect.

I hope that powers-that-be in Canada are with those of us in this
millennium, not the fantasyland of olden days as in the League.

LHA / WMD

1296. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182417.07155.00000157@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86070

In article <5c01b95b.0401200434.65f855e7@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Stebe the "veteran of hostile actions") writes:

> And people do not Honor thier comrades-in-arms by trying to
>garner newsgroup message points by trying to associate THIER Army
>"career" with the blood shed by soldiers KIA three years before they
>were in-theater.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the rage and anger resulting in all those typos!

Poor little Stebe, still getting all red in the face about another being proud of service to their country. What do you do on Memorial Day? Go around beating up old military veterans at cemetaries and stealing their flags?

LHA / WMD

1297. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182417.07155.00000156@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86072

In article <5c01b95b.0401200442.36aea16d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Stebe the hostile reflector) writes:

> You are the bully here, Lennie.
>
> A lying, antagonistic one. Sucks to be you...again.

More "charm school" output from the Dill Instructor.

Why don't you apply for a position as Greeter at the ARRL lobby
entrance, warm fuzzy one?

I'm sure they need all the PR they can muster after that wonderful
Plan to put before the FCC.

LHA / WMD

1298. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182418.07155.00000158@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86071

In article <5c01b95b.0401200420.6f9750d4@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Stebe the gunnery nurse) writes:

> Sorry, Scummy One...

Yup, still on the alternate-reality "charm school" thing. :-)

You still pished about not being able to be a Ham Dill Instructor?

[wry comment]

LHA / WMD

["ham on rye with a dill pickle" for the humor impaired... :-)]

1299. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182419.07155.00000159@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86073

In article <5c01b95b.0401200402.3eec8a4c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Still sucks to be you, Lennie. You're still a putz.

Still haven't found an Anger Therapist who won't quit after a few minutes?

:-)

LHA / WMD

1300. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182420.07155.00000160@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86075

In article <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented
>on previously, so here goes:
>
>On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:05 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms - [continued]

>> 8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on
>> approximately the same scale and still trying to privatize
>> commercial operator testing to save money. Radio use by
>> non-hams after 1934 grew sufficiently large to require the
>> agency to continue.
>
>I believe that they would, along with IC and all of the other national
>regulatory agencies. It's a vast spectrum, and most of their energies
>are directed towards management of the commercial sector.

That's where the majority of users exist and that is how it should
be (to me).

>> 9. "CB" would have been created anyway, a fore-runner of the
>> license-free personal radio wave of the future. [it is 46 years
>> old in our universe which already has FRS, R-C, cordless
>> telephones and wireless gizmos of all kinds]
>
>Probably - people love to communicate! Folks would have seen the
>cabbies, police and other commercial operators using 2-way radio
>equipment, many ex-military guys would have experienced using the
>technology first hand, and would have wanted the same type of system
>for themselves. (in the pre-cellular telephone days, anyway...). And,
>if there's a market, somebody would have developed it!

Did you say "market?" :-)

One in three Americans has a cell phone subscription; according
to our Census Bureau. Yet, a decade earlier we all got along just
fine with a relative handful of cell users. With the marketing blitz
still on-going for cell phone handsets, various user plans, all sorts
of attachments (including a little hands-free earphone-microphone
with its own little two-way radio), I'd say the marketeers have
pretty well established that side of telephony.

One in three Americans means a quantity of about 100 million.
At the end of 2004 some forecasters have predicted a worldwide
cellular telephone useage of over 2 billion units!

Think of it...2 billion little two-way radios...and not a single user
is required to test for any license or know morse code. :-)

And NONE of them "owe" any technology even remotely to
"amateur radio pioneering or innovation." Many U.S. hams speak
with contempt of the VHF and above region ("shack on the belt"
is a typical comment of our remaining newsgroupie bus driver).
Cell phones (in the U.S.) run at 900+ MHz.

People DO love to communicate, obvious to anyone at an airport
(among many venues)...even in supermarkets. Should be nothing
wrong with that except for the few that insist, nay demand, terrible
adherence to HOW the communication is done...along with
"official granting" of license, a permission to communicate. :-)

>> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
>> bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent.
>> Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign
>> behind their names to show how good and expert they were in
>> "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more
>> fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).
>
>Personally, I don't view my license as a measure of my expertise in
>the art of radio. As my examiner told me when he shook my hand after
>I passed the test - it's a license to learn.
>
>Nothing more.

I think that is a mentally healthy outlook on a recreational activity.

Obviously some Ham Lifestylers in here will disagree. Those love
to endlessly self-enoble themselves as "members of a service,"
apparently thinking they are an asset to the nation. They are simply
making an asset of themselves.

I am greatly amused by the U.S.A. population's apparent NEED for
royal titles of any kind, status, position, quasi-nobility, and all other
alphabet soup kinds of name add-ons. Was only 228 years ago that
the U.S.A. declared itself "free" of royalty. Yet, here we are now with
some desperately clinging to a "higher royal class" of labeling. :-)

For those cling-ons, the U.S. amateur radio "incentive plan" was a
godsend establishing all those classes of license. To them the
incentive was to "upgrade" so they could sneer with contempt at all
the lower forms of ham life. Many still do, more's the pity. [some
have a visceral need to attack the preceived inferior ones, a mental
sickness which I doubt will cease in any form of human activity...:-( ]

Nice discussing something with you, Leo. [others will disagree...:-)]

LHA / WMD

1301. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182422.07155.00000161@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86077

In article <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented
>on previously, so here goes:

[continued from previous start -]

>> 6. Radio broadcasting would have become successful and tele-
>> vision broadcasting even more so. "Overseas radiotelephone"
>> would still exist via the first HF SSB radios in the 1930s. The
>> first VHF FM mobiles would still be tested by various police

>Agreed - commercial and military radiocommunications would have grown
>anyway. Although some developments came from amateur radio, many more
>did not.
>
>A few years ago, I attended a Lucent course on their CDMA (spread
>spectrum, code division multiple access) cellular base station radio
>equipment. A Qualcomm engineer (CDMA is their patented technology)
>started off his presentation by asking us if we knew who invented the
>concept of CDMA. Bell Labs? MIT? The military? No. It was a
>German actress named Hedy Lamarr! She propsed it as a method of
>secret communications back in the 40s - obviously the technology
>(powerful computers) to implement it did not exist at the time. He
>went on to further amaze the group by informing us that she also
>devised the concept of frequency hopping (which I believe was used
>during the war - please correct me if I am wrong). Definitely a good
>thing that she got out of Germany prior to the war! Hedy was not an
>amateur, and had no interest in radio.

That's been distorted from the original. IEEE Spectrum did a piece
on Hedy's (Hedwig Markey is the name on the patent) and George
Antheil's patent for a torpedo guidance device. Antheil was a friend
of Hedy's and involved in automated pianos such as an updated
player piano. Hedy had been married in Germany to a German
industrialist who was a munitions maker; one of the products was a
torpedo. Hedy wasn't a brainless actress and could grasp ideas.
Antheil already had some inventions going in music and they traded
some thoughts and concepts. Hedy had adopted the USA (or the
other way around) and wanted to help the war effort any way she
could (besides USO tours). The end result was an idea of a
secure torpedo guidance system using programmable audio tones
sent over a wire umbilical. It was doable with vacuum tube
technology then.

The patent was granted but never used by anyone! Eventually it expired. The USN and other nations using submarines and torpedos eventually developed wireline guidance of some torpedos but not with the system proposed by Markey and Antheil. For communications security, the USA already had AT&T to help in eventually developing a good voice scrambler so that the Germans lost their ability to eavesdrop on FDR's and Churchill's radiotelephone chats. That scrambler used shifting voice sub-bands and took up a small tow-behind trailer. Think of that as a parallel development in audio tone things.

Hedy Lamarr inventing CDMA? I don't think so. The origin of that myth lies with some magazine or wire-service staffer who didn't know enough about electronic systems but probably saw a trade magazine article. Code Division Multiple Access is an eventual descendant of pulse-position modulation multiple voice channel radio relay equipment. The 8-voice-channel AN/TRC-6 that we signalmen in microwave radio relay school at Fort Monmouth used as a training system has much more in common to the eventual digitized voice comm systems than a torpedo guidance system. General Electric had already designed a 24-voice-channel microwave radio relay system for commercial use and that was purchased by the US Army. The later evolution of digital pulse trains in telephony circuits was a direct predecessor to CDMA.

For that matter, the "rotor" encryption teleprinters of WW2 have more in common with CDMA. Those scrambled the teleprinter character code according to the rotor settings (actually multiple-pole rotary switches) to yield encryption without changing the basic nature of the 5-bit character code. The "Sigaba" of WW2 is an example, never compromised until the capture of the Pueblo years later. Spread-Spectrum techniques came out of work on developing encryption electronics along with Information Theory that had begun with things like "Shannon's Law" of 1948.

Aligning a material object with an exceptionally beautiful woman of considerable intelligence is totally terrific PR. In truth, a stretch of the imagination that makes bungee cords break. Hedy and George came up with a TORPEDO GUIDANCE SYSTEM...that was never used as such. The original story has been told. Distortion came later.

>Good ideas come from everywhere.

Absolutely. Even gorgeous actresses or handsome newsgroupies...:-)

>A question: what would not have been invented, or delayed, had the ARS
>not existed?

Ham Radio Outlet, the chain, would never exist. :-)

Newington, CT, would have a museum only of local artifacts.

This and several other newsgroups would be about something entirely different...but just as concrete-headed in its patrons as the others.

QSL card printers would have to go back to making picture postcards for sale at drug stores and supermarkets.

TVI in urban neighborhoods would have a different flavor. Ed Hare might have to go out and work for a living... :-)

The possibilities in any alternate universe are infinite. Everyone's ideas would be as "correct" as any other since there is nothing to base them on for "proof." :-)

LHA / WMD

1302. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:24:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120182427.07155.00000162@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86078

In article <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

Some good thoughts there, Leo. I'll add to my previous comments.

>This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented
>on previously, so here goes:
>
>On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:05 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>>
>> 1. There would be NO ARRL to provide "guidance" and direction.
>> That expired before St. Hiram expired. [in this alternative
>> universe] Newington, CT, would have no museum.
>
>True - no AR, no ARRL. Mr. Maxim would be remembered only as the
>inventor of the Maxim Silencer for explosive weapons, and for his work
>on automobile silencers (mufflers, I assume).
>
>However, following along with the subject of the thread - the startup
>of a "new" Amateur Radio Service" would concievably attract a lot of
>people to it - an organization starting up to represent them and their
>interests (and take their money) seems like a given.

In the wider world of early radio organizations (see Thomas H.
White's very notable web pages as well as print history), ARRL
was a relative latecomer in amateur radio. The one thing they
can claim is having survived the early competition in the USA.

[I'll have to use the USA as a reference here, no slight intended
against Canada, only against my meager knowledge of Canadian
amateur activities of earlier times]

ARRL, by their own history, began as a local New England radio
club largely organized for relaying telegraphy messages
quicker than was provided by commercial carriers. In reality that
is a form of "hacking" hardly different than the CD music stealing
that went on through the Internet in modern times. So, the 3-man
club got more locals and "organized" in 1914. The Radio Club of
America had already existed for 5 years and some of the RCA
members were very involved in amateur radio activities. [first to
use acronym 'RCA' but not aligned with RCA Corporation that once
was] The local ARRL club was small in 1914 and many national
clubs for amateur radio were much larger in membership.

The "League" effectively used PR and promotional techniques to expand, slowly adding on news and technical publications. It had very little of what it eventually became. Intense self-promotion (League publications themselves are excellent vehicles to do such things) kept their name/organization in everyone's mind. It fostered an image in many minds to make up for the generally solitary activity of one amateur listening for hours to static in hopes of capturing a weak telegraphic signal. Technology of radio was still quite primitive. The first two attempts at trans-national (USA) message relay were disappointing failures. Nonetheless, the ARRL kept up the PR and eventually made it through the competition for "national amateur representation." Competition included the formidable base of Hugo Gernsback's little publishing empire and his own attempts at building an amateur radio organization.

The key element in establishing the ARRL was Maxim's own funded lobbying in DC after WW1 to restore U.S. amateur radio. That worked, amazingly enough, and became the stuff of legend in much later League self-promotion...even 86 years later. Maxim became "president for life" of the ARRL and "served" until the 1930s. Sort of a private little empire which happens in all organizations eventually. That's not to decry Maxim's efforts but, in order to be fair, one cannot pin 'altruism' on Maxim's "service to the League." He was instrumental in starting it and no doubt was self-possessive about it.

With radio technology still not climbing the steep walls of exponential leaps and bounds in electronics technology in 1920, ARRL publications were about the only trade news available to the everyman hobbyist at that time. There was very little of the information media bonanza we all enjoy today. Knowledge took time to spread. League publications helped that since they weren't involved in patent disputes (many, many in the 1920s, 1930s) or various groups' attempts to control radio or trade secret developments that industry was jealously guarding. ARRL pubs were an EXCELLENT vehicle, a medium for self-promotion and the League didn't hesitate one bit to keep on promoting itself.

>> 2. There would be NO morse code test since no other radio
>> service except Maritime Radio used morse code. There
>> would be NO need to keep a "pool of trained morse radio
>> operators" for any national need.
>
>True enough - if amateur radio were invented today, it's pretty
>unlikely that Morse Code would be a mandatory requirement or play any
>significant role - it's a dead technology in the commercial and
>military world today (just spies and some covert military ops remain
>professional users of morse signalling today). I believe that it
>would be a 'special interest' thing for people who wanted to play
>around with it.

There are MANY and varied groups of hobbyists involved in
electronics today and many of those existed before personal
computers began. "High fidelity" music/sound was one though it has
shrunk to a niche market now. Robotics in general seems to be
the latest in interest, merging microcontrollers and machinery in lots
of different forms. Keyboard synthesizers had been a big thing with
the first of the lower-cost personal computers, but now simplified into
commercially-available programmable music machines. A close
look into the availability of parts and materials at various smaller
merchandizers on websites will show that there is great interest in
electronics-oriented experimentation and hobby work besides just
radio communications. Merchants are a good barometer of where
the hobby work goes on...it's a cruel market where only the larger
interests survive (regardless of individual favorites)...merchants can't
pay bills with altruism. :-)

>I wonder, though, if in the absence of Amateur Radio, something else
>might have evolved to meet the need of having extra trained people
>available? Perhaps an auxillary (and voluntary) communications corps,
>mobilized by the military or local government during times of need?
>They might even provide the equipment and training...wouldn't be free,
>though - Amateur Radio doesn't cost them much (if anything) to
>mobilize.

I personally doubt it on scales larger than local, urban groups.
Radio - on the larger scale of human activities - is an established
medium of communications used by government and business on
a large scale. It's not a mystery or magic that it once appeared to
be in the 1920s or 1930s. Radio is far more widespread in society
of the USA than all of amateur radio in North America.

Use of a radio is ridiculously easy with existing radio equipment of
the 1960s era, not just that of the 2000s. Government and business
HTs on VHF-UHF are more numerous than amateur HTs in the USA
and have been so for more than 30 years. What is needed, if anything,
is the coordination of groups involved in "needy operations," the
control-and-response protocols, organizational structures to get the
various tasks done. That doesn't need specialized "radio training,"
just group organization. Police and fire people use radios every day
without any special classes in radio innards, often with just a few
minutes of personalized instruction.

>> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings because
>> there would be no old-timers left to tell the tales...only
>> pretenders who longed for a simpler (mythical) life way back
>> before they were born.
>
>Well, there would still be old timers telling tales - just not ham
>radio ones ;)

Of course! That's a given. :-)

Especially those bitter about not having the opportunity to do big-
leagues communications on HF a half century ago. <bseg, lol>

>> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway and several movies made
>> about that tragedy.
>
>Unfortunately, yes. And many other unfortunate events may well have
>become much disasters or have increased in magnitude, as there would
>have been far less people monitoring the bands and detecting /
>relaying emergency traffic if the ARS had not existed.

Would there be? That MIGHT be true in 1912, 92 years ago and 2
years before the ARRL existed. The international martime distress
frequency of 500 KHz had not yet been implemented in 1912. The
distance to land was not that great and the radios of that time were
not sensitive in receiving although some of the spark transmitters
where "high power." Had that happened in the much larger Pacific,
farther from land, or in the southern Atlantic or Indian Ocean, it
might have been a whole different story.

Pro-coders are quick on the trigger to trot out OLD tales of "need
to relay traffic" when there is NO need to relay any traffic today or
even four decades ago. GMDSS was implemented by the Maritime
Community to replace the old 500 KHz Autoalarms. That there
haven't been that many maritime disasters since is a tribute to
modern day shipbuilding and education/experience of ship masters.
The highly-touted 500 KHz frequency didn't save the Andrea Doria
from sinking back in 1956...or prevent the collosion with the
Stockholm. The international civil aviation community has had
121.5 MHz as an emergency frequency since 1955, several SSB
voice frequencies on HF since then for over-ocean flights.

Here in Los Angeles we just had the 10th anniversary of the Northridge
Earthquake. Widespread destruction and 60 deaths as a result. The
entire primary electrical power distribution was cut off for hours. The
area IS organized, trained, drilled for this sort of thing and it functioned
very well using the infrastructure of government-utilities-business
communications, both wireline and radio. Amateur radio did not aid
in that until about two days later. Utility crews had their hands full
trying to restore power (successful), repair damaged lines and streets,
clearing away some toppled buildings. Fire departments rolled as
needed, their stations and vehicle communications functioning fine.
Hospitals and care centers all had emergency electrical power, more
needed than "health and welfare message traffic." We survived.

>> "Independence Day" would have been
>> made anyway as a comic science-fiction vehicle for Will Smith
>> who would later wear black suits and shades.
>
>Uh-huh...even the ARS was unable to save the world from this.

From Hollywood? :-) Try the movie "Frequency."

>> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
>> belly-up anyway. Collins Radio would have continued on into
>> the military and commercial radio market without making any
>> overpriced fancy amateur radios. Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom
>> would still have been successful in the commercial and
>> government market. SGC might still exist but in the personal
>> sailing market. Ten-Tec might not exist.
>
>Without the ARS, one indeed wonders how long companies like
>Hallicrafters and National would have survived - after WWII, amateur
>radio was a large part of their market.

Not as much as you would believe. Bill Halligan's Chicago company
was busy with both prime and subcontracts for radio equipment,
including the famous BC-610 used in the SCR-299 mobile HF
station. Hallicrafters was busy with making HF radios for the
commercial and government market, not seen in popular ham
magazine ads. National Radio made a name for itself with the HRO
receivers sold also to commercial and government buyers, again not
that much advertisement in magazines. Very unlikely makers of
things got into the radio manufacture arena during WW2, such as
Lewyt Vacuum Cleaner Company who made some of the BC-339
1 KW HF transmitters I QSYed a half century ago! [name was on
the ID tag riveted to the frame...:-)]

Paul Galvin's Motorola-to-be (also in Chicago) was cranking out
the BC-1000 walkie-talkies (backpack VHF transceiver) of WW2
after stealing Dan Noble from Link, Link doing pioneering in mobile
FM radio for police departments...which led to widespread use of
mobile, channelized FM transceiver for land vehicles. Galvin was
also organizer/central-point for the number 2 priority of all U.S.
WW2 manufacturing (second only to the Manhattan Project) of
quartz crystal units. Better than a half million crystal units a
month made by over 30 U.S. companies for the last three years
of WW2...all for the military communications needs of the USA
and Great Britain.

>Could they have hung on by
>just selling radio equipment to SWLs listening to foreign commercial
>broadcasts?

No. No need. After WW2, there was a big (but not widely advertised)
push in other areas. Motorola went after the police and government
mobile FM radios along with other makers. Collins Radio, already big
enough in military-commercial radio, got a boost from SAC contracts
for single-channel SSB and various military land radios. RCA also got
into the single-channel SSB race, designed some, eventually dropped
out of much of the military market. Civil aviation got going on VHF AM
comm-nav and UHF radionav radios for aircraft after 1955 and the ICAO
decisions-allocations. Military TACAN had morphed into DME for civil
aviation, civil folks having develped VOR for bearing to ground stations.
National Radio Company continued for years to build radio systems

for the USN, past 1970. Collins continues to be a standard for excellence in aircraft systems.

Many of the makers of today's radios for commercial-government use aren't advertised in "popular" magazines because that's not a target market area. ITT in Fort Wayne, Indiana, designed (and redesigned) the SINCGARS basic small-unit land forces radio...between them and the former Land Division of General Dynamics in Florida, a quarter million sets were produced beginning in 1989. That's more than about a hundred thousand AN/PRC-25s and -77s made since the early 60s (VHF, channelized, voice only, used in Vietnam and elsewhere). One of the Hughes Aircraft divisions designed and made a bunch of the standard HF R/Ts for land forces (AN/PRC-104 for manpack version, 20 W PEP, automatic antenna tuner) beginning in 1984. There's a whole heaping glob of various military electronics produced by many since the end of WW2, too many to recount here.

Very little of that is evidenced by ads in ham magazines. Hams don't buy the stuff new and surplus radios don't generate money for the original manufacturers. It WILL be familiar to those of us who have worked in the electronics industry.

Nearly all the "radio" makers of 1945 tried their hand at TV sets for civilians. Hallicrafters did (with a push-button channel selector!), so did National Radio (I bought a 7-incher in 1949). Most dropped out in the intense competition. Eventually all the U.S. makers of TV sets went belly-up although the Indianapolis division of Thompson-CSF (the old RCA Corporation plant there) still makes some color TVs on-shore. General Radio, who long ago quit making radios in favor of precision instruments, eventually dropped out. I don't know why Hallicrafters quit or what happened to National Radio other than concentrating solely on government stuff. Collins Radio is alive and well but long out of amateur markets.

Icom, Yaesu, and Kenwood probably make more commercial-government radios than amateur equipment. Those are the triad from the Far East that beat the commercial pants off North American communications radio producers...except for some specialty divisions of General Electric and Motorola (two as an example in mobile radio market). Some of their commercial, non-amateur market radios are being sold through chains like HRO, but otherwise few amateurs get input from ham publications on that side of their business. All three do good in design and manufacture, are innovative and dare to hit the market with new things.

>Some companies may never have started up in the first place, as their
>beginnings were entirely in amateur radio.

Before or after WW2? Bill Halligan was a ham, also Art Collins, just two early examples. Collins Radio survived and prospered, Halli-crafters didn't. The reasons aren't simplistic. Business, to survive and grow, needs a lot of things and niche markets aren't successful

for the ambitious growth plans of some. Diversification may be necessary as was the growth of General Electric Company and its many divisions...RCA Corp was spun out of some of those and eventually GE bought RCA back (irony!). :-)

Whether or not specialty or niche-market companies survive depends on the founders and what they want to do. They may develop a fantastic reputation through clever PR and create an intense, loyal following, but the eventual color of bookkeeping ink can catch up to them. Adulation of customers doesn't pay bills...customers have to keep buying, write checks, not write peans of praise. Business is TOUGH.

[to be continued...]

LHA / WMD

1303. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-20 23:57:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZfjPb.32598$P%1.25738919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86079

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:HG2Pb.89209$5V2.165673@attbi_s53...
> And to really improve HF operations on ham radio...we must get rid of the
> archaic mode divisions on each band. I would like to see us have the same
> privileges as the rest of the world's amateurs enjoy....or are we not good
> enough???
>

As I mentioned in one of the other newsgroups, we need to divisions to protect us from our own rudeness. I just don't see us as being that good in following voluntary band plans in the heat of a contest or whatever. Excluding Japan, the US has more amateurs than the rest of the world combined. The rest of the world isn't too good about following band plans in contest either.

I exclude the Japanese as many of their licenses are for quite low power. In addition, many of the Japanese are inactive. They were licensed as kids and since they issue them for life, they stay in the database forever.

It is only the 40m band that is inconvenient with the current splits but the first steps to correct the situation have already taken place. Last summer's international treaty changes have directed broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and it will be allocated exclusively to amateurs world wide. I forget the implementation date though. However, perhaps eventually ITU regions 1 and 3 will eventually enjoy the extended 40m privileges that we have here in region 2 as amateurs continue to work on this issue.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1304. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:02:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <akjPb.32599$P%1.25739567@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86080

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:buj2hu$rpv@library2.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040120053547.07155.00000134@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <20040119214858.12501.00005664@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >
> > >Jim:
> > >
> > >This new ARRL Proposal is pretty much what I would expect to come out
of
> > >Newington these days.
> >
> > Except it didn't come out of Newington - it's the result of the BoD's
> vote. And
> > the BoD are from all over the country, elected by the members.
> >
>
> True indeed. However, it would be interesting to see how much
"membership"
> actually participated a) in the election of the BoD and b) how
much--because
> of that--the ARRL's decisions are actually influenced by a majority of US
> Amateur Radio Operators.
>
> Nothing wrong with the concept that the BoD represents someone, but who
they
> represent is those members of whom decide to actually be active in the
> goings-on of the ARRL; and I don't think many do. Any numbers on that?
>
>

Why single out the ARRL? Almost every organization and our national political scene is the same way. A few active people get out and vote. A few active people get out and do the work. These are the people who always have and always will shape policy. Yet those who are unwilling to vote or do the work continually whine about how they are not represented. It is the same thing throughout our society. The ARRL is not unique.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1305. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:11:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <psjPb.32601$P%1.25741009@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86081

"Harris" <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us> wrote in message
news:CycPb.5410$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
> > Oh great, I get to be an Extra by default. I had rather keep my
> > Advanced, advanced even sounds more advanced than Extra does.
>
> Yeah, my son is a Tech Plus. He was thinking of upgrading to General last
> year but didn't bother. Now he stands to get a free upgrade. The message
> is clear: Don't knock yourself out; be patient and eventually they'll give
> you everything without asking you to expend any effort.
>
> Art Harris N2AH

Actually I wonder if the ARRL petition isn't a crafty ruse. It will look good to people who want what it proposes but has high odds of being rejected by the FCC since the FCC has a long history of shooting down automatic upgrades. They get the "attaboy" for "trying" and can then lay it at the FCC's door when it fails even though they may want it to fail.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1306. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:16:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SxjPb.32602$P%1.25742284@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86082

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for
example,
> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it would
> harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>

This will crowd the CW/digital/data modes too much since there are so many US hams. It would be better to wait for the other treaty changes from the conference to take affect and synchronize Regions 1 and 3 with Region 2. You do know of course that the treaty now requires broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and that this will become an exclusive amateur allocation. I don't recall the timing but it is required in the treaty. Perhaps someday, the ITU will open up the 7.2 to 7.3 to the other regions. In the meantime, 7.150 to 7.200 could be a worldwide phone allocation. This is actually more space than either of the suggested proposals.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1307. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:31:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BLjPb.32604$P%1.25744842@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86083

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401201523.1e42a6da@posting.google.com...
>
> Oddly enough, in the years following "incentive licensing", the number
> of US hams grew like mad after having been flat through most of the
> 1960s.
>
> Go figure - they upped the requirements and ham radio grew...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The why is actually quite simple. The potential ham viewed it as being able to take the trip into ham radio in small, manageable, bitesize chunks instead of having to swallow the entire steak in one gulp. That perception is what caused the growth whether or not it represented reality.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1308. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:52:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120195253.25815.00006091@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86084

In article <5c01b95b.0401201429.6e15e8bf@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Stebe the Gnat Killer) writes:

> Not from you, Lennie. You are as heartless as anyone could be
>and still have a spontaneous pulse.

Ah, still among the living dead are you, gunnery nurse? :-)

Has the ARRL called you about that Lobby Door Greeter position?

With kindest regards for better mental health,

LHA / WMD

1309. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:52:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120195253.25815.00006092@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86085

In article <5c01b95b.0401201420.34c3e485@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Stebe, Mister Warmth) writes:

> Then I'd recommend removing your cranium from your rectum and
>passing an Amateur exam, Lennie.

Yep, you got an F in Charm School all right... :-)

LHA / WMD

1310. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:52:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120195255.25815.00006093@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86086

In article <a2fPb.16692$i4.5168@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Dwight, that's all too common in
>> computer-modem "communications,"
>> just as it is with morse code beeping
>> on ham band ragchews.
>>
>> No real clues on a person, no human
>> data input, just a lot of imagination and
>> too much concentration on the writer
>> in a public forum. Those with an
>> agenda, a hatred of something/somebody,
>> living in a quasi-fantasyland, brainwashed
>> into a different reality, are all into their
>> own "reality of sight and sound," just like
>> a Twilight Zone.
>>
>> To those too caught up in the unreality
>> don't have a hobby of ham radio anymore,
>> they have a Lifestyle and Belief. Any
>> puncturing of that fantasy will send them
>> off into paroxysms of rage, offense at
>> imagined slights, and the usual bigot's
>> demands of What is Right Should Be
>> Right. (snip)
>
> Well said, Len. I often find it amazing to read some of the messages here
>after being distracted from the newsgroup for a few days. The attitudes and
>realities here seem far out of touch with the realities of the world.

Dwight, that's what I meant about the "fantasyland." With so few clues on another person (especially with morse beeping), it's a wonderful opportunity to imagine all sorts of things about the other radio operator. :-)

Unfortunately, too many apply the same fantasy-imaginary things to a computer screen.

Blend all of that in with: (1) A NEED to belong...to something...to anything; (2) A need to VENT daily frustrations, take them out on another who cannot possibly harm the venter...and you've got the recipe for Instant Flame War. :-)

The League has constantly self-promoted itself and many have
allowed that self-promotion to brainwash them into thinking they
are this tremendous asset to the nation, are gifted radio operators
who stand ready to jump into action to save something whenever
called, and are better than ordinary people. Combined with an
honest-to-gosh Federal Certificate (suitable for framing) and they
start taking themselves sooooo seriously. They slip off reality and
enter the Twilight Zone of their imagination.

Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreational activity for personal
pleasure...but...a few NEED the status symbolism, the Titles,
all the pretty adornments to show off to others...instead of doing
an enjoyable thing with radio. As a result the U.S. got this
"incentive system" of professional-like rank-status (classes of
licenses) in an avocational amateur endeavor which is not a guild
or union or anything else but a hobby. Rank-status-privilege are
the thing, not the radio communication.

The League now wants to revisit all of that with Their Plan, complete
with emotional loading of the "Novice" name for "entrants." Gee suss,
are those 15 old men so out of touch with reality that radio is still
"new" or "mysterious" to the general population? Don't they under-
stand that radio is in widespread use in other radio services and that
there are hundreds of thousands of non-amateurs who have used
radio for years? Weird, wired apprentice-journeyman-master in a
still in a HOBBY activity!

It's like the Twilight Zone on a bad hair day...

>> U.S. amateur radio seems to be another
>> center for national misogyny. It is a hobby
>> activity engaged in largely by white males.
>
> I've thought about that many times and don't really see a problem with it.
>As long as there isn't a widespread effort to intentionally exclude, not
>everything in this world has to be all inclusive (to each his own). While
>some will obviously always want to exclude, it isn't more commonplace in
>Amateur Radio than elsewhere.

I disagree but won't press the point.

Just think of before 1960 the Civil Rights Laws. The atmosphere
might refresh the memory. Look at the pictures of hams in the
US shown in the ham publications. Check out their legal names.

The various ARCs encourage members "like them" which means
white male adults. Women are categorized as "special," not quite
on par with the men; wives are always "EX-young-ladies" regardless
of their real age. In many places it is like the 1930s and 1920s in
attitudes. Sometimes with members' radio smarts to match...even
if they've memorized every single radio ad in QST for the last 20
years.

But, all must march to the same drumbeep, close ranks and cheer the leadership. Keep those 1930s and 1920s feelings alive. Ham radio is a SERVICE and every newbie (to hamming, not radio) has to "learn their place" or the "NCOs" will have them "get down and give them twenty." Lifestylers. Narrowed in focus almost to tunnel vision.

It's not completely like that, of course...but there are just enough of the Lifestylers to allow them to force an eliteness de facto if not de jure. They don't see it even when looking in a mirror. :-)

LHA / WMD

1311. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:57:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <88kPb.17076$i4.16805@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86087

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a7dee37b.0401201141.41889167@posting.google.com...
> n2ah@hotmail.com (Art Harris) wrote in message
news:<774a2c02.0401200500.6f391383@posting.google.com>...
> > "Chuck...K1KW" wrote:
> >
> > > What really amazes me is you folks don't know what the real test is
for
> > > getting on HF!!!! You have to do it!!! That means really figuring
out how
> > > to put up the appropriate antenna, tuning it, tuning and running your
rig
> > > properly, ect.
> >
> > It can't be that hard; after all, hundreds of thousands of CBers
> > managed to get on 11 meters. Modern rigs don't require much "tuning"
> > and most newbies tend to buy pre-assembled dipoles or multiband
> > verticals. The rigs are plug and play with microphones included.
> >
> > We had a pretty good license structure in the mid '60s. Most folks
> > started with a (non-renewable) Novice ticket with very limited
> > privileges to get their feet wet. Then they upgraded to General with
> > full amateur privileges.
> >
> > That wasn't good enough for ARRL. They insisted we needed more license
> > classes and more exams (incentive licensing). FCC bought into it, and
> > we all had to upgrade or lose privileges. Now, ARRL is cheapening the
> > value of those higher class licenses they insisted we get.
> >
> > I figure that in about five years we'll have only one license class,
> > and that it will require only a single simple multiple-choice exam.
> > Will that re-energize ham radio? I doubt it.
> >
> > Art Harris N2AH
>
>
> I hope that I am not particularly out of line here, but I just passed
> my technician exam by mostly memorizing the question pool. I happen
> to learn best by doing, and while I've been studying morse code, and
> can send okay, I cannot receive very well. How much more of a "lazy,
> bum, low-brow idiot" can I be if I learn to receive and send code at a
> decent speed? (5WPM is so slow, it hurts my ears, by the way. I hate
> it. I like 10WPM most, in terms of copy.)
>

> The technician license really isn't a big deal at all. I'm seeing
> this SOLELY as an opportunity to get my feet wet, and if I wan't more,
> I'll GET more. It only took me three days of reading the first half
> of that ARRL book, and memorizing the test pool questions (though I
> did miss two). I'm anxiously awaiting my license, and looking forward
> to chatting with some folks on a repeater (I have an Icomv8000) And I
> *EXPECT* to learn more and more about this hobby by association.
>
> As soon as I get my callsign, I'm going to join the ARRL, and I'm
> STILL going to learn morse code, even if they drop it. I happen to
> think that it has practical use OUTSIDE of radio, to be honest...
> (Lights, etc...) and it's demise *IS* a tragedy. I jumped into this
> hobby at age 30, LATE in the game. The three days I've spent studying
> to take the test are a testament to my ability to MEMORIZE certain
> concepts, and while I'm proud to get to be a ham, I'm not particularly
> proud of the means. I will therefore conduct myself in the best
> manner possible at all times, and through my sincere intellectual
> pursuits in this regard, I will make my license mean more. Not
> necessarily YOUR way, I'm sure, but it's MY way.
>
> I made a promise to myself that if I wanted an upgrade to my license,
> that I would fully understand all of these critical concepts before
> proceeding forward with this hobby. I wanted to get to know the
> community, learn by doing, and go from there. I figured I'd find out
> sooner rather than later what I wanted out of this hobby. I apologize
> for my digression, but I sincerely believe that there are many such as
> myself who are interested in learning more about ham radio, AND
> putting that knowledge to use. For someone to do any serious DXing,
> they will need some kind of help making antennas, and knowing what to
> do to make them work the way you want them to. You cannot help but
> learn a thing or two when doing this. It's not all for naught.
>
> I would also like to add that until I bought my icom, I have NEVER
> touched, or personally seen a ham radio. I do not have an elmer, I
> have done every bit of this ALL BY MYSELF, with the help of only a few
> books from the ARRL. (I have until July to try and get my General,
> which I plan on doing, but... I digress)
>
> I understand the sentiments of you vets out there. The instant
> gratification crowd, you can just hear the boom boxes of that rotten
> group of "kidz" who're gonna "rock da wavez"... I won't lie to you,
> the disrespectful punks and riffraff that are bound to come on the air
> and start messing things up for everybody, but they'll eventually get
> bored of it. Ham radio *IS* dying as-is. It needs to be energized,
> and while I have mixed EMOTIONAL feelings about the "dumbing down" of
> the tests (which does cheapen the license much as our public education
> system has cheapened the high school diploma, which DID mean something
> before...) We'll still have people wanting to participate on field
> day, actively mailing out QSLs, etc... And at first you may have a few
> idiots get on HF (For God's sake, I've heard MANY an idiot on HF!)

> God knows that there are plenty on 2 meters, but I digress.)
>
> I will agree that the HF bands will be inundated, at least initially,
> with those that can only be described as "low-brows". But they'll need
> money, time, and patience setting up an HF rig, and if they have the
> patience to do all that they will at least do one of two things:
>
> a.) Get bored and quit.
> b.) Reform themselves, and become good hams.
>
> I guess a provisional c. would be that they'd become a lid, and make
> everybody mad, but even a lid (and they're semi-rare, I think) doesn't
> generally be a lid on purpose. <lol>
>
> The worst trait you can see in a ham is one that I'll admit I possess:
>
> Impatience.
>
> I spent a full day setting up my small rig and antenna, learning what
> to do, soldering for the first time in my entire life, and I haven't
> DARED press that transmit button. It is *KILLING* me that I can't
> transmit yet while I'm listening to some of these nets. There's a
> vast expanse of information just waiting to be unleased, and a nice,
> friendly community that I look very forward to joining. I look forward
> to the adventure. I'll do it right from here on in, and while I'm
> interested in morse code, I will agree that even 5WPM is a joke... It
> *IS* an insult, mostly because it SOUNDS TERRIBLE at 5WPM! I don't
> like it, in fact I hate it. 10WPM at LEAST, but I don't make the
> rules. I see morse ONLY as a practical thing to know. Not
> technologically necessary to ham radio.
>
> We're left with the ultimate reality that this nation is being
> inundated with instant gratification generation X, Y, Z, and that ham
> radio is *DYING* in America. I wasn't even EXPOSED to ham radio until
> I was 25 years old. (I wish I were exposed to it MUCH earlier! I'd
> have loved it!). It's been exclusively a money issue that's kept me
> from getting a rig set up, so when the money was there, I really
> applied myself to pass the tech exam ASAP, and once I get my feet wet,
> I've decided...
>
> 1.) I'll either go forward full force.
> 2.) I'll quit, and possibly sell my gear.
>
> I'm pretty sure that I'll choose #1, and to THAT end...
>
> My ultimate goal will be to build my own radio from scratch. Not from
> a kit, but from parts that I will have to buy myself. From a
> schematic that I will design myself. It's a worthy challenge, and one
> that I'm really not afraid of, because the laws of electricity don't
> change. All you have is what you have. If something doesn't work,

> you have only yourself to blame. <haha>
>
> Knowing this, though, at first, I will probably put together a kit
> radio to start, but my ULTIMATE goal is a homebrewed HF rig. We'll
> see how it goes, and I'm sure I'll be posting here from time to time.
>
> I have a very sincere desire to learn, and I want to learn MY way.
> I've taken advantage of the current situation, because the situation
> is there, and it has enabled me that I CAN learn my way. I'll be the
> proudest ham in the world when I achieve my first big goal of putting
> my own rig together, and if, Lord willing, I can get in the shape to
> do some serious hill climbing and DX'ing, I'll try to win me a field
> day contest.
>
> So the means to the end are how important in my case?
>
> Am I wrong to be proud to be a ham now? It's still going to be a
> close-knit fraternity. The idiots who will go on the air to jam, and
> to make body cavity noises will still be there, but if continued
> interest can be generated... I don't see this as a bad thing. (God,
> I've only studied code a week, and can send A-Z, 0-9, and some basic
> punctuation marks... And that's at 15 WPM, COPYING is another
> story..)
>
> Again I digress, and I blither... I hope to catch some of you on the
> air someday, and I hope you understand my love and interest in this
> hobby is sincere. The blood doesn't get much newer than this. I'm
> still waiting for my callsign.
>
> With all respect, and sincere admiration to you vets out there.
>
> 73
>
> DJM

No, you are doing just fine. For what its worth I welcome you to the fold.

Dan/W4NTI

1312. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 00:57:58 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <q8kPb.109067$8H.228092@attbi_s03>
Source record: 86088

> And to really improve HF operations on ham radio...we must get rid of the
> archaic mode divisions on each band. I would like to see us have the same
> privileges as the rest of the world's amateurs enjoy....or are we not good
> enough???
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW

Huh ???? Yepper I would like the Liberty Net right at say 7040 when I operate QRP . Yes that will make it a real challenge. Maybe we could get certificates for being able to copy 5 letters in a row. You are absolutely right Chuck .....I need to hear about someone's gall bladder while I am on with another CW station ...a real "improvement" for ham radio. Ya know I also need to hear some foul mouths while I am running the Pactor as I am not getting enough porno on my e-mail listing. Yep it is archaic all right ...but it does maintain my ham radio sanity if there is such a thing. But wait I could go out an buy a 1kw amp so I could enjoy my mode of operation and at the same time be a positive force for hamming by getting into the retired school teacher's organ next door. Boy this is opening a whole new world of enjoyment for me to contemplate.

Are there not enough fone frequencies to communicate on? Are not the CW segments just as dead as the phone segments when the band is out? God bless you if you want to operate fone ...have a good time but the idea has gone beyond booting the test to booting the mode. Then I would have to ask the question why. There must be some pretty deep seated hatred out there of CW and CW ops. But in the final analysis I guess my love of an elegant, narrow banded and relaxing mode should give way to the "gall bladder" kws ...to do otherwise would selfish on my part.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

ps in answer to you last question ...we are better for it....

1313. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 01:02:23 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <9lhr00998k8cg4qtm1t2hv0mjuir8q0co5@4ax.com>
Source record: 86089

On 20 Jan 2004 23:24:16 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <36gq00hqf30ulj3fdu7b9dg2am9fhqpffi@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>That's one way of looking at it, Jim. To me, it looks like a purely
>>political move - that is, trying to please the greatest number of
>>members...and voters...and customers...
>>
>>400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
>>Drop code = some number of happy new HF - using members.
>>Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
>>members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
>>code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
>>additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd, I'd say...but it
>>does make the Extra level licence harder to get - that's what
>>everybody wants, right?).
>
> The problem is that the 15 old men of the BoD have just
> disenfranchised themselves from over 200K Technician class
> licensees who will now carry the wonderful class name of
> "Novice."
>
> The ARRL has less than 170K members now. The number of
> existing Tech class licensees here is greater than that now.
> Those aren't likely to become members to support a group that
> thinks they are all "Novices."
>
> NOT good PR to attract membership.

True enough - I'd sure hate to give up the title of "Technician" for
"Novice". People would think that I became a Nun....well, some
might....

>
>>-and- the big one:
>>
>>New entry level licence with 100W on HF phone, plus simplified test =
>>a whole bunch of happy new potential ARRL members = lots more
>>potential members....and voters....and customers.....
>
> "Customers" they already got. Membership is lagging.
>
> ARRL is down to a measly $12 million annual budget (according
> to the IRS forms).

>
>>All of these proposals are good news for the manufacturers of ham
>>equipment, and perhaps for us too - if demand is increased, production
>>will increase and prices of HF radios might do down!
>
> ...and Ten-Tec Orion software might finally be completed...:-)

LOL!

>
>>Plus, each one of the above members that got something additional
>>added to their privileges if this proposal is accepted would have the
>>ARRL to thank for it. In theory, anyway.
>>
>>Considering that, following the ITU decision to make code optional
>>most of the world is moving towards removing the mandatory Morse Code
>>requirement outright, there isn't much else that they could do without
>>looking like defenders the status quo, and annoying even more of their
>>members....and denying them the rights being granted to their fellow
>>amateur radio neighbours in the rest of the world.
>
> They could have changed the Tech class name to something
> they must be thinking of...like "Scum of Radio" or "Not Real
> Ham" class.
>
> When the BoD met, they must have arrived with their baggage
> intact. Emotional baggage.
>
>>Like, for instance, those just north of you have proposed to do - and
>>that's likely to happen fairly soon, I expect.
>
> I hope that powers-that-be in Canada are with those of us in this
> millennium, not the fantasyland of olden days as in the League.

The system up here is different. We are not structured in "classes"
like the US model, per se. There are (at present) two licence
classifications - Basic and Advanced - and a 5 wpm Morse Code
endorsement. Each licence gives the user operating priviliges in line
with their technical knowledge.

"Basic" allows full access to all frequencies above 30 MHz - add the
Morse endorsement, and they have full access to all of the amateur
radio spectrum, including the US Extra subbands :oO) . There are
reasonable output power limits, all transmitting equipment must be
commercially built specifically for the Amateur service (no kits), and
they are not allowed to sponsor or act as control operator of a club
repeater. (and a few others).

Pass the "Advanced" test, and these restrictions are removed. You are
assumed to have proven that you have the technical knowledge required
to operate high power equipment safely, or construct (and understand)
your own transmitters, etc. In theory, anyway.

It is possible to hold an Advanced licence without Morse Code - they are not linked in any way. Because of this, there isn't nearly as much of the "I'm better than you" mentality here - an Advanced without code has less operating spectrum than a Basic with code, but he may only be interested in operating the local club 2-meter repeater - different goals, different licence. Different attitude.

Our ARRL equivalent, the Radio Amateurs of Canada, has proposed to retire code completely, and increase the level of knowledge demonstrated on tests to improve the quality of folks entering the hobby. An additional level has been proposed - "Intermediate", which would be the first level allowed HF access here. Testing for this level would eventually be geared towards specific knowledge required to operate on HF. I'm not a fan of this one - I'd prefer that if Code is to be dropped, then drop it and allow those without the Code endorsement full access to HF. Makes more sense than trying to create an artificial middle licence - HF really isn't difficult enough to use to warrant it, I'd say. I figured it out :)

What will happen is anyone's guess - but there is no rigid class structure here, and most of the hams that I have spoken to feel that there won't be any mandatory Morse here for much longer either...that is just as emotional an issue here as in the US, BTW - but only an emotional one, all the same. The world is changing, and we have to keep up!

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1314. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 01:07:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <5ujr00tcqhfs22tceeo1jjf72119nl3tej@4ax.com>
Source record: 86090

On 20 Jan 2004 23:24:20 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented
>>on previously, so here goes:
>>
>>On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:05 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms - [continued]
>
>>> 8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on
>>> approximately the same scale and still trying to privatize
>>> commercial operator testing to save money. Radio use by
>>> non-hams after 1934 grew sufficiently large to require the
>>> agency to continue.
>>
>>I believe that they would, along with IC and all of the other national
>>regulatory agencies. It's a vast spectrum, and most of their energies
>>are directed towards management of the commercial sector.
>
> That's where the majority of users exist and that is how it should
> be (to me).
>
>>> 9. "CB" would have been created anyway, a fore-runner of the
>>> license-free personal radio wave of the future. [it is 46 years
>>> old in our universe which already has FRS, R-C, cordless
>>> telephones and wireless gizmos of all kinds]
>>
>>Probably - people love to communicate! Folks would have seen the
>>cabbies, police and other commercial operators using 2-way radio
>>equipment, many ex-military guys would have experienced using the
>>technology first hand, and would have wanted the same type of system
>>for themselves. (in the pre-cellular telephone days, anyway...). And,
>>if there's a market, somebody would have developed it!
>
> Did you say "market?" :-)
>
> One in three Americans has a cell phone subscription; according
> to our Census Bureau. Yet, a decade earlier we all got along just
> fine with a relative handful of cell users. With the marketing blitz
> still on-going for cell phone handsets, various user plans, all sorts
> of attachments (including a little hands-free earphone-microphone

> with its own little two-way radio), I'd say the marketeers have
> pretty well established that side of telephony.
>
> One in three Americans means a quantity of about 100 million.
> At the end of 2004 some forecasters have predicted a worldwide
> cellular telephone useage of over 2 billion units!
>
> Think of it...2 billion little two-way radios...and not a single user
> is required to test for any license or know morse code. :-)
>
> And NONE of them "owe" any technology even remotely to
> "amateur radio pioneering or innovation." Many U.S. hams speak
> with contempt of the VHF and above region ("shack on the belt"
> is a typical comment of our remaining newsgroupie bus driver).
> Cell phones (in the U.S.) run at 900+ MHz.
>
> People DO love to communicate, obvious to anyone at an airport
> (among many venues)...even in supermarkets. Should be nothing
> wrong with that except for the few that insist, nay demand, terrible
> adherence to HOW the communication is done...along with
> "official granting" of license, a permission to communicate. :-)
>
>>> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
>>> bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent.
>>> Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign
>>> behind their names to show how good and expert they were in
>>> "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more
>>> fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).
>>
>>Personally, I don't view my license as a measure of my expertise in
>>the art of radio. As my examiner told me when he shook my hand after
>>I passed the test - it's a license to learn.
>>
>>Nothing more.
>
> I think that is a mentally healthy outlook on a recreational activity.
>
> Obviously some Ham Lifestylers in here will disagree. Those love
> to endlessly self-enoble themselves as "members of a service,"
> apparently thinking they are an asset to the nation. They are simply
> making an asset of themselves.
>
> I am greatly amused by the U.S.A. population's apparent NEED for
> royal titles of any kind, status, position, quasi-nobility, and all other
> alphabet soup kinds of name add-ons. Was only 228 years ago that
> the U.S.A. declared itself "free" of royalty. Yet, here we are now with
> some desperately clinging to a "higher royal class" of labeling. :-)
>
> For those cling-ons, the U.S. amateur radio "incentive plan" was a
> godsend establishing all those classes of license. To them the

> incentive was to "upgrade" so they could sneer with contempt at all
> the lower forms of ham life. Many still do, more's the pity. [some
> have a visceral need to attack the preceived inferior ones, a mental
> sickness which I doubt will cease in any form of human activity...:-( ]
>
> Nice discussing something with you, Leo. [others will disagree...:-)]

Len, I must admit that I fully agree. It took me over a half hour to
read through and absorb all of the information that you presented in
your three replies on this subject. That's an excellent depth of
knowledge you have there...

I learned a great deal, stand corrected on a couple of points, and am
following up on the Web on some of your referencess for more
information - fascinating stuff!

Much appreciated!

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1315. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 01:34:54 UTC
From: "Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2HkPb.17214$q4.15794@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86091
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"N8KDV" <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net> wrote

| Steve (Hopeful future Lord of Something)
| Holland, MI

I've already applied for "Lord of Boobies."

Sorry, OM.

73,

Steve Lawrence
Burnsville, MN

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.561 / Virus Database: 353 - Release Date: 1/13/04

1316. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 01:40:38 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <bukr00p145iv5l8srp5veaj499sqj8cnj0@4ax.com>
Source record: 86092

On 20 Jan 2004 23:24:27 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
> Some good thoughts there, Leo. I'll add to my previous comments.
>
>>This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented
>>on previously, so here goes:
>>
>>On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:05 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>>>
>>> 1. There would be NO ARRL to provide "guidance" and direction.
>>> That expired before St. Hiram expired. [in this alternative
>>> universe] Newington, CT, would have no museum.
>>
>>True - no AR, no ARRL. Mr. Maxim would be remembered only as the
>>inventor of the Maxim Silencer for explosive weapons, and for his work
>>on automobile silencers (mufflers, I assume).
>>
>>However, following along with the subject of the thread - the startup
>>of a "new" Amateur Radio Service" would concievably attract a lot of
>>people to it - an organization starting up to represent them and their
>>interests (and take their money) seems like a given.
>
> In the wider world of early radio organizations (see Thomas H.
> White's very notable web pages as well as print history), ARRL
> was a relative latecomer in amateur radio. The one thing they
> can claim is having survived the early competition in the USA.
>
> [I'll have to use the USA as a reference here, no slight intended
> against Canada, only against my meager knowledge of Canadian
> amateur activities of earlier times]

None taken - I haven't found much historical information on amateur
radio up here, so my own knowledge in this area is in the meager
department as well....
>
> ARRL, by their own history, began as a local New England radio
> club largely organized for relaying telegraphy messages
> quicker than was provided by commercial carriers. In reality that
> is a form of "hacking" hardly different than the CD music stealing
> that went on through the Internet in modern times. So, the 3-man

> club got more locals and "organized" in 1914. The Radio Club of
> America had already existed for 5 years and some of the RCA
> members were very involved in amateur radio activities. [first to
> use acronym 'RCA' but not aligned with RCA Corporation that once
> was] The local ARRL club was small in 1914 and many national
> clubs for amateur radio were much larger in membership.
>
> The "League" effectively used PR and promotional techniques to
> expand, slowly adding on news and technical publications. It had
> very little of what it eventually became. Intense self-promotion
> (League publications themselves are excellent vehicles to do such
> things) kept their name/organization in everyone's mind. It fostered
> an image in many minds to make up for the generally solitary
> activity of one amateur listening for hours to static in hopes of
> capturing a weak telegraphic signal. Technology of radio was still
> quite primitive. The first two attempts at trans-national (USA)
> message relay were disappointing failures. Nonetheless, the ARRL
> kept up the PR and eventually made it through the competition for
> "national amateur representation." Competition included the
> formidable base of Hugo Gernsback's little publishing empire and
> his own attempts at building an amateur radio organization.
>
> The key element in establishing the ARRL was Maxim's own
> funded lobbying in DC after WW1 to restore U.S. amateur radio.
> That worked, amazingly enough, and became the stuff of legend
> in much later League self-promotion...even 86 years later.
> Maxim became "president for life" of the ARRL and "served"
> until the 1930s. Sort of a private little empire which happens in
> all organizations eventually. That's not to decry Maxim's
> efforts but, in order to be fair, one cannot pin 'altruism' on Maxim's
> "service to the League." He was instrumental in starting it and no
> doubt was self-possessive about it.
>
> With radio technology still not climbing the steep walls of
> exponential leaps and bounds in electronics technology in 1920,
> ARRL publications were about the only trade news available to
> the everyman hobbyist at that time. There was very little of the
> information media bonanza we all enjoy today. Knowledge took
> time to spread. League publications helped that since they weren't
> involved in patent disputes (many, many in the 1920s, 1930s) or
> various groups' attempts to control radio or trade secret
> developments that industry was jealously guarding. ARRL pubs
> were an EXCELLENT vehicle, a medium for self-promotion and the
> League didn't hesitate one bit to keep on promoting itself.
>
>>> 2. There would be NO morse code test since no other radio
>>> service except Maritime Radio used morse code. There
>>> would be NO need to keep a "pool of trained morse radio
>>> operators" for any national need.
>>

>>True enough - if amateur radio were invented today, it's pretty
>>unlikely that Morse Code would be a mandatory requirement or play any
>>significant role - it's a dead technology in the commercial and
>>military world today (just spies and some covert military ops remain
>>professional users of morse signalling today). I believe that it
>>would be a 'special interest' thing for people who wanted to play
>>around with it.
>
> There are MANY and varied groups of hobbyists involved in
> electronics today and many of those existed before personal
> computers began. "High fidelity" music/sound was one though it has
> shrunk to a niche market now. Robotics in general seems to be
> the latest in interest, merging microcontrollers and machinery in lots
> of different forms. Keyboard synthesizers had been a big thing with
> the first of the lower-cost personal computers, but now simplified into
> commercially-available programmable music machines. A close
> look into the availability of parts and materials at various smaller
> merchandizers on websites will show that there is great interest in
> electronics-oriented experimentation and hobby work besides just
> radio communications. Merchants are a good barometer of where
> the hobby work goes on...it's a cruel market where only the larger
> interests survive (regardless of individual favorites)...merchants can't
> pay bills with altruism. :-)
>
>>I wonder, though, if in the absence of Amateur Radio, something else
>>might have evolved to meet the need of having extra trained people
>>available? Perhaps an auxillary (and voluntary) communications corps,
>>mobilized by the military or local government during times of need?
>>They might even provide the equipment and training...wouldn't be free,
>>though - Amateur Radio doesn't cost them much (if anything) to
>>mobilize.
>
> I personally doubt it on scales larger than local, urban groups.
> Radio - on the larger scale of human activities - is an established
> medium of communications used by government and business on
> a large scale. It's not a mystery or magic that it once appeared to
> be in the 1920s or 1930s. Radio is far more widespread in society
> of the USA than all of amateur radio in North America.
>
> Use of a radio is ridiculously easy with existing radio equipment of
> the 1960s era, not just that of the 2000s. Government and business
> HTs on VHF-UHF are more numerous than amateur HTs in the USA
> and have been so for more than 30 years. What is needed, if anything,
> is the coordination of groups involved in "needy operations," the
> control-and-response protocols, organizational structures to get the
> various tasks done. That doesn't need specialized "radio training,"
> just group organization. Police and fire people use radios every day
> without any special classes in radio innards, often with just a few
> minutes of personalized instruction.
>

>>> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings because
>>> there would be no old-timers left to tell the tales...only
>>> pretenders who longed for a simpler (mythical) life way back
>>> before they were born.
>>
>>Well, there would still be old timers telling tales - just not ham
>>radio ones ;)
>
> Of course! That's a given. :-)
>
> Especially those bitter about not having the opportunity to do big-
> leagues communications on HF a half century ago. <bseg, lol>

...caught that ;)

>
>>> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway and several movies made
>>> about that tragedy.
>>
>>Unfortunately, yes. And many other unfortunate events may well have
>>become much disasters or have increased in magnitude, as there would
>>have been far less people monitoring the bands and detecting /
>>relaying emergency traffic if the ARS had not existed.
>
> Would there be? That MIGHT be true in 1912, 92 years ago and 2
> years before the ARRL existed. The international martime distress
> frequency of 500 KHz had not yet been implemented in 1912. The
> distance to land was not that great and the radios of that time were
> not sensitive in receiving although some of the spark transmitters
> where "high power." Had that happened in the much larger Pacific,
> farther from land, or in the southern Atlantic or Indian Ocean, it
> might have been a whole different story.
>
> Pro-coders are quick on the trigger to trot out OLD tales of "need
> to relay traffic" when there is NO need to relay any traffic today or
> even four decades ago. GMDSS was implemented by the Maritime
> Community to replace the old 500 KHz Autoalarms. That there
> haven't been that many maritime disasters since is a tribute to
> modern day shipbuilding and education/experience of ship masters.
> The highly-touted 500 KHz frequency didn't save the Andrea Doria
> from sinking back in 1956...or prevent the collosion with the
> Stockholm. The international civil aviation community has had
> 121.5 MHz as an emergency frequency since 1955, several SSB
> voice frequencies on HF since then for over-ocean flights.
>
> Here in Los Angeles we just had the 10th anniversary of the Northridge
> Earthquake. Widespread destruction and 60 deaths as a result. The
> entire primary electrical power distribution was cut off for hours. The
> area IS organized, trained, drilled for this sort of thing and it functioned
> very well using the infrastructure of government-utilities-business
> communications, both wireline and radio. Amateur radio did not aid

> in that until about two days later. Utility crews had their hands full
> trying to restore power (successful), repair damaged lines and streets,
> clearing away some toppled buildings. Fire departments rolled as
> needed, their stations and vehicle communications functioning fine.
> Hospitals and care centers all had emergency electrical power, more
> needed than "health and welfare message traffic." We survived.
>
>>> "Independence Day" would have been
>>> made anyway as a comic science-fiction vehicle for Will Smith
>>> who would later wear black suits and shades.
>>
>>Uh-huh...even the ARS was unable to save the world from this.
>
> From Hollywood? :-) Try the movie "Frequency."
>
>>> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
>>> belly-up anyway. Collins Radio would have continued on into
>>> the military and commercial radio market without making any
>>> overpriced fancy amateur radios. Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom
>>> would still have been successful in the commercial and
>>> government market. SGC might still exist but in the personal
>>> sailing market. Ten-Tec might not exist.
>>
>>Without the ARS, one indeed wonders how long companies like
>>Hallicrafters and National would have survived - after WWII, amateur
>>radio was a large part of their market.
>
> Not as much as you would believe. Bill Halligan's Chicago company
> was busy with both prime and subcontracts for radio equipment,
> including the famous BC-610 used in the SCR-299 mobile HF
> station. Hallicrafters was busy with making HF radios for the
> commercial and government market, not seen in popular ham
> magazine ads. National Radio made a name for itself with the HRO
> receivers sold also to commercial and government buyers, again not
> that much advertisement in magazines. Very unlikely makers of
> things got into the radio manufacture arena during WW2, such as
> Lewyt Vacuum Cleaner Company who made some of the BC-339
> 1 KW HF transmitters I QSYed a half century ago! [name was on
> the ID tag riveted to the frame...:-)]

I have always been amazed at the versatility of some of the companies
engaged in WWII production - it would be no small feat for a company
manufacturing vacuum cleaners to retool their lines and train / hire
staff to build a 1 KW radio transmitter to mil spec.

...or the Rock-Ola Jukebox Company cranking out M1 Carbines.

Incredible!

>
> Paul Galvin's Motorola-to-be (also in Chicago) was cranking out

> the BC-1000 walkie-talkies (backpack VHF transceiver) of WW2
> after stealing Dan Noble from Link, Link doing pioneering in mobile
> FM radio for police departments...which led to widespread use of
> mobile, channelized FM transceiver for land vehicles. Galvin was
> also organizer/central-point for the number 2 priority of all U.S.
> WW2 manufacturing (second only to the Manhattan Project) of
> quartz crystal units. Better than a half million crystal units a
> month made by over 30 U.S. companies for the last three years
> of WW2...all for the military communications needs of the USA
> and Great Britain.
>
>>Could they have hung on by
>>just selling radio equipment to SWLs listening to foreign commercial
>>broadcasts?
>
> No. No need. After WW2, there was a big (but not widely advertised)
> push in other areas. Motorola went after the police and government
> mobile FM radios along with other makers. Collins Radio, already big
> enough in military-commercial radio, got a boost from SAC contracts
> for single-channel SSB and various military land radios. RCA also got
> into the single-channel SSB race, designed some, eventually dropped
> out of much of the military market. Civil aviation got going on VHF AM
> comm-nav and UHF radionav radios for aircraft after 1955 and the ICAO
> decisions-allocations. Military TACAN had morphed into DME for civil
> aviation, civil folks having develped VOR for bearing to ground stations.
> National Radio Company continued for years to build radio systems
> for the USN, past 1970. Collins continues to be a standard for
> excellence in aircraft systems.
>
> Many of the makers of today's radios for commercial-government use
> aren't advertised in "popular" magazines because that's not a target
> market area. ITT in Fort Wayne, Indiana, designed (and redesigned)
> the SINCGARS basic small-unit land forces radio...between them and
> the former Land Division of General Dynamics in Florida, a quarter
> million sets were produced beginning in 1989. That's more than about
> a hundred thousand AN/PRC-25s and -77s made since the early 60s
> (VHF, channelized, voice only, used in Vietnam and elsewhere). One
> of the Hughes Aircraft divisions designed and made a bunch of the
> standard HF R/Ts for land forces (AN/PRC-104 for manpack version,
> 20 W PEP, automatic antenna tuner) beginning in 1984. There's a
> whole heaping glob of various military electronics produced by many
> since the end of WW2, too many to recount here.
>
> Very little of that is evidenced by ads in ham magazines. Hams
> don't buy the stuff new and surplus radios don't generate money for
> the original manufacturers. It WILL be familiar to those of us who
> have worked in the electronics industry.
>
> Nearly all the "radio" makers of 1945 tried their hand at TV sets for
> civilians. Hallicrafters did (with a push-button channel selector!), so

> did National Radio (I bought a 7-incher in 1949). Most dropped out
> in the intense competition. Eventually all the U.S. makers of TV
> sets went belly-up although the Indianapolis division of Thompson-
> CSF (the old RCA Corporation plant there) still makes some color
> TVs on-shore. General Radio, who long ago quit making radios in
> favor of precision instruments, eventually dropped out. I don't know
> why Hallicrafters quit or what happened to National Radio other than
> concentrating solely on government stuff. Collins Radio is alive and
> well but long out of amateur markets.
>
> Icom, Yaesu, and Kenwood probably make more commercial-
> government radios than amateur equipment. Those are the triad
> from the Far East that beat the commercial pants off North American
> communications radio producers...except for some specialty
> divisions of General Electric and Motorola (two as an example in
> mobile radio market). Some of their commercial, non-amateur
> market radios are being sold through chains like HRO, but otherwise
> few amateurs get input from ham publications on that side of their
> business. All three do good in design and manufacture, are
> innovative and dare to hit the market with new things.
>
>>Some companies may never have started up in the first place, as their
>>beginnings were entirely in amateur radio.
>
> Before or after WW2? Bill Halligan was a ham, also Art Collins, just
> two early examples. Collins Radio survived and prospered, Halli-
> crafters didn't. The reasons aren't simplistic. Business, to survive
> and grow, needs a lot of things and niche markets aren't successful
> for the ambitious growth plans of some. Diversification may be
> necessary as was the growth of General Electric Company and its
> many divisions...RCA Corp was spun out of some of those and
> eventually GE bought RCA back (irony!). :-)
>
> Whether or not specialty or niche-market companies survive depends
> on the founders and what they want to do. They may develop a
> fantastic reputation through clever PR and create an intense, loyal
> following, but the eventual color of bookkeeping ink can catch up to
> them. Adulation of customers doesn't pay bills...customers have to
> keep buying, write checks, not write peans of praise. Business is
> TOUGH.
>
> [to be continued...]
>
> LHA / WMD

1317. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 01:48:03 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bukloe$a86@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86093

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401201428.6366ed9@posting.google.com...
>
> Then let her choose an appropriate callsign.
>

I (W5TIT) have an appropriate callsign (W5TIT). The word "tit" (not the callsign W5TIT) is not (the word tit) appropriate for use on the amateur radio bands (but the callsign W5TIT is). And, the word "tit" is *not* used on the amateur radio bands. Well, not that I (W5TIT) know of anyway. The callsign W5TIT is used on the amateur radio bands and is quite an appropriate callsign (W5TIT that is).

How can I (W5TIT) be more appropriate than that?

Kim W5TIT

1318. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 01:54:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <eqmr00dvtgo828nd4linl180ukutfjl26f@4ax.com>
Source record: 86094

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 19:48:03 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>
>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0401201428.6366ed9@posting.google.com...
>>
>> Then let her choose an appropriate callsign.
>>
>
>I (W5TIT) have an appropriate callsign (W5TIT). The word "tit" (not the
>callsign W5TIT) is not (the word tit) appropriate for use on the amateur
>radio bands (but the callsign W5TIT is). And, the word "tit" is *not* used
>on the amateur radio bands. Well, not that I (W5TIT) know of anyway. The
>callsign W5TIT is used on the amateur radio bands and is quite an
>appropriate callsign (W5TIT that is).
>
>How can I (W5TIT) be more appropriate than that?

Fully agreed, Kim.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
73, Leo

1319. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 02:09:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040120210943.21232.00003705@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86095

In article <9lhr00998k8cg4qtm1t2hv0mjuir8q0co5@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 20 Jan 2004 23:24:16 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <36gq00hqf30ulj3fdu7b9dg2am9fhqpffi@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>That's one way of looking at it, Jim. To me, it looks like a purely
>>>political move - that is, trying to please the greatest number of
>>>members...and voters...and customers...
>>>
>>>400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
>>>Drop code = some number of happy new HF - using members.
>>>Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
>>>members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
>>>code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
>>>additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd, I'd say...but it
>>>does make the Extra level licence harder to get - that's what
>>>everybody wants, right?).
>>
>> The problem is that the 15 old men of the BoD have just
>> disenfranchised themselves from over 200K Technician class
>> licensees who will now carry the wonderful class name of
>> "Novice."

Leo,

Lest anyone be confused, the above statement is not correct. It
is in error, mistaken, false, misleading and just plain wrong.

The ARRL proposal wants existing Technicians to get a
free upgrade to General, not a downgrade to Novice.

Direct quote from ARRL:

"The middle group of licensees--Technician, Tech Plus (Technician
with Element 1 credit) and General--would be merged into a new
General license that also would not require a Morse examination.
Current Technician and Tech Plus license holders automatically would
gain current General class privileges without additional testing."

Truth triumphs over error once again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1320. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:15:38 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9476E2674DCD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86096

Harris <aharris@bookworm.suffolk.lib.ny.us> wrote in
news:oUcPb.5411$5M.135513@dfw-read.news.verio.net:

> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:
>
>> Harris wrote:
>> >5 WPM for Extra Class is an insult, not a tip of the hat. The Extra
>> >Class ticket grants exclusive 25 kHz CW segments on 80, 40, 20, and
>> >15 meters. These are prime DX frequencies and the proposal doesn't
>> >change that. A higher speed code test for Extra would be more
>> >appropriate.
>
>> Oops again!
>
>> Being that the requirement was dropped fairly recently to 5 wpm, and
>> that other countries are dropping code altogether as a requirement,
>> how could the ARRL justify an increase in speed?
>
> They probably won't. But if Extra is the top class and the only one to
> retain a code test, why not make it realistic one? A 5 WPM test does
> not demonstrate code proficiency. A 13 WPM test would be a nice "Tip of
> the hat." We 20 WPM Extras haven't had much to cheer about in a LONG
> time!
>
> Art Harris N2AH

Speak for yourself

1321. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:35:29 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9476E5C56E9DAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86097

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
news:q8kPb.109067$8H.228092@attbi_s03:

>
>> And to really improve HF operations on ham radio...we must get rid of
>> the archaic mode divisions on each band. I would like to see us have
>> the same privileges as the rest of the world's amateurs enjoy....or
>> are we not good enough???
>>
>> 73,
>> Chuck...K1KW
>
> Huh ???? Yepper I would like the Liberty Net right at say 7040 when I
> operate QRP . Yes that will make it a real challenge. Maybe we could
> get certificates for being able to copy 5 letters in a row. You are
> absolutely right Chuck .....I need to hear about someone's gall bladder
> while I am on with another CW station ...a real "improvement" for ham
> radio. Ya know I also need to hear some foul mouths while I am running
> the Pactor as I am not getting enough porno on my e-mail listing. Yep
> it is archaic all right ...but it does maintain my ham radio sanity if
> there is such a thing. But wait I could go out an buy a 1kw amp so I
> could enjoy my mode of operation and at the same time be a positive
> force for hamming by getting into the retired school teacher's organ
> next door. Boy this is opening a whole new world of enjoyment for me
> to contemplate.
>
> Are there not enough fone frequencies to communicate on? Are not the
> CW segments just as dead as the phone segments when the band is out?
> God bless you if you want to operate fone ...have a good time but the
> idea has gone beyond booting the test to booting the mode. Then I
> would have to ask the question why. There must be some pretty deep
> seated hatred out there of CW and CW ops. But in the final analysis I
> guess my love of an elegant, narrow banded and relaxing mode should
> give way to the "gall bladder" kws ...to do otherwise would selfish on
> my part.
>
> God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>
> ps in answer to you last question ...we are better for it....
>
>
>

It isn't that we don't have enough 'fone' spectrum as you call it, we do.
No, the problem is that we can't operate phone on all the frequencies that

the DX can. This is true on 80, 40, 20 and 15 (30 too, but let's not go there).

On 40 it is worse, as we have none of the frequencies available in Region 1 (Europe and Africa). This latter problem will eventually be fixed as 7100-7200 will eventually be worldwide.

As you don't work phone DX I wouldn't really expect you to be aware of this, much less care, but there it is. I have no more desire than you do to see any 'gallbladder nets' further down the bands.

1322. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:39:59 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9476E68909B1Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86098

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:HVcPb.20602$zj7.12312
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
> < As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains
> on
> < the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level licence
> is
> < called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
>
> There is no such law.
>
> As an incentive to stimulate interest, the ARRL VEC (maybe others)
> adopted a policy of waiving the authorized charge for the Novice
> examination. W5YI VEC (for one) tossed a hissy fit and tried to
> convince FCC to require a fee, but the FCC declined to make it
> mandatory.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
```

That's not what I read. As far as I know it is in a law that was sponsored by the late Senator Barry Goldwater, K7UGA.

1323. "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:47:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040120224712.25815.00006104@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86100

In article <bukloe$a86@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>I (W5TIT) have an appropriate callsign (W5TIT). The word "tit" (not the
>callsign W5TIT) is not (the word tit) appropriate for use on the amateur
>radio bands (but the callsign W5TIT is). And, the word "tit" is *not* used
>on the amateur radio bands. Well, not that I (W5TIT) know of anyway. The
>callsign W5TIT is used on the amateur radio bands and is quite an
>appropriate callsign (W5TIT that is).
>
>How can I (W5TIT) be more appropriate than that?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Yeah, it's so "appropriate" that Riley Hollingsworth said that your decision to
request such a call sign has the potential to bring the ARS "...one step closer
to extinction."
Somehow, I think I value his judgement much more than yours.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1324. Re: Ham Radio needs a REAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:47:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040120224713.25815.00006105@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86001

In article <20040120000218.27149.00000286@mb-m11.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

> Group to support them, it sure as hell isnt the ARRL.

Bruce:

Sure it is. All we need to do is impose term limits on the Board of Directors and the Section Managers, and get some new thinking involved in the League leadership every few years or so. However, since the BoD makes decisions on such policy matters, do you think it will happen? As Lennie Anderson would say,

BWWWWAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHAAAAAAAAAHHHHAAAAAA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1325. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:47:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040120224713.25815.00006106@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86099

In article <buicds$5m6@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Oh, I don't know that he had any correspondence with the FCC; in fact I
>highly doubt it. The Riley Hollingsworth email was a direct response from
>him to me, and Larry has treasured it ever since :)
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

There's no doubt about that! It takes pride of place among my archive of gems
from my years on rrap, and there are very few of them, indeed! I hereby thank
you for providing it, and subsequently verifying it's authenticity.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1326. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:48:40 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86002

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>> >>@posting.google.com:
>> >>
>> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>> >>>
>> >>> Summary:
>> >>>
>> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>> >>
>> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
>> >>would reintroduce a free licence class.
>> >
>> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>> >
>>
>> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains
>> on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level
>> licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
>>
>> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
>> thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought
>> about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open
>> and it could be called something else.
>
> Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since no
> new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a moot
> point.
>
> But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
>>
>> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the
>> > entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
>> > privileges, but more HF privileges.

>> >
>> >>Provided the new class that happened to
>> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
>> >>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>> >
>> > Why?
>>
>> I thought the old Novice was too easy
>
> Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13 was
> adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first station was
> homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license started me on the
> path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about 3 years and BSEE in
> a little over 8 years....
>
> And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
> keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
> more, isn't that just about perfect?
>
>> > Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech
>> > Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between
>> > above and below 30 MHz privileges.
>>
>> So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
>
> How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for
> all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
> parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs
> proposed for the Novice?
>>
>> >>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>> >>
>> >>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>> >
>> > Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
>> > receiving.
>>
>> Won't happen
>
> Probably not, but it's still a good idea.
>>
>> >>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be
>> >>dumped.
>> >
>> > It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to
>> > use manufactured equipment.
>>
>> Not in my opinion
>
> It's the same argument used against the code test. Why *must* a ham

> learn all that theory to use manufactured, approved gear with no
> critical adjustments? Heck, most ham gear today won't transmit out
> of band unless modified!
>>
>> >>Moreover, it can be now,
>> >>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>> >>
>> > FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>>
>> I think they will too
>
> Unfortunately
>>
>> >>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>> >>
>> >>OK
>> >
>> > Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as
>> > has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>>
>> Can't stand loose ends
>
> What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
> 1967
> even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
> additional
> privileges at all.
>
>> >>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>> >>
>> >>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>> >>
>> > Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to
>> > Extra, but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to
>> > General?
>> >
>> > What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not
>> > the other?
>>
>> As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech, which
>> is already pretty easy
>
> Exactly. But that doesn't answer the question. You want Advanceds to
> get free upgrades to avoid ~82,000 loose ends, but not Techs and Tech
> pluses, who would
> amount to ~322,000 loose ends.
>
> I don't see why one and not the other.
>
>> >>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly

>> >>
>> >>Good.
>> >
>> > Bad.
>> >
>> >> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>> >
>> > That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>>
>> Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
>> spectrum to phone
>
> Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital voice?
>
>> >>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>> >>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on 6, 2,
>> >>> 222, and 440
>>
>> >>See above
>> >
>> > Please clarify.
>>
>> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone.
>
> 25 kHz more.
>
>> 7075-7100, for example,
>> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it would
>> harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>
> Hams outside Region 2 will be getting 7100-7200 anyway. Let them
> harmonize with us.
>

US hams outside R2 already have 7075-7100 phone

Read it again. *US* hams outside R2

>> >>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure evaluation
>> >>
>> >>OK
>> >
>> > Agreed.
>> >
>> >>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
>> >>
>> >>Not OK
>> >
>> > Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
>> > more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and modes,
>> > power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase) and much

>> > more.
>> >
>> > By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.
>> >
>>
>> With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure questions,
>> but I think the test is already easy enough.
>
> To a beginner, it's not so easy.
>>
>> >>> General to be
>> >>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>>
>> >>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't
>> >>say here.
>> >
>> > See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the work
>> > of a committee looking to give everyone something they want, but not
>> > giving anyone everything they want.
>> >
>> > What will FCC do?
>> >
>> > First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to
>> > attract more new hams.
>>
>> Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under existing
>> law. That has some appeal.
>
> See above about the "law".
>
>> > Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.
>>
>> Agreed
>>
>> > Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it
>> > costs them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.
>>
>> I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to handle
>> 5 classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there won't be two
>> types of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why they aren't
>> recorded differently right now).
>
> Incorrect!
>
> Before restructuring, their computers handled 6 classes of license
> (Novice, Tech, Tech Plus, General, Advanced, Extra). In fact their
> computers *still* handle 6 classes! So there should be no problem at
> all.
>
> And as Tech Pluses continue to be renewed as Techs, expire, and

> upgrade, that class will disappear completely.
>>
>> I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes,
>> though. I think it is better to move on.
>
> I agree, but not at the price of giveaways just to make things look
> neater.
>

Better that than the only possible alternative - taking privileges away

> How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams except
> Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
> "Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited licence. I would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence. Of course, to be fair you would have to extend that to Techs with old Element 3.

1327. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 03:53:39 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9476E8DA33B45elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86003

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:SxjPb.32602$P%1.25742284@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for
>> example, would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover,
>> it would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>>
>
> This will crowd the CW/digital/data modes too much since there are so
> many US hams. It would be better to wait for the other treaty changes
> from the conference to take affect and synchronize Regions 1 and 3 with
> Region 2. You do know of course that the treaty now requires
> broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and that this will become an
> exclusive amateur allocation.

Of course I do, but do you think they will really move? Some may, but I
think some of them never will.

> I don't recall the timing but it is
> required in the treaty. Perhaps someday, the ITU will open up the 7.2
> to 7.3 to the other regions. In the meantime, 7.150 to 7.200 could be
> a worldwide phone allocation. This is actually more space than either
> of the suggested proposals.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
I'm assuming that this will happen anyway. I just meant that 7075-7100,
where of course there is already phone, would be more use to phone ops than
the proposed 7125-7150, where there isn't.

1328. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 05:18:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <JYnPb.21394$zj7.4912@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86004

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

< That's not what I read. As far as I know it is in a law
< that was sponsored by the late Senator Barry
< Goldwater, K7UGA.

I'm certain you're mistaken.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1329. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 06:22:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400E1AB7.3010708@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86005

Alan wrote:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>
>
>
>>In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>><alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>>>@posting.google.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>>>
>>>>Summary:
>>>>
>>>>3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>>>>
>>>>
>>>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
>>>would reintroduce a free licence class.
>>>
>>>
>>Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>>
>>
>>
>
>As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains on
>the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level licence is
>called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
>
>No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole thing on
>the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought about this
>particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open and it could be
>called something else.
>
>
>

>>The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the entry
>>level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF privileges, but
>>more HF privileges.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Provided the new class that happened to
>>>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
>>>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>>>
>>>
>>Why?
>>
>>
>
>I thought the old Novice was too easy
>
>
>
>>Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech Plus
>>privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between above
>>and below 30 MHz privileges.
>>
>>
>
>So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
>
>
>
>>>>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>>>
>>>
>>Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
>>receiving.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Won't happen
>
Exactly. Nobody else uses code anymore. And what does the FCC
get out of it? And the medical wavier issues come back.... They ain't
gonna do anything to have THAT come up again!

>
>
>

>>>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be
>>>dumped.
>>>
>>>
>>It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to
>>use manufactured equipment.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Not in my opinion
>
>
>
>>>Moreover, it can be now,
>>>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>>
>>
>>
>
>I think they will too
>
Again, nobody else uses code anymore. Code made good sense back
50 years ago during the vacuum tube radio era. Simple equipment was
all that was needed and given the reliability of vacuum tube stuff voice
could likely fail when needed. But today's equipment is all made with
chips and quite reliable. And digital modes like packet can handle
automatically
health and welfare traffic code used to do, with less operators needed.

>
>
>
>>>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>OK
>>>
>>>
>>Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as has
>>been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>>
>>
>
>Can't stand loose ends
>

Let's say that 4 years experience as an advanced is equal to element 4B
(the old extra written an advanced used to be able to take to get his
extra).
So make the advanced turn into an extra next April.

>
>
>
>>>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to Extra,
>>but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to General?
>>
>>What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not
>>the other?
>>
>>
>
>As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech, which is
>already pretty easy
>
>
>
>>>>'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Good.
>>>
>>>
>>Bad.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>>>
>>>
>>That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>>
>>
>
>Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful spectrum to
>phone
>
Are the digital modes more tolerant of SW broadcaster QRM than SSB? If so,
move the digital modes to 7150-7300 and voice 7000-7150. If nothing

else, it would help chase the SW broadcasters away...

1330. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 06:33:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <O2pPb.17473$q4.8503@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86006

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> [THIS IS THE PART WHERE KIM
> QUOTES THE PART OF RILEY'S
> E-MAIL WHICH IS THE SUBJECT
> OF THIS THREAD:] (snip)
>
> > (snip) While that's true, just because
> > a person has a right to do something
> > doesn't mean it's right to do it on every
> > occasion. While the call sign may fit the
> > constitution, for every instance where
> > a parent or uncle or grandparent doesn't
> > want a young person to get involved in
> > Ham Radio because of something they
> > hear on the bands, then you have taken
> > the ARS one step closer to extinction.
> > Then we can sit around and debate what
> > happened to all those Amateur
> > frequencies that industry bought at
> > auction---debating, of course, on the
> > internet and cellular because that'll be
> > all we have left. The first amendment will
> > still be alive and well, just as it is now,
> > tho, if that's any consolation. (snip)

Thanks for posting this again, Larry. I didn't say anything when I first read it, but I remember having some doubts - doubts which still linger to this day. The most obvious is why Riley singled out Kim for this admonishment, without mentioning W4TIT (VA), W6TIT (TX), K5TIT (FL), K6TIT (CA), N0TIT (FL), N4TIT (FL), W1ASS (MA), W2ASS (MA), W4ASS (NC), W5ASS (TX), and similar callsigns. In other words, Kim's callsign, and similar callsigns, are not exactly unique.

Clearly, letters only become vulgar when one attaches a specific meaning to them. Without a context to make "TIT," or other such letters, vulgar, I can't really envision a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping a child out of Amateur Radio simply because those letters appear in a callsign.

Finally, I noticed most of the callsigns above belong to males (all except one, a club call). The absence of any comment about those callsigns (from Riley, you, or others here) makes me wonder if a callsign with the letters "TIT" only becomes vulgar when used by a woman. Would Riley say those callsigns bring Ham radio "one step closer to extinction?" Would Jim omit those callsigns from his list (the topic this thread spun off from)? Would

you as aggressively challenge one of those guys, like you've done with Kim, if any one of them were active in this newsgroup?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1331. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 10:02:51 UTC
From: Moe <rfb@radfreebnet.net>
Message-ID: <bulio8$6p2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86007
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The ARRL's latest licensing scheme is driven by money.

The league will achieve its goal by spreading cash to the correct
FCC managers. The FCC has no shortage of corrupt
management officials, ready to accept a bribe for anything.

ARRL is no friend of amateur radio.

Moe

1332. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 10:26:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bulk4p$g9o@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86008

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:O2pPb.17473$q4.8503@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Thanks for posting this again, Larry. I didn't say anything when I first
> read it, but I remember having some doubts - doubts which still linger to
> this day. The most obvious is why Riley singled out Kim for this
> admonishment, without mentioning W4TIT (VA), W6TIT (TX), K5TIT (FL), K6TIT
> (CA), N0TIT (FL), N4TIT (FL), W1ASS (MA), W2ASS (MA), W4ASS (NC), W5ASS
> (TX), and similar callsigns. In other words, Kim's callsign, and similar
> callsigns, are not exactly unique.
>

Another interesting little snippit... If I recall, it was only after I
"took on" some of the things Larry (and his ilk) was posting that he decided
to take a dislike to my callsign.

Makes one wonder if it is the callsign that is the reason for the attitude;
or that they just plain dislike me and can't think of any other way to
express it. Kind of like when I say something that would--under normal
conditions--stand on its own without the chance of drawing fire: just
because it was me that said it, there is disagreement that will be found for
it.

I think it's all that "other stuff" that comes into play. Riley was
probably closer to having a real opinion about my callsign than Larry or
anyone else here is. He was honest and forthright about it, and dignified
in his response. Larry seems to think it's "disrespectful" to disagree with
Riley's opinion--why I don't know. Riley is a person just like anyone else
and is entitled to his opinion. And, since the ARS is no closer to
exctinction today than it was prior to my ever getting a license, I totally
disagree with Riley.

>
> Clearly, letters only become vulgar when one attaches a specific meaning
> to them. Without a context to make "TIT," or other such letters, vulgar, I
> can't really envision a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping a child
out
> of Amateur Radio simply because those letters appear in a callsign.
>

Oh, I can. If they're prone to "protecting" their little tyke from the
evils of the world--in every way but actually dealing with the little tyke,
i.e., making it everyone else's fault but their own that their little tyke
is actually a little monster. ;)

>
> Finally, I noticed most of the callsigns above belong to males (all
except
> one, a club call). The absence of any comment about those callsigns (from
> Riley, you, or others here) makes me wonder if a callsign with the letters
> "TIT" only becomes vulgar when used by a woman. Would Riley say those
> callsigns bring Ham radio "one step closer to extinction?" Would Jim omit
> those callsigns from his list (the topic this thread spun off from)? Would
> you as aggressively challenge one of those guys, like you've done with
Kim,
> if any one of them were active in this newsgroup?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Fact ot the matter is my callsign is not vulgar, it is not disrespectful, it is not inappropriate. It's nothing more than a vanity callsign that brings out other peoples' vanity (here in this newsgroup anyway) way more than it even expresses my own :o And, it works great working DX and pileups--when I used to do that! ;)

Kim W5TIT

1333. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 12:35:17 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <mfrs00haqsa0n2bmbu9v8gtkec7o5h3l7i@4ax.com>
Source record: 86009

On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 04:26:39 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:O2pPb.17473$q4.8503@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> Thanks for posting this again, Larry. I didn't say anything when I first
>> read it, but I remember having some doubts - doubts which still linger to
>> this day. The most obvious is why Riley singled out Kim for this
>> admonishment, without mentioning W4TIT (VA), W6TIT (TX), K5TIT (FL), K6TIT
>> (CA), N0TIT (FL), N4TIT (FL), W1ASS (MA), W2ASS (MA), W4ASS (NC), W5ASS
>> (TX), and similar callsigns. In other words, Kim's callsign, and similar
>> callsigns, are not exactly unique.
>>
>
>Another interesting little snippit... If I recall, it was only after I
>"took on" some of the things Larry (and his ilk) was posting that he decided
>to take a dislike to my callsign.
>
>Makes one wonder if it is the callsign that is the reason for the attitude;
>or that they just plain dislike me and can't think of any other way to
>express it.

The statements of those who voice the strongest objections tend to
support your observation, Kim.

Jim himself, who insists that it is just the "inappropriate callsign"
that bothers him, stated (regarding his negative opinion towards the
callsign):

"It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."

This statement indicates that it isn't just the call that bothers him
- it's a combination of the call plus other 'factors'. The 'package',
as it were.

Dave, in his recent posts, appears to harbour similar feelings :)

> Kind of like when I say something that would--under normal
>conditions--stand on its own without the chance of drawing fire: just
>because it was me that said it, there is disagreement that will be found for
>it.
>
>I think it's all that "other stuff" that comes into play. Riley was
>probably closer to having a real opinion about my callsign than Larry or

>anyone else here is. He was honest and forthright about it, and dignified
>in his response. Larry seems to think it's "disrespectful" to disagree with
>Riley's opinion--why I don't know. Riley is a person just like anyone else
>and is entitled to his opinion. And, since the ARS is no closer to
>exctinction today than it was prior to my ever getting a license, I totally
>disagree with Riley.
>
>>
>> Clearly, letters only become vulgar when one attaches a specific meaning
>> to them. Without a context to make "TIT," or other such letters, vulgar, I
>> can't really envision a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping a child
>out
>> of Amateur Radio simply because those letters appear in a callsign.
>>
>
>Oh, I can. If they're prone to "protecting" their little tyke from the
>evils of the world--in every way but actually dealing with the little tyke,
>i.e., making it everyone else's fault but their own that their little tyke
>is actually a little monster. ;)

Anyone who believes that they can protect their youngsters from bad
language and sexual references by censoring what they see is deluding
themselves. They will hear worse things at the local schooltard than
they will on TV, radio or (gasp) RRAP....

>
>>
>> Finally, I noticed most of the callsigns above belong to males (all
>except
>> one, a club call). The absence of any comment about those callsigns (from
>> Riley, you, or others here) makes me wonder if a callsign with the letters
>> "TIT" only becomes vulgar when used by a woman. Would Riley say those
>> callsigns bring Ham radio "one step closer to extinction?" Would Jim omit
>> those callsigns from his list (the topic this thread spun off from)? Would
>> you as aggressively challenge one of those guys, like you've done with
>Kim,
>> if any one of them were active in this newsgroup?

They will defiantly state "of course not - we treat everyone equally".
lol.

>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>Fact ot the matter is my callsign is not vulgar, it is not disrespectful, it
>is not inappropriate. It's nothing more than a vanity callsign that brings
>out other peoples' vanity (here in this newsgroup anyway) way more than it

>even expresses my own :o And, it works great working DX and pileups--when I
>used to do that! ;)
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

1334. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 13:20:38 UTC
From: google blogger <nasa3dave@wans.net>
Message-ID: <e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86010
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Winston" <win@here.com> wrote in message
news:pjno009la2gm2oknimn27eqlv40c8938qg@4ax.com...
> I was an Advanced in 1963. I guess, by proxy, I will be able to say I
> was an Extra for 40 years. I became an Extra in 1979. What will I
> become now.

Think of it as having walked in a very large circle for the past 40 Years.

:) :) :)

> Do you think that if everyone would just buy five copies of QST every
> month the League would give up attempting to license every deadbeat
> dad and upgrading every licensee that can recite QST?
>
> Win/W0LZ

Probably an accurate observation Win. All that the ARRL has ever been
interested in for the past 40+ years is more subscriptions to their ad
filled fishwrap. No suprise really as the ARRL's 501-C3 Charter lists
them as a non-profit "scientific" publishing company.

Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the Incentive
License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.

Now their franticly trying to back-peddle the boat before it finally goes
over Niagra Falls. Not much you can do, seeing that 99.5% of young
persons are more interested in Ipod, Blogging, Chatrooms and other
Net related projects instead of this old antiquated hobby of their
granddaddy called "ham radio". (It used to be that ham radio was
unique in that it was the only alternative to making a long distance
telephone call to speak with someone far away. Today anyone can
do the same with a $10-per-month ISP and a PC. The NOVELTY
of long distance communications for the common person has worn
off - this is the root-cause of the issue - ham radio is become obsolete.)

1335. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 13:28:58 UTC
From: google blogger <nasa3dave@wans.net>
Message-ID: <34eb7$400e7e9d$d1cc7cd3$8161@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:iE%Ob.85899$Rc4.333443@attbi_s54...
> This proposal is a good start. However, the ultimate goal should be to
> align our privileges with those of the rest of the amateur radio world
and
> REMOVE all mode restrictions.

Already been there.....it's called ECHOLINK :) :) :)

1336. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 13:35:21 UTC
From: google blogger <nasa3dave@wans.net>
Message-ID: <2ae58$400e819b$d1cc7cd3$8383@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86013

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:j9fPb.16911$q4.15419@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> I forsee this latest debacle of the ARRL will result in further damage to
> Amateur Radio. Much worse than the failed and flawed 'Incentive
licensing'
> garbage of the late 1960s.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

You have it slightly wrong Dan. ARRL is doing this to
try and fix what they screwed up by Incentive Licensing.
Of course we all know the horse left the barn long ago
and the fat lady from CT has already sung her tune, but the
great Newington publishing company has to do something
or risk appearing redundant.

(looks like Ole Herbie Baby was right about one thing
all those years on 14.313! They are indeed nothing more
than a non-profit publishing company)

William
(ex-Wd4 in the 70's)

1337. AARL website vs. goal of spreading knowledge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 13:37:01 UTC
From: ARRL Buffoons <buf@arlbuffoons.org>
Message-ID: <bulv9p$t08$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86012
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Indianaradio" <indianaradio@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040121061622.28408.00000449@mb-m01.aol.com...
> ARRL= Its all about money and their power to help themselves.
> Has been, will be, and will always be. Been a ham (General) almost 50
years
> and they have never changed.
> I will NEVER join them people.
> To bad to, they could really do some good. Ok I'll admit they have done a
> little good but have been overshadowed by ALL the stuff they have screwed
up
> for us.
> Gene
>

Between the New England Yankees at ARRL & their corrupt
buddies at FCC, ham radio is in a mess. Wonder how much
the league will pay off corrupt FCC managers to get this latest
fiasco passed?

Buff

1338. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 14:10:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401210610.4c48e6a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86014

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040120195253.25815.00006091@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> With kindest regards for better mental health,

Your chances for better mental health are nil, Lennie. Accept it.

Steve, K4YZ

1339. Thanks Again, Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 14:29:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401210629.2a7e7d5a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86015

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040110153500.01893.00002529@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401080832.4f297812@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > I never said you "never" worked in electronics, Your Lyingness.
>
> Yes you have. Both as just plain worker and as an engineer.

I repeat...I NEVER said that YOU never worked in electronics.

PLEASE repost the item wherein I said that, Lennie, or accept that
you have been caught LYING once again.

> > The FACT is that I have spoken with people who KNEW you and wee
> >not impressed.
>
> Total utter bluffing BULLSHIT, sweetums.

Ahhhh...Expression of profanity from the allegedly learned and
professional mind.

Sorry you can't accept it.

> You've NEVER "spoken with people who knew me."

Yes, I have.

> Bluff. Bullshit. Very bad poker playing skills.

Not when it's not a bluff, Your Scumminess.

> > The FACT is that YOU refuse to accept that your "professional"
> >and military "experience" is NOT Amateur Radio.
>
> That was never a subject except in your disordered little mind,
> little man.

Sure it is...Tons and tons of recycled trivia about PLMRS, ADA,
your alleged contributions to the space program, etc etc etc.

> Radio is radio. It all works by the same principles of physics. It
> doesn't "work differently" because some lawmakers create different
> "services" for it.

Thank-you for (again) proving my assertion.

It's NOT about the PHYSICS of radio, Lennie...It's about the
application and practices associated with AMATEUR radios.

Rest of usual "I am so impressive" rantings snipped.

YOU already proved MY assertions.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1340. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 14:42:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86016

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
> >>
> >> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
> >> >>@posting.google.com:
> >> >>
> >> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >> >>>
> >> >>> Summary:
> >> >>>
> >> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
> >> >>
> >> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
> >> >>would reintroduce a free licence class.
> >> >
> >> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
> >> >
> >>
> >> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains
> >> on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level
> >> licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
> >>
> >> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
> >> thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought
> >> about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open
> >> and it could be called something else.
> >
> > Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since no
> > new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a moot
> > point.
> >
> > But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
> >>
> >> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the

> >> > entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
> >> > privileges, but more HF privileges.
> >> >
> >> >>Provided the new class that happened to
> >> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
> >> >>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
> >> >
> >> > Why?
> >>
> >> I thought the old Novice was too easy
> >
> > Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13 was
> > adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first station was
> > homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license started me on the
> > path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about 3 years and BSEE in
> > a little over 8 years....
> >
> > And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
> > keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
> > more, isn't that just about perfect?

Well?

Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do? If
it insures that newcomers know enough to keep out of trouble (on the
air, anyway,) gives them a sample of what amateur radio is about, and
inspires them to learn and do more with ham radio, isn't that just
about perfect?

> >> > Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech
> >> > Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between
> >> > above and below 30 MHz privileges.
> >>
> >> So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
> >
> > How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for
> > all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
> > parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs
> > proposed for the Novice?

How much is it reasonable to expect a newcomer to learn in order to be
turned loose with ~100 watts on parts of HF and ~25 watts on parts of
VHF/UHF?

> >> >>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
> >> >>
> >> >>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
> >> >
> >> > Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
> >> > receiving.
> >>
> >> Won't happen

> >
> > Probably not, but it's still a good idea.
> >>
> >> >>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be
> >> >>dumped.
> >> >
> >> > It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to
> >> > use manufactured equipment.
> >>
> >> Not in my opinion
> >
> > It's the same argument used against the code test. Why *must* a ham
> > learn all that theory to use manufactured, approved gear with no
> > critical adjustments? Heck, most ham gear today won't transmit out
> > of band unless modified!
> >>
> >> >>Moreover, it can be now,
> >> >>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
> >> >>
> >> > FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
> >>
> >> I think they will too
> >
> > Unfortunately
> >>
> >> >>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
> >> >>
> >> >>OK
> >> >
> >> > Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as
> >> > has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
> >>
> >> Can't stand loose ends
> >
> > What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
> > 1967
> > even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
> > additional
> > privileges at all.

Do those loose ends really cause any problems?
> >
> >> >>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
> >> >>
> >> >>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
> >> >>
> >> > Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to
> >> > Extra, but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to
> >> > General?
> >> >

> >> > What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not
> >> > the other?
> >>
> >> As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech, which
> >> is already pretty easy
> >
> > Exactly. But that doesn't answer the question. You want Advanceds to
> > get free upgrades to avoid ~82,000 loose ends, but not Techs and Tech
> > pluses, who would
> > amount to ~322,000 loose ends.
> >
> > I don't see why one and not the other.
> >
> >> >>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
> >> >>
> >> >>Good.
> >> >
> >> > Bad.
> >> >
> >> >> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
> >> >
> >> > That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
> >>
> >> Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
> >> spectrum to phone
> >
> > Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital voice?
> >
> >> >>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> >> >>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on 6, 2,
> >> >>> 222, and 440
>
> >> >>See above
> >> >
> >> > Please clarify.
> >>
> >> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone.
> >
> > 25 kHz more.
> >
> >> 7075-7100, for example,
> >> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it would
> >> harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
> >
> > Hams outside Region 2 will be getting 7100-7200 anyway. Let them
> > harmonize with us.
> >
>
> US hams outside R2 already have 7075-7100 phone

Only because they don't have 7100-7200. US hams outside R2 are rare
enough to be conidered "DX" anyway.
>
> Read it again. *US* hams outside R2

I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below
7100 goes away completely.
>
> >> >>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure evaluation
> >> >>
> >> >>OK
> >> >
> >> > Agreed.
> >> >
> >> >>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
> >> >>
> >> >>Not OK
> >> >
> >> > Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
> >> > more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and modes,
> >> > power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase) and much
> >> > more.
> >> >
> >> > By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.
> >> >
> >>
> >> With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure questions,
> >> but I think the test is already easy enough.
> >
> > To a beginner, it's not so easy.
> >>
> >> >>> General to be
> >> >>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
> >
> >> >>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You don't
> >> >>say here.
> >> >
> >> > See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the work
> >> > of a committee looking to give everyone something they want, but not
> >> > giving anyone everything they want.
> >> >
> >> > What will FCC do?
> >> >
> >> > First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to
> >> > attract more new hams.
> >>
> >> Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under existing
> >> law. That has some appeal.
> >
> > See above about the "law".
> >

> >> > Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.
> >>
> >> Agreed
> >>
> >> > Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it
> >> > costs them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.
> >>
> >> I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to handle
> >> 5 classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there won't be two
> >> types of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why they aren't
> >> recorded differently right now).
> >
> > Incorrect!
> >
> > Before restructuring, their computers handled 6 classes of license
> > (Novice, Tech, Tech Plus, General, Advanced, Extra). In fact their
> > computers *still* handle 6 classes! So there should be no problem at
> > all.
> >
> > And as Tech Pluses continue to be renewed as Techs, expire, and
> > upgrade, that class will disappear completely.
> >>
> >> I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes,
> >> though. I think it is better to move on.
> >
> > I agree, but not at the price of giveaways just to make things look
> > neater.
> >
>
> Better that than the only possible alternative - taking privileges away

But is there really any reason not to simply continue those license
classes? That's a much, much better option than freebies or removing
privileges.

>
> > How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams except
> > Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
> > "Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited licence.

Why would Techs be singled out for a limited license? They have full
privs above 50 MHz.

> I
> would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence.

By your reasoning, there's no reason to have the Extra, then. Nor its test.

> Of course, to be
> fair you would have to extend that to Techs with old Element 3.

Where ya been, Alun?

Techs with old Element 3 (licensed before March 21, 1987) can get a General
license *today* with no additional testing. Just show up at a VE session with
proof of such license, fill out the 605 and pay the VE fee. Instant General.
And if such a ham can pass the Extra written (might as well try, the same
VE fee buys that test too), they get an Extra.

Been that way since April 15, 2000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1341. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 15:23:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401210723.780a1472@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86017

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040120182417.07155.00000157@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401200434.65f855e7@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stebe the "veteran of hostile actions") writes:
>
> > And people do not Honor thier comrades-in-arms by trying to
> >garner newsgroup message points by trying to associate THIER Army
> >"career" with the blood shed by soldiers KIA three years before they
> >were in-theater.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...the rage and anger resulting in all those typos!
>
> Poor little Stebe, still getting all red in the face about another being
> proud of service to their country. What do you do on Memorial
> Day? Go around beating up old military veterans at cemetaries and
> stealing their flags?

You try to embellish your NG "rep" by associating yourself with
Korean-era Army KIA's...get caught doing it...then try to redirect the
attention away from yourself.

Add coward to scumbag and liar.

Steve, K4YZ

1342. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 15:32:06 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <no4t00tdevkerhu611b53ub6494ep32vv1@4ax.com>
Source record: 86018

Jim,

I sense a fair amount of hostility in your reply - I see that you are even taking issue with the statements that I made in agreement or support with several of your earlier points. I can also see that to expect objectivity from you on this issue would be impossible as well, as you continue to hold up your "standards" in defense of your actions, even where they would not be compromised at all. You also adhere to the principle that it is only Kim's callsign that you find "inappropriate", yet you have also stated that this decision was based upon your consideration of not only the callsign, but other factors: (the following statement was with reference to your opinion of the appropriateness of the callsign):

"It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."

This statement points to a much deeper issue than just a simple "inappropriate" callsign.

The use of one's own moralistic views and beliefs to deny the rights of another is "inappropriate" too, Jim.

But, if you wish to further moralize upon this issue, I refer you to the ultimate authority, with all sincerity and best wishes:

God, grant me the serenity
to accept the things I cannot change;
the courage to change the things I can
and the wisdom to know the difference

May you find peace and comfort with the world, Jim.

73 es 30, Leo

On 20 Jan 2004 14:28:12 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>I thought I answered this, but apparently not. I'll try again...
>
>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<pd9h005fafcc1865drb90h9fst9o20iein@4ax.com>...
>> On 17 Jan 2004 00:57:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >>For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the

>> >>core "issue" that began our discourse.
>> >
>> >There are several issues, not just one.
>>
>> OK - I'm listening.
>
>> >>Perhaps I haven't stated it
>> >>clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
>> >>clouded.
>
>> >Let's see what you've got, then.
>
>> Let's go.
>
>> >>I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
>> >>continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.
>
>> >>I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
>> >>inappropriate.
>
>> >That's correct. It's also an issue to some people.
>
>> OK - fair enough. And it shouldn't be.
>
>That's a moral judgement on your part. You're declaring what should
>and should not be an issue to other people. IOW, you're telling them
>what to think and what their standards should be when you say it
>shouldn't be an issue.
>
>> Your personal standards are
>> your own - no one else's. Let's clear that one off - agreed?
>
>My personal standards are shared by other people. I don't know
>how many, but if there's even one other person who shares my
>standards, then they're *not* "no one else's".
>
>> >> No issue there - that is entirely your right.
>
>> >Some people say it isn't. Not you, but some others.
>
>> Others may, but who cares - it's none of their business.
>
>Why not?
>
>> >>I also
>> >>understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.
>
>> >Also correct. And also an issue to some people, who say that my deletion of
>> >Kim's call is "wrong".
>

>> Let's focus on that one, and agree that deleting her call from your
>> post is necessary for you to due to your standards. I have no issue
>> there at all. If you don't want to use it, OK. Let's clear this one
>> off too - agreed?
>
>I won't use it in my posts. I'm not legally required to, either.
>
>> >>Again, no issue there - I respect that.
>
>> >>For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:
>
>> >>Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
>> >>unfair, as it singled her out. I agree.
>
>> >And I disagree. Kim singled herself out by choosing that callsign. As you are
>> >aware.
>
>> Yes she did - and quite intentionally, too, as she has stated.
>
>Then she needs to accept the consequences of that action.
>
>> That wasn't, however, what I was saying in my statement above. Simply
>> that Kim feels that you singled her out too, by omitting just her call
>> from the list.
>
>She and you know exactly why her call was omitted.
>
>> Forget the inappropriatenesss of the call for a moment....
>
>Why? It's the cause of the omission.
>
>> do you see where she might get that feeling?
>
>Sure - she wants to be included in the list even though she
>disregards the list's standards.
>
>> >>Would finding a compromise
>> >>whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
>> >>all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
>> >>have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?
>
>> >No, it wouldn't.
>
>> Honestly, I dont agree with you on this point. It would have been an
>> easy compromise to make, and woulld potentially have offended no one.
>
>It would have offended me and anyone who agreed with my standards.
>
>> More on this further down in the post!
>

>> >>That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim.
>
>> >No, it isn't, but we'll get to that later. Right now, let's discuss that issue.
>> >
>> >It seems to me that what you're saying is that I should either include
>> >everyone's callsign, or no one's.
>
>> >Now since I don't wish to include Kim's callsign, that leaves only the option
>> >of including no one's callsign, in order to accomodate Kim's feelings.
>
>> Agreed - in order to treat everyone equally, that would be the only
>> other option available given the situation.
>
>That means everyone must suffer in order to avoid the possibility of
>Kim's feelings being hurt.
>
>> >But what about everyone else's feelings, including mine? I want my call listed.
>
>> >I would feel disrespected to be listed by name rather than callsign or name and
>> >callsign on an amateur radio newsgroup.
>>
>> Yes, and I believe that Kim feels exactly the same way, Jim.
>
>Then let her choose an appropriate callsign.
>
>> For the
>> same reason as you, I suppose - she is also a ham. (She does not feel
>> that her call is in any way wrong, remember.)
>
>You're saying her feelings are more important than my standards and my feelings.
>
>> >Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
>> >callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.
>> >
>> >Don't the feelings of everyone else count?
>>
>> Of course they do - but are you sure that these people world be that
>> upset by this?
>
>Are you sure they aren't?
>
>Why should the people who chose appropriate callsigns not get them
>listed in order to appease those who chose inappropriate ones?
>
>> (except Dave, of course - he appears, from his recent
>> correspondence, to be annoyed that Kim is still breathing... :))
>
>Not at all.
>>
>> In fact, if it had been my post, I would have revised it to names only

>> immediately after Kim's original complaint.
>
>But it wasn't your post. It was my post.
>
>> And seen what comments
>> came back next. If I had several legitimate complaints (without the
>> agendas that we have seen in several recent posts {not yours, Jim!)
>> which obviously relate to Kim personally rather than just her
>> call...), then yes there would be no other alternative than to put the
>> calls back - but I would have written and offered Kim the option of
>> going by name only or dropping out before I went ahead. At least I'd
>> be able to tell Kim that I tried to fix it for her, but it didn't work
>> out with the rest of the group.
>
>So you'd go through all that and wind up with the calls in the post because
>some of us would complain.
>
>> Maybe it's just me, but I would try first to resolve her complaint if
>> possible, out of respect for her as a fellow amateur.
>
>That's nice - but by doing so, you are validating her choice of
>callsign. I won't do that.
>
>> I prefer
>> compromise whenever possible - not compromising my standards, but
>> finding a way to achieve a balance.
>
>My standards say that your compromise involves compromising my standards.
>>
>> >Note also, Kim said that if I wouldn't use her callsign, she didn't want to > >be on
the list..
>>
>> True, but that was after the had become frustrated with trying to
>> solve this issue.
>
>She could solve it very easily by choosing an appropriate callsign.
>
>> >>Your rights and
>> >>standards are not at question here.
>> >
>> >Yes, they are. I've been told that "it's not my place" to determine whether a
>> >callsign is appropriate or not. I've been told that my actions are "wrong".
>> >
>> >As you are aware.
>>
>> I did state that it is in fact no one individual's place to determine
>> what is or is not appropriate for the ARS - that role belongs to the
>> regulators, and to the will of the majority of us, I suppose.
>
>I recall being told it was not *MY* place to judge. And I disagree.

>It's my place to judge in terms of what I will and will not validate.
>
>> Each of us is however completely in charge of determining what is
>> appropriate for us as an individual, however. No question there.
>>
>> Jim, my intent was not to criticize your standards
>
>Tell it to those who used words like "prejudice" to describe
>my standards.
>
>> - simply to point
>> out that perhaps a more amicable solution to this issue was possible
>> without compromising anyone's standards - finding a common ground for
>> all.
>>
>> That's it - that's my point.
>>
>>
>That's fine. And I disagree.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

1343. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 18:18:39 UTC
From: n2ah@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <774a2c02.0401211018.eb98652@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Moe" wrote:
> The ARRL's latest licensing scheme is driven by money.
>
> The league will achieve its goal by spreading cash to the correct
> FCC managers. The FCC has no shortage of corrupt
> management officials, ready to accept a bribe for anything.

And you know this, how?

Let's think this through. We're talking about ham radio, right?
Someone at ARRL is going to risk jail time to funnel personal or
League funds to corrupt FCC officials in the hope that by doing so,
the proposal will become reality. Then, when it does become reality,
there will be a HUGE increase in League membership, and said ARRL
person will presumably siphon off huge profits (again risking jail
time) and live the good life ever after.

Meanwhile, the FCC bureaucrats are going to risk their jobs and jail
time to accept these funds and push through this crazy proposal. Then,
they too will live the good life ever after. Oh yeah, that's real
plausible.

Art Harris N2AH
(No fan of ARRl, but not stark raving mad either)

1344. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 18:58:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400ECBCE.5010606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86020

>
>
>>>
>>>
>
>Well?
>
>Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do? If
>it insures that newcomers know enough to keep out of trouble (on the
>air, anyway,) gives them a sample of what amateur radio is about, and
>inspires them to learn and do more with ham radio, isn't that just
>about perfect?
>
>
An entry level license test should expect knowledge of how to know what
frequency
your transmitter is on, what mode, the subbands for which modes, how to
identify
RFI problems (harmonics), simple antennas, rules about IDing, no
business traffic,
operating (pick a frequency nobody else is using to call CQ, but once
you're done
it's not your frequency anymore), simple emergency traffic operations.

>
>
>>>>>Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech
>>>>>Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between
>>>>>above and below 30 MHz privileges.
>>>>>
Aside from propagation, there's really little difference from HF and
VHF/UHF.
Questions like "Is 80m likely to have good propagation for DX during the
daytime?"
don't really address issues of safety and interference to other
services. A beginner
will soon learn on the air what times and bands make sense for DX
operations.

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
>>>>
>>>>
>>>How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for

>>>all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
>>>parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs
>>>proposed for the Novice?
>>>
Number of questions, given all the time you want to finish the test, doesn't
make a test easy or hard. 5 tough questions is a lot harder to pass than
100 really easy questions.

>>>
>>>
>
>How much is it reasonable to expect a newcomer to learn in order to be
>turned loose with ~100 watts on parts of HF and ~25 watts on parts of
>VHF/UHF?
>
>
>
>>>>>>>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
>>>>>receiving.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Won't happen
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Probably not, but it's still a good idea.
>>>
Why, no otehr service uses code anymore, and more modern data
modes now exist. Yes, they require more advanced equipment, but
modern equipment is much more reliable than the vacuum tube stuff
we had 50 years ago. NASA's JPL doesn't use Morse code with
the Mars probes. And that's really hard DX to do.

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Moreover, it can be now,
>>>>>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>I think they will too

>>>>
>>>>
>>>Unfortunately
>>>
What does the FCC get out of requiring code, now that the treaty doesn't
require it anymore?

>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>OK
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as
>>>>>has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Can't stand loose ends
>>>>
>>>>
>>>What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
>>>1967
>>>even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
>>>additional
>>>privileges at all.
>>>
>>>
>
>Do those loose ends really cause any problems?
>
Not that I can see. But if there is a problem, well, let's call 4 years
of experience as an advanced the same as passing the old element 4B,
and make them extras.

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
>>>>spectrum to phone
>>>>
>>>>

>>>Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital voice?
>>>
>>>
Maybe designate some subbands for new and experimental modes as
primary, and allow older modes on a secondary basis. That is, you
have to accept interference from them, and not cause them interference.
And encourage new methods of modulating the RF carrier directly
instead of say 2m packet where everyone just injected the modem signal
into their FM voice mode rigs. Not efficient.

>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>>>>>>>
Maybe we might want some Morse code beginner subbands where new users
can feel comfortable operating and not get blown away by experts. As an
informal gentlemen's agreement. Need not be much bandwidth, a few "CW
channels"
should be enough.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>
>>
>>>>>>>Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure evaluation
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>OK
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Agreed.
>>>>>
Used to be 75 watts input power. Make it the level that most
commercial yeacomwood trancievers produce "barefoot".

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams except
>>>Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
>>>"Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited licence.
>>
Then that'd be 3 classes then.

>>
>>
>
>Why would Techs be singled out for a limited license? They have full
>privs above 50 MHz.
>
>
>
>>I
>>would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence.
>>
>>
>
>By your reasoning, there's no reason to have the Extra, then. Nor its
>test.
>
Used to be the extra only gave you a shorter callsign (if avaliable) and
bragging rights.

>
>
>
>
>
>Techs with old Element 3 (licensed before March 21, 1987) can get a
>General
>license *today* with no additional testing. Just show up at a VE
>session with
>proof of such license, fill out the 605 and pay the VE fee. Instant
>General.
>And if such a ham can pass the Extra written (might as well try, the
>same
>VE fee buys that test too), they get an Extra.
>
That's what I did. I did study for it, though. Wanted to "lock in" my
element 3
and element 1 anyway (so I wouldn't need to worry about holding onto old
copies of my tech license) and also might as well go for the whole
enchallida
while I was at it. Though that enchallida doesn't have a 20WPM topping...

>
>Been that way since April 15, 2000.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1345. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:00:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400ECC4F.9040505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86021

Alun wrote:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>news:SxjPb.32602$P%1.25742284@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>
>
>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>news:Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>>
>>>I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for
>>>example, would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover,
>>>it would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>This will crowd the CW/digital/data modes too much since there are so
>>many US hams. It would be better to wait for the other treaty changes
>>from the conference to take affect and synchronize Regions 1 and 3 with
>>Region 2. You do know of course that the treaty now requires
>>broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and that this will become an
>>exclusive amateur allocation.
>>
>>
>
>Of course I do, but do you think they will really move? Some may, but I
>think some of them never will.
>
>
Maybe we all should move voice to the bottom of 40m, and create a new
subband for
modes that create bad QRM to the broadcasters who don't vacate? :-)

>
>

1346. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:10:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400ECEAA.8040808@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86022

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>I don't see why the Extra-class code test requirement needs to be set at the
>current 5 WPM level. A 12-wpm code test would be a better idea, and anyone
>interested enough in achieving Extra could go from nothing to that level in a
>matter of weeks. However, since Extra is already dumbed-down to 5 WPM, I
>guess there's no putting the toothpaste back in the tube.
>
>
>
The medical wavier issue would pop up again. And the FCC doesn't want
to deal
with that. As I (mis)undestand it, all you had to do to get a wavier
was to tell your
family doctor you had this problem with the code, and all he had to do
was sign off
on it. Most doctors probably didn't understand the issue beyond that
there was no
safety issue involved ("What, you can't learn how to drive a bus, well,
here's a
wavier to take to the DMV to get a commercial driver's license") and it was
unlikely that anyone would question the doctor about it. So it was
easily abused,
and the FCC doesn't want to deal with it. And the FCC doesn't gain anything
out of requiring higher speed code (it's not a lid filter, as witness
14.313 before
restructuring).

>
>

1347. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:15:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400ECFB3.2050008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86023

Zonedout wrote:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>
>>3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>>
>>
>
>The ARRL & FCC should just stop screwing around, forget
>hams' need to have their ego stroked with the license
>class of "Advanced" or "Extra" printed on their ticket,
>and just rename the classes Class A, B, & C.
>
>Everyone gets a new "name" for their license class and
>all the whiners that "Advanced" sounds more advanced
>than "Extra", etc., are just cut off at the knees.
>
>
>
>
Change the names to "top banana", "2nd banana", and "beginner"

;-)

1348. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:25:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401211125.5e2b5ead@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86024
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040119195621.00545.00003711@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article , "Kï¿½HB"
> writes:
>
> >If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
> >four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
> >proposing!
>
> The ARRL proposal is much less lame than the "Amateur Radio in the 21st
> Century" paper's ideas.
> >
> >A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
> >General, and Extra.
>
> Good idea.
> >
> >Novice is still ghetto-ized
>
> Not at all.

They certainly are. The term "Novice" was a valid choice back when the
Novice license was a one year drop-dead entry ticket. Novices
absolutely were novices in the real sense of the term back then, we
were all raw beginners. Continuing to use the term today when a
"Novice" can hold the license basically forever is not only an
oxymoron, it's also reeks of maintaining the worn out old "pecking
order" crappola. Call 'em "Tech IIs", call 'em anything which doesn't
infer that a 30 year Novice is just a newbie getting his feet wet in
ham radio.

Asinine.

> > and renewable until you assume room
> >temperature.
>
> Good idea.
>
> >Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
>
> Good idea.

I'd love it but don't bet the farm on it or hold yer breath. How do ya
spell "waivers AGAIN"?

> >
> >General just like today except without Morse.
> >
> Bad idea.
>
> >Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
> >
> >But there's more.....
> >
> >A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.
>
> Very bad idea.
> >

> >All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
>
> Extra.
>
> Another very bad idea.

WHY??

> >That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
> >the next higher license without testing for that grade.
>
> No reason given for it, either. FCC has maintained the old Advanced and
> Novice classes for almost 4 years with no problems. There's no reason it would
> be a problem for FCC to maintain the Advanced and Tech classes
> the same way.

It's obvious, at least to me, that one major bottom line intent of the
proposal is to foster more activity on the HF phone bands. If the
proposal is adopted I expect that objective might be met so I support
the basics of the proposal.

James I fail miserably to understand why you're so adamantly opposed
to the free passes. How exactly do you see the proposed free passes
having any real-world adverse effects on the service? Or how would
these free passes infringe on your privs and operations to the point
where you have such a big problem with 'em?

> >And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
> >must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
> >not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
> >passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.
>
> Yep!

Nope. Not if ya expect HF newbies to even try CW. If newbies don't try
it we might as well drive a stake in mode now and get the pain over
with.

> >
> >C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a

> >committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
> >the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
> >for the future.
>
> It's better than anything you or NCVEC has proposed. But not as good
> as my proposal.
>
> >Nasty letter to follow.
>
> Try a little diplomacy.

Dream on.

> >I>AM< THE ARRL!!!
> >
> So am I.

I wasn't for a few days again and beat 'em out of another free book
for rejoining.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1349. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:26:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400ED26C.6020804@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>"Tom Winston" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
>
>
>>On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>>>
>>>
>>That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
>>passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
>>Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
>>-- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.
>>
>>
>
> Uhhhh...in what universe?
>
> The only "Advanced" class licensees that I know of that took an
>Extra written test but didn't upgrade were one's who failed the 20WPM.
>
There was that window of time from Jan 2000 to April 14, 2000 where one
could take the
extra written, pass it, get the CSCE, and cash it in on April 15, 2000.
And then have
your extra. And not fail the 20wpm test because he didn't take it. I
did this and also
took the advanced written (was an old tech plus), and cashed in the
CSCEs April 15th.

>
> And I'd like to know how getting more operating privileges is a
>"downgrade"...?!?!
>
> Would you take an airline ticket "upgrade" by moving FROM First
>Class to Coach? Uh uh...It's the other way around. Same here.
>
>
>
>>Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
>>higher standards than the current crop of Extras.

>>
But those advanceds didn't do the extra writtens (4B). So, if the extra written is "worth"
more than 13wpm, then todays' extras have higher standards than the advanceds'.
Depends on how you call it, if element 4B > 13wpm or not.

>>
>>
>
> Perhaps. Certainly the Advanced Class folks passed a more
>stringent code test. My Advanced written was hard, but so was the
>Extra. I am proud of both.
>
It's a good thing to have, but it's not at the top of my resume. My 13 patents
and BSEE are above it. Now that we're in bragging mode.... :-)

>
>
>

1350. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:32:03 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc0tl4i.e53.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 86026

In article <400ECFB3.2050008@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey wrote:
>>
> Change the names to "top banana", "2nd banana", and "beginner"

Then I get to change my Phonetics to
"Another Banana 2 Render Code"

Alex / AB2RC

1351. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 19:48:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Ke6dnbcZaIUrRJPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86027

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Fact ot the matter is my callsign is not vulgar, it is not disrespectful, it
> is not inappropriate.

It, like those other call signs mentioned, is in very bad taste. But
then what else should we expect of you?

1352. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 20:16:15 UTC
From: Lenny <len@bossdaplane.org>
Message-ID: <bummmb$7bb$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86028
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The ARRL & FCC count on idiots like you.

Lenny

>
> And you know this, how?
>
> Let's think this through. We're talking about ham radio, right?
> Someone at ARRL is going to risk jail time to funnel personal or
> League funds to corrupt FCC officials in the hope that by doing so,
> the proposal will become reality. Then, when it does become reality,
> there will be a HUGE increase in League membership, and said ARRL
> person will presumably siphon off huge profits (again risking jail
> time) and live the good life ever after.
>
> Meanwhile, the FCC bureaucrats are going to risk their jobs and jail
> time to accept these funds and push through this crazy proposal. Then,
> they too will live the good life ever after. Oh yeah, that's real
> plausible.
>
> Art Harris N2AH
> (No fan of ARRl, but not stark raving mad either)

1353. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 20:37:54 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <0got00p8d3hphfufjsjerpo2d5c35epb71@4ax.com>
Source record: 86029

Jim,

Thanks - got it!.

The comment that you are referring to, however, wasn't mine - you may
wish to take this issue up directly with its author.

73, Leo

On 21 Jan 2004 02:09:43 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <9lhr00998k8cg4qtm1t2hv0mjuir8q0co5@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 20 Jan 2004 23:24:16 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <36gq00hqf30ulj3fdu7b9dg2am9fhqpffi@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@noway.com>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>That's one way of looking at it, Jim. To me, it looks like a purely
>>>>political move - that is, trying to please the greatest number of
>>>>members...and voters...and customers...
>>>>
>>>>400,000 upgraded licences = 400,000 happier ARRL members.
>>>>Drop code = some number of happy new HF - using members.
>>>>Keep code for Extra licence = a 'tip of the hat' to the 'Extra' class
>>>>members, to give them something to be happy about (although keeping
>>>>code testing as a requirement for a licence class that provides only
>>>>additional phone bandwidth as a perk is pretty odd, I'd say...but it
>>>>does make the Extra level licence harder to get - that's what
>>>>everybody wants, right?).
>>>
>>> The problem is that the 15 old men of the BoD have just
>>> disenfranchised themselves from over 200K Technician class
>>> licensees who will now carry the wonderful class name of
>>> "Novice."
>
>Leo,
>
>Lest anyone be confused, the above statement is not correct. It
>is in error, mistaken, false, misleading and just plain wrong.
>
>The ARRL proposal wants existing Technicians to get a
>free upgrade to General, not a downgrade to Novice.
>

>Direct quote from ARRL:
>
>"The middle group of licensees--Technician, Tech Plus (Technician
>with Element 1 credit) and General--would be merged into a new
>General license that also would not require a Morse examination.
>Current Technician and Tech Plus license holders automatically would
>gain current General class privileges without additional testing."
>
>Truth triumphs over error once again.
>
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

1354. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:21:51 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477A66CF851Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86030

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:JYnPb.21394$zj7.4912
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
> < That's not what I read. As far as I know it is in a law
> < that was sponsored by the late Senator Barry
> < Goldwater, K7UGA.
>
> I'm certain you're mistaken.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
```

It might be more productive if someone could produce some evidence one way
or the other!

1355. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:31:29 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477A80E33C3Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86031

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:400E1AB7.3010708@ix.netcom.com:

> Alan wrote:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>
>>>In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>><alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>>>>@posting.google.com:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>>>>
>>>>>Summary:
>>>>>
>>>>>3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
>>>>would reintroduce a free licence class.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains
>>on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level licence
>>is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
>>
>>No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
>>thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought
>>about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open
>>and it could be called something else.

>>
>>
>>
>>>The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the
>>>entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
>>>privileges, but more HF privileges.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Provided the new class that happened to
>>>>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
>>>>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Why?
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I thought the old Novice was too easy
>>
>>
>>
>>>Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech
>>>Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between
>>>above and below 30 MHz privileges.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
>>
>>
>>
>>>>>>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
>>>receiving.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Won't happen
>>
> Exactly. Nobody else uses code anymore. And what does the FCC
> get out of it? And the medical wavier issues come back.... They ain't
> gonna do anything to have THAT come up again!
>

>>
>>
>>
>>>>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should be
>>>>dumped.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed to
>>>use manufactured equipment.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Not in my opinion
>>
>>
>>
>>>>Moreover, it can be now,
>>>>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I think they will too
>>
> Again, nobody else uses code anymore. Code made good sense back
> 50 years ago during the vacuum tube radio era. Simple equipment was
> all that was needed and given the reliability of vacuum tube stuff
> voice could likely fail when needed. But today's equipment is all made
> with chips and quite reliable. And digital modes like packet can
> handle automatically
> health and welfare traffic code used to do, with less operators needed.
>
>>
>>
>>
>>>>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>OK
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as has
>>>been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>>>
>>>

>>
>>Can't stand loose ends
>>
> Let's say that 4 years experience as an advanced is equal to element 4B
> (the old extra written an advanced used to be able to take to get his
> extra).
> So make the advanced turn into an extra next April.
>
>>
>>
>>
>>>>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to
>>>Extra, but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to
>>>General?
>>>
>>>What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but not
>>>the other?
>>>
>>>
>>
>>As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech, which
>>is already pretty easy
>>
>>
>>
>>>>>'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Good.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Bad.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful

>>spectrum to phone
>>
> Are the digital modes more tolerant of SW broadcaster QRM than SSB? If
> so, move the digital modes to 7150-7300 and voice 7000-7150. If
> nothing else, it would help chase the SW broadcasters away...
>
>

Brilliant idea! Now that's what I call lateral thinking. It'll never happen
though.

I suggest:-

7000-7045 CW/Digital
7045-7100 Phone
7100-7150 CW/Digital
7150-7245 Phone
7245-7300 CW/Digital

Nothing atall wrong with that, in fact it would be a major improvement.
It'll get me flamed, though!

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1356. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:43:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121164300.15923.00003340@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86033

In article <bukr00p145iv5l8srp5veaj499sqj8cnj0@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Subject: Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)
>From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 01:40:38 GMT
>
>On 20 Jan 2004 23:24:27 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <2u8q00du1je37qqmvcaa0cu3g7s4d387ep@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>> Some good thoughts there, Leo. I'll add to my previous comments.
>>
>>>This follows on the lines of the thread that Mike and I have commented
>>>on previously, so here goes:
>>>
>>>On 18 Jan 2004 20:34:05 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>>
>>>> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>>>>
>>>> 1. There would be NO ARRL to provide "guidance" and direction.
>>>> That expired before St. Hiram expired. [in this alternative
>>>> universe] Newington, CT, would have no museum.
>>>
>>>True - no AR, no ARRL. Mr. Maxim would be remembered only as the
>>>inventor of the Maxim Silencer for explosive weapons, and for his work
>>>on automobile silencers (mufflers, I assume).
>>>
>>>However, following along with the subject of the thread - the startup
>>>of a "new" Amateur Radio Service" would concievably attract a lot of
>>>people to it - an organization starting up to represent them and their
>>>interests (and take their money) seems like a given.
>>
>> In the wider world of early radio organizations (see Thomas H.
>> White's very notable web pages as well as print history), ARRL
>> was a relative latecomer in amateur radio. The one thing they
>> can claim is having survived the early competition in the USA.
>>
>> [I'll have to use the USA as a reference here, no slight intended
>> against Canada, only against my meager knowledge of Canadian
>> amateur activities of earlier times]
>

>None taken - I haven't found much historical information on amateur
>radio up here, so my own knowledge in this area is in the meager
>department as well....
>>
>> ARRL, by their own history, began as a local New England radio
>> club largely organized for relaying telegraphy messages
>> quicker than was provided by commercial carriers. In reality that
>> is a form of "hacking" hardly different than the CD music stealing
>> that went on through the Internet in modern times. So, the 3-man
>> club got more locals and "organized" in 1914. The Radio Club of
>> America had already existed for 5 years and some of the RCA
>> members were very involved in amateur radio activities. [first to
>> use acronym 'RCA' but not aligned with RCA Corporation that once
>> was] The local ARRL club was small in 1914 and many national
>> clubs for amateur radio were much larger in membership.
>>
>> The "League" effectively used PR and promotional techniques to
>> expand, slowly adding on news and technical publications. It had
>> very little of what it eventually became. Intense self-promotion
>> (League publications themselves are excellent vehicles to do such
>> things) kept their name/organization in everyone's mind. It fostered
>> an image in many minds to make up for the generally solitary
>> activity of one amateur listening for hours to static in hopes of
>> capturing a weak telegraphic signal. Technology of radio was still
>> quite primitive. The first two attempts at trans-national (USA)
>> message relay were disappointing failures. Nonetheless, the ARRL
>> kept up the PR and eventually made it through the competition for
>> "national amateur representation." Competition included the
>> formidable base of Hugo Gernsback's little publishing empire and
>> his own attempts at building an amateur radio organization.
>>
>> The key element in establishing the ARRL was Maxim's own
>> funded lobbying in DC after WW1 to restore U.S. amateur radio.
>> That worked, amazingly enough, and became the stuff of legend
>> in much later League self-promotion...even 86 years later.
>> Maxim became "president for life" of the ARRL and "served"
>> until the 1930s. Sort of a private little empire which happens in
>> all organizations eventually. That's not to decry Maxim's
>> efforts but, in order to be fair, one cannot pin 'altruism' on Maxim's
>> "service to the League." He was instrumental in starting it and no
>> doubt was self-possessive about it.
>>
>> With radio technology still not climbing the steep walls of
>> exponential leaps and bounds in electronics technology in 1920,
>> ARRL publications were about the only trade news available to
>> the everyman hobbyist at that time. There was very little of the
>> information media bonanza we all enjoy today. Knowledge took
>> time to spread. League publications helped that since they weren't
>> involved in patent disputes (many, many in the 1920s, 1930s) or
>> various groups' attempts to control radio or trade secret

>> developments that industry was jealously guarding. ARRL pubs
>> were an EXCELLENT vehicle, a medium for self-promotion and the
>> League didn't hesitate one bit to keep on promoting itself.
>>
>>>> 2. There would be NO morse code test since no other radio
>>>> service except Maritime Radio used morse code. There
>>>> would be NO need to keep a "pool of trained morse radio
>>>> operators" for any national need.
>>>
>>>True enough - if amateur radio were invented today, it's pretty
>>>unlikely that Morse Code would be a mandatory requirement or play any
>>>significant role - it's a dead technology in the commercial and
>>>military world today (just spies and some covert military ops remain
>>>professional users of morse signalling today). I believe that it
>>>would be a 'special interest' thing for people who wanted to play
>>>around with it.
>>
>> There are MANY and varied groups of hobbyists involved in
>> electronics today and many of those existed before personal
>> computers began. "High fidelity" music/sound was one though it has
>> shrunk to a niche market now. Robotics in general seems to be
>> the latest in interest, merging microcontrollers and machinery in lots
>> of different forms. Keyboard synthesizers had been a big thing with
>> the first of the lower-cost personal computers, but now simplified into
>> commercially-available programmable music machines. A close
>> look into the availability of parts and materials at various smaller
>> merchandizers on websites will show that there is great interest in
>> electronics-oriented experimentation and hobby work besides just
>> radio communications. Merchants are a good barometer of where
>> the hobby work goes on...it's a cruel market where only the larger
>> interests survive (regardless of individual favorites)...merchants can't
>> pay bills with altruism. :-)
>>
>>>I wonder, though, if in the absence of Amateur Radio, something else
>>>might have evolved to meet the need of having extra trained people
>>>available? Perhaps an auxillary (and voluntary) communications corps,
>>>mobilized by the military or local government during times of need?
>>>They might even provide the equipment and training...wouldn't be free,
>>>though - Amateur Radio doesn't cost them much (if anything) to
>>>mobilize.
>>
>> I personally doubt it on scales larger than local, urban groups.
>> Radio - on the larger scale of human activities - is an established
>> medium of communications used by government and business on
>> a large scale. It's not a mystery or magic that it once appeared to
>> be in the 1920s or 1930s. Radio is far more widespread in society
>> of the USA than all of amateur radio in North America.
>>
>> Use of a radio is ridiculously easy with existing radio equipment of
>> the 1960s era, not just that of the 2000s. Government and business

>> HTs on VHF-UHF are more numerous than amateur HTs in the USA
>> and have been so for more than 30 years. What is needed, if anything,
>> is the coordination of groups involved in "needy operations," the
>> control-and-response protocols, organizational structures to get the
>> various tasks done. That doesn't need specialized "radio training,"
>> just group organization. Police and fire people use radios every day
>> without any special classes in radio innards, often with just a few
>> minutes of personalized instruction.
>>
>>>> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings because
>>>> there would be no old-timers left to tell the tales...only
>>>> pretenders who longed for a simpler (mythical) life way back
>>>> before they were born.
>>>
>>>Well, there would still be old timers telling tales - just not ham
>>>radio ones ;)
>>
>> Of course! That's a given. :-)
>>
>> Especially those bitter about not having the opportunity to do big-
>> leagues communications on HF a half century ago. <bseg, lol>
>
>...caught that ;)
>
>>
>>>> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway and several movies made
>>>> about that tragedy.
>>>
>>>Unfortunately, yes. And many other unfortunate events may well have
>>>become much disasters or have increased in magnitude, as there would
>>>have been far less people monitoring the bands and detecting /
>>>relaying emergency traffic if the ARS had not existed.
>>
>> Would there be? That MIGHT be true in 1912, 92 years ago and 2
>> years before the ARRL existed. The international martime distress
>> frequency of 500 KHz had not yet been implemented in 1912. The
>> distance to land was not that great and the radios of that time were
>> not sensitive in receiving although some of the spark transmitters
>> where "high power." Had that happened in the much larger Pacific,
>> farther from land, or in the southern Atlantic or Indian Ocean, it
>> might have been a whole different story.
>>
>> Pro-coders are quick on the trigger to trot out OLD tales of "need
>> to relay traffic" when there is NO need to relay any traffic today or
>> even four decades ago. GMDSS was implemented by the Maritime
>> Community to replace the old 500 KHz Autoalarms. That there
>> haven't been that many maritime disasters since is a tribute to
>> modern day shipbuilding and education/experience of ship masters.
>> The highly-touted 500 KHz frequency didn't save the Andrea Doria
>> from sinking back in 1956...or prevent the collosion with the

>> Stockholm. The international civil aviation community has had
>> 121.5 MHz as an emergency frequency since 1955, several SSB
>> voice frequencies on HF since then for over-ocean flights.
>>
>> Here in Los Angeles we just had the 10th anniversary of the Northridge
>> Earthquake. Widespread destruction and 60 deaths as a result. The
>> entire primary electrical power distribution was cut off for hours. The
>> area IS organized, trained, drilled for this sort of thing and it
>functioned
>> very well using the infrastructure of government-utilities-business
>> communications, both wireline and radio. Amateur radio did not aid
>> in that until about two days later. Utility crews had their hands full
>> trying to restore power (successful), repair damaged lines and streets,
>> clearing away some toppled buildings. Fire departments rolled as
>> needed, their stations and vehicle communications functioning fine.
>> Hospitals and care centers all had emergency electrical power, more
>> needed than "health and welfare message traffic." We survived.
>>
>>>> "Independence Day" would have been
>>>> made anyway as a comic science-fiction vehicle for Will Smith
>>>> who would later wear black suits and shades.
>>>
>>>Uh-huh...even the ARS was unable to save the world from this.
>>
>> From Hollywood? :-) Try the movie "Frequency."
>>
>>>> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
>>>> belly-up anyway. Collins Radio would have continued on into
>>>> the military and commercial radio market without making any
>>>> overpriced fancy amateur radios. Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom
>>>> would still have been successful in the commercial and
>>>> government market. SGC might still exist but in the personal
>>>> sailing market. Ten-Tec might not exist.
>>>
>>>Without the ARS, one indeed wonders how long companies like
>>>Hallicrafters and National would have survived - after WWII, amateur
>>>radio was a large part of their market.
>>
>> Not as much as you would believe. Bill Halligan's Chicago company
>> was busy with both prime and subcontracts for radio equipment,
>> including the famous BC-610 used in the SCR-299 mobile HF
>> station. Hallicrafters was busy with making HF radios for the
>> commercial and government market, not seen in popular ham
>> magazine ads. National Radio made a name for itself with the HRO
>> receivers sold also to commercial and government buyers, again not
>> that much advertisement in magazines. Very unlikely makers of
>> things got into the radio manufacture arena during WW2, such as
>> Lewyt Vacuum Cleaner Company who made some of the BC-339
>> 1 KW HF transmitters I QSYed a half century ago! [name was on
>> the ID tag riveted to the frame...:-)]

>
>I have always been amazed at the versatility of some of the companies
>engaged in WWII production - it would be no small feat for a company
>manufacturing vacuum cleaners to retool their lines and train / hire
>staff to build a 1 KW radio transmitter to mil spec.
>
>...or the Rock-Ola Jukebox Company cranking out M1 Carbines.
>
>Incredible!
>
>>
>> Paul Galvin's Motorola-to-be (also in Chicago) was cranking out
>> the BC-1000 walkie-talkies (backpack VHF transceiver) of WW2
>> after stealing Dan Noble from Link, Link doing pioneering in mobile
>> FM radio for police departments...which led to widespread use of
>> mobile, channelized FM transceiver for land vehicles. Galvin was
>> also organizer/central-point for the number 2 priority of all U.S.
>> WW2 manufacturing (second only to the Manhattan Project) of
>> quartz crystal units. Better than a half million crystal units a
>> month made by over 30 U.S. companies for the last three years
>> of WW2...all for the military communications needs of the USA
>> and Great Britain.
>>
>>>Could they have hung on by
>>>just selling radio equipment to SWLs listening to foreign commercial
>>>broadcasts?
>>
>> No. No need. After WW2, there was a big (but not widely advertised)
>> push in other areas. Motorola went after the police and government
>> mobile FM radios along with other makers. Collins Radio, already big
>> enough in military-commercial radio, got a boost from SAC contracts
>> for single-channel SSB and various military land radios. RCA also got
>> into the single-channel SSB race, designed some, eventually dropped
>> out of much of the military market. Civil aviation got going on VHF AM
>> comm-nav and UHF radionav radios for aircraft after 1955 and the ICAO
>> decisions-allocations. Military TACAN had morphed into DME for civil
>> aviation, civil folks having develped VOR for bearing to ground stations.
>> National Radio Company continued for years to build radio systems
>> for the USN, past 1970. Collins continues to be a standard for
>> excellence in aircraft systems.
>>
>> Many of the makers of today's radios for commercial-government use
>> aren't advertised in "popular" magazines because that's not a target
>> market area. ITT in Fort Wayne, Indiana, designed (and redesigned)
>> the SINCGARS basic small-unit land forces radio...between them and
>> the former Land Division of General Dynamics in Florida, a quarter
>> million sets were produced beginning in 1989. That's more than about
>> a hundred thousand AN/PRC-25s and -77s made since the early 60s
>> (VHF, channelized, voice only, used in Vietnam and elsewhere). One
>> of the Hughes Aircraft divisions designed and made a bunch of the

>> standard HF R/Ts for land forces (AN/PRC-104 for manpack version,
>> 20 W PEP, automatic antenna tuner) beginning in 1984. There's a
>> whole heaping glob of various military electronics produced by many
>> since the end of WW2, too many to recount here.
>>
>> Very little of that is evidenced by ads in ham magazines. Hams
>> don't buy the stuff new and surplus radios don't generate money for
>> the original manufacturers. It WILL be familiar to those of us who
>> have worked in the electronics industry.
>>
>> Nearly all the "radio" makers of 1945 tried their hand at TV sets for
>> civilians. Hallicrafters did (with a push-button channel selector!), so
>> did National Radio (I bought a 7-incher in 1949). Most dropped out
>> in the intense competition. Eventually all the U.S. makers of TV
>> sets went belly-up although the Indianapolis division of Thompson-
>> CSF (the old RCA Corporation plant there) still makes some color
>> TVs on-shore. General Radio, who long ago quit making radios in
>> favor of precision instruments, eventually dropped out. I don't know
>> why Hallicrafters quit or what happened to National Radio other than
>> concentrating solely on government stuff. Collins Radio is alive and
>> well but long out of amateur markets.
>>
>> Icom, Yaesu, and Kenwood probably make more commercial-
>> government radios than amateur equipment. Those are the triad
>> from the Far East that beat the commercial pants off North American
>> communications radio producers...except for some specialty
>> divisions of General Electric and Motorola (two as an example in
>> mobile radio market). Some of their commercial, non-amateur
>> market radios are being sold through chains like HRO, but otherwise
>> few amateurs get input from ham publications on that side of their
>> business. All three do good in design and manufacture, are
>> innovative and dare to hit the market with new things.
>>
>>>Some companies may never have started up in the first place, as their
>>>beginnings were entirely in amateur radio.
>>
>> Before or after WW2? Bill Halligan was a ham, also Art Collins, just
>> two early examples. Collins Radio survived and prospered, Halli-
>> crafters didn't. The reasons aren't simplistic. Business, to survive
>> and grow, needs a lot of things and niche markets aren't successful
>> for the ambitious growth plans of some. Diversification may be
>> necessary as was the growth of General Electric Company and its
>> many divisions...RCA Corp was spun out of some of those and
>> eventually GE bought RCA back (irony!). :-)
>>
>> Whether or not specialty or niche-market companies survive depends
>> on the founders and what they want to do. They may develop a
>> fantastic reputation through clever PR and create an intense, loyal
>> following, but the eventual color of bookkeeping ink can catch up to
>> them. Adulation of customers doesn't pay bills...customers have to

>> keep buying, write checks, not write peans of praise. Business is
>> TOUGH.
>>
>> [to be continued...]
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>

1357. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:43:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121164302.15923.00003341@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86032

In article <5ujr00tcqhfs22tceeo1jjf72119nl3tej@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Len, I must admit that I fully agree. It took me over a half hour to
>read through and absorb all of the information that you presented in
>your three replies on this subject. That's an excellent depth of
>knowledge you have there...

Well, memory I still got...and a few years in the radio-electronics
industry. Glad to share it.

>I learned a great deal, stand corrected on a couple of points, and am
>following up on the Web on some of your referencess for more
>information - fascinating stuff!

The Thomas H. White early (USA) radio history "papers" are
most interesting, putting into one place where I've seen it before
in many different texts...plus some oddities like the first radio
circuit to Catalina Island just off the Los Angeles coastline (not
seen before). White has lots of digitized photos to go with the
texts.

The Corning Frequency Control (quartz crystal making division)
website has a fascinating contributed paper (deep in its archives)
about the tremendous effort here to make quartz crystal units
during WW2. That one is written by a retired PhD who was part
of the war effort. Imagine being #2 on the national priority list for
strategic materials, second only to the atomic bomb! :-)

Motorola has supplied some of its history previously and reproed
some of that on its website. Paul Galvin's own book-biography
details more about the WW2 "handie-talkie" (in use before Dec 7
1941) and the "walkie-talkie" developed by Dan Noble. Noble was
lauded by the IEEE History Center for his pioneering design of
mobile and portable FM radio (the old SCR-300 was not crystal
controlled, but VFOed...a "calibrate" crystal oscillator checked the
dial hairline position...a bit tough on design considering the
environment it had to meet).

National Radio Co. put out a rather thick booklet of photos of its
first 50 years in the radio business...still have that along with a
"golden rule" (gold anodized 12" ruler) they gave away. Did you
know that one of the old National receivers was called a "Thrill
Box?!?" Yup. Ought to make the purists in here cringe all over!
[Bill Halligan should have thought of that...might have livened up
his Chicago works towards the end]

The "surplus restorer" fanatics have lots and lots of old information that is fascinating although some ascribe uneven importance and try to second-guess some of the reasons for doing designs the way they were done. One of the U.S. cosmetic companies in Noo Yawk Zitty once decided to make R-390 receivers on a mass Request-For-Bid by the government on later production (legal, the government owned the design originally done by Collins). Once the production chiefs saw the complexity of it - and differences from their cosmetics containers - they decided to simply buy some R-390s from another source, change the nameplates, and sell those at their too-low bid price. :-)

I've had the opportunity to meet with some of the engineering folks in this corner of the country and hear about projects in the works. One is Hughes Aircraft's design of the PRC-104 HF transceiver (I've been a HAC employee twice, once at El Segundo, again at Canoga Park) circa the early 1980s. That's still in service and comes with a vehicular mounting power amplifier for greater PEP and a higher-power antenna tuner. The manpack basic R/T includes an automatic antenna tuner! I finally got my own copy of the TM on it a few months ago...from, of all things, a U.S. Army CD! The world and military all changing. :-)

I've had lots of opportunites to see (up close and personal) the rest of the radio world...including the U.S. Army field comms for regiment size units at Fort Irwin, CA, the Desert Warfare Training Center. That was in 1989 and didn't have any idea of what lay ahead for applying such training a year and a half later in the first Gulf War.

The SINCGARS program is fascinating from a design standpoint in that it pulled together some totally tough things for a nasty environmental range...such as crystal stability and being able to frequency hop 10 times per second and remain locked in the net. ITT Fort Wayne did a tremendous job on that (in my book) and did an encore when they improved it to more functions in half the bulk. Harris up in NY state is doing a similar radio for UK military, compatible with the PRC-119 family. It's outlined on ITT's website. General Dynamics Land Division did some of the production and they had a website on it once...that division went bye-bye when they lost a production contract follow-on.

One only needs to keep eyes and ears open wherever one is. Lots and lots of information on the Internet now and even more in the other-than-ham-radio-history-by-a-large-US-club histories such as the old Electronics magazine (a biweekly from McGraw-Hill). It's surprising how MUCH information is available that is totally cleared for public distribution!

>Much appreciated!

If you need some links, let me know...preferrably in private...that way it isn't messed up by the hecklers. :-)

LHA / WMD

1358. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:55:59 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86034

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> >> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>> >>
>> >> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>> >> >
>> >> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>> >> >>@posting.google.com:
>> >> >>
>> >> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>> Summary:
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>> >> >>
>> >> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so
>> >> >>it would reintroduce a free licence class.
>> >> >
>> >> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices
>> >> remains on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry
>> >> level licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test
>> >> is free.
>> >>
>> >> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
>> >> thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't
>> >> thought about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is
>> >> still open and it could be called something else.
>> >
>> > Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since
>> > no new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a
>> > moot point.

>> >
>> > But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...

As best as I can follow it a statute made testing free for Novices, and a later administrative decision closed the class to new entrants. Obviously the FCC don't have to include in Part 97 a rule giving free testing for Novices whilst there are no Novice tests, but if they re-started Novice testing it would have to be free. I admit I could be wrong, but that is how I understand it, unless someone can show me proof to the contrary.

>> >>
>> >> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the
>> >> > entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
>> >> > privileges, but more HF privileges.
>> >> >
>> >> >>Provided the new class that happened to
>> >> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass
>> >> >>the current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>> >> >
>> >> > Why?
>> >>
>> >> I thought the old Novice was too easy
>> >
>> > Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13
>> > was adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first station
>> > was homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license started me
>> > on the path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about 3 years and
>> > BSEE in a little over 8 years....
>> >
>> > And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
>> > keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
>> > more, isn't that just about perfect?
>
> Well?
>
> Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do? If
> it insures that newcomers know enough to keep out of trouble (on the
> air, anyway,) gives them a sample of what amateur radio is about, and
> inspires them to learn and do more with ham radio, isn't that just
> about perfect?

I don't see very many people having any great difficulty with the present Element 2, so why does it need to be easier? The privileges would be more than the old Novice as well.

>
>> >> > Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current
>> >> > Tech Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance
>> >> > between above and below 30 MHz privileges.
>> >>
>> >> So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down

>> >
>> > How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for
>> > all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
>> > parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs proposed
>> > for the Novice?
>
> How much is it reasonable to expect a newcomer to learn in order to be
> turned loose with ~100 watts on parts of HF and ~25 watts on parts of
> VHF/UHF?
>

To put it another way, why shouldn't the Techs have all those proposed HF privileges, since they have passed a test with more questions than that proposed?

>> >> >>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>> >> >>
>> >> >>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>> >> >
>> >> > Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
>> >> > receiving.
>> >>
>> >> Won't happen
>> >
>> > Probably not, but it's still a good idea.
>> >>
>> >> >>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should
>> >> >>be dumped.
>> >> >
>> >> > It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed
>> >> > to use manufactured equipment.
>> >>
>> >> Not in my opinion
>> >
>> > It's the same argument used against the code test. Why *must* a ham
>> > learn all that theory to use manufactured, approved gear with no
>> > critical adjustments? Heck, most ham gear today won't transmit out
>> > of band unless modified!
>> >>
>> >> >>Moreover, it can be now,
>> >> >>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six
>> >> >>months.
>> >> >>
>> >> > FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>> >>
>> >> I think they will too
>> >
>> > Unfortunately
>> >>
>> >> >>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>> >> >>

>> >> >>OK
>> >> >
>> >> > Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class,
>> >> > as has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>> >>
>> >> Can't stand loose ends
>> >
>> > What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
>> > 1967 even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
>> > additional privileges at all.
>
> Do those loose ends really cause any problems?

Confusion?

Besides, Element 4A had most of the harder questions anyway.

>> >
>> >> >>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>> >> >>
>> >> >>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>> >> >>
>> >> > Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to
>> >> > Extra, but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade
>> >> > to General?
>> >> >
>> >> > What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but
>> >> > not the other?
>> >>
>> >> As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech,
>> >> which is already pretty easy
>> >
>> > Exactly. But that doesn't answer the question. You want Advanceds to
>> > get free upgrades to avoid ~82,000 loose ends, but not Techs and
>> > Tech pluses, who would
>> > amount to ~322,000 loose ends.
>> >
>> > I don't see why one and not the other.
>> >
>> >> >>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>> >> >>
>> >> >>Good.
>> >> >
>> >> > Bad.
>> >> >
>> >> >> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>> >> >
>> >> > That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>> >>
>> >> Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
>> >> spectrum to phone

>> >
>> > Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital
>> > voice?

It has worse S/N performance than SSB

>> >
>> >> >>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>> >> >>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on 6,
>> >> >>> 2, 222, and 440
>>
>> >> >>See above
>> >> >
>> >> > Please clarify.
>> >>
>> >> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone.
>> >
>> > 25 kHz more.
>> >
>> >> 7075-7100, for example,
>> >> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it
>> >> would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>> >
>> > Hams outside Region 2 will be getting 7100-7200 anyway. Let them
>> > harmonize with us.
>> >
>>
>> US hams outside R2 already have 7075-7100 phone
>
> Only because they don't have 7100-7200. US hams outside R2 are rare
> enough to be conidered "DX" anyway.
>>
>> Read it again. *US* hams outside R2
>
> I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below
> 7100 goes away completely.

Only when:-

1 - all the broadcasters have moved, probably circa the year 2100; and

2 - all the countries have 7100-7200, which might almost take as long

>>
>> >> >>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
>> >> >>> evaluation
>> >> >>
>> >> >>OK
>> >> >
>> >> > Agreed.
>> >> >
>> >> >>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",

>> >> >>
>> >> >>Not OK
>> >> >
>> >> > Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
>> >> > more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and
>> >> > modes, power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase)
>> >> > and much more.
>> >> >
>> >> > By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure questions,
>> >> but I think the test is already easy enough.
>> >
>> > To a beginner, it's not so easy.

My XYL passed Elements 2 and 3A, and she has no real interest in radio.

>> >>
>> >> >>> General to be
>> >> >>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>> >>
>> >> >>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You
>> >> >>don't say here.
>> >> >
>> >> > See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the
>> >> > work of a committee looking to give everyone something they want,
>> >> > but not giving anyone everything they want.
>> >> >
>> >> > What will FCC do?
>> >> >
>> >> > First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to
>> >> > attract more new hams.
>> >>
>> >> Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under
>> >> existing law. That has some appeal.
>> >
>> > See above about the "law".
>> >
>> >> > Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.
>> >>
>> >> Agreed
>> >>
>> >> > Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it
>> >> > costs them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.
>> >>
>> >> I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to
>> >> handle 5 classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there
>> >> won't be two types of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why
>> >> they aren't recorded differently right now).
>> >

>> > Incorrect!
>> >
>> > Before restructuring, their computers handled 6 classes of license
>> > (Novice, Tech, Tech Plus, General, Advanced, Extra). In fact their
>> > computers *still* handle 6 classes! So there should be no problem at
>> > all.
>> >
>> > And as Tech Pluses continue to be renewed as Techs, expire, and
>> > upgrade, that class will disappear completely.
>> >>
>> >> I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes,
>> >> though. I think it is better to move on.
>> >
>> > I agree, but not at the price of giveaways just to make things look
>> > neater.
>> >
>>
>> Better that than the only possible alternative - taking privileges
>> away
>
> But is there really any reason not to simply continue those license
> classes? That's a much, much better option than freebies or removing
> privileges.

No it's not. If we abolish them we can sort out all the subbands.

>>
>> > How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams
>> > except Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
>> > "Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>>
>> I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited licence.
>
> Why would Techs be singled out for a limited license? They have full
> privs above 50 MHz.
>
>> I
>> would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence.
>
> By your reasoning, there's no reason to have the Extra, then. Nor its
> test.
>

Correct.

>> Of course, to be
>> fair you would have to extend that to Techs with old Element 3.
>

> Where ya been, Alun?
>
> Techs with old Element 3 (licensed before March 21, 1987) can get a
> General
> license *today* with no additional testing. Just show up at a VE
> session with
> proof of such license, fill out the 605 and pay the VE fee. Instant
> General.
> And if such a ham can pass the Extra written (might as well try, the
> same
> VE fee buys that test too), they get an Extra.
>
> Been that way since April 15, 2000.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1359. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:58:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hCCPb.32911$P%1.25897746@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86036
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Moe" <rfb@radfreebnet.net> wrote in message
news:bulio8$6p2$0@pita.alt.net...
> The ARRL's latest licensing scheme is driven by money.
>
> The league will achieve its goal by spreading cash to the correct
> FCC managers. The FCC has no shortage of corrupt
> management officials, ready to accept a bribe for anything.
>
> ARRL is no friend of amateur radio.
>
> Moe

Interesting seeing as how many of the ARRL's past proposals were turned
down.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1360. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 21:59:47 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477ACDAF23FFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86035

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in news:400ECC4F.9040505
@ix.netcom.com:

> Alun wrote:
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>>news:SxjPb.32602$P%1.25742284@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>>
>>
>>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>
>>>
>>>>I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for
>>>>example, would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover,
>>>>it would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>This will crowd the CW/digital/data modes too much since there are so
>>>many US hams. It would be better to wait for the other treaty changes
>>>from the conference to take affect and synchronize Regions 1 and 3 with
>>>Region 2. You do know of course that the treaty now requires
>>>broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and that this will become an
>>>exclusive amateur allocation.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Of course I do, but do you think they will really move? Some may, but I
>>think some of them never will.
>>
>>
> Maybe we all should move voice to the bottom of 40m, and create a new
> subband for
> modes that create bad QRM to the broadcasters who don't vacate? :-)
>
>>
>>
>
>

With a power limit of 50kW to make sure, ROTFL!

1361. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 22:00:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZDCPb.32914$P%1.25898293@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86037
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the Incentive
> License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
>

Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the idea of
the FCC.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1362. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 22:06:22 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477ADF84234Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86038
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in
news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com:

>
> "Winston" <win@here.com> wrote in message
> news:pjno009la2gm2oknimn27eqlv40c8938qg@4ax.com...
>> I was an Advanced in 1963. I guess, by proxy, I will be able to say I
>> was an Extra for 40 years. I became an Extra in 1979. What will I
>> become now.
>
> Think of it as having walked in a very large circle for the past 40
> Years.
>
>:) :) :)
>
>> Do you think that if everyone would just buy five copies of QST every
>> month the League would give up attempting to license every deadbeat
>> dad and upgrading every licensee that can recite QST?
>>
>> Win/W0LZ
>
> Probably an accurate observation Win. All that the ARRL has ever been
> interested in for the past 40+ years is more subscriptions to their ad
> filled fishwrap. No suprise really as the ARRL's 501-C3 Charter lists
> them as a non-profit "scientific" publishing company.
>
> Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the
> Incentive License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
>
> Now their franticly trying to back-peddle the boat before it finally
> goes over Niagra Falls. Not much you can do, seeing that 99.5% of young
> persons are more interested in Ipod, Blogging, Chatrooms and other
> Net related projects instead of this old antiquated hobby of their
> granddaddy called "ham radio". (It used to be that ham radio was
> unique in that it was the only alternative to making a long distance
> telephone call to speak with someone far away. Today anyone can
> do the same with a $10-per-month ISP and a PC. The NOVELTY
> of long distance communications for the common person has worn
> off - this is the root-cause of the issue - ham radio is become
> obsolete.)
>
>

I didn't realise that people wrapped fish in publications over here. Fish wrapped in newspaper used to be really common back home in G land, and I dare say you might still find it if you looked hard enough.

73 de Alun, N3KIP (Ex-G8VUK)

1363. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 22:13:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <wQCPb.32917$P%1.25900219@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86039

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:O2pPb.17473$q4.8503@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Finally, I noticed most of the callsigns above belong to males (all
except
> one, a club call). The absence of any comment about those callsigns (from
> Riley, you, or others here) makes me wonder if a callsign with the letters
> "TIT" only becomes vulgar when used by a woman. Would Riley say those
> callsigns bring Ham radio "one step closer to extinction?" Would Jim omit
> those callsigns from his list (the topic this thread spun off from)? Would
> you as aggressively challenge one of those guys, like you've done with
Kim,
> if any one of them were active in this newsgroup?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

No it only becomes vulgar when chosen as a vanity call for the purpose of
"getting in someone's face". If a person were to choose it because there
name was something like "Tonya Irene Tidwell" and they wanted their
initials, it is not vulgar. However parents are often careful not to name
their children such that the initials would give rise to unwelcome teasing
and other problems.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1364. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 22:36:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <k9DPb.32920$P%1.25902878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86040

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
>
> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below
> > 7100 goes away completely.
>
> Only when:-
>
> 1 - all the broadcasters have moved, probably circa the year 2100; and
>
> 2 - all the countries have 7100-7200, which might almost take as long
>

As I recall, the treaty language from the past summer requires the broadcasters to move out. It's not a recommendation and it's not optional. I think the year is either 2007 or 2009 (I forget and don't want to take the time to go look it up).

Since the equipment is already available, I would expect the various countries to move rather quickly on adding the allocation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1365. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 22:43:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <EgDPb.18147$q4.10172@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86041

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:tIednSUFyJk7-5HdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra
>
> Oh great, I get to be an Extra by default. I had rather keep my
> Advanced, advanced even sounds more advanced than Extra does.

To the average lay person, I bet they'd agree that of the five
license classes, they think Advanced would likly be the highest.
I've never thought the EXTRA name conveyed the true sense
of the license being the highest overall.

YMMV

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1366. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 22:47:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <auudneUIy5FonpLdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86042

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:O2pPb.17473$q4.8503@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>> Finally, I noticed most of the callsigns above belong to males (all
>
> except
>
>>one, a club call). The absence of any comment about those callsigns (from
>>Riley, you, or others here) makes me wonder if a callsign with the letters
>>"TIT" only becomes vulgar when used by a woman. Would Riley say those
>>callsigns bring Ham radio "one step closer to extinction?" Would Jim omit
>>those callsigns from his list (the topic this thread spun off from)? Would
>>you as aggressively challenge one of those guys, like you've done with
>
> Kim,
>
>>if any one of them were active in this newsgroup?
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>
> No it only becomes vulgar when chosen as a vanity call for the purpose of
> "getting in someone's face".

Which is the exact reason kim chose that call. Nothing more than to call
attention to herself. Some people have to resort to those type of things
for any recgonition.

1367. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:11:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mGDPb.22507$zj7.7765@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86043

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

> It might be more productive if someone could
> produce some evidence one way or the other!

I can do better than evidence, I can provide proof....

The governing regulation is &#65533;97.527 which allows, but does NOT require,
VEC's to collect reimbursement for examinations. (In other words, there
is no requirement that VEC's collect money for ANY examination.)
Collection of reimbursement is AUTHORIZED but it is not MANDATORY.

Back in the early-mid 90's the ARRL VEC decided not to collect fees for
Novice examinations. This pissed off the W5YI VEC who actually
petitioned the FCC to REQUIRE the collection of fees. FCC declined to
grant his petition.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1368. Angry Stebie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:14:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121181446.08626.00002727@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86046

Some may wonder why Stebie is hate-filled and angry all the time.
I may have the root cause of it -

A number of years ago Stebie found this newsgroup and jumped in aggressively. Straightening his Dill Instructor campaign hat and pinning on the Shield (Radio Cop) above his Hostile Action campaign ribbons, he challenged all opponents in his military manner..

When I replied, Stebie shouted "GET DOWN AND GIMME TEN!!!"

I told him "I have only $6.25 on me...do you take VISA?"

He's been angry at me ever since...:-)

LHA / WMD

1369. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:14:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121181448.08626.00002729@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86047

In article <psjPb.32601$P%1.25741009@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Actually I wonder if the ARRL petition isn't a crafty ruse. It will look
>good to people who want what it proposes but has high odds of being rejected
>by the FCC since the FCC has a long history of shooting down automatic
>upgrades. They get the "attaboy" for "trying" and can then lay it at the
>FCC's door when it fails even though they may want it to fail.

SHAME!

Thinking improper and vulgar thoughts about the ARRL!

Say 100 Hail Hirams as penance and sin no more.

LHA / WMD

1370. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:14:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121181448.08626.00002728@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86048

In article <c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>news:<Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> >> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>> >>
>> >> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>> >> >
>> >> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>> >> >>@posting.google.com:
>> >> >>
>> >> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>> Summary:
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>> >> >>
>> >> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so it
>> >> >>would reintroduce a free licence class.
>> >> >
>> >> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices remains
>> >> on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry level
>> >> licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test is free.
>> >>
>> >> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
>> >> thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't thought
>> >> about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is still open
>> >> and it could be called something else.
>> >
>> > Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since no
>> > new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a moot
>> > point.
>> >

>> > But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
>> >>
>> >> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the
>> >> > entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
>> >> > privileges, but more HF privileges.
>> >> >
>> >> >>Provided the new class that happened to
>> >> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass the
>> >> >>current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>> >> >
>> >> > Why?
>> >>
>> >> I thought the old Novice was too easy
>> >
>> > Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13 was
>> > adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first station was
>> > homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license started me on the
>> > path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about 3 years and BSEE in
>> > a little over 8 years....
>> >
>> > And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
>> > keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
>> > more, isn't that just about perfect?
>
>Well?
>
>Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do?

Here's a few suggestions on what they "should" do -

1. When meeting an Extra in person, always salute and show
respect at all times as required by the Geneva Convention.

2. Always call Extras "sir" or "madam" as the case may be,
always using military courtesy. After all, amateur radio IS a
service..

3. If an Extra wants to use the frequency you are operating on,
apologize and immediately QSY to another frequency. The
bands really belong to him.

4. Allot 10 percent of one's income to the League. This is the
the tithe that binds better than duct tape.

5. Always defer to the Extra's desires. If they like a particular
boatanchor, profess to show an interest in the clunker and
praise them for their choice. If they can afford a top-of-the-
line expensive transceiver, express deep envy for same and
congratulate them on being able to go into hock to get it.

6. Above all, profess a deep and sincere love for morse code, the
most elegant and sophisticated means of communications used

by amateurs today. Always say you are working hard on code to demonstrate your committment to the ideals of the amateur community.

7. Remember that the Extra is Always Right in technical matters and never ever contradict him/her even if they make a moronic mistake about any radio theory or amateur regulations. Their rank/status/privilege plus that important certificate (suitable for framing) from the federal government shows that They Are Right.

8. In the Amateur Service try to remember General Order #1 - You will walk the bands in a military manner being always on the alert for "the rare one" and always deferring to an Extra's need to play on your frequency whenever they wish.

9. Never ever use any jargon or phrases that were not used in amateur radio prior to 1940. Use morse mode abbreviations wherever possible in written communications...to show a dedication and committment to the amateur way and that you belong with them, heart and soul. Even thinking of using 10 codes will get you excommunicated without forgiveness.

10. Always treat CB users as river bottom scum and call them all bad names and do not permit them to drink from the same water fountains as you do. They deserve to ride in the back of the EM bus...as they have for 46 years.

LHA / WMD

1371. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:14:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121181449.08626.00002730@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86044

In article <akjPb.32599$P%1.25739567@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Why single out the ARRL? Almost every organization and our national
>political scene is the same way. A few active people get out and vote. A
>few active people get out and do the work. These are the people who always
>have and always will shape policy. Yet those who are unwilling to vote or
>do the work continually whine about how they are not represented. It is the
>same thing throughout our society. The ARRL is not unique.

Gasp! You mean that the ARRL does NOT represent amateur
radio in the USA?

How can that be? Doesn't everyone write their Director/Section
Manager who will faithfully and honestly bring their views to the
Big Board?

Strange. LESS than a quarter of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs
belone to the League.

You mean that ARRL represents those three-fourths who aren't
members?!?

Does the ARRL represent any of those interested in becoming a
radio amteur?

LHA / WMD

1372. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:14:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121181449.08626.00002731@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86045

In article <5c01b95b.0401210723.780a1472@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Add coward to scumbag and liar.

Thank you, charm school dropout Stebe. :-)

LHA / WMD

1373. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:16:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86049
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:hCCPb.32911$P%1.25897746@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Moe" <rfb@radfreebnet.net> wrote in message
> news:bulio8$6p2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > The ARRL's latest licensing scheme is driven by money.
> >
> > The league will achieve its goal by spreading cash to the correct
> > FCC managers. The FCC has no shortage of corrupt
> > management officials, ready to accept a bribe for anything.
> >
> > ARRL is no friend of amateur radio.
> >
> > Moe
>
> Interesting seeing as how many of the ARRL's past proposals were turned
> down.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
True, but with the FCC they could butcher it up so bad that the Novice
equivelant would be Extra no code.

The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch of
world class hypocrites. They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'. Then 40 years later they totally
reverse themselves. Bullcrap. The league has shown their true colors to
me. Money Money and more Money.

Dan/W4NTI

1374. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:29:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4XDPb.32936$P%1.25911033@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86050
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:hCCPb.32911$P%1.25897746@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Moe" <rfb@radfreebnet.net> wrote in message
> > news:bulio8$6p2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > The ARRL's latest licensing scheme is driven by money.
> > >
> > > The league will achieve its goal by spreading cash to the correct
> > > FCC managers. The FCC has no shortage of corrupt
> > > management officials, ready to accept a bribe for anything.
> > >
> > > ARRL is no friend of amateur radio.
> > >
> > > Moe
> >
> > Interesting seeing as how many of the ARRL's past proposals were turned
> > down.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> True, but with the FCC they could butcher it up so bad that the Novice
> equivelant would be Extra no code.
>
> The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch of
> world class hypocrites. They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing'
to
> FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'. Then 40 years later they totally
> reverse themselves. Bullcrap. The league has shown their true colors to
> me. Money Money and more Money.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

The historical articles state that the FCC forced it down everyone's throat
and the ARRL tried to fight it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1375. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-21 23:55:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121185526.22081.00003566@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86151
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article , kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040119195621.00545.00003711@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article , "Kï¿½HB"
>> writes:
>>
>> >If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
>> >four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
>> >proposing!
>>
>> The ARRL proposal is much less lame than the "Amateur Radio in the 21st
>> Century" paper's ideas.
>> >
>> >A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
>> >General, and Extra.
>>
>> Good idea.
>> >
>> >Novice is still ghetto-ized
>>
>> Not at all.
>
>They certainly are.

How? Under the proposal, they get sizable chunks of four HF bands with CW, data
and 'phone. Plus
6, 2, etc. I'd give 'em a good slice of 20 plus all of the WRC bands. Plus 160.

>The term "Novice" was a valid choice back when the
>Novice license was a one year drop-dead entry ticket. Novices
>absolutely were novices in the real sense of the term back then, we
>were all raw beginners. Continuing to use the term today when a
>"Novice" can hold the license basically forever is not only an
>oxymoron, it's also reeks of maintaining the worn out old "pecking
>order" crappola. Call 'em "Tech IIs", call 'em anything which doesn't
>infer that a 30 year Novice is just a newbie getting his feet wet in
>ham radio.
>
>Asinine.
>
Yep, that's what arguing over the name really is.

Call 'em "Basics" and be done with it. Basic, General, Extra.

>> > and renewable until you assume room
>> >temperature.
>>
>> Good idea.
>>
>> >Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
>>
>> Good idea.

>I'd love it but don't bet the farm on it or hold yer breath. How do ya
>spell "waivers AGAIN"?
>
'zactly. But never let it be said that I gave up.

>> >General just like today except without Morse.

>> Bad idea.
>>
>> >Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
>> >
>> >But there's more.....
>> >
>> >A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.
>>
>> Very bad idea.
>
>> >All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
>>
>> Extra.
>>
>> Another very bad idea.
>
>WHY??

Because if they want the privs, let 'em take the tests.

Heck, any Advanced who wants an Extra need only take Element 4.
Is it *really* that hard? Heck, the old Extra was earned by an 8 year old
in 3rd grade. Obviously a bright kid, but c'mon - how hard can the test
really be?

>> >That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
>> >the next higher license without testing for that grade.
>>
>> No reason given for it, either. FCC has maintained the old Advanced and
>> Novice classes for almost 4 years with no problems. There's no reason it
>> would
>> be a problem for FCC to maintain the Advanced and Tech classes
>> the same way.
>
>It's obvious, at least to me, that one major bottom line intent of the

>proposal is to foster more activity on the HF phone bands.

Why? Do they need it? Why not foster activity on *all* bands and modes?

Besides, the problem ain't the license. Plenty of folks with the license but
no station set up. I mean, look how complicated and difficult it can be
for some folks to put up an end-fed wire...

>If the
>proposal is adopted I expect that objective might be met so I support
>the basics of the proposal.

What parts don't you support?

>James I fail miserably to understand why you're so adamantly opposed
>to the free passes.

Because there's no reason for 'em. Is giving all Advanceds a few more kHz on
80/40/20/15 going to get many more of them on the air? I don't think so.

>How exactly do you see the proposed free passes
>having any real-world adverse effects on the service? Or how would
>these free passes infringe on your privs and operations to the point
>where you have such a big problem with 'em?

Since I've had the big E for 34 years, it's kinda hard to imagine any
infringement.

The problem is that the freebies say that there's nothing essential about the
General and Extra writtens. And it's unfair to those who come after
GiveAwayDay.

>> >And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
>> >must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
>> >not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
>> >passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.
>>
>> Yep!
>
>Nope. Not if ya expect HF newbies to even try CW. If newbies don't try
>it we might as well drive a stake in mode now and get the pain over
>with.

You misunderstand. 20 per would be for Extra only, not for all classes.
>
>> >C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
>> >committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
>> >the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
>> >for the future.
>>
>> It's better than anything you or NCVEC has proposed. But not as good
>> as my proposal.
>>
>> >Nasty letter to follow.

>>
>> Try a little diplomacy.
>
>Dream on.
>
bwaahaahaa
>
>> >I>AM< THE ARRL!!!
>> >
>> So am I.
>
>I wasn't for a few days again and beat 'em out of another free book
>for rejoining.

I remember..

Of course, the fact that ARRL put those ideas in a proposal may be the kiss of death for
them. They haven't had much success in license restructuring proposalsin the past few years!
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1376. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:00:35 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477C155AD900elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86152

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:mGDPb.22507$zj7.7765
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
>> It might be more productive if someone could produce some evidence one
>> way or the other!
>
> I can do better than evidence, I can provide proof....
>
> The governing regulation is §97.527 which allows, but does NOT require,
> VEC's to collect reimbursement for examinations. (In other words, there
> is no requirement that VEC's collect money for ANY examination.)
> Collection of reimbursement is AUTHORIZED but it is not MANDATORY.
>
> Back in the early-mid 90's the ARRL VEC decided not to collect fees for
> Novice examinations. This pissed off the W5YI VEC who actually
> petitioned the FCC to REQUIRE the collection of fees. FCC declined to
> grant his petition.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

I don't think that qualifies as proof. Oh well, never mind.

1377. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:02:34 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477C1AC65757elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86153

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:k9DPb.32920$P%1.25902878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below 7100
>> > goes away completely.
>>
>> Only when:-
>>
>> 1 - all the broadcasters have moved, probably circa the year 2100; and
>>
>> 2 - all the countries have 7100-7200, which might almost take as long
>>
>
> As I recall, the treaty language from the past summer requires the
> broadcasters to move out. It's not a recommendation and it's not
> optional. I think the year is either 2007 or 2009 (I forget and don't
> want to take the time to go look it up).
>
> Since the equipment is already available, I would expect the various
> countries to move rather quickly on adding the allocation.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

A triumph of optimism over reality

1378. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:14:02 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9477C39D3FB3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86154

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040121181448.08626.00002728@mb-m27.aol.com:

> In article <c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com>,
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:
>
>>Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>news:<Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>>> news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:
>>>
>>> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>> > news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>> >> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>>> >>
>>> >> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>> >> >
>>> >> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>>> >> >>@posting.google.com:
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>> >> >>>
>>> >> >>> Summary:
>>> >> >>>
>>> >> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices,
>>> >> >>so it would reintroduce a free licence class.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>>> >> >
>>> >>
>>> >> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices
>>> >> remains on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry
>>> >> level licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test
>>> >> is free.
>>> >>
>>> >> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
>>> >> thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't
>>> >> thought about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name
>>> >> is still open and it could be called something else.
>>> >

>>> > Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since
>>> > no new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a
>>> > moot point.
>>> >
>>> > But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
>>> >>
>>> >> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as
>>> >> > the entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
>>> >> > privileges, but more HF privileges.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >>Provided the new class that happened to
>>> >> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass
>>> >> >>the current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>>> >> >
>>> >> > Why?
>>> >>
>>> >> I thought the old Novice was too easy
>>> >
>>> > Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13
>>> > was adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first
>>> > station was homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license
>>> > started me on the path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about
>>> > 3 years and BSEE in a little over 8 years....
>>> >
>>> > And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
>>> > keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
>>> > more, isn't that just about perfect?
>>
>>Well?
>>
>>Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do?
>
> Here's a few suggestions on what they "should" do -
>
> 1. When meeting an Extra in person, always salute and show
> respect at all times as required by the Geneva Convention.
>
> 2. Always call Extras "sir" or "madam" as the case may be,
> always using military courtesy. After all, amateur radio IS a
> service..
>
> 3. If an Extra wants to use the frequency you are operating on,
> apologize and immediately QSY to another frequency. The
> bands really belong to him.
>
> 4. Allot 10 percent of one's income to the League. This is the
> the tithe that binds better than duct tape.
>
> 5. Always defer to the Extra's desires. If they like a particular
> boatanchor, profess to show an interest in the clunker and

> praise them for their choice. If they can afford a top-of-the-
> line expensive transceiver, express deep envy for same and
> congratulate them on being able to go into hock to get it.
>
> 6. Above all, profess a deep and sincere love for morse code, the
> most elegant and sophisticated means of communications used
> by amateurs today. Always say you are working hard on code to
> demonstrate your committment to the ideals of the amateur
> community.
>
> 7. Remember that the Extra is Always Right in technical matters
> and never ever contradict him/her even if they make a moronic
> mistake about any radio theory or amateur regulations. Their
> rank/status/privilege plus that important certificate (suitable
> for framing) from the federal government shows that They Are
> Right.
>
> 8. In the Amateur Service try to remember General Order #1 - You
> will walk the bands in a military manner being always on the
> alert for "the rare one" and always deferring to an Extra's
> need to play on your frequency whenever they wish.
>
> 9. Never ever use any jargon or phrases that were not used in
> amateur radio prior to 1940. Use morse mode abbreviations
> wherever possible in written communications...to show a
> dedication and committment to the amateur way and that you
> belong with them, heart and soul. Even thinking of using 10
> codes will get you excommunicated without forgiveness.
>
> 10. Always treat CB users as river bottom scum and call them all
> bad names and do not permit them to drink from the same
> water fountains as you do. They deserve to ride in the back of
> the EM bus...as they have for 46 years.
>
> LHA / WMD
>

Hilarious!

I have actually encountered someone who actually thought he must be right and spoke down to me on the air because he had a 2x1 call and I was a mere 1x3. Never mind that I am an Extra (not to mention a BSEE) but just kept my no-code call. This must come under 7. Not as common as you might think, this one.

I have met many people who actually abide by number 6, i.e. they pretend to like the code, but they make only one CW QSO every 2-3 years. Usually, they are pro the CW test too. They never use it, but think the tradition is important. I am not talking about anyone here, AFAIK, but they are out there.

Numbers 1-3 sound fair to me, though, ROTFL!

1379. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:15:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <e95u00dovb0qm7euid1hr6uep8q1bua35l@4ax.com>
Source record: 86155

On 22 Jan 2004 00:02:34 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>news:k9DPb.32920$P%1.25902878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>>
>> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>>> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
>>>
>>> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below 7100
>>> > goes away completely.

Except for us up North, perhaps - we have 7.050 to 7.100 allocated as
SSB on our 40M band plan. There are a few Canadian nets that operate
there regularily, as well as quite a bit of foreign DX.

Fortunately, our band plans are guidelines prepared by Radio Amateurs
of Canada - not federally mandated.

73, Leo

>>>
>>> Only when:-
>>>
>>> 1 - all the broadcasters have moved, probably circa the year 2100; and
>>>
>>> 2 - all the countries have 7100-7200, which might almost take as long
>>>
>>
>> As I recall, the treaty language from the past summer requires the
>> broadcasters to move out. It's not a recommendation and it's not
>> optional. I think the year is either 2007 or 2009 (I forget and don't
>> want to take the time to go look it up).
>>
>> Since the equipment is already available, I would expect the various
>> countries to move rather quickly on adding the allocation.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>
>A triumph of optimism over reality

1380. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:22:26 UTC
From: David Drumheller <david@drumheller.org>
Message-ID: <400f17da@news101.his.com>
Source record: 86156

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> Summary:
>
> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
> [STUFF DELETED]
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Even though I support the removal of the CW requirement for any license, I find this to be an acceptable compromise. The reduction to three license classes has already happened, although the Novice license as proposed is actually a new license. Perhaps a different name could be found for it to reduce confusion with the current Novice license.

Dave, K3WQ

1381. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:30:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <jt5u00pe08obp7htheqo34aeq2hajicbm0@4ax.com>
Source record: 86157

On 21 Jan 2004 23:14:48 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

ROTFL etc.... again!

Not sure where moralizing, assessing levels of taste and
inappropriateness, and passing vengeful judgement on fellow hams fits
in, though. - 9 kinda fits, with its 1940s flavour. It could also be
combined with 10, but that would annoy the CBers and other scum as it
is at least a layer of decency down from that.

Do we perhaps need to consider an Item 11? Hmmmm.....

73, Leo

> 1. When meeting an Extra in person, always salute and show
> respect at all times as required by the Geneva Convention.
>
> 2. Always call Extras "sir" or "madam" as the case may be,
> always using military courtesy. After all, amateur radio IS a
> service..
>
> 3. If an Extra wants to use the frequency you are operating on,
> apologize and immediately QSY to another frequency. The
> bands really belong to him.
>
> 4. Allot 10 percent of one's income to the League. This is the
> the tithe that binds better than duct tape.
>
> 5. Always defer to the Extra's desires. If they like a particular
> boatanchor, profess to show an interest in the clunker and
> praise them for their choice. If they can afford a top-of-the-
> line expensive transceiver, express deep envy for same and
> congratulate them on being able to go into hock to get it.
>
> 6. Above all, profess a deep and sincere love for morse code, the
> most elegant and sophisticated means of communications used
> by amateurs today. Always say you are working hard on code to
> demonstrate your committment to the ideals of the amateur
> community.
>
> 7. Remember that the Extra is Always Right in technical matters
> and never ever contradict him/her even if they make a moronic
> mistake about any radio theory or amateur regulations. Their
> rank/status/privilege plus that important certificate (suitable for
> framing) from the federal government shows that They Are Right.
>

> 8. In the Amateur Service try to remember General Order #1 - You
> will walk the bands in a military manner being always on the
> alert for "the rare one" and always deferring to an Extra's need to
> play on your frequency whenever they wish.
>
> 9. Never ever use any jargon or phrases that were not used in
> amateur radio prior to 1940. Use morse mode abbreviations
> wherever possible in written communications...to show a
> dedication and committment to the amateur way and that you
> belong with them, heart and soul. Even thinking of using 10
> codes will get you excommunicated without forgiveness.
>
> 10. Always treat CB users as river bottom scum and call them all
> bad names and do not permit them to drink from the same
> water fountains as you do. They deserve to ride in the back of
> the EM bus...as they have for 46 years.
>
> LHA / WMD

1382. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:39:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fZEPb.22599$zj7.10801@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86158

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

From K0HB:

< > The governing regulation is &#65533;97.527 which allows, but does NOT require,
< > VEC's to collect reimbursement for examinations. (In other words, there
< > is no requirement that VEC's collect money for ANY examination.)
< > Collection of reimbursement is AUTHORIZED but it is not MANDATORY.

< I don't think that qualifies as proof.

Since it is a citation of the actual federal rules, it is certainly more convincing than your tenuous assertion that you "read somewhere".....

73, de Hans, K0HB

1383. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:54:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <8bFPb.32955$P%1.25926361@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86159

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:e95u00dovb0qm7euid1hr6uep8q1bua35l@4ax.com...
> On 22 Jan 2004 00:02:34 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> >news:k9DPb.32920$P%1.25902878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> >
> >>
> >> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> news:Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >>> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
> >>>
> >>> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below 7100
> >>> > goes away completely.
>
> Except for us up North, perhaps - we have 7.050 to 7.100 allocated as
> SSB on our 40M band plan. There are a few Canadian nets that operate
> there regularily, as well as quite a bit of foreign DX.
>
> Fortunately, our band plans are guidelines prepared by Radio Amateurs
> of Canada - not federally mandated.
>
> 73, Leo
>

Do you really think you would like all the US amateurs jumping in down there?? Remember the population difference. We have a tremendous amount of activity on 40m voice on 7.150 to 7.300 until the broadcasts drive us off. If we had SSB access to that 7.050 to 7.100 used by other countries, it would be packed solid and nobody else could get in. Do you want that? Far better to continue the battle to get the allocation extended to 7.300 for all amateurs around the world.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1384. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 00:58:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F202F.4DADCB83@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86160

Leo wrote:

> You may want to suggest an experiment to those guys who do not
> understand how this must feel. Ask them to place a large banana in
> the inside front of their pants before they head off to work one
> morning. Have them engage as many of their co-workers as possible in
> conversation.

> Then, the next day, have them go in (minus the banana :)) and see if
> they can find anyone who remembers what the hell they were talking
> about the day before......

Actually that doesn't seem like a very good example, "Leo". You'd get the same result whether the guy wore the banana in the front or in the rear of his pants.

Dave K8MN

1385. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:06:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F2216.31DE3F0E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86161

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4004343A.8C7ECE44@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len, won't you tell us again about your purpose here? You know, the
> >thing about only being here for the civil debate of code test issue?
> >That's such a good tale.
>
> Why?

I already addressed the "why": ...because that's such a good tale.

> YOUR whole purpose in here is to spit bile at those that don't
> agree with your noble elitist thoughts.

That can only be guess work on your part. I've never stated a purpose
for being here. You have stated a specific purpose for being here but
can't be counted upon to do just about everything accept that which
you've stated.

> You follow that course for more than 19 out of 20 postings.

...and you seem bent on outdoing me by a factor of 10 to 1.

> You never want to discuss any subject matter unless it involves
> tossing s**t on others.

Maybe your remarkable inferiority complex in just bubbling to the top,
kindly old gent. If you'd like, we can review some of your posts of the
past week, we can debate the matter of who tosses what.

> Is that what U.S. amateur radio has evolved into today?

What's it to you, Len. You aren't involved in U.S or any other amateur
radio.

> Certainly looks like it.

No, I don't think it looks like it, Len. This isn't amateur radio.
This is Usenet.

Dave K8MN

1386. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:11:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F2328.1F436A5D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86162

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4004351F.2CD8046E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Let's put it in terms you might be able to understand, Leonard. Dee
> >lives in a nice little house with a lovely flower garden and a pond.
> >Some years later, an unsightly landfill is built across the road. Dee
> >decides to build a privacy fence of tall evergreens so she doesn't have
> >to view the landfill.
> >
> >In this scenario, you are the landfill.
>
> Only in YOUR mind, Trashman.

That reminds me; I have to take some stuff to the Lenfill.

> Well, you are a fine example of U.S. amateur radio as it has evolved
> up to today. The antithesis of "The Amateur's Code."

Let's see, Leonard....This isn't amateur radio and you aren't a radio
amateur.

> Look out for that big D-7 coming at your antenna farm, olde-tymer.

Naw, it was just a big backhoe coming *for* my antenna farm. Holes for
the towers, trenches for electric and gas lines and a couple for the
hardline runs. At ease, Sgt. Anderson.

Dave K8MN

1387. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:25:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F267D.7F9CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86163

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40042FCA.3F2834BF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3FFCE328.1733823E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> I believe that's the beauty of the Orion, it's never "ancient." The
> >latest
> >> >> upgrade is just a download away. I feel for the poor slob who finally
> >> >breaks
> >> >> down and buys a '7800 just before the '7800 Pro or Pro II comes out.
> >> >
> >> >TT just keeps making it better and better. The rig is now about eight
> >> >months old and I've downloaded about ten firmware releases in that time.
> >>
> >> "FIRMWARE releases?!?"
> >
> >Yes, firmware releases.
> >
> >> Gosh, you must be equipped with a Star Trek Transporter! :-)
> >
> >No, just a PC with an internet connection.
> >
> >> Oh, you mean SOFTWARE updates, right?
> >
> >No, I don't. I mean firmware updates.
>
> Get it straight, Herr Robust.
>
> "Firmware" is hardware.

Actually, kindly old gent, you don't have it quite right. You may go to
http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/0,,sid9_gci212127,00.html to
educate yourself. Afterward, you may like to take a look at the site
where such firmware upgrades are available for the Orion:
http://www.rfsquared.com/ Please note the first two words in blue at
the top center of the page.

> There is NO computer system anywhere in the world that will "download
> firmware."

It appears that you are quite mistaken.

> >> Let's see, that's more than one per month.
> >
> >- Version 1.325 - initial release
> >03/26/03 Version 1.326
> >03/27/03 Version 1.327
> >03/28/03 Version 1.328
> >03/31/03 Version 1.329
> >04/01/03 Version 1.330
> >04/02/03 Version 1.331
> >04/03/04 Version 1.332
> >04/04/03 Version 1.333
> >04/06/03 Version 1.334
> >04/07/03 Version 1.335
> >04/08/03 Version 1.336
> >04/10/03 Version 1.337
> >04/11/03 - 04/13/03 Version 1.338
> >04/14/03 - 04/16/03 Version 1.339
> >04/26/03-05/06/03 Version 1.340
> >05/12/03-05/14/03 Version 1.341
> >05/19/03-05/22/03 Version 1.342
> >05/27/03 Version 1.343
> >06/03/03 Version 1.344
> >06/06/03 Version 1.345
> >06/11/03 Version 1.346
> >06/13/03 Version 1.347
> >06/25/03 Version 1.348
> >07/08/03 Version 1.349
> >07/10/03 VERSION 1.350
> >07/29/03 Version 1.351
> >08/07/03 Version 1.352
> >08/11/03 Version 1.353
> >08/12/03 Version 1.354
> >08/15/03 Version 1.355
> >08/19/03 Version 1.356
> >08/21/03 Version 1.357
> >08/22/03 Version 1.358
> >08/25/03 Version 1.359
> >09/12/03 Version 1.360
> >09/16/03 Version 1.361
> >09/25/03 Version 1.362
> >10/06/03 Version 1.363
> >10/22/03 Version 1.364
> >10/23/03 Version 1.365
> >11/14/03 Version 1.366
> >12/19/03 Version 1.367
> >
> >Well, it certainly looks like more than one per month, doesn't it old fellow?
> >Interestingly, the manufacturer lists the above list under "Firmware
> >Revision History".

>
> All that many updates?

Why would I have reason to manufacture a phony list?

> Tells me they didn't know what they were doing to begin with, or just
> shoved software and hardware out the door before they had finished
> testing the firmware and software.

No, that's simply what you've guessed and you'd again be incorrect.

> >> I would think that Orion could have stabilized the programming by
> >> now. No new band changes have happened in eight months... :-)
> >
> >Really? I seem to recall adding 60m capability to the Orion. Weren't
> >you paying attention? Were you under the impression that "band changes"
> >were the only things which could be modified in the Orion?
>
> Apparently it can also TRANSPORT material things as they did on
> Star Trek.
>
> Perhaps they should have beamed up some smarts to release the
> RIGHT code the first time...

I'm sure that you'd have done so and that you'd have designed a
transceiver which performed much, much better. Your abilities are
legend.

> Oh, my, you drone on busy prussian bee. It's like listening to a
> lecture on 1800s science...all done by amateurs.
>
> Nothing new, same old "landfill" remarks from the prussian.

There's plenty new, Leonard. You may start your education after you
learn about firmware.

Dave K8MN

1388. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:35:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F28F9.32A3D06D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86164

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40043284.B160890B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> This newsgroup is all about lets-pretend fish-story-tellers trying
> >> to put down lots of other amateurs. All amateurishly.
> >
> >You seem confused again, old timer. While you tell your fish stories
> >and put down radio amateurs, you aren't in fact a radio amateur.
>
> And you are not God...despite your claims to same...

I'm not really sure at this point. At times you've written that I am a
god, then that I'm not a god, then that I am a god. Let the several of
you inhabiting the body of Leonard H. Anderson try to come to some sort
of consensus.

> >> I'm all for eliminating the morse code test from any radio license
> >> examination. That's all.
> >
> > "Go for it, EX purchasing agent..."
> >
> > "Of course you did...right after you accepted the Presidential Medal
> > of Freedom for keeping Homeland Security safe through ham radio."
> >
> > "Yeah, like a little few-page weekly is on par with the New York
> >TIMES."
> >
> > "MODERN HF amateur radio: 'What was good in the 1930s is still
> > good in 2000s!'"
> >
> > "Real ham radio is working DX on HF with CW."
> >
> > "Quit trying to be a Host, sweetums. The only "host" you can be is
> > of a communicable disease."
> >
> > "Go get some therapy."
> >
> >Yep, it appears quite evident from the quoted material just from one of
> >your posts, Len. You just want to eliminate a code test.
>
> I'd like to concentrate on the SUBJECTS instead of your incessant

> prussian arrogant order-giving, Herr Robust.

So my presence is the only thing which has prevented your engaging in the civil debate you've told us is all you're here for? That might explain the seven or more years that you've done everything but what you've claimed.

> If you feel that anyone you don't approve of is offensive to you,
> your holiness, feel free to have their ISP get rid of their account
> or at least forbid them to post in this free, open, unmoderated
> newsgroup. Or just skip over the post.

Some may do those things. Others have killfiled you. I'm content to take you to task or use you as an outlet for sarcasm.

> Do you need to change the prescription in your monocle again,
> Herr Robust? You can't continue to do an impression of a modern
> prussian officer without it...go rent a DVD with Otto Preminger
> in "Stalag 17" and study it some more.

You've become quite predictable, Foghorn. Some may believe you to be the Howard Dean of r.r.a.p. I happen to think you're more like Dennish Kusinich.

Dave K8MN

1389. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:40:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F2A1B.75700767@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86165

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >
> >Do you practice being an

[word deleted]

> , Dave? You must...because you're nearly
> >perfect at it.
>
> Herr Robust is without imperfection in that regard...

Did you ever notice that those who do ice-skating commentary are often former ice skating champions? that those who do NFL commentary are usually former professional football players?

I think you've found your area of expertise, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

1390. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:43:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400F2AC2.3020509@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86166

>
>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Maybe we all should move voice to the bottom of 40m, and create a new
>>subband for
>>modes that create bad QRM to the broadcasters who don't vacate? :-)
>>
>>
>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>With a power limit of 50kW to make sure, ROTFL!
>
>
Unfortunatley quite true, unless their intended audience lives in your
town. Maybe we should still put our digital modes there, as CW and
such I think may not be bothered much by broadcaster QRM. CW
as it's narrowband and one could use a frequency a couple KHz's
away from the broadcast carriers, and other digital modes I think
may not be bothered by the QRM much.

1391. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:46:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WXFPb.3784$Fp1.2371622@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 86167

Dave Heil wrote:

> There's plenty new, Leonard. You may start your education after you
> learn about firmware.

I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.
Guess I'll have to use UPS next time. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1392. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:47:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F2B9B.EAA76DD7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86168

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40096083.8796BBBB@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Why not admit that you fall short of being able to read and understand?
>
> At the end of the day, we learn that only Dave has understanding and
> everyone else has problems.

Not really. All we've learned is that someone who isn't sure of his
name believes that he is "everyone else".

Dave K8MN

1393. Re: Don't work the legal ones, work the bootleggers!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:50:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F2C49.A4BF2789@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86169

William wrote:

> I know about you, Dave.

It would be difficult to accept this one. From your previous posts, it isn't clear that you know much about anything.

Dave K8MN

1394. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:52:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F2CC7.15D566F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86170

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > There's plenty new, Leonard. You may start your education after you
> > learn about firmware.
>
> I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.
> Guess I'll have to use UPS next time. 8^)

Careful, Mike. Leonard is an electrical engineer and a proud
electronics professional.

Dave K8MN

1395. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:53:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <c9au0059btmoq3r7q84b708t01qu5jlfv0@4ax.com>
Source record: 86171

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 00:58:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> You may want to suggest an experiment to those guys who do not
>> understand how this must feel. Ask them to place a large banana in
>> the inside front of their pants before they head off to work one
>> morning. Have them engage as many of their co-workers as possible in
>> conversation.
>
>> Then, the next day, have them go in (minus the banana :)) and see if
>> they can find anyone who remembers what the hell they were talking
>> about the day before......
>
>Actually that doesn't seem like a very good example, "Leo". You'd get
>the same result whether the guy wore the banana in the front or in the
>rear of his pants.

um - I think that putting the banana in the back of the pants might
send a very different message, "Dave". And elicit a very different
reaction.

In front, they'd probably be embarassed by the obvious -um-
masculinity that appears to be showing. Red faces, can't keep the eyes
off it - like a big magnet....

In back - well, they'd hear what the guy had to say alright, but
they's probably never stop laughing when they watched him walk away.
Some may even be horrified....

One of these, though, would cause folks to stare at the guy in a
similar way to that experienced by many well endowed women every day -
you don't think that the banana in the back of the pants' would do
that.....do you?

YMMV!

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1396. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 01:58:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <400F2E43.5090705@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>True, but with the FCC they could butcher it up so bad that the Novice
>equivelant would be Extra no code.
>
Well, some FCC brearucrat botched the lifetime code credit thing. You
get lifetime
credit for passing a 5wpm, but not for 13 or 20. So we need to look
closely at
what they write up....

>
>The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch of
>world class hypocrites. They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
>FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'. Then 40 years later they totally
>reverse themselves.
>
Me thinks that different people are in charge there now then back 40
years ago.

>
>

1397. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 02:44:41 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0401211844.16428741@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86173
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"Kï¿½HB" wrote in message news:...
> If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
> four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
> proposing!
>
> A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
> General, and Extra.
>
> Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room
> temperature.
>
> Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
>
> General just like today except without Morse.
>
> Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!

Stop your lame whining.

> C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
> committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
> the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
> for the future.
>
> Nasty letter to follow.

Don't you EVER have anything good to say about anything? You have
been wrong about everything for so long, why should anyone pay any
attention to your negative ramblings anymore?

> Love always,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> I >AM< THE ARRL!!!

Bullcrap. You are a throwback to the past, who fails to see the
obvious need for this move.

The ARRL got it perfect... I will continue to renew my membership for
years to come.

WE are the ARRL!

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/groups/MURS-OPEN

1398. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 02:55:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121215551.06226.00002524@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86175

In article <0got00p8d3hphfufjsjerpo2d5c35epb71@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Jim,
>
>Thanks - got it!.

I kinda thought you would.
>
>The comment that you are referring to, however, wasn't mine

I know. I didn't see the original post, just your reply. I addressed the reply
to you so you'd know the facts of the matter.

> - you may wish to take this issue up directly with its author.
>
I learned a long time ago that doing so is a complete waste of time. The
author of those mistakes doesn't take correction from those who disagree
with his views.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1399. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 02:55:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121215552.06226.00002525@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86176

In article <4XDPb.32936$P%1.25911033@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>The historical articles state that the FCC forced it down everyone's throat
>and the ARRL tried to fight it.
>
Yep - with some success. FCC made it clear that they weren't going to leave things alone.

I remember those times - all kinds of griping and moaning about having to take more tests. Many hams back then felt that since they'd passed the General test they were *entitled* to all amateur privileges, forever. FCC said no.

The big mystery, though, is why FCC got all fired up back in 1958 and started making noises about changing the system, only 5 years after they'd done the Big Giveaway of 1953. My best guess is that they had a serious case of Sputnik Fever.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1400. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 02:55:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121215552.06226.00002526@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86177

In article <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch of
>world class hypocrites.

And who elected the directors, Dan?

>They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
>FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'.

How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.

>Then 40 years later they totally
>reverse themselves.

Who? I don't think there's a single person at Hq or in the Board of Directors
today who was a League official of any kind back in the '60s. Most of the '60s
BoD and Hq folks are dead.

So it's a completely different bunch that reversed the policies.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1401. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 02:55:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040121215553.06226.00002527@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86174

In article <WXFPb.3784$Fp1.2371622@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.

Something electro-existentialist about that, Mike.

Reminds me of a Lily Tomlin joke where she describes going to the store and buying a wastepaper basket. At the checkout counter the cashier put the wastepaper basket in a paper bag. Once she got it home, Lily took the wastepaper basket out of the paper bag, folded up the paper bag, and put the paper bag into the wastepaper basket.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1402. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 03:12:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <KcHPb.22852$zj7.20802@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86178
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshit7@yahoo.com> wrote

< > Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!

< Stop your lame whining.

I wasn't whining, I was yawning.

For details consult http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

73, de Hans, K0HB

1403. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 03:12:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <%cHPb.3811$Fp1.2392834@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 86179

Dave Heil wrote:

> Leo wrote:
>
>
>>You may want to suggest an experiment to those guys who do not
>>understand how this must feel. Ask them to place a large banana in
>>the inside front of their pants before they head off to work one
>>morning. Have them engage as many of their co-workers as possible in
>>conversation.
>
>
>
>>Then, the next day, have them go in (minus the banana :)) and see if
>>they can find anyone who remembers what the hell they were talking
>>about the day before......
>
>
> Actually that doesn't seem like a very good example, "Leo". You'd get
> the same result whether the guy wore the banana in the front or in the
> rear of his pants.

ROFL! And *that* kind folks, is the retort of the week! Good one Dave.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1404. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 03:15:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jfHPb.3812$Fp1.2393138@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 86180

Dave Heil wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>
>>>There's plenty new, Leonard. You may start your education after you
>>>learn about firmware.
>>
>> I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.
>>Guess I'll have to use UPS next time. 8^)
>
>
> Careful, Mike. Leonard is an electrical engineer and a proud
> electronics professional.

Oh, I'm certain I'll get the old chops busted. I'm firmly convinced of
that!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1405. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 03:16:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ugHPb.3814$Fp1.2393101@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 86181

N2EY wrote:

> In article <WXFPb.3784$Fp1.2371622@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.
>
>
> Something electro-existentialist about that, Mike.
>
> Reminds me of a Lily Tomlin joke where she describes going to the store and
> buying a wastepaper basket. At the checkout counter the cashier put the
> wastepaper basket in a paper bag. Once she got it home, Lily took the
> wastepaper basket out of the paper bag, folded up the paper bag, and put the
> paper bag into the wastepaper basket.

Yeah, I though of that after I reread the post. Cool!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1406. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 03:27:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JqHPb.3821$Fp1.2395515@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 86182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "stewart" <horseshit7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> < > Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
>
> < Stop your lame whining.
>
> I wasn't whining, I was yawning.

Well at least cover your mouth, Hans! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1407. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 03:43:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0GHPb.3826$Fp1.2398777@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 86183

Leo wrote:

> On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 00:58:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>You may want to suggest an experiment to those guys who do not
>>>understand how this must feel. Ask them to place a large banana in
>>>the inside front of their pants before they head off to work one
>>>morning. Have them engage as many of their co-workers as possible in
>>>conversation.
>>
>>>Then, the next day, have them go in (minus the banana :)) and see if
>>>they can find anyone who remembers what the hell they were talking
>>>about the day before......
>>
>>Actually that doesn't seem like a very good example, "Leo". You'd get
>>the same result whether the guy wore the banana in the front or in the
>>rear of his pants.
>
>
> um - I think that putting the banana in the back of the pants might
> send a very different message, "Dave". And elicit a very different
> reaction.
>
> In front, they'd probably be embarassed by the obvious -um-
> masculinity that appears to be showing. Red faces, can't keep the eyes
> off it - like a big magnet....
>
> In back - well, they'd hear what the guy had to say alright, but
> they's probably never stop laughing when they watched him walk away.
> Some may even be horrified....
>
> One of these, though, would cause folks to stare at the guy in a
> similar way to that experienced by many well endowed women every day -
> you don't think that the banana in the back of the pants' would do
> that.....do you?

The whole argument is kind of moot, Leo. Some women seek out the attention, witness padded bras and surgical disfigurement that some women go through in order to be stared at.

I think the best defense against someone who leers is to simply mention it. Most will be mortified, and those that aren't are jerks anyhow.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1408. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 04:13:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040121231321.21955.00000104@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86184

In article <bulk4p$g9o@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Fact ot the matter is my callsign is not vulgar, it is not disrespectful, it
>is not inappropriate.

Kim:

In fact, it is all of the above, but, I guess you're entitled to your
delusions.

>It's nothing more than a vanity callsign that brings
>out other peoples' vanity (here in this newsgroup anyway) way more than it
>even expresses my own :o

What it is bringing out is other people's disgust. However, anyone who would
have the poor taste to request such a call sign would also not be very likely
to latch on to other people's negative reaction to it, except for whatever sick
pleasure you derive from it.

>And, it works great working DX and pileups--when I
>used to do that! ;)

Don't look now, Kim, but you're a No-code Technician. There is no way
you can "work DX and pileups" on HF unless you were operating as a
third party using your OM's privileges, and that would also require the
use of his call sign. Oh, yeah, six meters. Sure, I DX and pileups are
possible there, but I rather suspect you were talking about HF. Please
give us a run-down on your OM's VHF DX'ing capabilities. That should
be a good one.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1409. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 04:13:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040121231321.21955.00000103@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86185

In article <O2pPb.17473$q4.8503@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> > (snip) While that's true, just because
>> > a person has a right to do something
>> > doesn't mean it's right to do it on every
>> > occasion. While the call sign may fit the
>> > constitution, for every instance where
>> > a parent or uncle or grandparent doesn't
>> > want a young person to get involved in
>> > Ham Radio because of something they
>> > hear on the bands, then you have taken
>> > the ARS one step closer to extinction.
>> > Then we can sit around and debate what
>> > happened to all those Amateur
>> > frequencies that industry bought at
>> > auction---debating, of course, on the
>> > internet and cellular because that'll be
>> > all we have left. The first amendment will
>> > still be alive and well, just as it is now,
>> > tho, if that's any consolation. (snip)
>
>
> Thanks for posting this again, Larry. I didn't say anything when I first
>read it, but I remember having some doubts - doubts which still linger to
>this day. The most obvious is why Riley singled out Kim for this
>admonishment, without mentioning W4TIT (VA), W6TIT (TX), K5TIT (FL), K6TIT
>(CA), N0TIT (FL), N4TIT (FL), W1ASS (MA), W2ASS (MA), W4ASS (NC), W5ASS
>(TX), and similar callsigns. In other words, Kim's callsign, and similar
>callsigns, are not exactly unique.

Dwight:

Obviously, Riley was responding to Kim's specific inquiry regarding her own call sign. It is likely that he would have also found those particular call signs to be of questionable appropriateness in a family-oriented hobbyist radio service.

> Clearly, letters only become vulgar when one attaches a specific meaning
>to them. Without a context to make "TIT," or other such letters, vulgar, I
>can't really envision a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping a child out
>of Amateur Radio simply because those letters appear in a callsign.

The "context" is self-evident. It is a well-known vulgarity referring to a woman's breasts in a connotation which is generally considered to be of a sexual nature.

> Finally, I noticed most of the callsigns above belong to males (all except
>one, a club call).

Maybe so, but that doesn't make them any less objectionable.

>The absence of any comment about those callsigns (from
>Riley, you, or others here) makes me wonder if a callsign with the letters
>"TIT" only becomes vulgar when used by a woman.

You have just seen me raise the issue of the objectionable nature of those particular call sign suffixes, regardless of the sex of the holder.

>Would Riley say those
>callsigns bring Ham radio "one step closer to extinction?"

I would not presume to speak for Riley -- why don't you ask him?

>Would Jim omit
>those callsigns from his list (the topic this thread spun off from)? Would
>you as aggressively challenge one of those guys, like you've done with Kim,
>if any one of them were active in this newsgroup?

Yes, I would. Even if those call signs were issued sequentially, there is no reason for the licensee to keep them and use them on the air if they are of an objectionable nature. The FCC would certainly honor their request for a call sign reassignment. Anyone who kept and used such a call would be subject to the same questions regarding their motives as is Kim.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1410. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:13:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122001345.25815.00006121@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86190

In article <WXFPb.3784$Fp1.2371622@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>
>> There's plenty new, Leonard. You may start your education after you
>> learn about firmware.
>
> I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.

>Guess I'll have to use UPS next time. 8^)

Mike, "firmware" is programming instructions that are quite
permanent, almost never alterable by a user.

An example of "firmware" is a mask-programmed ROM. Not the
erasable type such as in a 2716 EPROM. With the advent of
FLASH memory the extra cost of masking for a mask-programmed
ROM has fallen out of favor over the last decade. Once made, a
mask-programmed ROM cannot be altered.

Another example of "firmware" is the PLD or Programmable Logic
Devices. Those are literally "blown" using on-chip "fuses" (links)
which are vaporized by the programmer. Once done, the PLD can
not be altered, thus it is not "upgradeable."

There are EPROMs available which have NO UV-erase window.
That cuts the cost of the package by a cent or two. Those are
production-erased before programming, then programmed to the
customer's request data by a multiple-unit programmer. Definitely
FIRM ware since a user would have to open the IC package to
erase the ROM and reprogram it.

All microprocessors have "firmware" in them in the form of the
Instruction Set decode-and-execute part of the chip. Those form
the entire instruction set of the microprocessor and cannot be
changed...hence the label of "firm."

A rare form of "firmware" is the hard-wired logic arrangment of ICs,
particularly with "state machines." That can only be "upgraded"
with actual physical wire changes on the board. The 1979 Apple][
Disk Controller card was mostly a state machine designed by
Steve Wozniak himself. In early minicomputers the instruction set
decoder was a combination of state machine and hard-wired logic
chips; that evolved into ROM and then became part of the micro-
processor chip structure.

"Software" is instructions which can be altered by a user. Every program for a PC or MAC is a "software." The instructions or program are stored locally on a disk ("hard" or "floppy") and may be accessed at any time by the PC's disk operating system. Early software was loaded by paper tape, then magnetic tape, then by floppy, then by hard disk, finally by CD-ROM.

A CD-ROM is not labelled either "firm" or "soft" since it contains software which is not easily altered by the user...but parts of each one can be rewritten if the content does not fill the CD. Software on so-called "protected" media can be defeated but that takes a modification of the CD writer program and probably some physical changes in the CD drive itself.

The electronics industry has pretty well defined what is "firmware" and what is "software" over the last three decades. Lately (in the last half-dozen years) the appearance of the useable/programmable microcontroller such as Microchip's "PIC" series has allowed a re-programming of the stored program in the PIC's FLASH memory. This is because Microchip's design (and other microcontrollers) usually allow an extra package pin and internal registers/instruction-set for such reprogramming. That isn't always the case with mass-purchase special microcontrollers which may have the reprogramming feature inaccessible to the user. Examples of that are various low-cost appliances such as lawn sprinkler controllers or automatic coffee makers. On those, the only thing alterable is some settings of operation such as time. Settings sometimes go into FLASH memory but the user cannot necessarily alter the main instruction program set into the microcontroller.

Industry is going away from the absolute labels of "firmware" with the new IC technologies. A microcontroller's program is simply called "a program" if it can be loaded over the existing program or otherwise changed by the user. Program content is still called "software" because that has become normal in the wider group of computer and consumer electronics users. Such software comes on CD-ROM, floppy disks, but sometimes (for hobbyists) as "source code" for a microcontroller's development program which can also load the program into the micro. "Source code" is the human-readable instructions of the program and the development program translates that into microcontroller machine code for programming.

Anything that is "firm" in ware is not readily alterable by the user. Anything that is "soft" in ware is readily alterable by the user.

If a program or data is downloadable over a modem, it does so in software form.

You can call anything you want by whatever name you want but it won't necessarily be understood by a distributor or parts seller. There's several millions of folks involved in the worldwide electronics industry (which includes radio) so, if you want some "firmware" that can be downloaded over a modem, you'd best be VERY specific

in describing it.

You can call a spade a hoe, but be prepared to talk to the NAACP.

LHA / WMD

1411. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:13:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122001346.25815.00006123@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86186

In article <8bFPb.32955$P%1.25926361@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Do you really think you would like all the US amateurs jumping in down
>there?? Remember the population difference. We have a tremendous amount of
>activity on 40m voice on 7.150 to 7.300 until the broadcasts drive us off.
>If we had SSB access to that 7.050 to 7.100 used by other countries, it
>would be packed solid and nobody else could get in. Do you want that? Far
>better to continue the battle to get the allocation extended to 7.300 for
>all amateurs around the world.

Ahem...the "40m 'battle'" has been going on since WARC-79.

That's a mere 24 1/2 years. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...sounds like somebody hasn't been through Basic
Training and learning how to "battle" effectively.

LHA / WMD

1412. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:13:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122001346.25815.00006122@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86189

In article <ZDCPb.32914$P%1.25898293@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the idea of
>the FCC.

The ARRL can do NO wrong, of course.

Evil is the FCC...of course.

FCC has been around since 1934...almost 70 years.

ARRL doesn't grant amateur licenses although they think they "control" it. FCC grants amateur licenses and is THE authority on U.S. civil radio regulation.

Vote early and often...

LHA / WMD

1413. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:13:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122001347.25815.00006124@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86187

In article <jt5u00pe08obp7htheqo34aeq2hajicbm0@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 21 Jan 2004 23:14:48 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>ROTFL etc.... again!
>
>Not sure where moralizing, assessing levels of taste and
>inappropriateness, and passing vengeful judgement on fellow hams fits
>in, though. - 9 kinda fits, with its 1940s flavour. It could also be
>combined with 10, but that would annoy the CBers and other scum as it
>is at least a layer of decency down from that.
>
>Do we perhaps need to consider an Item 11? Hmmmm.....

A musician might get creative and write something for a
SANCTIMONIUM. That's the horn they like to blow, part of
the Big Brass section of their community orchestra of
amateur blowhards. [Toot, toot! They are on a Tootsie Roll!]

I didn't include the all-important Self-Righteousness aspect of
the sanctimonius sect of status quoists. My omission. Good
point to bring it up!

This could turn into a "Never Ending Story!" :-)

LHA / WMD

1414. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:13:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122001347.25815.00006125@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86188

In article <Xns9477C39D3FB3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>I have actually encountered someone who actually thought he must be right
>and spoke down to me on the air because he had a 2x1 call and I was a mere
>1x3. Never mind that I am an Extra (not to mention a BSEE) but just kept my
>no-code call. This must come under 7. Not as common as you might think,
>this one.
>
>I have met many people who actually abide by number 6, i.e. they pretend to
>like the code, but they make only one CW QSO every 2-3 years. Usually, they
>are pro the CW test too. They never use it, but think the tradition is
>important. I am not talking about anyone here, AFAIK, but they are out
>there.

Ohhh...SOME in here might come under at least 2 items...:-)

LHA / WMD

1415. Re: Bookmark for Santa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:46:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F63BC.2370EBCC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86191

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <WXFPb.3784$Fp1.2371622@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> >> There's plenty new, Leonard. You may start your education after you
> >> learn about firmware.
> >
> > I just downloaded new firmware for my cable modem, over my cable modem.
>
> >Guess I'll have to use UPS next time. 8^)
>
> Mike, "firmware" is programming instructions that are quite
> permanent, almost never alterable by a user.

Leonard, I can't alter the firmware upgrades. I can only replace the
existing download with the new one.

> An example of "firmware" is a mask-programmed ROM. Not the
> erasable type such as in a 2716 EPROM. With the advent of
> FLASH memory the extra cost of masking for a mask-programmed
> ROM has fallen out of favor over the last decade. Once made, a
> mask-programmed ROM cannot be altered.

I'm the user. I can't alter the program at all. I can, however,
replace the program with an updated one.

> Another example of "firmware" is the PLD or Programmable Logic
> Devices. Those are literally "blown" using on-chip "fuses" (links)
> which are vaporized by the programmer. Once done, the PLD can
> not be altered, thus it is not "upgradeable."

I'll bet that's what Ten-Tec has done! Those characters have used a PLD
and simply put the serial port on the back of the Orion just for show.
Users download the firmware upgrade, attach a serial cable and only
think they are loading the newest version into the transceiver. Yep,
that's probably what happened.

> There are EPROMs available which have NO UV-erase window.
> That cuts the cost of the package by a cent or two. Those are
> production-erased before programming, then programmed to the
> customer's request data by a multiple-unit programmer. Definitely
> FIRM ware since a user would have to open the IC package to
> erase the ROM and reprogram it.

>
> All microprocessors have "firmware" in them in the form of the
> Instruction Set decode-and-execute part of the chip. Those form
> the entire instruction set of the microprocessor and cannot be
> changed...hence the label of "firm."
>
> A rare form of "firmware" is the hard-wired logic arrangment of ICs,
> particularly with "state machines." That can only be "upgraded"
> with actual physical wire changes on the board. The 1979 Apple][
> Disk Controller card was mostly a state machine designed by
> Steve Wozniak himself. In early minicomputers the instruction set
> decoder was a combination of state machine and hard-wired logic
> chips; that evolved into ROM and then became part of the micro-
> processor chip structure.
>
> "Software" is instructions which can be altered by a user.

Users can't alter the Orion's instructions. They can use them or not.
They can load them into the transceiver or not.

> Every
> program for a PC or MAC is a "software."

The Orion is not a PC or a Mac.

> The instructions or
> program are stored locally on a disk ("hard" or "floppy") and may be
> accessed at any time by the PC's disk operating system. Early
> software was loaded by paper tape, then magnetic tape, then by
> floppy, then by hard disk, finally by CD-ROM.

The Orion has no hard drive, no floppy disks, no paper or magnetic tape
and no CD-ROM drive.

> A CD-ROM is not labelled either "firm" or "soft" since it contains
> software which is not easily altered by the user...but parts of each
> one can be rewritten if the content does not fill the CD. Software on
> so-called "protected" media can be defeated but that takes a
> modification of the CD writer program and probably some physical
> changes in the CD drive itself.

Nope. I checked. There's no CD-ROM drive on the Orion.

> The electronics industry has pretty well defined what is "firmware"
> and what is "software" over the last three decades. Lately (in the
> last half-dozen years) the appearance of the useable/programmable
> microcontroller such as Microchip's "PIC" series has allowed a
> re-programming of the stored program in the PIC's FLASH memory.
> This is because Microchip's design (and other microcontrollers)
> usually allow an extra package pin and internal registers/instruction-
> set for such reprogramming. That isn't always the case with mass-
> purchase special microcontrollers which may have the reprogramming
> feature inaccessible to the user. Examples of that are various low-

> cost appliances such as lawn sprinkler controllers or automatic coffee
> makers. On those, the only thing alterable is some settings of
> operation such as time. Settings sometimes go into FLASH memory
> but the user cannot necessarily alter the main instruction program
> set into the microcontroller.

I'm the user. I can't alter the program. I provided you with a link to
an accurate definition and one to Ten-Tec's site, the one with the big
blue letters reading "Firmware Upgrades".

> Industry is going away from the absolute labels of "firmware" with
> the new IC technologies. A microcontroller's program is simply called
> "a program" if it can be loaded over the existing program or otherwise
> changed by the user. Program content is still called "software"
> because that has become normal in the wider group of computer and
> consumer electronics users. Such software comes on CD-ROM,
> floppy disks, but sometimes (for hobbyists) as "source code" for a
> microcontroller's development program which can also load the
> program into the micro. "Source code" is the human-readable
> instructions of the program and the development program translates
> that into microcontroller machine code for programming.

Industry is going away from labels like "firmware"? Ten-Tec is an
industry. Did you visit the site yet?

> Anything that is "firm" in ware is not readily alterable by the user.
> Anything that is "soft" in ware is readily alterable by the user.

I can't alter the program, Leonard. It must be firmware.

> If a program or data is downloadable over a modem, it does so in
> software form.

You'd better contact Ten-Tec and straighten those guys out!

> You can call anything you want by whatever name you want but
> it won't necessarily be understood by a distributor or parts seller.
> There's several millions of folks involved in the worldwide electronics
> industry (which includes radio) so, if you want some "firmware" that
> can be downloaded over a modem, you'd best be VERY specific
> in describing it.

Uhhhhh, I didn't have to describe the firmware upgrades for Ten-Tec,
Len.
They described them for me. They produce them. I get to use them (but
not alter them). They refer to them as firmware upgrades. I'm quite
content with that term. So the Ten-Tec folks are happy. I'm happy.
But, oh yes, you're not happy. Yet you have nothing to do with Ten-Tec
and don't own an Orion.

> You can call a spade a hoe, but be prepared to talk to the NAACP.

I've never asked Ten-Tec about garden tools but both they and I are
quite amenable to discussing the firmware upgrades which they produce.

You are as uninvolved with this one as you are in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

1416. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 05:49:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400F6473.2FDEC160@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86192

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <ZDCPb.32914$P%1.25898293@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the idea of
> >the FCC.
>
> The ARRL can do NO wrong, of course.
>
> Evil is the FCC...of course.

Months from now, you'll state with much confidence that someone here
said such things. You will of course be correct. The someone was you.

> FCC has been around since 1934...almost 70 years.

...not nearly as old as the League, is it?

> ARRL doesn't grant amateur licenses although they think they "control"
> it.

Who, beside you, believes such a statement?

FCC grants amateur licenses and is THE authority on U.S. civil
> radio regulation.
>
> Vote early and often...

Vote Leonard Kusinich!

Dave K8MN

1417. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 06:50:17 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0401212250.353fc6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86193

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040121215552.06226.00002525@mb-m19.aol.com>...

> The big mystery, though, is why FCC got all fired up back in 1958 and
> started making noises about changing the system, only 5 years after they'd
> done the Big Giveaway of 1953. My best guess is that they had a serious
> case of Sputnik Fever.

Yep... and guess what, it is 2004 now, and the 'ol US of A is going
thru a serious case of "Sacred Vessel" fever.

We need to give the young people who are willing to learn about RF, a
decent place to learn in the ham ranks, with incentives that match the
requirements.

What changed? The Internet... Cell Phones... The WTC attack...
Chinese astronauts... Outsourced Engineering jobs to India... A
terminated fool-for-a-governer who allowed illegal aliens to sink the
California economy into a $36bln debt... A President who refuses to
guard our country's borders, and who now proposes to let illegal
aliens sink the USA economy (or is it just a Chess Gambit, designed to
pull a plank from the Dem's platform?).

The ARRL proposal is GOOD FOR AMERICA, and is the obvious right thing
to do.

You old naysaying farts talk about work ethic, and bemoan the lowering
of standards... But it is now clear that you simply don't want to
share frequencies (which are now all virtually unused!), nor
information (which is now all 10-15 years out of date!)... you just
want to sit on your asses and bitch.

This old fart likes Morse code up to a point, but it can NO LONGER be
the centerpiece of contention in Amateur Radio - we MUST move on. We
are DONE listening to this MORSE CODE BULLSHIT! STOP IT! Get on with
your lives! Do SOMETHING positive. ANYTHING!

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

- Stewart (N0MHS)
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

1418. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 07:02:04 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <xPadnYuyf_Px6JLdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 86194
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I wonder if this guy has a Professional Idiot License? If not, he should apply. They won't even charge him a fee.

"chocolate rabbit" <bunnyears3003@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:ad622$400d63d4$d1cc7a2c$17942@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> They're trying to revive a DEAD HORSE Hans.
> (For as long as you've been in ham radio cannot you
> realize this?)
>
> Better face up to it, Ham Radio is DEAD.
>
> Burt and Wayne Green are right on this one I am afraid.
> Even new 2 Meter radios are going for under $200.00
> at HRO and AES. Nobody's buying ham gear except
> for on e-Bay where you chances of getting "E-screwed"
> on that "perfect condition used radio" are better than 7 to 1.
>
> Nobody new wants to bother with ham radio and antennas
> and climbing a roof or putting up a tower when
> all you need is a $300 Dell Multimedia PC and a DSL or
> Cable Modem connection? I mean, let's get real here, OK?
>
> ...and please...everyone else, spare us all the tired
> rehashed old comments we've *all heard already*
> 100 times about "when the power goes out, CW
> always gets thru the QRM, my 2M HT will
> still work" ...etc etc ad-nasuem
>
> (We've all heard this schitk 20 years ago)
>
> Ham radio is TECHNOLOGICALLY OBSOLETE and has
> become *nothing more* than a venue where old retired white males
> get together to kibitz on the air for an hour a day or more about the same
> old tired topics they've been talking about for the past 5 Years.
>
> Stick a fork in it, or send it off to the glue factory or Fred Sanford's
> junkyard.
>
> Jay
> SWL for 26 yrs
>
>
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message

> news:b%WOb.19566$zj7.10115@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
> > four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
> > proposing!
> >
> > A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
> > General, and Extra.
> >
> > Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room
> > temperature.
> >
> > Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
> >
> > General just like today except without Morse.
> >
> > Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
> >
> > But there's more.....
> >
> > A third of a million Tech/Tech+ would get a free pass to General.
> >
> > All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to Advanced.
> >
> > That works out to about 60% of todays licensees would get a free pass to
> > the next higher license without testing for that grade.
> >
> > And while I personally don't support a Morse test for any license, if we
> > must have a Morse test for Extra, then lets make it something 'Extra',
> > not the same old count-the-dots-and-dashes which Novices have been
> > passing for over a half-century! 20WPM sounds about right.
> >
> > C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
> > committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
> > the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
> > for the future.
> >
> > Nasty letter to follow.
> >
> > Love always,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > I >AM< THE ARRL!!!
> >
> >
> >
>

1419. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 07:06:04 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <GtmdnfsytYvG65LdRVn-hw@comcast.com>
Source record: 86195
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

You undoubtedly listen to FM radio. Are you a DJ? Do you have your own talk
show? No? Why not, they wouldn't hire you?
"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:ydudnQJXdfyfEZDdRVn-ig@gbronline.com...
> chocolate rabbit wrote:
>
> meaningless ranting deleted
> > Jay
> > SWL for 26 yrs
>
> So you were SWL for 26 years and never could pass the test for a ham
> license.
>

1420. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 07:45:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vcLPb.18937$q4.1844@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86196

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> No it only becomes vulgar when
> chosen as a vanity call for the
> purpose of "getting in someone's
> face". If a person were to choose
> it because there name was
> something like "Tonya Irene
> Tidwell" and they wanted their
> initials, it is not vulgar. (snip)

However, given the topic of this discussion (children and the ARS one step closer to extinction), how is one supposed to know the difference between the in your face "TIT" and the "TIT" initials? In the end, without a specific context, it's just a callsign. And how would a callsign bring the ARS one step closer to extinction?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1421. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 08:07:09 UTC
From: Dan Mattingly N0FQN <n0fqn@charter.net>
Message-ID: <100v15m37nr7cf4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86197

The issue is it was not invented today. So, what's your point??? You could say this statement about any subject. It's too, broad in texture. Narrow your point or I won't give you a grade.
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040118153405.12501.00005627@mb-m04.aol.com...
> Alternative Universe Probable Truisms -
>
> 1. There would be NO ARRL to provide "guidance" and direction.
> That expired before St. Hiram expired. [in this alternative
> universe] Newington, CT, would have no museum.
>
> 2. There would be NO morse code test since no other radio
> service except Maritime Radio used morse code. There
> would be NO need to keep a "pool of trained morse radio
> operators" for any national need.
>
> 3. There would be NO tales of olde-tyme ham doings because
> there would be no old-timers left to tell the tales...only
> pretenders who longed for a simpler (mythical) life way back
> before they were born.
>
> 4. The Titanic would have sunk anyway and several movies made
> about that tragedy. "Independence Day" would have been
> made anyway as a comic science-fiction vehicle for Will Smith
> who would later wear black suits and shades.
>
> 5. Hallicrafters and National Radio and Heathkit would have gone
> belly-up anyway. Collins Radio would have continued on into
> the military and commercial radio market without making any
> overpriced fancy amateur radios. Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom
> would still have been successful in the commercial and
> government market. SGC might still exist but in the personal
> sailing market. Ten-Tec might not exist.
>
> 6. Radio broadcasting would have become successful and tele-
> vision broadcasting even more so. "Overseas radiotelephone"
> would still exist via the first HF SSB radios in the 1930s. The
> first VHF FM mobiles would still be tested by various police
> departments in the late 1930s. The military would still be the
> first HT user courtesy of Galvin (later Motorola)...and the back-
> pack radio ("walkie-talkie" again from Galvin)...and the radio
> relay (WW2) and VHF repeater (Korean War) uses...and single-
> channel HF SSB (USAF, post WW2)...and aircraft VHF AM
> (WW2). HF RTTY circuits would have been formed before WW2

> and continued on in wide-bandwidth HF SSB, later to have
> much higher data rates from transferrence of modem and
> information theory techniques. Cross-country microwave radio
> relay would still exist for hundreds of telephone circuits and
> many TV circuits on a single link. Government and business
> would still have tens of thousands of HT and mobile radios
> courtesy of the military WW2 legacy and the invention of
> transistors and integrated circuits. Communications satellites
> would still exist as soon as rockets could put them up there
> (first published paper on that by an up-coming science fiction
> writer named Arthur C. Clarke, then a "boffin" in the RAF right
> after WW2). All sorts of watercraft would have VHF radios in
> harbors due to the success of small land VHF radios. Radio-
> sondes by the hundreds of thousands would be used up
> annually using simple one-tube (pencil triode in a sheet metal
> cavity) transmitters in low microwave frequencies. The cellular
> telephone (past legal age in our universe) would still exist by
> the millions, morphed into a single-hand package with built-in
> video capability. There would still be "headphone radio"
> receivers for personal use, sometimes merged with CD players.
> "Wireless" would take on a new meaning as hundreds of
> thousands of data transceivers linked computers without wires.
> "Shortwave" broadcasting would still be trying out digital
> sound and finding out that it works despite dire warnings of
> impossibility. The U.S. military would still be using digital VHF
> manpack radios with encryption for voice and data for a total of
> a quarter million sets. None of the preceding required any
> "ham radio pioneering."
>
> 7. Arthur Godfrey would still get his TV show cancelled. Barry
> Goldwater would still unsuccessfully run for U.S. President.
> [the fate of Julius LaRosa is unknown in this universe]
>
> 8. The Federal Communications Commission would still exist on
> approximately the same scale and still trying to privatize
> commercial operator testing to save money. Radio use by
> non-hams after 1934 grew sufficiently large to require the
> agency to continue.
>
> 9. "CB" would have been created anyway, a fore-runner of the
> license-free personal radio wave of the future. [it is 46 years
> old in our universe which already has FRS, R-C, cordless
> telephones and wireless gizmos of all kinds]
>
> 10. Tens of thousands of electronic/radio hobbyists would be
> bereft of Title, Status, Privilege of the Royal-equivalent.
> Amateur Radio License that allowed them to add a callsign
> behind their names to show how good and expert they were in
> "radio." That would make it a bitter scene with many more
> fights of the amateurs (minority) with professionals (majority).

>
> LHA / WMD

1422. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 10:24:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ixNPb.18836$i4.7572@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86198

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > Clearly, letters only become vulgar when
> > one attaches a specific meaning to them.
> > Without a context to make "TIT," or other
> > such letters, vulgar, I can't really envision
> > a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping
> > a child out of Amateur Radio simply
> > because those letters appear in a callsign.
>
> The "context" is self-evident. It is a well-
> known vulgarity referring to a woman's
> breasts in a connotation which is generally
> considered to be of a sexual nature. (snip)

The "vulgarity" and "of a sexual nature" is self-evident to you, Larry. Funk & Wagnals describes "tit" as "teat, breast or nipple." Princeton University's WordWeb defines "tit" as "either of two soft fleshy milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman" or "the small projection of a mammary gland." And, of course, both mention a "small insectivorous bird." Many farm animals have teats or "tits," but most don't consider them to be "of a sexual nature."

> > (snip) Would you as aggressively challenge
> > one of those guys, like you've done with
> > Kim, if any one of them were active in this
> > newsgroup?
>
> Yes, I would. Even if those call signs were
> issued sequentially, there is no reason for
> the licensee to keep them and use them on
> the air if they are of an objectionable nature.
> The FCC would certainly honor their request
> for a call sign reassignment. Anyone who
> kept and used such a call would be subject to
> the same questions regarding their motives as
> is Kim.

Then you have a lot of aggressive questioning to do. In addition to the examples given before (containing either "TIT" and "ASS"), I found about a dozen more with the same suffixes and several dozen more with other questionable suffixes (GAY, FAG, LEZ, CUM, SEX, and so on). At this stage in the search, I suspect there may eventually be several hundred callsigns you might object to. Given that, and the amount of time you've spent just

questioning Kim alone, you may have decades of aggressive questioning still to do before you finish the entire list. Of course, the more logical approach would to discuss this with the FCC instead. After all, if getting rid of "questionable" callsigns in a "family-oriented hobbyist radio service" is your true goal, that would be the most appropriate, and effective, way to do so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1423. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 10:29:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401220229.1d41a744@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86199

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040121181449.08626.00002730@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> Does the ARRL represent any of those interested in becoming a
> radio amteur?

No, Lennie...but they represent folks interested in becoming
radio AMATEURS.

A TYPO! Lennie MUST be in RAGE ! ! ! He's MAD that folks even
LESS qualified than he percieves himself MAY be allowed to get on HF
soon!

SEEK HELP Lennie! That "rage" thing is burning you up!

Steve, K4YZ

1424. Re: Angry Stebie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 10:33:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401220233.73c0941b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86200

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040121181446.08626.00002727@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> Some may wonder why Stebie is hate-filled and angry all the time.
> I may have the root cause of it -

Lennie! Don't be shy! Take your bow. You ARE the reason a lot
of people here are disgusted..."hate-filled" and "angry" are
excessive, but then you ARE prone to excesses...

Like calling people who don't agree with YOU Nazis, elitists,
jack-booted thugs, etc etc etc, when no such adjectives were adressed
to you in the first place.

You've since added liar and antagonist to that. Plagarist is
going a bit far, but you border on it.

Yes, Lennie..You're the "root" alright...of crabgrass.

Steve, K4YZ

1425. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 10:35:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401220235.235788eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86101

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040121181449.08626.00002731@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401210723.780a1472@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > Add coward to scumbag and liar.
>
> Thank you, charm school dropout Stebe.

Sorry you have a hard time with the truth, Lennie. I know it's
got to hurt, but sooner or later you'll finally wake up to just
exactly how foolish you've been.

Steve, K4YZ

1426. Re: A Newbies View On Things

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 10:36:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401220236.165fc847@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86102

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040120182417.07155.00000156@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401200442.36aea16d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stebe the hostile reflector) writes:
>
> > You are the bully here, Lennie.
> >
> > A lying, antagonistic one. Sucks to be you...again.
>
> More "charm school" output from the Dill Instructor.

I just call them as I see them, Lennie.

Liar and antagonist seem to fit pretty well.

> Why don't you apply for a position as Greeter at the ARRL lobby
> entrance, warm fuzzy one?
>
> I'm sure they need all the PR they can muster after that wonderful
> Plan to put before the FCC.

Oh no, Lennie...that's reserved for you.

Steve, K4YZ

1427. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 11:22:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <loOPb.18845$i4.14089@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86103

"Leo" wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > Another interesting little snippit... If
> > I recall, it was only after I "took on"
> > some of the things Larry (and his ilk)
> > was posting that he decided to take
> > a dislike to my callsign.
> >
> > Makes one wonder if it is the callsign
> > that is the reason for the attitude; or
> > that they just plain dislike me and can't
> > think of any other way to express it.
>
> The statements of those who voice the
> strongest objections tend to support your
> observation, Kim. (snip)

Your message didn't show up on my server, Kim. So I'll use Leo's message (thanks, Leo) to post my response. Anyway, yes, I also seem to remember your callsign wasn't an issue until after you disagreed with Larry and friends. Only at that point did they decide to focus on your callsign to distract from the counter-arguments you made. However, regardless of how it started, that is certainly how your callsign is being used now. It now seems Larry and some of his friends would rather belittle your callsign than seriously respond to your comments on various issues. Of course, some, on the other hand, are simply using your callsign in the same manner as the codswallop of the typical newsgroup troll (including Larry on occasion).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1428. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 11:58:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buodt3$ovt@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86104

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040121231321.21955.00000104@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <bulk4p$g9o@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
>
> >And, it works great working DX and pileups--when I
> >used to do that! ;)
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but you're a No-code Technician. There is no way
> you can "work DX and pileups" on HF unless you were operating as a
> third party using your OM's privileges, and that would also require the
> use of his call sign. Oh, yeah, six meters. Sure, I DX and pileups are
> possible there, but I rather suspect you were talking about HF. Please
> give us a run-down on your OM's VHF DX'ing capabilities. That should
> be a good one.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

"Don't look now, Larry" but I am a CODED Tech+. Don't even tell me you have missed that for the past umpteenth years! I have been a CODED Tech+ nearly since the beginning of being an amateur. I think it was a couple/few months after getting my ticket that I finally passed the 5 wpm.

And, yes, for the first two or three years I worked a lot of HF, on 10M anyway, and always worked a pileup if I heard one, always worked DX if I happened to hear someone during the weekday on my lunchhour and can't think of a time when I have failed to "get through."

So, don't look now, Larry, you're wrong, as usual. Sneer away....it becomes you.

Kim W5TIT

1429. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 12:01:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buoe1p$fj5@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86105

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:vcLPb.18937$q4.1844@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > No it only becomes vulgar when
> > chosen as a vanity call for the
> > purpose of "getting in someone's
> > face". If a person were to choose
> > it because there name was
> > something like "Tonya Irene
> > Tidwell" and they wanted their
> > initials, it is not vulgar. (snip)
>
>
> However, given the topic of this discussion (children and the ARS one
step
> closer to extinction), how is one supposed to know the difference between
> the in your face "TIT" and the "TIT" initials? In the end, without a
> specific context, it's just a callsign. And how would a callsign bring the
> ARS one step closer to extinction?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Thank you. And, as someone else pointed out, if a kid derives the word
"tit" from my callsign, it AIN'T because I taught 'em. *Anyone* who thinks
kids are still that innocent these days, has not been on a schoolyard or
listening in on kids' conversations when they think no one is around--and
I've even heard Kindergartners speaking of some pretty risque topics. Sad
but true.

Kim W5TIT

1430. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 12:01:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buoe3g$rne@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86106

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ixNPb.18836$i4.7572@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > Clearly, letters only become vulgar when
> > > one attaches a specific meaning to them.
> > > Without a context to make "TIT," or other
> > > such letters, vulgar, I can't really envision
> > > a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping
> > > a child out of Amateur Radio simply
> > > because those letters appear in a callsign.
> >
> > The "context" is self-evident. It is a well-
> > known vulgarity referring to a woman's
> > breasts in a connotation which is generally
> > considered to be of a sexual nature. (snip)
>
>
> The "vulgarity" and "of a sexual nature" is self-evident to you, Larry.
> Funk & Wagnals describes "tit" as "teat, breast or nipple." Princeton
> University's WordWeb defines "tit" as "either of two soft fleshy
> milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman" or "the small
> projection of a mammary gland." And, of course, both mention a "small
> insectivorous bird." Many farm animals have teats or "tits," but most
don't
> consider them to be "of a sexual nature."
>

Vulgar is in the eye of the beholder...and Larry must believes women's
breasts are vulgar.

Kim W5TIT

1431. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 12:03:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buoe6v$ahr@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86107

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:loOPb.18845$i4.14089@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Your message didn't show up on my server, Kim. So I'll use Leo's message
> (thanks, Leo) to post my response. Anyway, yes, I also seem to remember
your
> callsign wasn't an issue until after you disagreed with Larry and friends.
> Only at that point did they decide to focus on your callsign to distract
> from the counter-arguments you made. However, regardless of how it
started,
> that is certainly how your callsign is being used now. It now seems Larry
> and some of his friends would rather belittle your callsign than seriously
> respond to your comments on various issues. Of course, some, on the other
> hand, are simply using your callsign in the same manner as the codswallop
of
> the typical newsgroup troll (including Larry on occasion).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Yep. Period. That's the end of the story ;)

Kim W5TIT

1432. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 12:09:45 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <18fv00thohm07sq00p126l4rreq40hr844@4ax.com>
Source record: 86108

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 03:12:59 GMT, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>
>> Leo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>You may want to suggest an experiment to those guys who do not
>>>understand how this must feel. Ask them to place a large banana in
>>>the inside front of their pants before they head off to work one
>>>morning. Have them engage as many of their co-workers as possible in
>>>conversation.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Then, the next day, have them go in (minus the banana :)) and see if
>>>they can find anyone who remembers what the hell they were talking
>>>about the day before......
>>
>>
>> Actually that doesn't seem like a very good example, "Leo". You'd get
>> the same result whether the guy wore the banana in the front or in the
>> rear of his pants.
>
> ROFL! And *that* kind folks, is the retort of the week! Good one Dave.

I wonder if Dave is basing his statement on first-hand empirical
evidence... :)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

1433. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 12:13:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <mifv00dhrqb4kk9kss5bt6jgcajf9b23va@4ax.com>
Source record: 86109

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 10:24:14 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > Clearly, letters only become vulgar when
>> > one attaches a specific meaning to them.
>> > Without a context to make "TIT," or other
>> > such letters, vulgar, I can't really envision
>> > a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping
>> > a child out of Amateur Radio simply
>> > because those letters appear in a callsign.
>>
>> The "context" is self-evident. It is a well-
>> known vulgarity referring to a woman's
>> breasts in a connotation which is generally
>> considered to be of a sexual nature. (snip)
>
>
> The "vulgarity" and "of a sexual nature" is self-evident to you, Larry.
>Funk & Wagnals describes "tit" as "teat, breast or nipple." Princeton
>University's WordWeb defines "tit" as "either of two soft fleshy
>milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman" or "the small
>projection of a mammary gland." And, of course, both mention a "small
>insectivorous bird." Many farm animals have teats or "tits," but most don't
>consider them to be "of a sexual nature."
>
>
>> > (snip) Would you as aggressively challenge
>> > one of those guys, like you've done with
>> > Kim, if any one of them were active in this
>> > newsgroup?
>>
>> Yes, I would. Even if those call signs were
>> issued sequentially, there is no reason for
>> the licensee to keep them and use them on
>> the air if they are of an objectionable nature.
>> The FCC would certainly honor their request
>> for a call sign reassignment. Anyone who
>> kept and used such a call would be subject to
>> the same questions regarding their motives as
>> is Kim.
>

>
> Then you have a lot of aggressive questioning to do. In addition to the
>examples given before (containing either "TIT" and "ASS"), I found about a
>dozen more with the same suffixes and several dozen more with other
>questionable suffixes (GAY, FAG, LEZ, CUM, SEX, and so on). At this stage in
>the search, I suspect there may eventually be several hundred callsigns you
>might object to. Given that, and the amount of time you've spent just
>questioning Kim alone, you may have decades of aggressive questioning still
>to do before you finish the entire list. Of course, the more logical
>approach would to discuss this with the FCC instead. After all, if getting
>rid of "questionable" callsigns in a "family-oriented hobbyist radio
>service" is your true goal, that would be the most appropriate, and
>effective, way to do so.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Well said, Dwight!

73, Leo

1434. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 12:34:54 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <k7gv001arosbasae08o9ii6gpt0dfkahbt@4ax.com>
Source record: 86110

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 00:54:28 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:e95u00dovb0qm7euid1hr6uep8q1bua35l@4ax.com...
>> On 22 Jan 2004 00:02:34 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>>
>> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> >news:k9DPb.32920$P%1.25902878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>> >
>> >>
>> >> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> news:Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> >>> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
>> >>>
>> >>> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below 7100
>> >>> > goes away completely.
>> >>
>> >> Except for us up North, perhaps - we have 7.050 to 7.100 allocated as
>> >> SSB on our 40M band plan. There are a few Canadian nets that operate
>> >> there regularily, as well as quite a bit of foreign DX.
>> >>
>> >> Fortunately, our band plans are guidelines prepared by Radio Amateurs
>> >> of Canada - not federally mandated.
>> >>
>> >> 73, Leo
>> >>
>> >
>> >Do you really think you would like all the US amateurs jumping in down
>> >there?? Remember the population difference. We have a tremendous amount of
>> >activity on 40m voice on 7.150 to 7.300 until the broadcasts drive us off.
>> >If we had SSB access to that 7.050 to 7.100 used by other countries, it
>> >would be packed solid and nobody else could get in. Do you want that? Far
>> >better to continue the battle to get the allocation extended to 7.300 for
>> >all amateurs around the world.
>> >
>> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Agree that the exclusivity of the 40M band should be extended to 7.300
- but that is likely quite a few years away. It will be a few more
years before the 7.100 to 7.200 segment is cleared of broadcast
stations. And, the bandwidth from 7.050 to 7.100 (at least from my
QTH) is relatively underutilized - not a great deal of CW or digital

traffic going on there.

Just thinking that it might provide some clear space for you to
operate if it was opened to phone in the US.

Personally, I don't mind having it as clear as it is right now at all!
There are, as I stated, some excellent DX opportunities there...

73, Leo

1435. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 13:42:14 UTC
From: Tom W <address.masked@for.no.spam>
Message-ID: <8701FUD7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 86111
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 22:00:25 GMT, Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> "google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
> news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > >
> > > Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the Incentive
> > > License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
> > >
> >
> > Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the idea of
> > the FCC.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Learn *your* history. It was the ARRL which first proposed incentive licensing.

From http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html:

"In summary, although the vast number of hams were satisfied, a small minority had complaints. And the ARRL listened. In 1963, acting on complaints they claim they received from members and operators in other countries, the ARRL proposed "Incentive Licensing." In an editorial, the ARRL implied that perhaps it was a mistake when the Class B and Generals were given the 75 and 20 meter phone segments. The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be restored to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the Generals an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that in order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the General class hams."

1436. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 15:20:43 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9478692FABB3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86112

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:fZEPb.22599$zj7.10801
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
> From K0HB:
>
> < > The governing regulation is �97.527 which allows, but does NOT
> require,
> < > VEC's to collect reimbursement for examinations. (In other words,
> there
> < > is no requirement that VEC's collect money for ANY examination.)
> < > Collection of reimbursement is AUTHORIZED but it is not MANDATORY.
>
> < I don't think that qualifies as proof.
>
> Since it is a citation of the actual federal rules, it is certainly more
> convincing than your tenuous assertion that you "read somewhere".....
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

That's the problem though, isn't it? What we need is the statute, not the
rules, which prove nothing in the absence of Novice testing.

1437. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 16:26:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <400FF9A0.CF708B74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86113

Alun wrote:
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:fZEPb.22599$zj7.10801
> @newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
> >
> > From K0HB:
> >
> > < > The governing regulation is ï¿½97.527 which allows, but does NOT
> > require,
> > < > VEC's to collect reimbursement for examinations. (In other words,
> > there
> > < > is no requirement that VEC's collect money for ANY examination.)
> > < > Collection of reimbursement is AUTHORIZED but it is not MANDATORY.
> >
> > < I don't think that qualifies as proof.
> >
> > Since it is a citation of the actual federal rules, it is certainly more
> > convincing than your tenuous assertion that you "read somewhere".....

> That's the problem though, isn't it? What we need is the statute, not the
> rules, which prove nothing in the absence of Novice testing.

So if I understand your view, you'd like to see a statute as proof that
the statute does not exist. Does that sum it up?

Dave K8MN

1438. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 16:43:02 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <400FFD96.5793D5C4@ptt.edu>
Source record: 86114
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be restored
> to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the Generals
> an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that in
> order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the
> General class hams."

All this so the top HAMs have something to gloat about.

1439. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:01:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122120129.24678.00000557@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86115

>All this so the top HAMs have something to gloat about.

Heres what so Stupid, there is nothing to prevent you from being a "TOP HAM"

1440. Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:03:33 UTC
From: ARRL Philosophy <No.m@il.com>
Message-ID: <FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86116
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I canceled my Leage membership after their first restructuring proposal for amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new proposal, I wish I had NEVER been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is that: if ham radio is to survive it MUST sound like CB.

Tee'd Off

1441. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:12:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401220912.2707111f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86117

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<buoe1p$fj5@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:vcLPb.18937$q4.1844@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > And how would a callsign bring the
> > ARS one step closer to extinction?
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Simple - by making the ARS seem to be something many people won't
want to be a part of - or have their kids be a part of.

Dwight, you previously said you didn't know any parents who would
keep their kids out of ham radio over a callsign like Kim's. Well,
I know plenty of parents who would not support their kids' being
involved in ham radio if their first (or second, or third)
impression involved such callsigns.

> as someone else pointed out, if a kid derives the word

[word deleted]

> from my callsign, it AIN'T because I taught 'em.

That's true. A child who has never seen the word won't learn it
from your callsign.

But if the child already knows the word, you will have taught him/her
something worse. You'll have taught the child that the use of such
words in public, and in ham radio, is OK. That it's acceptable behavior.
And you've made it that much harder for them to learn appropriate
behavior.

Kids are influenced by what they see and hear adults doing, even though
they will deny such influence. Kids who see adults smoking, drinking
irresponsibly, cussing, etc., will be influenced to try the same or
similar behaviors themselves *IF* those behaviors in adults are
portrayed as acceptable, "fun", glamorous, etc.

I recall quite clearly how, as a teenager, I and my peers were subjected
to lectures on the evils of illegal drugs like marijuana, LSD, speed,
'ludes, etc. Those lectures were not very convincing when delivered by
adults who needed two cups of coffee in the morning to get started, a few
beers or manhattans in the evening to slow down, and cigarettes all day to
keep going. Same principle applies in any subject - if Coach emphasizes

fair play and following the rules over winning at any cost, the team is
much more likely to learn that lesson.

>*Anyone* who thinks
> kids are still that innocent these days, has not been on a schoolyard or
> listening in on kids' conversations when they think no one is around--and
> I've even heard Kindergartners speaking of some pretty risque topics.

But that does *not* mean it doesn't matter what adults say and do in their
presence, or in public! The mere fact that you have to listen in when
they don't know you're there means the kids are learning that not all
behavior is appropriate in all contexts.

Same principle as teaching them it's OK to pull their pants down in the
bathroom or doctor's office, but *not* OK to do in public! Even though
everyone knows what's under their clothes, what those body parts are
called, etc.

> Sad but true.
>
The reason it's like that is the failure of adults to act appropriately.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1442. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:29:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401220929.38aeca78@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86118

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0401212250.353fc6f@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040121215552.06226.00002525@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
> > The big mystery, though, is why FCC got all fired up back in 1958 and
> > started making noises about changing the system, only 5 years after they'd
> > done the Big Giveaway of 1953. My best guess is that they had a serious
> > case of Sputnik Fever.
>
> Yep... and guess what, it is 2004 now, and the 'ol US of A is going
> thru a serious case of "Sacred Vessel" fever.

What is "Sacred Vessel" fever, Stew? Never heard that one!
>
> We need to give the young people who are willing to learn about RF, a
> decent place to learn in the ham ranks, with incentives that match the
> requirements.

Agreed! That's why we need different license levels, for one thing.
>
> What changed? The Internet... Cell Phones... The WTC attack...
> Chinese astronauts... Outsourced Engineering jobs to India... A
> terminated fool-for-a-governer who allowed illegal aliens to sink the
> California economy into a $36bln debt... A President who refuses to
> guard our country's borders, and who now proposes to let illegal
> aliens sink the USA economy (or is it just a Chess Gambit, designed to
> pull a plank from the Dem's platform?).

What do any of those things have to do with the tests for a ham radio
license?
>
> The ARRL proposal is GOOD FOR AMERICA, and is the obvious right thing
> to do.

Parts of it are. Other parts are not so good - like the free upgrades.

btw, the proposed revamped Novice is nothing like your 'Colt' ideas.
>
> You old naysaying

[expletive deleted]

> talk about work ethic, and bemoan the lowering
> of standards...

Are you talking about me?

> But it is now clear that you simply don't want to
> share frequencies (which are now all virtually unused!), nor
> information (which is now all 10-15 years out of date!)... you just
> want to sit on your

[expletives deleted]

None of that is true in my case, so you can't be talking about me.
>
> This old

[expletive deleted]

> likes Morse code up to a point, but it can NO LONGER be
> the centerpiece of contention in Amateur Radio - we MUST move on.

We have, Stew. The code test is only one part of the debate.

Do you think giving all Techs a free upgrade to General, and all
Advanceds
a free upgrade to Extra would be good things? I don't.

> We are DONE listening to this MORSE CODE

[expletive deleted]

> STOP IT!

Sounds like you're telling people to shut up, Stew. Is that what civil
debate in a free society means to you?

> Get on with
> your lives! Do SOMETHING positive. ANYTHING!

We are. We're working towards a better license structure and tests for
same.
There's some disagreement about how to do that.

K0HB, Hans, has proposed a radically different license and test
structure here.
Lots of good debate on it. No words from you, though.

Now, as for getting "the young people who are willing to learn about
RF, a
decent place to learn in the ham ranks, with incentives that match the
requirements", think about the following:

The greatest period of growth in the number of US hams in the past 70
years was the 12 year period from 1951 to 1962. The number of US hams
grew from about 100,000 to almost 250,000 in that time, even though
amateur radio was bedeviled
by TVI and other problems. One of the prime reasons for that growth, I
think, was the introduction (in 1951) of the Novice license, with its
simple 20 question written test and 5 wpm code test. But that license
also gave very limited privileges and was only good for one year,
after which the new ham

had to upgrade to a permanent license or leave the ham bands. Many, many of
those new hams were young people.

The young people today are not lazier or dumber than the young people of those
times, so if we're not getting them like we did back then, the problem must lie elsewhere.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1443. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:30:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <AMTPb.19510$i4.16412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:4XDPb.32936$P%1.25911033@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:hCCPb.32911$P%1.25897746@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Moe" <rfb@radfreebnet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:bulio8$6p2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > The ARRL's latest licensing scheme is driven by money.
> > > >
> > > > The league will achieve its goal by spreading cash to the correct
> > > > FCC managers. The FCC has no shortage of corrupt
> > > > management officials, ready to accept a bribe for anything.
> > > >
> > > > ARRL is no friend of amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > Moe
> > >
> > > Interesting seeing as how many of the ARRL's past proposals were
turned
> > > down.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > True, but with the FCC they could butcher it up so bad that the Novice
> > equivelant would be Extra no code.
> >
> > The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch
of
> > world class hypocrites. They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing'
> to
> > FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'. Then 40 years later they totally
> > reverse themselves. Bullcrap. The league has shown their true colors
to
> > me. Money Money and more Money.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> The historical articles state that the FCC forced it down everyone's
throat
```

> and the ARRL tried to fight it.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Sorry Dee D, I was there, were you? The ARRL was the main reason Incentive Licensing happened. They are the ones that started it all. The 'good ole boys' in Newington are the ones responsible.

True, by the time the FCC got into it, it came up with a bunch of crap that the ARRL did try and fight. But by that time it was too late.

Yes indeed...the ARRL is the reason we have incentive licensing. And now they want to open it up so much that a untrained monkey could be on HF in a week.

I am a life member of the ARRL. And have been a member since 1962. With only 1 year lapse because of military service. I was there Dee D.

Dan/W4NTI

1444. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:31:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <BJqdnRy1l5eyl43dRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86123

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>>No it only becomes vulgar when
>>chosen as a vanity call for the
>>purpose of "getting in someone's
>>face". If a person were to choose
>>it because there name was
>>something like "Tonya Irene
>>Tidwell" and they wanted their
>>initials, it is not vulgar. (snip)
>
>
>
> However, given the topic of this discussion (children and the ARS one step
> closer to extinction), how is one supposed to know the difference between
> the in your face "TIT" and the "TIT" initials? In the end, without a
> specific context, it's just a callsign.

IIRC kim chose the call sign on a dare because of the "TIT". Now why would anyone challenge someone to chose that callsign unless they saw the "TIT" had some kind of in your face or sexual reference? That is exactly why she chose the call sign, because of the tit reference. Extremely bad taste.

> And how would a callsign bring the
> ARS one step closer to extinction?

Picture a senerio where some ham brings his young grandson or granddaughter to a ham meeting or a field day to introduce them to amateur radio. They walk in and there stands some broad with an XL size tee shirt on that is still two sizes too small, with a call sign like that across her chest. Not a very good statement for ham radio.

1445. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:34:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <cQTPb.19514$i4.4556@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86120

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0401212250.353fc6f@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040121215552.06226.00002525@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
> > The big mystery, though, is why FCC got all fired up back in 1958 and
> > started making noises about changing the system, only 5 years after
they'd
> > done the Big Giveaway of 1953. My best guess is that they had a serious
> > case of Sputnik Fever.
>
> Yep... and guess what, it is 2004 now, and the 'ol US of A is going
> thru a serious case of "Sacred Vessel" fever.
>
> We need to give the young people who are willing to learn about RF, a
> decent place to learn in the ham ranks, with incentives that match the
> requirements.
>
> What changed? The Internet... Cell Phones... The WTC attack...
> Chinese astronauts... Outsourced Engineering jobs to India... A
> terminated fool-for-a-governer who allowed illegal aliens to sink the
> California economy into a $36bln debt... A President who refuses to
> guard our country's borders, and who now proposes to let illegal
> aliens sink the USA economy (or is it just a Chess Gambit, designed to
> pull a plank from the Dem's platform?).
>
> The ARRL proposal is GOOD FOR AMERICA, and is the obvious right thing
> to do.
>
> You old naysaying farts talk about work ethic, and bemoan the lowering
> of standards... But it is now clear that you simply don't want to
> share frequencies (which are now all virtually unused!), nor
> information (which is now all 10-15 years out of date!)... you just
> want to sit on your asses and bitch.
>
> This old fart likes Morse code up to a point, but it can NO LONGER be
> the centerpiece of contention in Amateur Radio - we MUST move on. We
> are DONE listening to this MORSE CODE BULLSHIT! STOP IT! Get on with
> your lives! Do SOMETHING positive. ANYTHING!
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> - Stewart (N0MHS)
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

Unused frequencies? Where are they? 15 and 10 during a sunspot minimum in the middle of a day?

You sound like K1MAN claiming to have tuned 20 meters and found only two active frequencies. Balderdash.

Try hooking up an antenna next time.

Dan/W4NTI

1446. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:35:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PRTPb.19517$i4.1205@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86121
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:400F2E43.5090705@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >True, but with the FCC they could butcher it up so bad that the Novice
> >equivelant would be Extra no code.
> >
> Well, some FCC brearucrat botched the lifetime code credit thing. You
> get lifetime
> credit for passing a 5wpm, but not for 13 or 20. So we need to look
> closely at
> what they write up....
>
> >
> >The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch
of
> >world class hypocrites. They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing'
to
> >FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'. Then 40 years later they totally
> >reverse themselves.
> >
> Me thinks that different people are in charge there now then back 40
> years ago.
>
> >
> >
>
>

True, different folks. But of a similar mind set. They do what they want
WITHOUT the input of the alleged voting members. Same crap, different day.

Dan/W4NTI

1447. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:36:09 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <4010096e$0$99193$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86122

In <20040121181448.08626.00002729@mb-m27.aol.com> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <psjPb.32601$P%1.25741009@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>>Actually I wonder if the ARRL petition isn't a crafty ruse. It will look
>>good to people who want what it proposes but has high odds of being rejected
>>by the FCC since the FCC has a long history of shooting down automatic
>>upgrades. They get the "attaboy" for "trying" and can then lay it at the
>>FCC's door when it fails even though they may want it to fail.

> SHAME!

> Thinking improper and vulgar thoughts about the ARRL!

> Say 100 Hail Hirams as penance and sin no more.

> LHA / WMD

You probably realized that Dee D. may be assuming the role of "devil's
advocate" here (by overplaying an idea to generate further discussion).
In other words, we might not want to take her words at face value until
she clarifies what she really means.

So, Dee D., what did you really mean to say above?

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

1448. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:38:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <XfGdnQHvpMtWlo3d4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86125

N2EY wrote:

> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<buoe1p$fj5@library2.airnews.net>...
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>news:vcLPb.18937$q4.1844@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>And how would a callsign bring the
>>>ARS one step closer to extinction?
>>>
>>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>>
>>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
> Simple - by making the ARS seem to be something many people won't
> want to be a part of - or have their kids be a part of.
>
> Dwight, you previously said you didn't know any parents who would
> keep their kids out of ham radio over a callsign like Kim's. Well,
> I know plenty of parents who would not support their kids' being
> involved in ham radio if their first (or second, or third)
> impression involved such callsigns.
>
>
>>as someone else pointed out, if a kid derives the word
>
>
> [word deleted]
>
>
>>from my callsign, it AIN'T because I taught 'em.
>
>
> That's true. A child who has never seen the word won't learn it
> from your callsign.
>
> But if the child already knows the word, you will have taught him/her
> something worse. You'll have taught the child that the use of such
> words in public, and in ham radio, is OK. That it's acceptable behavior.
> And you've made it that much harder for them to learn appropriate
> behavior.
>
> Kids are influenced by what they see and hear adults doing, even though

> they will deny such influence. Kids who see adults smoking, drinking
> irresponsibly, cussing, etc., will be influenced to try the same or
> similar behaviors themselves *IF* those behaviors in adults are
> portrayed as acceptable, "fun", glamorous, etc.
>
> I recall quite clearly how, as a teenager, I and my peers were subjected
> to lectures on the evils of illegal drugs like marijuana, LSD, speed,
> 'ludes, etc. Those lectures were not very convincing when delivered by
> adults who needed two cups of coffee in the morning to get started, a few
> beers or manhattans in the evening to slow down, and cigarettes all day to
> keep going. Same principle applies in any subject - if Coach emphasizes
> fair play and following the rules over winning at any cost, the team is
> much more likely to learn that lesson.
>
>
>>*Anyone* who thinks
>>kids are still that innocent these days, has not been on a schoolyard or
>>listening in on kids' conversations when they think no one is around--and
>>I've even heard Kindergartners speaking of some pretty risque topics.
>
>
> But that does *not* mean it doesn't matter what adults say and do in their
> presence, or in public! The mere fact that you have to listen in when
> they don't know you're there means the kids are learning that not all
> behavior is appropriate in all contexts.
>
> Same principle as teaching them it's OK to pull their pants down in the
> bathroom or doctor's office, but *not* OK to do in public! Even though
> everyone knows what's under their clothes, what those body parts are
> called, etc.
>
>
>>Sad but true.
>>
>
> The reason it's like that is the failure of adults to act appropriately.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

But kim has already stated she dosen't care what anyone else thinks,
which is the general attitude of people with little or no taste.

1449. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:39:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401220939.75742ce7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86124

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<mfrs00haqsa0n2bmbu9v8gtkec7o5h3l7i@4ax.com>...
> On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 04:26:39 -0600, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Another interesting little snippit... If I recall, it was only after I
> >"took on" some of the things Larry (and his ilk) was posting that he decided
> >to take a dislike to my callsign.
> >
> >Makes one wonder if it is the callsign that is the reason for the attitude;
> >or that they just plain dislike me and can't think of any other way to
> >express it.
>
> The statements of those who voice the strongest objections tend to
> support your observation, Kim.
>
> Jim himself, who insists that it is just the "inappropriate callsign"
> that bothers him, stated (regarding his negative opinion towards the
> callsign):
>
> "It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
> the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."
>
> This statement indicates that it isn't just the call that bothers him
> - it's a combination of the call plus other 'factors'. The 'package',
> as it were.

You are mistaken, Leo.

That statement of mine was in response to claims that I was "prejudiced"
about Kim's callsign.

The word "prejudice" means to "pre-judge". IOW, to come to a conclusion
before knowing all the relevant facts. My statement

"It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."

simply proves that I wasn't prejudiced because I didn't pre-judge. And I
did not encounter that callsign, or ones like it, before I saw it here
on rrap, in use by its holder.

IOW, I did not hear about it somewhere else, see it used by someone other
than Kim, etc. And I did not rush to judgement.

In fact, when I first saw it, I thought "Kim" and the callsign were pseudonyms being used to hide the identity of the poster. Like your use of only your first name, rather than your callsign. Imagine my surprise when I discovered it was for-real!

Look at the context in which I wrote that statement, and it is clear that it simply means I formed my opinion of Kim's callsign based on experiences here, not on prejudice.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1450. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:44:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86126

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040121215552.06226.00002526@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch
of
> >world class hypocrites.
>
> And who elected the directors, Dan?
>

I don't know who 'elected' the directors. I know I didn't.

> >They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
> >FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'.
>
> How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
> and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.

It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.

The FCC did not propose Incentive Licensing. It was the ARRL back about
1963 or so. The FCC followed up on it and 'modified' it and it was
implemented beginning November of 1968.

Why do I know this? Because I read QST cover to cover while stateside in
the military. And when I went overseas I lost track due to military
activities. I returned to the USA in 1968. I operated on 7.010 and received
a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
band for my class of license.
>
> >Then 40 years later they totally
> >reverse themselves.
>
> Who? I don't think there's a single person at Hq or in the Board of
Directors
> today who was a League official of any kind back in the '60s. Most of the
'60s
> BoD and Hq folks are dead.
>
> So it's a completely different bunch that reversed the policies.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

1451. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:45:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <K4ednd GT97YAkI3dRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86129

N2EY wrote:

> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<mfrs00haqsa0n2bmbu9v8gtkec7o5h3l7i@4ax.com>...
>
>>On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 04:26:39 -0600, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Another interesting little snippit... If I recall, it was only after I
>>>"took on" some of the things Larry (and his ilk) was posting that he decided
>>>to take a dislike to my callsign.
>>>
>>>Makes one wonder if it is the callsign that is the reason for the attitude;
>>>or that they just plain dislike me and can't think of any other way to
>>>express it.
>>
>>The statements of those who voice the strongest objections tend to
>>support your observation, Kim.
>>
>> Jim himself, who insists that it is just the "inappropriate callsign"
>>that bothers him, stated (regarding his negative opinion towards the
>>callsign):
>>
>>"It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
>>the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."
>>
>>This statement indicates that it isn't just the call that bothers him
>>- it's a combination of the call plus other 'factors'. The 'package',
>>as it were.
>
>
> You are mistaken, Leo.
>
> That statement of mine was in response to claims that I was "prejudiced"
> about Kim's callsign.
>
> The word "prejudice" means to "pre-judge". IOW, to come to a conclusion
> before knowing all the relevant facts. My statement
>
> "It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
> the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."
>
> simply proves that I wasn't prejudiced because I didn't pre-judge. And I

> did not encounter that callsign, or ones like it, before I saw it here
> on rrap, in use by its holder.
>
> IOW, I did not hear about it somewhere else, see it used by someone other
> than Kim, etc. And I did not rush to judgement.
>
> In fact, when I first saw it, I thought "Kim" and the callsign were
> pseudonyms being used to hide the identity of the poster. Like your
> use of only your first name, rather than your callsign. Imagine
> my surprise when I discovered it was for-real!
>
> Look at the context in which I wrote that statement, and it is clear
> that it simply means I formed my opinion of Kim's callsign based on
> experiences here, not on prejudice.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And I might add, if I were trying to introduce my grandson or granddaughter to amateur radio, do you think I would walk up to kim and say, "I would like you to meet kim, her callsign is W5TIT." Hardly, she would be the one person I would steer them away from as I would certainly like to present better examples of what amateur radio is about.

1452. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:47:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <lr2010p0p1nhnfgftjnqipfka0abih5foe@4ax.com>
Source record: 86127

On 22 Jan 2004 09:39:22 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<mfrs00haqsa0n2bmbu9v8gtkec7o5h3l7i@4ax.com>...
>> On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 04:26:39 -0600, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Another interesting little snippit... If I recall, it was only after I
>> >"took on" some of the things Larry (and his ilk) was posting that he decided
>> >to take a dislike to my callsign.
>> >
>> >Makes one wonder if it is the callsign that is the reason for the attitude;
>> >or that they just plain dislike me and can't think of any other way to
>> >express it.
>>
>> The statements of those who voice the strongest objections tend to
>> support your observation, Kim.
>>
>> Jim himself, who insists that it is just the "inappropriate callsign"
>> that bothers him, stated (regarding his negative opinion towards the
>> callsign):
>>
>> "It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
>> the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."
>>
>> This statement indicates that it isn't just the call that bothers him
>> - it's a combination of the call plus other 'factors'. The 'package',
>> as it were.
>
>You are mistaken, Leo.
>
>That statement of mine was in response to claims that I was "prejudiced"
>about Kim's callsign.
>
>The word "prejudice" means to "pre-judge". IOW, to come to a conclusion
>before knowing all the relevant facts. My statement
>
>"It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
>the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."
>
>simply proves that I wasn't prejudiced because I didn't pre-judge. And I
>did not encounter that callsign, or ones like it, before I saw it here
>on rrap, in use by its holder.
>

>IOW, I did not hear about it somewhere else, see it used by someone other
>than Kim, etc. And I did not rush to judgement.
>
>In fact, when I first saw it, I thought "Kim" and the callsign were
>pseudonyms being used to hide the identity of the poster. Like your
>use of only your first name, rather than your callsign. Imagine
>my surprise when I discovered it was for-real!
>
>Look at the context in which I wrote that statement, and it is clear
>that it simply means I formed my opinion of Kim's callsign based on
>experiences here, not on prejudice.

You are saying that your opinion was formed based on experiences here,
and not simply on the callsign, aren't you? Your statement that you
did not pre-judge certainly enforces this, does it not?

I keep hearing that the callsign is inappropriate, but what you really
mean that it is a combination of factors - right?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1453. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 17:49:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2830109bsbtc2mujrm3b33c9d0r7l93eva@4ax.com>
Source record: 86128

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 10:38:24 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
wrote:

>
>But kim has already stated she dosen't care what anyone else thinks,
>which is the general attitude of people with little or no taste.

LOL!

You do see the irony in this statement, I hope..... :)

73, Leo

1454. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 18:33:25 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0401221033.41b8f82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86130

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

>
> That's the problem though, isn't it?
>

It's not a problem for me.

> What we need is the statute, not the
> rules, which prove nothing in the absence
> of Novice testing.

The rule cited shows that there is not a requirement to charge a fee for any license examination of any class.

If you think otherwise, then I guess the burden of proof lies with you, not with me. I've made my case by citing the governing regulation.

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB

1455. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 18:58:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <H3VPb.22188$1e.15373@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86131

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

> I don't think that qualifies as proof.

Here is a direct quote from the "Amateur Radio Newsline" broadcast of Sept 12th, 1993, where the hissy-fit of W5YI is described. Since K7UGA left the Senate in 1986, long before this incident, it's unlikely that he responded with legislation which required free Novice exams.

Sunuvagun!

de Hans, K0HB

" VEC UPSET ABOUT FREE NOVICE TESTS

The ARRL says that it will not charge applicants for Novice tests. This even though the W5YI VEC has filed a complaint with the FCC alleging that the League's VEC operation is in violation of the rules because it refuses to charge applicants for these tests.
But Fred Maia W5YI who operates the VEC bearing his callsign claims that its a matter of uniformity. That all VEC's who use what is called the annual method of figuring reimbursement are required to charge an examination fee for every test it gives, including Novice exams. The ARRL says that it plans to continue its policy of administering Novice tests free of charge because it believes that this policy is consistent with an FCC tradition established back in the 1950's. This, as a way of making it easy for youngsters to get entry level licenses.
The League's President, George Wilson, W4OYI says that the whole thing is nothing more than one of the ironies that keeps ham radio politics interesting. Wilson notes that VEC's have always had the latitude to set their own fees. He adds -- and we quote -- "Frankly, we see no compelling Federal interest in whether or not a class of nine year olds ought to be charged for taking an entry level ham radio exam."
But Maia and his W5YI VEC operation see it very differently. In his September 1st issue of his W5YI Report newsletter Maia says that the potential financial benefit to the League resulting from its policy is to serious to be ignored. He says that free examinations when all other VEC's charge, attract applicants who are the potential purchasers of examination preparation materials. Maia believes that the purchasing decisions of these people may be unduly influenced by their choice of VEC's.

1456. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:19:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401221219.6a11a473@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701FUD7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 22:00:25 GMT, Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >
> > "google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
> > news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > >
> > > Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the Incentive
> > > License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
> > >
> >
> > Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the idea of
> > the FCC.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Learn *your* history. It was the ARRL which first proposed incentive
> licensing.
>
> From http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html:
>
> "In summary, although the vast number of hams were satisfied, a small
> minority had complaints. And the ARRL listened. In 1963, acting on
> complaints they claim they received from members and operators in
> other countries, the ARRL proposed "Incentive Licensing." In an
> editorial, the ARRL implied that perhaps it was a mistake when the
> Class B and Generals were given the 75 and 20 meter phone segments.
> The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be restored
> to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the Generals
> an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that in
> order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the
> General class hams."

Unfortunately, that's not quite how it happened.

FCC thought that hams would go for the Extra after 1953 simply
"because it
was there". And some did - but not many.

As early as 1958, FCC asked why there were so few Extras. They were
concerned about certain trends in amateur radio they didn't care
for, such as increasing use of manufactured equipment whose inner
workings the ham-owner had only a vague concept of.

FCC asked ARRL for proposals in 1958, and again in 1963. ARRL put together a
very simple proposal in 1963, *in response to* FCC's request. It consisted
of just two items:

1) Reopen the Advanced class license to new applicants (it had been closed
at the end of 1952)

2) Require an Advanced or Extra class license to use 'phone on the 80, 40,
20 and 15 meter ham bands. (back then 30, 17 and 12 meters were not
ham bands).

That was the whole proposal. No additional code testing would be needed to
retain full privileges. No subbands-by-license-class except those already
in place for Novices. No new limitations on CW. Existing Advanceds
wouldn't have to do a thing. Existing Generals and Conditionals would have to take
one additional written test to get their 80 thru 15 'phone privileges back.

This proposal was nothing new - it was essentially a return to the old
"ABC" system that had existed from the mid '30s to February 1953, and which FCC
had revised in 1951 by adding Novice, Tech and Extra and renaming the
ABC classes of license.

The 1963 ARRL proposal got an RM number and the commentary began...

FCC looked at that simple proposal, and then asked for more. They got quite
a bit of response from the amateur committee, and at least 10 of the
proposals were assigned RM numbers. There were at least 11 proposals with
RM numbers by 1965.

Commentary to ARRL was mixed, to say the least, but a slight majority were
in favor of "incentive licensing" changes. ARRL and FCC took that as a
mandate...

Out of all these proposals FCC put together ideas and came up with a proposed
scheme that bore little resemblance to the 1963 ARRL proposal. It was far more
draconian, restrictive and encompassing than anything ARRL proposed,
and was strongly opposed. Finally a compromise was announced in 1967.

Over 6000 comments were received by FCC on the matter, even though the
number

of hams back then was less than a quarter million and there were no online
comment systems. The whole process took years (1963-1967).

Most hams then and today are not aware that FCC asked first. But they did.

And I'll ask the question again:

How did incentive licensing "trash ham radio"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1457. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:24:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401221224.7cafc83c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86133

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<y5ePb.20658$zj7.4491@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> < I recall Hans predicting a 15 wpm code test for Extra as part ot the
> ARRL
> < proposal.....
>
> You recall wrong.

You are correct, sir! I was mistaken. Sorry.

You predicted 12-13 wpm.

> To see my actual prediction, do a google group search
> on "ARRL BoD platitudes" without the quotes.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

And here it is!

73 de Jim, N2EY

The following is a direct copy of Hans' post in original format:

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE:

Reply-To: "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
From: "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
References: <20031129185820.15462.00004607@mb-m06.aol.com>
<20040104185711.07961.00001044@mb-m03.aol.com>
Subject: Re: The Pool
Lines: 23
Organization: Chaos & Confusion
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
Message-ID: <Jo2Kb.20834$lo3.9817@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 05 Jan 2004 00:41:13 GMT
NNTP-Posting-Host: 67.250.209.220
X-Complaints-To: abuse@earthlink.net
X-Trace: newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net 1073263273 67.250.209.220
(Sun, 04 Jan 2004 16:41:13 PST)

NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 04 Jan 2004 16:41:13 PST

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the past.

Given that ARRL likely will lobby for continuing a code test for
Amateur
Extra (12-13WPM?) applicants, I predict that Morse testing will not be
eliminated in this decade.

While it's a cop out, it's probably the only way they can get 15
politicians
to sign up for a "New Amateur Radio Plan" without a palace revolt on
their
hands at the BoD meeting. They'll be able to go back to East
Overshoe, Iowa
and Resume Speed, Arizona and mumble platitudes to their membership
about
how "We've opened HF to non-Morse applicants, but where it really
counts we
actually increased the Morse requirement."

That's my story and I'm sticking to it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

END GOOGLE QUOTE

1458. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:31:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122153135.23171.00003603@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86135

In article <5c01b95b.0401220229.1d41a744@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> SEEK HELP Lennie! That "rage" thing is burning you up!

You snitched some Uppers from the hospital medicine room again?

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

LHA / WMD

1459. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:31:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122153135.23171.00003602@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86139

In article <4010096e$0$99193$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>You probably realized that Dee D. may be assuming the role of "devil's
>advocate" here (by overplaying an idea to generate further discussion).
>In other words, we might not want to take her words at face value until
>she clarifies what she really means.
>
>So, Dee D., what did you really mean to say above?

Paul, I appreciate your "guidance" in newsgroupism, but let's clear
the board and outline a few things -

1. Double-D has claimed that I am on her "killfile." That means
"she doesn't read any of my postings" for whatever righteous
reasons she has (such as puritanism and syncophancy of
some unclear "amateur ideals").

2. Killfiling may be good for removing those mouthing vulgarities
and obscenities ("deleting explitives" like 'heck' and 'darn') but
it is also an ostrich syndrome, burying one's head in the virtual
sand of righteous thoughts of the "ideal" so that "impure"
thoughts (differences from righteous personal opinions) are
filtered out.

3. Those who claim "killfiling" are irresistable open targets for
commentary, taking pot-shots against the syncophants, the
sanctimonious self-righteous self-propelled "experts" and
olde-tymers's ideas. In Double-D's case she has exhibited
Parentalism, that of treating others not thinking as she does
as "little children needing to be taught the Right way..."

4. Hunting Season is ALWAYS open on the Internet. If you wish
to "guide appropriate behavior," there are several in HERE who
are likely recipients of "guidance and counseling." QED.

5. For proper sanctimonity (sanctimoniousism?) of the self-righteous
olde-tymers, you and the newsgroup ruling triad (are you still one
of those?) should CLOSE the public access here, install a
monitor, demand a showing of "papers" for access. That is the
proper way to Control Thought. An ultimate in Ostrich Syndrome.

6. Obvious Pro-Code Test Advocates do NOT play "Devil's Advocate."
Those are hide-bound olde-tyme-thinking PCTAs who are not
only sanctimonious self-righteous self-important self-propelled
"experts" but are all seriously devoid of a sense of humor. They
are so stuck on the "proper" way to act that their rigidity

collapses in the slightest breeze of independent thought...and they quickly lapse into anger (sometimes hatred) against the independent person, oft-times jumping into puerile barbaric behavior of using personal insults rather than arguing subjects. Quod Erat Demonstrandum by all that is Google and DejaNews.

7. Independence of Thought is a cherished item in the United States of America since its beginning a scant 228 years ago. So much so that it is incorporated into the First Amendment of our Constitution to make it clear what we citizens can say to our government. By tradition and independent spirit, we Americans also cherish being able to pot-shoot politician's opinions and their political parties. ARRL is a political entity as well as a publishing house and is NOT any sort of agency of the federal government; they are more open for pot-shooting than any feds despite the santimony expressed by their devout followers of the Church of St. Hiram.

8. "The Devil made me do it." :-)

LHA / WMD

1460. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:31:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122153137.23171.00003605@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86134

In article <buoe3g$rne@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Vulgar is in the eye of the beholder...and Larry must believes women's
>breasts are vulgar.

He can't handle it, ergo they are vulgar... :-)

LHA / WMD

1461. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:31:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122153137.23171.00003604@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86138

In article <100v15m37nr7cf4@corp.supernews.com>, "Dan Mattingly N0FQN" <n0fqn@charter.net> writes:

>The issue is it was not invented today. So, what's your point??? You could >say this statement about any subject. It's too, broad in texture. Narrow >your point or I won't give you a grade.

Oh, wow, another LITERALIST joins the group grope!

You really don't understand the context of the original subject question or that alternate realities are INFINITE and that any and all such alternatives are as valid, true, etc., as any other?

To sum it up, Mistah Supreme Grade Literalist, it can be said that, in an ALTERNATE REALITY, the rest of the radio world would have gone on, advanced, improved, innovated, invented, grown by leaps and bounds WITHOUT amateur radio...just as it did in this present reality when amateur radio does exist.

You want to "give me a grade" that is an "F" because you don't like to hear about the Rest Of The Radio World?

Go ahead. The rest of the radio world doesn't really care because it long ago TOOK OVER all of the innovation, invention, development, pioneering, etc., etc., etc. You don't want to believe that? Look around you past the League propaganda with its history of sinning by omission in the "history of (amateur) radio," implying that amateurs "pioneered" everything (they didn't).

ARRL wasn't even the first national radio club in the USA. That "distinction" belongs to the Radio Club of America...still in existance (as it was five years before the League was formed) but no longer favoring amateur activities over other things in all of radio.

Back in the beginning of "radio," generally accredited by historians to be 1896 (108 years ago), there were neither amateurs OR professionals. Hardly anyone knew anything and it couldn't have been a big business. Heck and darn (expletives are not allowed in here lest the Puritans become offended and outraged), early radio was hardly advanced in "radio" technology by 1920, two years after WW1 ended...and Ed Armstrong received his superheterodyne receiver patent (applied for 2 years earlier)...and ol' Hiram lobbied for the return of amateur radio activity (thereby achieving immortality and sainthood via the League).

The original question was conjecture on What Would Happen IFF (thats "If and only If" in literary conjecture spelling) Amateur Radio

were "invented" TODAY instead of being shut down past 1919.

Try some concentration on CONJECTURE, not some "lecturing"
based on what happened in the present reality...with all the
ass-umptions of your "instructorship" and "ability to give grades."

I say the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD (a heckuva lot bigger
than amateur radio can ever be) would have gone on ANYWAY
because hardly any of that growth, innovation, invention, etc., is
NOT based on amateur activity. I've been IN that rest of the radio
world for half a century and have very little evidence that any of it's
growth was ever due to amateurism.

Prove me "wrong" about an ALTERNATE REALITY with your
"instructorship" and "teaching credentials" and "ability to 'give'
grades."

Pffft. Consider yourself fired from the class, the key to the teacher's
lounge taken away, your parking space eliminated. No pension.
Take it up with the Bored of Education in the Alternate Reality.

LHA / WMD

1462. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:31:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122153138.23171.00003606@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86136

In article <ixNPb.18836$i4.7572@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> The "vulgarity" and "of a sexual nature" is self-evident to you, Larry.
>Funk & Wagnals describes "tit" as "teat, breast or nipple." Princeton
>University's WordWeb defines "tit" as "either of two soft fleshy
>milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman" or "the small
>projection of a mammary gland." And, of course, both mention a "small
>insectivorous bird." Many farm animals have teats or "tits," but most don't
>consider them to be "of a sexual nature."

Dwight, a number of years ago (in 1956 to be exact), Playboy magazine published a hilarious spoof of the "outrage" of the public to "vulgarity implied" in print. To prove the point, they wiggled their asterisks in some familiar poems somewhat like -

"Little Miss M****** sat on a t*****, eating her c**** and w***, along c*** a spider who s** down b****** h**...."

No doubt lots of folks were tittering at the IMPLIED VULGARITY of all that. :-)

It's just a tiny step from the above generality (via transferrence) to the supreme outrage and anger of supposed vulgarity and terrible sexual inuendo when the sanctimonious self-righteous are challenged on their noble, good, and godly opinions in here.

Supremely noble ("effective, ubiquitous, etc.") morse code is the PUREST form of communications, right in line with the PURITAN thoughts of the Latter-Day Victorians who wish for the 1930s all over again.

Technically, the Purists of amateur radio consist of some of the best dielectric material possible, insulating themselves from all that is impure, filthy, nasty, vulgar, etc., etc., etc of modern times. It might even be called "dielectric materialism" (although the pun in that will be lost for humor is one of the vulgarities of the Puritans).

With all that pure dielectric around, it is a wonder that the Puritans can conduct themselves properly...enough to get a circulating electric current. :-)

LHA / WMD

1463. Re: Angry Stebie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:31:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122153139.23171.00003607@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86137

In article <5c01b95b.0401220233.73c0941b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Like calling people who don't agree with YOU Nazis, elitists,
>jack-booted thugs, etc etc etc, when no such adjectives were adressed
>to you in the first place.
>
> You've since added liar and antagonist to that. Plagarist is
>going a bit far, but you border on it.
>
> Yes, Lennie..You're the "root" alright...of crabgrass.

You still don't take VISA? :-)

LHA / WMD

1464. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 20:56:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jOWPb.22254$1e.1866@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86140

Unfortunately, I overestimated the amount of balls carried by the BoD.
Not only didin't they have the balls to recommend complete elimination
of the Morse exam, but in recommending that Morse testing be continued
for "EXTRA", the speed they recommended was the same count-the-dots 5WPM
which Novices have been passing for over a half-century.

Pathetic!

73, de Hans, K0HB

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
|
| The following is a direct copy of Hans' post in original format:
|
| BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE:
|
| Reply-To: "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
| From: "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
| Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
| References: <20031129185820.15462.00004607@mb-m06.aol.com>
| <20040104185711.07961.00001044@mb-m03.aol.com>
| Subject: Re: The Pool
| Lines: 23
| Organization: Chaos & Confusion
| X-Priority: 3
| X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
| X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
| X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
| Message-ID: <Jo2Kb.20834$lo3.9817@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
| Date: Mon, 05 Jan 2004 00:41:13 GMT
| NNTP-Posting-Host: 67.250.209.220
| X-Complaints-To: abuse@earthlink.net
| X-Trace: newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net 1073263273 67.250.209.220
| (Sun, 04 Jan 2004 16:41:13 PST)
| NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 04 Jan 2004 16:41:13 PST
|
|
| "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
|
| > Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing
will be
| > eliminated in the US. Note that four predicted dates are in the
past.
|

| Given that ARRL likely will lobby for continuing a code test for
| Amateur
| Extra (12-13WPM?) applicants, I predict that Morse testing will not be
| eliminated in this decade.
|
| While it's a cop out, it's probably the only way they can get 15
| politicians
| to sign up for a "New Amateur Radio Plan" without a palace revolt on
| their
| hands at the BoD meeting. They'll be able to go back to East
| Overshoe, Iowa
| and Resume Speed, Arizona and mumble platitudes to their membership
| about
| how "We've opened HF to non-Morse applicants, but where it really
| counts we
| actually increased the Morse requirement."
|
| That's my story and I'm sticking to it.
|
| 73, de Hans, K0HB
|
| END GOOGLE QUOTE

1465. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 21:11:06 UTC
From: Tee Ice <tee@teeiceman.net>
Message-ID: <bupe96$f7v$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86141
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You are full of shit!
And so are your buddies at ARRL HQ.

Tee

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401221219.6a11a473@posting.google.com...
>
> Unfortunately, that's not quite how it happened.
>
> FCC thought that hams would go for the Extra after 1953 simply
> "because it
> was there". And some did - but not many.
>
> As early as 1958, FCC asked why there were so few Extras. They were
> concerned about certain trends in amateur radio they didn't care
> for, such as increasing use of manufactured equipment whose inner
> workings the ham-owner had only a vague concept of.
>
> FCC asked ARRL for proposals in 1958, and again in 1963. ARRL put
> together a
> very simple proposal in 1963, *in response to* FCC's request. It
> consisted
> of just two items:
>
> 1) Reopen the Advanced class license to new applicants (it had been
> closed
> at the end of 1952)
>
> 2) Require an Advanced or Extra class license to use 'phone on the 80,
> 40,
> 20 and 15 meter ham bands. (back then 30, 17 and 12 meters were not
> ham bands).
>
> That was the whole proposal. No additional code testing would be
> needed to
> retain full privileges. No subbands-by-license-class except those
> already
> in place for Novices. No new limitations on CW. Existing Advanceds
> wouldn't have to do a thing. Existing Generals and Conditionals would
> have to take
> one additional written test to get their 80 thru 15 'phone privileges
> back.
>

> This proposal was nothing new - it was essentially a return to the old
> "ABC" system that had existed from the mid '30s to February 1953, and
> which FCC
> had revised in 1951 by adding Novice, Tech and Extra and renaming the
> ABC classes of license.
>
> The 1963 ARRL proposal got an RM number and the commentary began...
>
> FCC looked at that simple proposal, and then asked for more. They got
> quite
> a bit of response from the amateur committee, and at least 10 of the
> proposals were assigned RM numbers. There were at least 11 proposals
> with
> RM numbers by 1965.
>
> Commentary to ARRL was mixed, to say the least, but a slight majority
> were
> in favor of "incentive licensing" changes. ARRL and FCC took that as a
> mandate...
>
> Out of all these proposals FCC put together ideas and came up with a
> proposed
> scheme that bore little resemblance to the 1963 ARRL proposal. It was
> far more
> draconian, restrictive and encompassing than anything ARRL proposed,
> and was strongly opposed. Finally a compromise was announced in 1967.
>
> Over 6000 comments were received by FCC on the matter, even though the
> number
> of hams back then was less than a quarter million and there were no
> online
> comment systems. The whole process took years (1963-1967).
>
> Most hams then and today are not aware that FCC asked first. But they
> did.
>
> And I'll ask the question again:
>
> How did incentive licensing "trash ham radio"?
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1466. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 21:36:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40104269.3040004@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86142

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>Unfortunately, I overestimated the amount of balls carried by the BoD.
>Not only didin't they have the balls to recommend complete elimination
>of the Morse exam, but in recommending that Morse testing be continued
>for "EXTRA", the speed they recommended was the same count-the-dots 5WPM
>which Novices have been passing for over a half-century.
>
>
>
IIRC, most VEs give the code test using farnsworth method. That is, 13
wpm characters
spaced at 5 wpm rate. Harder to count the dahs dots. Idea is that one
can get faster
at code quicker, as you learn the sounds of letters instead of counting
the dots.

Way back when, I had to receive and *send* with an FCC provided straight
key 5wpm.
I think that the FCC found that nobody ever failed sending if they could
receive, so they
dropped the send test.

>
>

1467. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 21:41:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401221341.4d41b74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86143

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9476E8DA33B45elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:SxjPb.32602$P%1.25742284@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for
> >> example, would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover,
> >> it would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
> >>
> >
> > This will crowd the CW/digital/data modes too much since there are so
> > many US hams. It would be better to wait for the other treaty changes
> > from the conference to take affect and synchronize Regions 1 and 3 with
> > Region 2. You do know of course that the treaty now requires
> > broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and that this will become an
> > exclusive amateur allocation.
>
> Of course I do, but do you think they will really move?

Yes. They agreed to it in the treaty.

> Some may, but I think some of them never will.

Why?

Many countries are reducing or even eliminating their SWBC operations.
The others have agreed to move, and they have about 3 years to do so.

In the 60s and 70s, SWBC was so crowded that some countries moved
below
7100. Complaints from ARRL and others to the various State Departments
got them to move. The only real failure of the "Intruder Watch" of
those days
was the woodpecker, which was an OTHR system. It was made to move by
other means ;-)
>
> > I don't recall the timing but it is
> > required in the treaty.

Three years or so IIRC. Maybe before FCC drops Element 1.

> > Perhaps someday, the ITU will open up the 7.2
> > to 7.3 to the other regions. In the meantime, 7.150 to 7.200 could be

> > a worldwide phone allocation. This is actually more space than either
> > of the suggested proposals.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> I'm assuming that this will happen anyway. I just meant that 7075-7100,
> where of course there is already phone, would be more use to phone ops than
> the proposed 7125-7150, where there isn't.

If the USA opens 7075-7100 to 'phone, all that will happen is the DX
'phones
will move still lower in the band to get away. There are already some
on 7050
and lower - and many of them are in R2!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1468. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 21:57:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401221357.5447609e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86144

```
Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> >> >> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
> >> >>
> >> >> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
> >> >> >>@posting.google.com:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>> Summary:
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices, so
> >> >> >>>it would reintroduce a free licence class.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices
> >> >> remains on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the entry
> >> >> level licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then the test
> >> >> is free.
> >> >>
> >> >> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the whole
> >> >> thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league haven't
> >> >> thought about this particular wrinkle, as they say that the name is
> >> >> still open and it could be called something else.
> >> >
> >> > Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And since
```

> >> > no new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a bit of a
> >> > moot point.
> >> >
> >> > But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
>
> As best as I can follow it a statute made testing free for Novices, and a
> later administrative decision closed the class to new entrants.

No such statute exists. If it did, it would be in Part 97.

> Obviously
> the FCC don't have to include in Part 97 a rule giving free testing for
> Novices whilst there are no Novice tests, but if they re-started Novice
> testing it would have to be free. I admit I could be wrong, but that is how
> I understand it, unless someone can show me proof to the contrary.

The nonexistence of something cannot be proven. There used to be a
rule in Part 97 that Novice tests were free.

> >> >> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as the
> >> >> > entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer VHF/UHF
> >> >> > privileges, but more HF privileges.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >>Provided the new class that happened to
> >> >> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass
> >> >> >>the current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Why?
> >> >>
> >> >> I thought the old Novice was too easy
> >> >
> >> > Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of 13
> >> > was adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first station
> >> > was homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license started me
> >> > on the path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in about 3 years and
> >> > BSEE in a little over 8 years....
> >> >
> >> > And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level license
> >> > keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to learn and do
> >> > more, isn't that just about perfect?
> >
> > Well?
> >
> > Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do? If
> > it insures that newcomers know enough to keep out of trouble (on the
> > air, anyway,) gives them a sample of what amateur radio is about, and
> > inspires them to learn and do more with ham radio, isn't that just
> > about perfect?
>
> I don't see very many people having any great difficulty with the present
> Element 2, so why does it need to be easier?

Present Element 2 is for the VHF/UHF-centric Tech. The more balanced
"NewNovice"
simply needs a different test.

> The privileges would be more
> than the old Novice as well.
>
Yep - and much less in some ways than the Tech.

Each license level needs a test tailored to its privileges and intent.

> >> >> > Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current
> >> >> > Tech Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance
> >> >> > between above and below 30 MHz privileges.
> >> >>
> >> >> So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
> >> >
> >> > How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for
> >> > all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
> >> > parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs proposed
> >> > for the Novice?
> >
> > How much is it reasonable to expect a newcomer to learn in order to be
> > turned loose with ~100 watts on parts of HF and ~25 watts on parts of
> > VHF/UHF?

> To put it another way, why shouldn't the Techs have all those proposed HF
> privileges, since they have passed a test with more questions than that
> proposed?

It would be reasonable for exiting Techs to keep their existing
license name
and VHF/UHF privileges, *and* get "NewNovice" privileges on HF.
>
> >> >> >>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
> >> >> > receiving.
> >> >>
> >> >> Won't happen
> >> >
> >> > Probably not, but it's still a good idea.
> >> >>
> >> >> >>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and should
> >> >> >>be dumped.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be allowed
> >> >> > to use manufactured equipment.
> >> >>
> >> >> Not in my opinion
> >> >

> >> > It's the same argument used against the code test. Why *must* a ham
> >> > learn all that theory to use manufactured, approved gear with no
> >> > critical adjustments? Heck, most ham gear today won't transmit out
> >> > of band unless modified!
> >> >>
> >> >> >>Moreover, it can be now,
> >> >> >>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six
> >> >> >>months.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> > FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
> >> >>
> >> >> I think they will too
> >> >
> >> > Unfortunately
> >> >>
> >> >> >>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>OK
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class,
> >> >> > as has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
> >> >>
> >> >> Can't stand loose ends
> >> >
> >> > What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
> >> > 1967 even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
> >> > additional privileges at all.
> >
> > Do those loose ends really cause any problems?
>
> Confusion?

Whose? Not FCC's!
>
> Besides, Element 4A had most of the harder questions anyway.

Not really. I passed old Element 4A back in 1968, at the age of 14,
between 8th and 9th grades. I wasn't even intending to try it - I was
at the FCC for the 13 wpm code, and the examiner said "why not try
Advanced while you're here?". So I did.

How hard could it have really been if I passed it first-time under
those circumstances?
>
> >> >> >>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
> >> >> >>
> >> >> > Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade to
> >> >> > Extra, but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade
> >> >> > to General?

> >> >> >
> >> >> > What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK but
> >> >> > not the other?
> >> >>
> >> >> As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech,
> >> >> which is already pretty easy
> >> >
> >> > Exactly. But that doesn't answer the question. You want Advanceds to
> >> > get free upgrades to avoid ~82,000 loose ends, but not Techs and
> >> > Tech pluses, who would
> >> > amount to ~322,000 loose ends.
> >> >
> >> > I don't see why one and not the other.
> >> >
> >> >> >> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>Good.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Bad.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
> >> >> >
> >> >> > That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
> >> >>
> >> >> Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
> >> >> spectrum to phone
> >> >
> >> > Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital
> >> > voice?
>
> It has worse S/N performance than SSB

That depends entirely on the type of encoding and modulation used,
doesn't it?
Can you categorically say that digital voice can *never* outperform
SSB?

> >> >> >> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
> >> >> >> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on 6,
> >> >> >> 2, 222, and 440
>
> >> >> >>See above
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Please clarify.
> >> >>
> >> >> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone.
> >> >
> >> > 25 kHz more.
> >> >
> >> >> 7075-7100, for example,
> >> >> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it

> >> >> would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
> >> >
> >> > Hams outside Region 2 will be getting 7100-7200 anyway. Let them
> >> > harmonize with us.
> >> >
> >>
> >> US hams outside R2 already have 7075-7100 phone
> >
> > Only because they don't have 7100-7200. US hams outside R2 are rare
> > enough to be conidered "DX" anyway.
> >>
> >> Read it again. *US* hams outside R2
> >
> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below
> > 7100 goes away completely.
>
> Only when:-
>
> 1 - all the broadcasters have moved, probably circa the year 2100;

Why do they *all* have to move? And the timetable is 2007, IIRC

> and
>
> 2 - all the countries have 7100-7200, which might almost take as long
>
I think you just want to have 7075-7100 regardless of what would
happen.

> >>
> >> >> >>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
> >> >> >>> evaluation
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>OK
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Agreed.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>Not OK
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a lot
> >> >> > more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands and
> >> >> > modes, power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C phrase)
> >> >> > and much more.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be enough.
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure questions,
> >> >> but I think the test is already easy enough.

> >> >
> >> > To a beginner, it's not so easy.
>
> My XYL passed Elements 2 and 3A, and she has no real interest in radio.

That's one example.

> >> >> >>> General to be
> >> >> >>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
> >> >> >>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You
> >> >> >>don't say here.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the
> >> >> > work of a committee looking to give everyone something they want,
> >> >> > but not giving anyone everything they want.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > What will FCC do?
> >> >> >
> >> >> > First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort to
> >> >> > attract more new hams.
> >> >>
> >> >> Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under
> >> >> existing law. That has some appeal.
> >> >
> >> > See above about the "law".
> >> >
> >> >> > Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.
> >> >>
> >> >> Agreed
> >> >>
> >> >> > Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because it
> >> >> > costs them little or nothing to keep the closed-off classes.
> >> >>
> >> >> I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to
> >> >> handle 5 classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there
> >> >> won't be two types of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why
> >> >> they aren't recorded differently right now).
> >> >
> >> > Incorrect!
> >> >
> >> > Before restructuring, their computers handled 6 classes of license
> >> > (Novice, Tech, Tech Plus, General, Advanced, Extra). In fact their
> >> > computers *still* handle 6 classes! So there should be no problem at
> >> > all.
> >> >
> >> > And as Tech Pluses continue to be renewed as Techs, expire, and
> >> > upgrade, that class will disappear completely.
> >> >>
> >> >> I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes,
> >> >> though. I think it is better to move on.

> >> >
> >> > I agree, but not at the price of giveaways just to make things look
> >> > neater.
> >> >
> >>
> >> Better that than the only possible alternative - taking privileges
> >> away
> >
> > But is there really any reason not to simply continue those license
> > classes? That's a much, much better option than freebies or removing
> > privileges.
>
> No it's not. If we abolish them we can sort out all the subbands.

Why are the subbands a problem?

> >> > How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams
> >> > except Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
> >> > "Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >>
> >> I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited licence.
> >
> > Why would Techs be singled out for a limited license? They have full
> > privs above 50 MHz.
> >
> >> I
> >> would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence.
> >
> > By your reasoning, there's no reason to have the Extra, then. Nor its
> > test.
> >
>
> Correct.

So you're for reducing the *written test* requirements for a full
privileges license.

Bad idea.
>
> >> Of course, to be
> >> fair you would have to extend that to Techs with old Element 3.
> >
> > Where ya been, Alun?
> >
> > Techs with old Element 3 (licensed before March 21, 1987) can get a
> > General
> > license *today* with no additional testing. Just show up at a VE
> > session with

> > proof of such license, fill out the 605 and pay the VE fee. Instant
> > General.
> > And if such a ham can pass the Extra written (might as well try, the
> > same
> > VE fee buys that test too), they get an Extra.
> >
> > Been that way since April 15, 2000.
> >
73 de Jim, N2EY

1469. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 22:03:16 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton.T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a79e87eedb7d4ab989c1a@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 86145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
No.m@il.com says...

> I canceled my Leage membership after their first restructuring proposal for
> amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new proposal, I wish I had NEVER
> been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is that: if ham radio is to
> survive it MUST sound like CB.
>
>
> Tee'd Off

Seems to me like you're getting mad at the wrong people.

Ham radio, like Life itself (I've said this before, and I'll
probably end up saying it again), is a mirror. You get back EXACTLY what
you put into it.

What you hear on the air is a reflection of the PERSONALITY of
each INDIVIDUAL operator. It has NOTHING to do with how hard they
studied for their license, or how much they know, or how many letters
they have after their name.

If ham radio is declining in the "quality" of what's heard on the
air, it's because of poor operators making life miserable for the
newbies, apparently all because of some misguided sense of loyalty. To
what or to whom this loyalty is directed, I have never understood.

Let me ask you something: Have you ever made comments on the air
that were derogatory to someone who was new to the hobby? Have you ever
adopted an air of superiority in the presence of a newbie?

If so, then YOU are part of the problem. If you do not feel you
can be civil to a new operator (remember, there was a day when NONE of
us had ever seen a microphone or transmitter, let alone operated one),
then simply ignore them and move on to something else.

The "Death of Ham Radio" has been predicted by many others for
many years. Yet, the Amateur Radio SERVICE endures to this day.
Different from what it was ten or twenty years ago, yes, but it endures.
This tells me that new licensees aren't the problem, and it tells me
that the ARRL isn't the problem.

What I see as the REAL problem are those "veterans" in the HOBBY
who have become so obsessed with their own ideas of whom is superior to
whom that they will deliberately make life on the air miserable for
anyone who doesn't measure up to their own standards. I think such

people would be doing much better to offer polite-but-firm correction to operating errors, and be willing to SHARE their knowlege as opposed to zealously guarding it like some grumpy dragon guarding their hoard.

You may not like the ARRL for whatever reason. Fine. That's your choice (I'm proud to be a 'Lifer' myself). But would you find it so very hard to remember and respect "The Amateur's Code" that they publish? It dates all the way back to the League's founding, and the days of Hiram Percy Maxim (without whom we wouldn't even HAVE Amateur Radio).

Chill out. The only things that will truly kill amateur radio are forgetting its origins, WHY we have it today, and more anger and hatred at newbies just because they have an easier time getting licensed than some of us did.

--
Dr. Anton Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)
kyrrin a/t bluefeathertech d-o=t c&o&m
Motorola Radio Programming & Service Available -
http://www.bluefeathertech.com/rf.html
"Quando Omni Flunkus Moritati" (Red Green)

1470. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 22:26:17 UTC
From: Roger Gt <not@here.net>
Message-ID: <d6YPb.4673$yN6.2576@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dr. Anton.T. Squeegee"
<SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a79e87eedb7d4ab989c1a@192.168.42.131...
> In article
<FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink
.net>,
> No.m@il.com says...
>
> > I canceled my Leage membership after their
first restructuring proposal for
> > amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new
proposal, I wish I had NEVER
> > been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is
that: if ham radio is to
> > survive it MUST sound like CB.
> >
> >
> > Tee'd Off
>
> Seems to me like you're getting mad at the wrong
people.
>
> Ham radio, like Life itself (I've said this
before, and I'll
> probably end up saying it again), is a mirror.
You get back EXACTLY what
> you put into it.
>
> What you hear on the air is a reflection of the
PERSONALITY of
> each INDIVIDUAL operator. It has NOTHING to do
with how hard they
> studied for their license, or how much they
know, or how many letters
> they have after their name.
>
> If ham radio is declining in the "quality" of
what's heard on the
> air, it's because of poor operators making life
miserable for the
> newbies, apparently all because of some
misguided sense of loyalty. To
> what or to whom this loyalty is directed, I have

never understood.
>
> Let me ask you something: Have you ever made
comments on the air
> that were derogatory to someone who was new to
the hobby? Have you ever
> adopted an air of superiority in the presence of
a newbie?
>
> If so, then YOU are part of the problem. If you
do not feel you
> can be civil to a new operator (remember, there
was a day when NONE of
> us had ever seen a microphone or transmitter,
let alone operated one),
> then simply ignore them and move on to something
else.
>
> The "Death of Ham Radio" has been predicted by
many others for
> many years. Yet, the Amateur Radio SERVICE
endures to this day.
> Different from what it was ten or twenty years
ago, yes, but it endures.
> This tells me that new licensees aren't the prob
lem, and it tells me
> that the ARRL isn't the problem.
>
> What I see as the REAL problem are those
"veterans" in the HOBBY
> who have become so obsessed with their own ideas
of whom is superior to
> whom that they will deliberately make life on
the air miserable for
> anyone who doesn't measure up to their own
standards. I think such
> people would be doing much better to offer
polite-but-firm correction to
> operating errors, and be willing to SHARE their
knowledge as opposed to
> zealously guarding it like some grumpy dragon
guarding their hoard.
>
> You may not like the ARRL for whatever reason.
Fine. That's your
> choice (I'm proud to be a 'Lifer' myself). But
would you find it so very
> hard to remember and respect "The Amateur's
Code" that they publish? It
> dates all the way back to the League's founding,

and the days of Hiram
> Percy Maxim (without whom we wouldn't even HAVE
Amateur Radio).
>
> Chill out. The only things that will truly kill
amateur radio are
> forgetting its origins, WHY we have it today,
and more anger and hatred
> at newbies just because they have an easier time
getting licensed than
> some of us did.
> --
> (Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)

Right on!!!!

Like the Radio school at Ft Gordon Ga? Where students were already learning CW and Radio theory in classes, and at K4WAR the guys got together and studied for their license with instructors from the school. Like you were going to fail with all that help? Vs the determined blind guy who learned it on his own? Like is not Fair, it is what you make of it!

K7DUP......

1471. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:07:28 UTC
From: Mike <mlawson1@twcny.rr.com>
Message-ID: <QIYPb.6275$Tk3.3894@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 86147
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You should have waited until after the FCC decides what to do with the ARRL's "suggestion". Yes, I am a Tech and was furious when I seen that they were wanting to grandfather the Techs to General with no written test. Just because the ARRL suggested it, does not mean that it is set in stone yet. FCC may have other ideas. Don't forget that the ARRL does not consist of so many X number of board members at meetings. You and the rest of us as members have a say in these matters also. More than likely they got input from alot of other people and tallied it all up. Yet, I still would like to know where the idea came from about grandfathering techs with no test.
73's OM
Ticked also, Mike KC2JGA

"Roger Gt" <not@here.net> wrote in message
news:d6YPb.4673$yN6.2576@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dr. Anton.T. Squeegee"
> <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1a79e87eedb7d4ab989c1a@192.168.42.131...
> > In article
> <FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink
> .net>,
> > No.m@il.com says...
> >
> > > I canceled my Leage membership after their
> first restructuring proposal for
> > > amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new
> proposal, I wish I had NEVER
> > > been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is
> that: if ham radio is to
> > > survive it MUST sound like CB.
> > >
> > >
> > > Tee'd Off
> >
> > Seems to me like you're getting mad at the wrong
> people.
> >
> > Ham radio, like Life itself (I've said this
> before, and I'll
> > probably end up saying it again), is a mirror.
> You get back EXACTLY what
> > you put into it.
> >

> > What you hear on the air is a reflection of the
> PERSONALITY of
> > each INDIVIDUAL operator. It has NOTHING to do
> with how hard they
> > studied for their license, or how much they
> know, or how many letters
> > they have after their name.
> >
> > If ham radio is declining in the "quality" of
> what's heard on the
> > air, it's because of poor operators making life
> miserable for the
> > newbies, apparently all because of some
> misguided sense of loyalty. To
> > what or to whom this loyalty is directed, I have
> never understood.
> >
> > Let me ask you something: Have you ever made
> comments on the air
> > that were derogatory to someone who was new to
> the hobby? Have you ever
> > adopted an air of superiority in the presence of
> a newbie?
> >
> > If so, then YOU are part of the problem. If you
> do not feel you
> > can be civil to a new operator (remember, there
> was a day when NONE of
> > us had ever seen a microphone or transmitter,
> let alone operated one),
> > then simply ignore them and move on to something
> else.
> >
> > The "Death of Ham Radio" has been predicted by
> many others for
> > many years. Yet, the Amateur Radio SERVICE
> endures to this day.
> > Different from what it was ten or twenty years
> ago, yes, but it endures.
> > This tells me that new licensees aren't the prob
> lem, and it tells me
> > that the ARRL isn't the problem.
> >
> > What I see as the REAL problem are those
> "veterans" in the HOBBY
> > who have become so obsessed with their own ideas
> of whom is superior to
> > whom that they will deliberately make life on
> the air miserable for
> > anyone who doesn't measure up to their own

> standards. I think such
> > people would be doing much better to offer
> polite-but-firm correction to
> > operating errors, and be willing to SHARE their
> knowledge as opposed to
> > zealously guarding it like some grumpy dragon
> guarding their hoard.
> >
> > You may not like the ARRL for whatever reason.
> Fine. That's your
> > choice (I'm proud to be a 'Lifer' myself). But
> would you find it so very
> > hard to remember and respect "The Amateur's
> Code" that they publish? It
> > dates all the way back to the League's founding,
> and the days of Hiram
> > Percy Maxim (without whom we wouldn't even HAVE
> Amateur Radio).
> >
> > Chill out. The only things that will truly kill
> amateur radio are
> > forgetting its origins, WHY we have it today,
> and more anger and hatred
> > at newbies just because they have an easier time
> getting licensed than
> > some of us did.
> > --
> > (Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)
>
> Right on!!!!
>
> Like the Radio school at Ft Gordon Ga? Where
> students were already learning CW and Radio theory
> in classes, and at K4WAR the guys got together and
> studied for their license with instructors from
> the school. Like you were going to fail with all
> that help? Vs the determined blind guy who
> learned it on his own? Like is not Fair, it is
> what you make of it!
>
> K7DUP......
>
>

1472. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:17:27 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <bSYPb.127747$na.136568@attbi_s04>
Source record: 86148

> It isn't that we don't have enough 'fone' spectrum as you call it, we do.
> No, the problem is that we can't operate phone on all the frequencies that
> the DX can. This is true on 80, 40, 20 and 15 (30 too, but let's not go
> there).

Hi Alun .... Got a point there ....I have heard on fone (sic)that some foreign ops are very happy with this arrangement. I am in agreement that the 40 situation needed attention. Hopefully this will make things better for everyone. As for 30 ...well not bad generally but the Espanol pirates, fishing boats and big signal data do stink up the neighborhood. I know I know we are secondary users ....

> As you don't work phone DX I wouldn't really expect you to be aware of
> this, much less care,

No no Alun I do care ...I see the problems that are there are making the service less enjoyable for all hams. I wish that I had the constitution to put up with the stuff I hear up band but I do not. This service-hobby is at the forefront of the idea of manners and procedures maximizing the enjoyment for all.

but there it is. I have no more desire than you do to
> see any 'gallbladder nets' further down the bands.

We collectively Alun have let these problems fester and boil over to the extent that enjoyment of this service is compromised by what we hear on the bands today. I would venture to say that a $25 to $50 a year fee for a ticket would separate the proverbial wheat and chaff. That would give the feds the resources to properly police the roost but given the present resolve of the FCC ...oh well ... and the fact that a lot of hams still have their communion money ..... The idea that we are self policing is just so much vaporware mantra.

God Bless and good DX there Alun ..73 Tom KI3R

1473. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:28:40 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <I0ZPb.125298$8H.332381@attbi_s03>
Source record: 86149

. The FCC followed up on it and 'modified' it and it was
> implemented beginning November of 1968.
>
> Why do I know this? Because I read QST cover to cover while stateside in
> the military. And when I went overseas I lost track due to military
> activities. I returned to the USA in 1968. I operated on 7.010 and
received
> a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
> band for my class of license.

Amazing Jim ....I know there are people out there who do not believe you regarding the notice. Your situation taken in context of what we hear today on the bands is crazy by today's "standards" but it does show where we have gone in this service .....unfortunately.

God Bless there Jim 73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

1474. FCC Vanity Call Sign Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:41:24 UTC
From: Keith <kilo_watt_radio2@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1010nt4avos5bf2@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 86150

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of Amateur Radio Station License of Richard L. Smith to Modify the Call Sign of Amateur Station KC4USH File No. 0000993298

ORDER OF MODIFICATION Adopted: January 16, 2004 Released: January 22, 2004

By the Chief, Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau:

1. Introduction. In this Order of Modification, we modify the license for Amateur Radio Station KC4USH, Chesapeake, Virginia. Specifically, we modify the Amateur Radio Service station license issued to Richard L. Smith (Smith) to show the call sign KG4UKV, which was the call sign assigned to his amateur station prior to the grant of the captioned application. As explained in further detail below, we take this action pursuant to an earlier order proposing to modify Smith s license.1

2. Background. In the Modification Proposal, we concluded that the grant of the vanity call sign KC4USH to Smith s amateur station was defective because the call sign is included in the call sign block KC4USA through KC4USZ which is available to the Department of the Navy for the use of amateur stations at U. S. Navy Antarctic stations.2 We were unable to set aside the grant of Smith s abovecaptioned application because we did not become aware of the error until more than thirty days after the grant occurred. As a result of our error, we proposed to modify Smith s license pursuant to Section 316(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,3 by exchanging KC4USH with the call sign previously assigned to Smith s amateur radio station, KG4UKV.4 In this connection, we tentatively concluded that the proposed modification would serve the public interest by ensuring that the call sign block KC4USA-KC4USZ is only used to identify amateur stations that are located at U. S. Navy Antarctic stations as provided in the Commission s Rules.

3. Discussion. A copy of the Modification Proposal was sent to Mr. Smith with the requirement that any protest thereto be submitted within thirty days of its the release date.5 On July 30, 2003, Mr. Smith submitted a letter protesting the proposed modification.6 In support of his protest, Mr. Smith states that the call sign KC4USH was the only call sign he wanted as a vanity call sign because it was the call sign used at Cape Hallett Station, Antarctica, when his father was located there during Operation Deep Freeze 60,7 that he applied for the call sign in good faith, and that he has spent considerable personal funds to make others aware that he was assigned this call sign.8 Mr. Smith also notes that the call sign KC4USH has not been issued since 1974 and that, with the exception of the call sign KC4USV, the U.S. Navy is not using any call

signs in the call sign block made available to it.9

4. We have considered the statement and evidence that Mr. Smith has submitted. As an initial matter, we note that the reason a licensee requests a particular vanity call sign is not a sufficient basis to allow a licensee to retain a call sign that is otherwise unassignable to the licensee s station pursuant to the Commission s Rules. In this case, all call signs from the call sign block KC4USA through KC4USZ have been made available to the Department of the Navy for the use of amateur stations at U.S. Navy Antarctic locations.10 For this reason the rules applicable to our call sign systems, including the vanity call sign system, have consistently stated that call signs from the call sign block KC4USA-KC4USZ are not available for assignment to amateur stations licensed by the FCC.11 We conclude, therefore, that we must modify Mr. Smith s license to show a call sign that is available to the FCC-licensed amateur station.

5. With regard to Mr. Smith s contention that the U.S. Navy is only using one call sign in the call sign block made available to it, we note that such claim, even if it is correct, does not provide a sufficient basis for Mr. Smith to retain the call sign KC4USH in contravention of the FCC s rules and policies. In this regard, we note that other call sign blocks have been made available to other agencies12 and that with the exception of the call sign block KG4AA-KG4ZZ, very few of these call signs have been assigned. Nonetheless, once the FCC makes a call sign block available to another licensing agency, those call signs may no longer be assigned to amateur stations by the Commission. Call sign assignment policies applicable to those call signs, including when and whether to assign them, become the responsibility of the other agency. We also note that we are unaware of any reason that the U.S. Navy could not resume assigning these call signs to stations operating from Antarctica. Further, given the FCC s prior decision to make such call signs available to the U.S. Navy, the record in this proceeding does not present a sufficient basis for revisiting this issue or suggesting modification of the U.S. Navy s flexibility in this regard.

6. As we noted in the Modification Proposal, the assignment of the call sign KC4USH was an error. We apologize for any inconvenience this error has caused Mr. Smith. We have reviewed our call sign assignment systems and policies and made corrections necessary to ensure that these systems do not assign call signs that are unavailable to FCC-licensed amateur stations in the future. Based on the record in this matter, however, we conclude that it would be in the public interest to modify Mr. Smith s amateur station license for KC4USH, Chesapeake, Virginia, by exchanging the call sign KC4USH with the call sign KG4UKV.13

7. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 316(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Â§Â§ 154(i), 316(a), and Section 1.87 of the Commission s Rules, 47 C.F.R. Â§ 1.87, that the station license for Amateur Radio Station KC4USH IS MODIFIED to show the call sign KG4UKV.

8. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order of Modification shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested to Richard L. Smith, 509 Homestead Road, Chesapeake, Virginia 23321.

9. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.131 and 0.331 of the Commission s Rules, 47 C.F.R. Â§Â§ 0.131, 0.331.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Dwana R. Terry
Chief, Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

Footnotes: 1 See Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 03-2183 (w/copy to Mr. Smith) (rel. July 3, 2003) (Modification Proposal).

2 Id. at 1.

3 47 U.S.C. Â§ 316(a). Section 316(a) requires that we notify the affected station(s) of the proposed modification(s), the public interest reasons for the action, and afford at least 30 days to respond.

4 See Modification Proposal at 1.

5 47 C.F.R. Â§ 1.87(a).

6 Letter from Richard L. Smith (filed Jul. 30, 2003) (Letter).

7 See Letter at 1.

8 Id. at 2.

9 Id.

10 See Letter dated July 21, 1959, from Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, to Dr. T. O. Jones, Office of Special International Programs, National Science Foundation (NSF) (making available to NSF the call sign block KC4AAA-KC4AAF and reciting conditions applicable to use of the call sign block KC4USA-KC4USZ by the U. S. Navy.)

11 See Public Notice FCC Announces Amateur Station Call Sign Assignment System Mimeo No. 98607 (released Mar. 30, 1978) (call signs not assignable to amateur stations by the FCC: KC4AAA-KC4AAF and KC4USAKC4USZ) and http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/amateur/callsigns/vanity/index.html#2 (the following call signs are not available for assignment: KC4AAA-KC4AAF and KC4USA-KC4USZ.)

12 For example, the call sign block KA2AA-KA9ZZ is available to U.S. Army authorized amateur stations in Japan, the call sign block KG4AA-KG4ZZ is available to U.S. Navy authorized amateur stations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and forty call signs having the first two letters AF, KF, NF, or WF and the letters EMA following a numeral are available to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

13 47 C.F.R. Â§ 1.87(i).

--
Best Regards, Keith
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
http://linux.com http://freebsd.org http://apple.com

1475. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:47:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NiZPb.33222$P%1.26071920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86251

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:buoe3g$rne@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:ixNPb.18836$i4.7572@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > > Clearly, letters only become vulgar when
> > > > one attaches a specific meaning to them.
> > > > Without a context to make "TIT," or other
> > > > such letters, vulgar, I can't really envision
> > > > a "parent or uncle or grandparent" keeping
> > > > a child out of Amateur Radio simply
> > > > because those letters appear in a callsign.
> > >
> > > The "context" is self-evident. It is a well-
> > > known vulgarity referring to a woman's
> > > breasts in a connotation which is generally
> > > considered to be of a sexual nature. (snip)
> >
> >
> > The "vulgarity" and "of a sexual nature" is self-evident to you,
Larry.
> > Funk & Wagnals describes "tit" as "teat, breast or nipple." Princeton
> > University's WordWeb defines "tit" as "either of two soft fleshy
> > milk-secreting glandular organs on the chest of a woman" or "the small
> > projection of a mammary gland." And, of course, both mention a "small
> > insectivorous bird." Many farm animals have teats or "tits," but most
> don't
> > consider them to be "of a sexual nature."
> >
>
> Vulgar is in the eye of the beholder...and Larry must believes women's
> breasts are vulgar.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Both you and Dwight must lead sheltered lives. More people use the word
"tit" in the derogatory, vulgar manner than use it in the neutral, clinical
sense except of course for farmers, who as a group do use it in the neutral
form. For women, farmers prefer to use breast or bust.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1476. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:50:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZkZPb.33223$P%1.26072016@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86252

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:k7gv001arosbasae08o9ii6gpt0dfkahbt@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 00:54:28 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> >news:e95u00dovb0qm7euid1hr6uep8q1bua35l@4ax.com...
> >> On 22 Jan 2004 00:02:34 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> >> >news:k9DPb.32920$P%1.25902878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> >> news:Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >> >>> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
> >> >>>
> >> >>> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below
7100
> >> >>> > goes away completely.
> >> >>
> >> Except for us up North, perhaps - we have 7.050 to 7.100 allocated as
> >> SSB on our 40M band plan. There are a few Canadian nets that operate
> >> there regularily, as well as quite a bit of foreign DX.
> >>
> >> Fortunately, our band plans are guidelines prepared by Radio Amateurs
> >> of Canada - not federally mandated.
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >>
> >
> >Do you really think you would like all the US amateurs jumping in down
> >there?? Remember the population difference. We have a tremendous amount
of
> >activity on 40m voice on 7.150 to 7.300 until the broadcasts drive us
off.
> >If we had SSB access to that 7.050 to 7.100 used by other countries, it
> >would be packed solid and nobody else could get in. Do you want that?
Far
> >better to continue the battle to get the allocation extended to 7.300 for
> >all amateurs around the world.
> >

> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Agree that the exclusivity of the 40M band should be extended to 7.300
> - but that is likely quite a few years away. It will be a few more
> years before the 7.100 to 7.200 segment is cleared of broadcast
> stations. And, the bandwidth from 7.050 to 7.100 (at least from my
> QTH) is relatively underutilized - not a great deal of CW or digital
> traffic going on there.
>
> Just thinking that it might provide some clear space for you to
> operate if it was opened to phone in the US.
>
> Personally, I don't mind having it as clear as it is right now at all!
> There are, as I stated, some excellent DX opportunities there...
>
> 73, Leo
>

Leo, my point is that it would not stay clear very long. It would fill up in a heart beat with domestic nets and QSOs thereby causing hardship and hard feelings among the those outside the US.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1477. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-22 23:56:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86253

"Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net> wrote in message
news:4010096e$0$99193$45beb828@newscene.com...
> In <20040121181448.08626.00002729@mb-m27.aol.com> lenover21@aol.com (Len
Over 21) writes:
>
>
> >In article <psjPb.32601$P%1.25741009@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >>Actually I wonder if the ARRL petition isn't a crafty ruse. It will
look
> >>good to people who want what it proposes but has high odds of being
rejected
> >>by the FCC since the FCC has a long history of shooting down automatic
> >>upgrades. They get the "attaboy" for "trying" and can then lay it at
the
> >>FCC's door when it fails even though they may want it to fail.
>
> > SHAME!
>
> > Thinking improper and vulgar thoughts about the ARRL!
>
> > Say 100 Hail Hirams as penance and sin no more.
>
> > LHA / WMD
>
>
> You probably realized that Dee D. may be assuming the role of "devil's
> advocate" here (by overplaying an idea to generate further discussion).
> In other words, we might not want to take her words at face value until
> she clarifies what she really means.
>
> So, Dee D., what did you really mean to say above?
>

Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has never
gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea for
the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
decide to do anything at all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1478. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 00:01:08 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <71p0101l432025cengjuaclg1ucimam9uv@4ax.com>
Source record: 86254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 14:03:16 -0800, Dr. Anton.T. Squeegee
<SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote:

>In article <FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>No.m@il.com says...
>
>> I canceled my Leage membership after their first restructuring proposal for
>> amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new proposal, I wish I had NEVER
>> been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is that: if ham radio is to
>> survive it MUST sound like CB.
>>
>>
>> Tee'd Off
>
> Seems to me like you're getting mad at the wrong people.
>
> Ham radio, like Life itself (I've said this before, and I'll
>probably end up saying it again), is a mirror. You get back EXACTLY what
>you put into it.
>
> What you hear on the air is a reflection of the PERSONALITY of
>each INDIVIDUAL operator. It has NOTHING to do with how hard they
>studied for their license, or how much they know, or how many letters
>they have after their name.
>
> If ham radio is declining in the "quality" of what's heard on the
>air, it's because of poor operators making life miserable for the
>newbies, apparently all because of some misguided sense of loyalty. To
>what or to whom this loyalty is directed, I have never understood.
>
> Let me ask you something: Have you ever made comments on the air
>that were derogatory to someone who was new to the hobby? Have you ever
>adopted an air of superiority in the presence of a newbie?
>
> If so, then YOU are part of the problem. If you do not feel you
>can be civil to a new operator (remember, there was a day when NONE of
>us had ever seen a microphone or transmitter, let alone operated one),
>then simply ignore them and move on to something else.
>
> The "Death of Ham Radio" has been predicted by many others for
>many years. Yet, the Amateur Radio SERVICE endures to this day.
>Different from what it was ten or twenty years ago, yes, but it endures.
>This tells me that new licensees aren't the problem, and it tells me

>that the ARRL isn't the problem.
>
> What I see as the REAL problem are those "veterans" in the HOBBY
>who have become so obsessed with their own ideas of whom is superior to
>whom that they will deliberately make life on the air miserable for
>anyone who doesn't measure up to their own standards. I think such
>people would be doing much better to offer polite-but-firm correction to
>operating errors, and be willing to SHARE their knowlege as opposed to
>zealously guarding it like some grumpy dragon guarding their hoard.
>
> You may not like the ARRL for whatever reason. Fine. That's your
>choice (I'm proud to be a 'Lifer' myself). But would you find it so very
>hard to remember and respect "The Amateur's Code" that they publish? It
>dates all the way back to the League's founding, and the days of Hiram
>Percy Maxim (without whom we wouldn't even HAVE Amateur Radio).
>
> Chill out. The only things that will truly kill amateur radio are
>forgetting its origins, WHY we have it today, and more anger and hatred
>at newbies just because they have an easier time getting licensed than
>some of us did.

Well said, Sir.

73, Leo

1479. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 00:40:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122194026.12501.00005702@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86255

In article <AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040121215552.06226.00002526@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch
>> >of world class hypocrites.
>>
>> And who elected the directors, Dan?

>I don't know who 'elected' the directors. I know I didn't.

Every member with a license gets a ballot. If you didn't vote...
>
>> >They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
>> >FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'.
>>
>> How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
>> and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.
>
>It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
>seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
>inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.

There were "class distinctions" before IL, Dan. I heard folks say, way back
then,
that Novices and Techs weren't "real hams".

People who look down on others because of license class usually look down for
other reasons too. There were the Collins owners who looked down on the Drake
folks, etc. The SSB-vs-AM stuff. The appliance ops vs, the homebrewers. DX vs.
traffic handlers, contesters vs. ragchewers, etc. That sort of thing comes from
the
person, not the system.
>
>The FCC did not propose Incentive Licensing. It was the ARRL back about
>1963 or so. The FCC followed up on it and 'modified' it and it was
>implemented beginning November of 1968.
>
>Why do I know this? Because I read QST cover to cover while stateside in
>the military. And when I went overseas I lost track due to military
>activities. I returned to the USA in 1968.

I was a ham back then, too, Dan, and I read the same mags.

We're not going to agree on who started it, but I think we can agree on these things:

1) Whoever started it, the ARRL BoD pushed IL from 1963 onwards
2) What the FCC finally enacted in 1967 was very different from what ARRL proposed in 1963
3) ARRL claimed that a majority of hams at the time supported IL. Others claim a majority opposed it. Nobody *really* knows, just as nobody knows what would have happened otherwise.
4) There's still a lot of bad feeling about the whole thing.
5) The present ARRL BoD and Hq folks are a completely different lot than was there in the '60s

>I operated on 7.010 and received
>a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
>band for my class of license.

And if the original 1963 ARRL proposal had been enacted, you would not have been in violation.
>>
>> >Then 40 years later they totally
>> >reverse themselves.
>>
>> Who? I don't think there's a single person at Hq or in the Board of
>> Directors today who was a League official of any kind back in the
>> '60s. Most of the '60s BoD and Hq folks are dead.
>>
>> So it's a completely different bunch that reversed the policies.
>>
So what *should* be done, Dan? Do you support Hans' 2-level idea?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1480. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 00:59:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122195925.07984.00000144@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86258

In article <lr2010p0p1nhnfgftjnqipfka0abih5foe@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 22 Jan 2004 09:39:22 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:<mfrs00haqsa0n2bmbu9v8gtkec7o5h3l7i@4ax.com>...
>>> On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 04:26:39 -0600, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>> >Another interesting little snippit... If I recall, it was only after I
>>> >"took on" some of the things Larry (and his ilk) was posting that he
>decided
>>> >to take a dislike to my callsign.
>>> >
>>> >Makes one wonder if it is the callsign that is the reason for the
>attitude;
>>> >or that they just plain dislike me and can't think of any other way to
>>> >express it.
>>>
>>> The statements of those who voice the strongest objections tend to
>>> support your observation, Kim.
>>>
>>> Jim himself, who insists that it is just the "inappropriate callsign"
>>> that bothers him, stated (regarding his negative opinion towards the
>>> callsign):
>>>
>>> "It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
>>> the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."
>>>
>>> This statement indicates that it isn't just the call that bothers him
>>> - it's a combination of the call plus other 'factors'. The 'package',
>>> as it were.
>>
>>You are mistaken, Leo.
>>
>>That statement of mine was in response to claims that I was "prejudiced"
>>about Kim's callsign.
>>
>>The word "prejudice" means to "pre-judge". IOW, to come to a conclusion
>>before knowing all the relevant facts. My statement
>>
>>"It wasn't formed beforehand. It was formed only after I encountered
>>the callsign and its owner here, and considered all the issues."

>>
>>simply proves that I wasn't prejudiced because I didn't pre-judge. And I
>>did not encounter that callsign, or ones like it, before I saw it here
>>on rrap, in use by its holder.
>>
>>IOW, I did not hear about it somewhere else, see it used by someone other
>>than Kim, etc. And I did not rush to judgement.
>>
>>In fact, when I first saw it, I thought "Kim" and the callsign were
>>pseudonyms being used to hide the identity of the poster. Like your
>>use of only your first name, rather than your callsign. Imagine
>>my surprise when I discovered it was for-real!
>>
>>Look at the context in which I wrote that statement, and it is clear
>>that it simply means I formed my opinion of Kim's callsign based on
>>experiences here, not on prejudice.
>
>You are saying that your opinion was formed based on experiences here,
>and not simply on the callsign, aren't you?

Nope.

I'm saying that I didn't have an opinion until I encountered the callsign here.

>Your statement that you
>did not pre-judge certainly enforces this, does it not?

Nope. All my statement says is that I did not have an opinion until I saw the
callsign. And at first I thought it wasn't a real, FCC issued callsign, but
simply a way of staying anonymous. Like you do, "Leo".

I figured that the person using it here chose it as a screen name
because FCC wouldn't issue such a call. I was mistaken - FCC
would issue it, but only as a vanity. Which surprised the

[expletive deleted]

out of me!
>
>I keep hearing that the callsign is inappropriate, but what you really
>mean that it is a combination of factors - right?

Wrong. The callsign, and others like it, are simply inappropriate for the
ARS. Just my opinion. That FCC allows them and that hams choose
them doesn't make them any more appropriate for the ARS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1481. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 00:59:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86256

In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has never
>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea for
>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
>decide to do anything at all.
>
That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!

As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue came up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech Pluses to get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their database.

So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes everybody's time.

More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.

oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1482. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 00:59:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122195927.07984.00000146@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86257

In article <AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040121215552.06226.00002526@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a bunch
>> >of world class hypocrites.
>>
>> And who elected the directors, Dan?

>I don't know who 'elected' the directors. I know I didn't.

Every member with a license gets a ballot. If you didn't vote...
>
>> >They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
>> >FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'.
>>
>> How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
>> and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.
>
>It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
>seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
>inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.

There were "class distinctions" before IL, Dan. I heard folks say, way back
then,
that Novices and Techs weren't "real hams".

People who look down on others because of license class usually look down for
other reasons too. There were the Collins owners who looked down on the Drake
folks, etc. The SSB-vs-AM stuff. The appliance ops vs, the homebrewers. DX vs.
traffic handlers, contesters vs. ragchewers, etc. That sort of thing comes from
the
person, not the system.
>
>The FCC did not propose Incentive Licensing. It was the ARRL back about
>1963 or so. The FCC followed up on it and 'modified' it and it was
>implemented beginning November of 1968.
>
>Why do I know this? Because I read QST cover to cover while stateside in
>the military. And when I went overseas I lost track due to military
>activities. I returned to the USA in 1968.

I was a ham back then, too, Dan, and I read the same mags.

We're not going to agree on who started it, but I think we can agree on these things:

1) Whoever started it, the ARRL BoD pushed IL from 1963 onwards
2) What the FCC finally enacted in 1967 was very different from what ARRL proposed in 1963
3) ARRL claimed that a majority of hams at the time supported IL. Others claim a majority opposed it. Nobody *really* knows, just as nobody knows what would have happened otherwise.
4) There's still a lot of bad feeling about the whole thing.
5) The present ARRL BoD and Hq folks are a completely different lot than was there in the '60s

>I operated on 7.010 and received
>a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
>band for my class of license.

And if the original 1963 ARRL proposal had been enacted, you would not have been in violation.
>>
>> >Then 40 years later they totally
>> >reverse themselves.
>>
>> Who? I don't think there's a single person at Hq or in the Board of
>> Directors today who was a League official of any kind back in the
>> '60s. Most of the '60s BoD and Hq folks are dead.
>>
>> So it's a completely different bunch that reversed the policies.
>>
So what *should* be done, Dan? Do you support Hans' 2-level idea?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1483. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 01:12:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040122201206.02537.00002594@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 86259

In article <5ee63311.0312311446.3ebe5f10@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
>
>> As for "free upgrades", the FCC already unleased THAT genie with thier
>> last round of "restructuring" with no help at all from the ARRL.
>
>And what "free upgrade" did you see in the last round or
>restructuring?

ARRL proposed that all existing Novices and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade to
General. Didn't happen, of course.
>
>The only thing that remotely resembles "free", was giving Pre-87
>Technicians credit for the General written exam which they took.
>Since the exam was EXACTLY the same as Generals took, I don't see any
>freebie there.

Exactly. In fact, it wasn't even automatic - the Tech Plus had to show up at a
VE
session, pay the fee (even if no tests were taken) and provide documentation.

>But just wait till ARRL BoD meets next month..... I expect to see
>them recommend a three-tier license regime, with a new low-powered 50W
>beginners "C" license,

100 W, but what's 3 dB?

>a new mid-range "B" license with 3-400W power
>limit,

Nope.

> and a new top of the line "A" class license with 1.5KW power
>limit and a CW test in the 15-25WPM range.

WHOA!

You *did* predict it!

>Frequency ghettos for "C"
>and "B" similar to now. Current Novice/Tech get free upgrade to "B"
>privs, current General/Advanced get free upgrade to "A".

Half credit for half right.

>Yawwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!
>
>I'm sure I'll miss some of the details in their proposal, but the
>above is pretty much the way I read the tea-leaves.

And it's closer to what I recommended than what the BoD actually did.
>
And as we now know....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1484. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 01:16:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86260

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040121185526.22081.00003566@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0401211125.5e2b5ead@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >order" crappola. Call 'em "Tech IIs", call 'em anything which doesn't
> >infer that a 30 year Novice is just a newbie getting his feet wet in
> >ham radio.
> >
> >Asinine.
> >
> Yep, that's what arguing over the name really is.

As long as they don't tag you as a "Novice"eh? . . the word outta HQ
is that they're gonna change it anyway so we'll see what they come up
with.

> >> >All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
> >>
> >> Extra.
> >>
> >> Another very bad idea.
> >
> >WHY??
>
> Because if they want the privs, let 'em take the tests.
>
> Heck, any Advanced who wants an Extra need only take Element 4.
> Is it *really* that hard? Heck, the old Extra was earned by an 8 year old
> in 3rd grade. Obviously a bright kid, but c'mon - how hard can the test
> really be?

Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
license structure, the testing process and the record keeping. There
are little to no differences in the levels of difficulty between the
Extra and Advanced writtens and they both cover the same general
material in the same depth. Both have passed at least 5 wpm code
tests. All of which has clearly rendered the Advanced redundant today
so it should be done away with if we expect any significant
streamlining of the regs. If it takes a one-shot giveaway to clean up
the mess fine, do it.

> >It's obvious, at least to me, that one major bottom line intent of the
> >proposal is to foster more activity on the HF phone bands.
>

> Why? Do they need it?

Who is "they"?

> Why not foster activity on *all* bands and modes?

The new entry-level ticket should do a good job of just that. Give 'em
a taste of HF phone beyond just 10M and the activity level ought to go
up. Particularly since we're on the downside of the spots count curve.
The other bands and modes will take care of themselves. The
restrictions on the entry-level ticket provide realistic incentives to
upgrade. I like it.

> Besides, the problem ain't the license. Plenty of folks with the license but
> no station set up. I mean, look how complicated and difficult it can be
> for some folks to put up an end-fed wire...

Yeah, the tests can't filter out the Brainiacs but that's not a
regulatory issue.

> >If the
> >proposal is adopted I expect that objective might be met so I support
> >the basics of the proposal.
>
> What parts don't you support?

I'm not convinced that leaving 20M completely out of the picture is a
good idea. They shoved the "Novices" pretty far up the phone bands
which will severly limit their opportunities to get into contests
and/or chase DX. And I'm a bit cool to the concept of expanding the
phone bands down into the old Novice bands.

> >James I fail miserably to understand why you're so adamantly opposed
> >to the free passes.
>
> Because there's no reason for 'em. Is giving all Advanceds a few more kHz on
> 80/40/20/15 going to get many more of them on the air? I don't think so.

Again that's not the point. The overriding point is getting rid of the
Advanced class license, has nothing to do with activity levels. The
only "losers" would be the entrenched Extras who would suddenly have
to share their exclusive spaces with the dayum low-born new "givaway"
Extras. Pore babies. .

> The problem is that the freebies say that there's nothing essential about the
> General and Extra writtens.

That's just plain BS. Let 'em eat cake.

> And it's unfair to those who come after
> GiveAwayDay.

Yeah, yeah, and we had to walk uphill both ways in a blizzard to take
our 20wpm code tests. And now they're giving 'em away for a lousy 5

wpm. "That ain't fair!" Pfft.

Those who miss "giveaway day" will be faced with some specific much
more rational regime or another just like those who came before them
have faced all sorts of different regimes over the years. And they'll
deal with it as usual. So pfft on them too.

> >Nope. Not if ya expect HF newbies to even try CW. If newbies don't try
> >it we might as well drive a stake in the mode now and get the pain over
> >with.
>
> You misunderstand. 20 per would be for Extra only, not for all classes.

20 wpm worked when the steps to get there were 5, 13 then 20w wpm.
Going from zip directly to 20 would be another whole story and I
expect the results would be dismal. Not to mention the waivers
problem. I would really go for changing the 5 wpm code test to at
least one minute solid copy or take it again.

> >> >I>AM< THE ARRL!!!
> >> >
> >> So am I.
> >
> >I wasn't for a few days again and beat 'em out of another free book
> >for rejoining.
>
> I remember..

That was last year. I just done it again.

>
> Of course, the fact that ARRL put those ideas in a proposal may be the kiss of
> death for
> them.

Heh.

> They haven't had much success in license restructuring proposalsin the
> past few years!

They gotta keep thowing stuff at the wall or none of it will stick.

> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1485. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 01:47:09 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <dtu010tvo4p9edbbgop828m5qepa25hcd3@4ax.com>
Source record: 86261

On 23 Jan 2004 00:59:25 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <lr2010p0p1nhnfgftjnqipfka0abih5foe@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>snip

>>>
>>>Look at the context in which I wrote that statement, and it is clear
>>>that it simply means I formed my opinion of Kim's callsign based on
>>>experiences here, not on prejudice.
>>
>>You are saying that your opinion was formed based on experiences here,
>>and not simply on the callsign, aren't you?
>
>Nope.

Guess this is the part that confuses me, Jim - in the first sentence
above, you state that you formed your opinion of Kim's callsign based
on experiences here. In the decond sentence, you said "nope" to
exactly the same thing....

I'm confused!

>snip
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1486. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 01:48:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401221748.3ee9293d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86262

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<H3VPb.22188$1e.15373@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
> > I don't think that qualifies as proof.
>
> Here is a direct quote from the "Amateur Radio Newsline" broadcast of
> Sept 12th, 1993, where the hissy-fit of W5YI is described. Since K7UGA
> left the Senate in 1986, long before this incident, it's unlikely that
> he responded with legislation which required free Novice exams.
>
> Sunuvagun!
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> " VEC UPSET ABOUT FREE NOVICE TESTS
>
> The ARRL says that it will not charge applicants for Novice
> tests. This even though the W5YI VEC has filed a complaint with
> the FCC alleging that the League's VEC operation is in violation
> of the rules because it refuses to charge applicants for these
> tests.
> But Fred Maia W5YI who operates the VEC bearing his callsign
> claims that its a matter of uniformity. That all VEC's who use
> what is called the annual method of figuring reimbursement are
> required to charge an examination fee for every test it gives,
> including Novice exams. The ARRL says that it plans to continue
> its policy of administering Novice tests free of charge because
> it believes that this policy is consistent with an FCC tradition
> established back in the 1950's. This, as a way of making it easy
> for youngsters to get entry level licenses.
> The League's President, George Wilson, W4OYI says that the
> whole thing is nothing more than one of the ironies that keeps
> ham radio politics interesting. Wilson notes that VEC's have
> always had the latitude to set their own fees. He adds -- and we
> quote -- "Frankly, we see no compelling Federal interest in
> whether or not a class of nine year olds ought to be charged for
> taking an entry level ham radio exam."
> But Maia and his W5YI VEC operation see it very differently.
> In his September 1st issue of his W5YI Report newsletter Maia
> says that the potential financial benefit to the League
> resulting from its policy is to serious to be ignored. He says
> that free examinations when all other VEC's charge, attract

> applicants who are the potential purchasers of examination
> preparation materials. Maia believes that the purchasing
> decisions of these people may be unduly influenced by their
> choice of VEC's.

Did this flap ever make it to the U.S. Dept. of Justice trust busters or the SEC?

Gotta just love Maia. He's more fun than Wayne Green.

w3rv

1487. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 01:49:53 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <aav010t044c5vv6jjk5vdb9mpgedd5rgpq@4ax.com>
Source record: 86263

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 01:47:09 GMT, Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:

>On 23 Jan 2004 00:59:25 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <lr2010p0p1nhnfgftjnqipfka0abih5foe@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>snip
>
>>>>
>>>>Look at the context in which I wrote that statement, and it is clear
>>>>that it simply means I formed my opinion of Kim's callsign based on
>>>>experiences here, not on prejudice.
>>>
>>>You are saying that your opinion was formed based on experiences here,
>>>and not simply on the callsign, aren't you?
>>
>>Nope.
>
>Guess this is the part that confuses me, Jim - in the first sentence
>above, you state that you formed your opinion of Kim's callsign based
>on experiences here. In the decond sentence, you said "nope" to
>exactly the same thing....
>
>I'm confused!

...and spelling challenged too. Make that 'second' sentence (what the
H$%% is a decond?? I dunno).......

73, Leo ...again
>
>>snip
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>73, Leo

1488. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:13:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ir%Pb.20455$i4.5394@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86264

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040122194026.12501.00005702@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040121215552.06226.00002526@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> In article <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >"Dan/W4NTI"
> >> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a
bunch
> >> >of world class hypocrites.
> >>
> >> And who elected the directors, Dan?
>
> >I don't know who 'elected' the directors. I know I didn't.
>
> Every member with a license gets a ballot. If you didn't vote...
> >

I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE Director has
run un-opposed for the last several elections. Which explains why I don't
remember having voted for a Director recently.

Also since I have NOT seen the results of his voting I don't know how he
stands.

> >> >They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
> >> >FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'.
> >>
> >> How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
> >> and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.
> >
> >It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
> >seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
> >inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.
>
> There were "class distinctions" before IL, Dan. I heard folks say, way
back
> then,
> that Novices and Techs weren't "real hams".
>

> People who look down on others because of license class usually look down
for
> other reasons too. There were the Collins owners who looked down on the
Drake
> folks, etc. The SSB-vs-AM stuff. The appliance ops vs, the homebrewers. DX
vs.
> traffic handlers, contesters vs. ragchewers, etc. That sort of thing comes
from
> the
> person, not the system.

Totally different situation compaired to mandatory class difference based on
license.

> >
> >The FCC did not propose Incentive Licensing. It was the ARRL back about
> >1963 or so. The FCC followed up on it and 'modified' it and it was
> >implemented beginning November of 1968.
> >
> >Why do I know this? Because I read QST cover to cover while stateside in
> >the military. And when I went overseas I lost track due to military
> >activities. I returned to the USA in 1968.
>
> I was a ham back then, too, Dan, and I read the same mags.
>
> We're not going to agree on who started it, but I think we can agree on
these
> things:
>
> 1) Whoever started it, the ARRL BoD pushed IL from 1963 onwards
> 2) What the FCC finally enacted in 1967 was very different from what
> ARRL proposed in 1963
> 3) ARRL claimed that a majority of hams at the time supported IL. Others
> claim a majority opposed it. Nobody *really* knows, just as nobody
> knows what would have happened otherwise.
> 4) There's still a lot of bad feeling about the whole thing.
> 5) The present ARRL BoD and Hq folks are a completely different lot
> than was there in the '60s

True....but the bottom line on this particular commentary is the ARRL
initiated the incentive stuff. If not for that....the FCC would have not
done what they did. Period.

>
> >I operated on 7.010 and received
> >a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
> >band for my class of license.
>
> And if the original 1963 ARRL proposal had been enacted, you would not
have
> been in violation.

> >>
> >> >Then 40 years later they totally
> >> >reverse themselves.
> >>
> >> Who? I don't think there's a single person at Hq or in the Board of
> >> Directors today who was a League official of any kind back in the
> >> '60s. Most of the '60s BoD and Hq folks are dead.
> >>
> >> So it's a completely different bunch that reversed the policies.
> >>
> So what *should* be done, Dan? Do you support Hans' 2-level idea?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

It makes no difference what I support. The ARRL and the FCC will do as they please. But I DO RESERVE my RIGHTS to bitch about it.

Dan/W4NTI

1489. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:13:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Aa2dnS-vlcgdGI3d4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86268

Leo wrote:

>
> ...and spelling challenged too. Make that 'second' sentence (what the
> H$%% is a decond?? I dunno).......
>

Don't worry about it Leo, anyone who can't spell a word more than one
way simply has no imegintion.

1490. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:16:30 UTC
From: Bonzi <s@asds.com>
Message-ID: <7u01101itf7h33s9rkihvf7hm6qlj9edrf@4ax.com>
Source record: 86265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 08:23:39 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
<lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:

>My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
>This day would come, just as I said it would.
>
>Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing you
>can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
>with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
>
>Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
>A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
>
How you going to get a signal out of that HUD apartment, fatboy?

1491. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:19:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gx%Pb.20473$i4.5704@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86266

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:ZkZPb.33223$P%
> Leo, my point is that it would not stay clear very long. It would fill up
> in a heart beat with domestic nets and QSOs thereby causing hardship and
> hard feelings among the those outside the US.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

True indeed.....some time back the bottom of 20 m phone was 14.200. I
remember the 'opening day' of moving down to 14.175...thats right,
175....you should have heard the South Americans bitching.

Dan/W4NTI

1492. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:22:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lz%Pb.20480$i4.11714@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86267

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
> >their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
never
> >gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
> >would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
for
> >the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
> >decide to do anything at all.
> >
> That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>
> As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue
came
> up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
Pluses to
> get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no
> problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
database.
>
> So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
> everybody's time.
>
> More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>
> oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

That theory works but for one major problem. Were talking about the 'gang
of fifteen' here. What makes you think they have enough sense?

Dan/W4NTI

1493. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:24:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rB%Pb.20488$i4.3612@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86269

>
> Did this flap ever make it to the U.S. Dept. of Justice trust busters or the SEC?
>
> Gotta just love Maia. He's more fun than Wayne Green.
>
> w3rv

Maia, Wayne Green and Dick Bash should be drawn and quartered on the Nevada sands.

Dan/W4NTI

1494. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:28:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040122212856.29660.00002592@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86271

In article <buodt3$ovt@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Don't look now, Larry" but I am a CODED Tech+. Don't even tell me you have
>missed that for the past umpteenth years! I have been a CODED Tech+ nearly
>since the beginning of being an amateur. I think it was a couple/few months
>after getting my ticket that I finally passed the 5 wpm.
>
>And, yes, for the first two or three years I worked a lot of HF, on 10M
>anyway, and always worked a pileup if I heard one, always worked DX if I
>happened to hear someone during the weekday on my lunchhour and can't think
>of a time when I have failed to "get through."
>
>So, don't look now, Larry, you're wrong, as usual. Sneer away....it becomes
>you.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Yes, you're right. I was wrong. I admit my mistake. Too bad you won't
do the same and change your call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1495. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:28:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040122212857.29660.00002594@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86270

In article <20040122153137.23171.00003605@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>Vulgar is in the eye of the beholder...and Larry must believes women's
>>breasts are vulgar.
>
> He can't handle it, ergo they are vulgar... :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Lennie:

I sure as heck can't handle Kim's, that's for darn sure! BTW, I don't consider there to be anything vulgar about a woman's breasts, except when a woman like Kim uses a vulgarity commonly used to refer to a woman's breasts as a Vanity Call Sign, for the exclusive purpose of calling attention to herself and inciting controversy.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1496. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 02:28:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040122212857.29660.00002593@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86272

In article <buoe3g$rne@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>
>Vulgar is in the eye of the beholder...and Larry must believes women's
>breasts are vulgar.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

To the contrary, I believe that a woman's breasts are a thing of exceptional beauty (usually -- yours may be an exception, of course) and there is absolutely nothing vulgar about them unless they are displayed or referred to in a vulgar manner. Your callsign is calculated to call attention to you (not necessarily your breasts, but that's a logical consequence) and your "in your face" attitude toward others. It has the effect of cheapening you personally, stripping you of your credibility, and creating an uncomfortable atmosphere around you in meetings of other hams who may quite rightly object to your choice of a call sign. Of course, you are in deep denial of all this, and that is understandable. Maybe someday you'll grow up, face the fact that you have cheapened yourself and all other YL hams with that call sign, and change it. When that day comes, if it ever comes, I will congratulate you for your decision. Until then, you will be the object of my scorn.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1497. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 04:05:35 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <3b7110ltqh9o8hfc7tig94bkb0n1dnas91@4ax.com>
Source record: 86273

On Thu, 22 Jan 2004 19:13:59 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>>
>> ...and spelling challenged too. Make that 'second' sentence (what the
>> H$%% is a decond?? I dunno).......
>>
>
>Don't worry about it Leo, anyone who can't spell a word more than one
>way simply has no imegintion.

Absalutely right!

73, Leo

1498. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 04:33:54 UTC
From: Hamguy <hamguy@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Su1Qb.35567$Fe1.19188@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 86274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BRAVO Anton....BRAVO !

"Dr. Anton.T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a79e87eedb7d4ab989c1a@192.168.42.131...
> In article <FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> No.m@il.com says...
>
> > I canceled my Leage membership after their first restructuring proposal
for
> > amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new proposal, I wish I had NEVER
> > been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is that: if ham radio is to
> > survive it MUST sound like CB.
> >
> >
> > Tee'd Off
>
> Seems to me like you're getting mad at the wrong people.
>
> Ham radio, like Life itself (I've said this before, and I'll
> probably end up saying it again), is a mirror. You get back EXACTLY what
> you put into it.
>
> What you hear on the air is a reflection of the PERSONALITY of
> each INDIVIDUAL operator. It has NOTHING to do with how hard they
> studied for their license, or how much they know, or how many letters
> they have after their name.
>
> If ham radio is declining in the "quality" of what's heard on the
> air, it's because of poor operators making life miserable for the
> newbies, apparently all because of some misguided sense of loyalty. To
> what or to whom this loyalty is directed, I have never understood.
>
> Let me ask you something: Have you ever made comments on the air
> that were derogatory to someone who was new to the hobby? Have you ever
> adopted an air of superiority in the presence of a newbie?
>
> If so, then YOU are part of the problem. If you do not feel you
> can be civil to a new operator (remember, there was a day when NONE of
> us had ever seen a microphone or transmitter, let alone operated one),
> then simply ignore them and move on to something else.
>
> The "Death of Ham Radio" has been predicted by many others for
> many years. Yet, the Amateur Radio SERVICE endures to this day.

> Different from what it was ten or twenty years ago, yes, but it endures.
> This tells me that new licensees aren't the problem, and it tells me
> that the ARRL isn't the problem.
>
> What I see as the REAL problem are those "veterans" in the HOBBY
> who have become so obsessed with their own ideas of whom is superior to
> whom that they will deliberately make life on the air miserable for
> anyone who doesn't measure up to their own standards. I think such
> people would be doing much better to offer polite-but-firm correction to
> operating errors, and be willing to SHARE their knowlege as opposed to
> zealously guarding it like some grumpy dragon guarding their hoard.
>
> You may not like the ARRL for whatever reason. Fine. That's your
> choice (I'm proud to be a 'Lifer' myself). But would you find it so very
> hard to remember and respect "The Amateur's Code" that they publish? It
> dates all the way back to the League's founding, and the days of Hiram
> Percy Maxim (without whom we wouldn't even HAVE Amateur Radio).
>
> Chill out. The only things that will truly kill amateur radio are
> forgetting its origins, WHY we have it today, and more anger and hatred
> at newbies just because they have an easier time getting licensed than
> some of us did.
>
>
> --
> Dr. Anton Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute
> (Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)
> kyrrin a/t bluefeathertech d-o=t c&o&m
> Motorola Radio Programming & Service Available -
> http://www.bluefeathertech.com/rf.html
> "Quando Omni Flunkus Moritati" (Red Green)

1499. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 04:37:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4010A511.24C02725@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86275

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Paul, I appreciate your "guidance" in newsgroupism, but let's clear
> the board and outline a few things -

> ... (such as puritanism and syncophancy of....

The what?

> commentary, taking pot-shots against the syncophants

Against whom?

Looks like you need some help with that clearing and outlining.

> 6. Obvious Pro-Code Test Advocates do NOT play "Devil's Advocate."
> Those are hide-bound olde-tyme-thinking PCTAs who are not
> only sanctimonious self-righteous self-important self-propelled
> "experts" but are all seriously devoid of a sense of humor.

You know, Leonard, all of those adjectives could easily be used to
describe you.

Dave K8MN

1500. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 05:19:17 UTC
From: Milt Leskoe <badseedleskoc@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8ea72$4010aed6$d1cc5859$653@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"ARRL Philosophy" <No.m@il.com> wrote in message
news:FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> I canceled my Leage membership after their first restructuring proposal
for
> amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new proposal, I wish I had NEVER
> been a member! Seems the Arrl philosophy is that: if ham radio is to
> survive it MUST sound like CB.
>
>
> Tee'd Off

You may have cancelled your ARRL Membership, but I am afraid
that the greater percentage of hams will continue to send their Yearly
subscription (tribute?) to the snooty yankees in their ivy covered brick
walls at 225 Main Street, just like they have continued to do so for
the past 5-10-20-30+ Years. Just like the lemmings they are, they just
cannot seem to pry themselves away from that shi+ self-serving magazine
that's in reality, more advertising than relative topic. Truly pathetic.

(Tell me, does the ink in QST still rub off onto
your thumb when you rub the print like it used
to do in the 70's and 80's - before I wised up
and left these bastards subscripton letter in file 19?)

What I mean to say is, do they still use the same thin cheap paper stock
and that
half-assed ink that not only smells like acetone solvent, but is of a worse
grade than the ink used for the daily newspaper, which is usually cheaper.
Makes you wonder if their printer back then was some
New Haven sweatshop factory, staffed with min-wage wetbacks that ducked
outta sight whenever the INS van pulled up in the parking lot out
front.....)

1501. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 05:57:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123005747.15923.00003367@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86277

In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>They gotta keep thowing stuff at the wall or none of it will stick.

But...the floor is THICK with it now...can hardly walk around.

:-)

LHA / WMD

1502. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 05:57:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123005748.15923.00003368@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86278

In article <20040122212857.29660.00002594@mb-m24.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I sure as heck can't handle Kim's, that's for darn sure! BTW, I don't
>consider there to be anything vulgar about a woman's breasts, except
>when a woman like Kim uses a vulgarity commonly used to refer to
>a woman's breasts as a Vanity Call Sign, for the exclusive purpose
>of calling attention to herself and inciting controversy.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, tyRoll apparently doesn't understand amateur radio regulations insofar as callsigns.

Kim's callsign begins with a W, not a T. W is perfectly legal and permissible for callsigns administered by the United States of America...as are those that begin with A, N, or K.

Go thee and put your asterisk on the Little Miss Muffet poem to understand who is the REAL vulgarity. We have met him and he is YOU.

Don't you have something more important to do? Like catch a bus or something?

Yours in excelsior (shipping costs extra if ordered from Newington),

LHA / WMD

1503. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 06:32:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401222232.6caaacc3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86279

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

> > How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
> > and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.
>
> It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
> seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
> inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.

That's incorrect Dan. I was an early '50s kid Novice. The OFs of those days more than just occasionally bent over backwards to make sure that I knew that I was at the bottom of the totem pole. In retrospect no doubt some of it involved the usual compulsive cocky male pubescent/male adult conflict which had nothing to do with ham radio. But it was also obvious that those OFs were also ticked off about the recent emergence of the 5 wpm code test which allowed us weenies to get on the air without having to go thru the same pushups they had to go thru to get on the air. There were neighborhood radio clubs which didn't allow full voting memberships to Novices and Techs.

It's all just cycles Dan and the 1968 maneuver was not the first cycle by any means and welcome to the current cycle. There will be others.

w3rv

1504. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 07:15:53 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns947916F9BF0E5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86280

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0401221341.4d41b74@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns9476E8DA33B45elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:SxjPb.32602$P%1.25742284@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone. 7075-7100, for
>> >> example, would be the same size and in a more useful place.
>> >> Moreover, it would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside
>> >> R2.
>> >>
>> >
>> > This will crowd the CW/digital/data modes too much since there are
>> > so many US hams. It would be better to wait for the other treaty
>> > changes from the conference to take affect and synchronize Regions 1
>> > and 3 with Region 2. You do know of course that the treaty now
>> > requires broadcasters to move out of 7.1 to 7.2 and that this will
>> > become an exclusive amateur allocation.
>>
>> Of course I do, but do you think they will really move?
>
> Yes. They agreed to it in the treaty.
>
>> Some may, but I think some of them never will.
>
> Why?
>
> Many countries are reducing or even eliminating their SWBC operations.
> The others have agreed to move, and they have about 3 years to do so.
>
> In the 60s and 70s, SWBC was so crowded that some countries moved
> *below*
> 7100. Complaints from ARRL and others to the various State Departments
> got them to move. The only real failure of the "Intruder Watch" of
> those days
> was the woodpecker, which was an OTHR system. It was made to move by
> other means ;-)
>>
>> > I don't recall the timing but it is required in the treaty.

>
> Three years or so IIRC. Maybe before FCC drops Element 1.
>
>> > Perhaps someday, the ITU will open up the 7.2
>> > to 7.3 to the other regions. In the meantime, 7.150 to 7.200 could
>> > be a worldwide phone allocation. This is actually more space than
>> > either of the suggested proposals.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>> >
>> I'm assuming that this will happen anyway. I just meant that
>> 7075-7100, where of course there is already phone, would be more use
>> to phone ops than the proposed 7125-7150, where there isn't.
>
> If the USA opens 7075-7100 to 'phone, all that will happen is the DX
> 'phones
> will move still lower in the band to get away. There are already some
> on 7050
> and lower - and many of them are in R2!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I beleive the R2 bandplan allows phone down to 7045, same as R1. In R3 it's 7030! R2 hams operatong phone 'on 7050 and lower' are abiding by the ITU bandplan unless they go below 7045.

1505. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 07:21:42 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns947917F3AA9BDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86281

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0401221357.5447609e@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns9477AC3405C43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0401210642.375edb64@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns9476E7FFEA3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> >> news:c2356669.0401201459.19553202@posting.google.com:
>> >>
>> >> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<Xns94767623B3715elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> >> >> news:20040119205713.21642.00003871@mb-m01.aol.com:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> > In article <Xns9475A50AA2B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376
>> >> >> >>@posting.google.com:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>> Summary:
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>The _only_ merit to that is that testing was free for Novices,
>> >> >> >>so it would reintroduce a free licence class.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Not part of the proposal as I read it.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >>
>> >> >> As I understand it, the law providing free testing for Novices
>> >> >> remains on the books. Hence, it really does matter what the
>> >> >> entry level licence is called. If it is re-named 'Novice', then
>> >> >> the test is free.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> No, it's not part of the proposal, and having since read the
>> >> >> whole thing on the ARRL web site, it appears that the league
>> >> >> haven't thought about this particular wrinkle, as they say that

>> >> >> the name is still open and it could be called something else.
>> >> >
>> >> > Unless K0HB is mistaken, no such rule exists in Part 97. And
>> >> > since no new Novices have been issued in almost 4 years, it's a
>> >> > bit of a moot point.
>> >> >
>> >> > But it might be a nice thing for VECs to do...
>>
>> As best as I can follow it a statute made testing free for Novices,
>> and a later administrative decision closed the class to new entrants.
>
> No such statute exists. If it did, it would be in Part 97.
>
>> Obviously
>> the FCC don't have to include in Part 97 a rule giving free testing
>> for Novices whilst there are no Novice tests, but if they re-started
>> Novice testing it would have to be free. I admit I could be wrong, but
>> that is how I understand it, unless someone can show me proof to the
>> contrary.
>
> The nonexistence of something cannot be proven. There used to be a
> rule in Part 97 that Novice tests were free.
>
>> >> >> > The new Novice would replace the existing Technician class as
>> >> >> > the entry level exam. It would have less power and fewer
>> >> >> > VHF/UHF privileges, but more HF privileges.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >>Provided the new class that happened to
>> >> >> >>be called Novice had Tech Plus privileges and they had to pass
>> >> >> >>the current Element 2 I would have no trouble with that
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Why?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I thought the old Novice was too easy
>> >> >
>> >> > Why? The old 20-25 question Novice I took in 1967 at the age of
>> >> > 13 was adequate to keep me out of trouble, even though my first
>> >> > station was homebrewed from junk parts. And that Novice license
>> >> > started me on the path to Advanced in about a year, Extra in
>> >> > about 3 years and BSEE in a little over 8 years....
>> >> >
>> >> > And there were many many Novices like me. If an entry level
>> >> > license keeps the newbies out of trouble and inspires them to
>> >> > learn and do more, isn't that just about perfect?
>> >
>> > Well?
>> >
>> > Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do? If
>> > it insures that newcomers know enough to keep out of trouble (on the
>> > air, anyway,) gives them a sample of what amateur radio is about,

>> > and inspires them to learn and do more with ham radio, isn't that
>> > just about perfect?
>>
>> I don't see very many people having any great difficulty with the
>> present Element 2, so why does it need to be easier?
>
> Present Element 2 is for the VHF/UHF-centric Tech. The more balanced
> "NewNovice"
> simply needs a different test.
>
>> The privileges would be more
>> than the old Novice as well.
>>
> Yep - and much less in some ways than the Tech.
>
> Each license level needs a test tailored to its privileges and intent.
>
>> >> >> > Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current
>> >> >> > Tech Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a
>> >> >> > balance between above and below 30 MHz privileges.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down
>> >> >
>> >> > How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate
>> >> > for all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200
>> >> > watts on parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited
>> >> > privs proposed for the Novice?
>> >
>> > How much is it reasonable to expect a newcomer to learn in order to
>> > be turned loose with ~100 watts on parts of HF and ~25 watts on
>> > parts of VHF/UHF?
>
>> To put it another way, why shouldn't the Techs have all those proposed
>> HF privileges, since they have passed a test with more questions than
>> that proposed?
>
> It would be reasonable for exiting Techs to keep their existing
> license name
> and VHF/UHF privileges, *and* get "NewNovice" privileges on HF.
>>
>> >> >> >>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending
>> >> >> > and receiving.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Won't happen
>> >> >
>> >> > Probably not, but it's still a good idea.

>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>Morse skill testing for voice privileges is illogical and
>> >> >> >>should be dumped.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > It's no more illogical than testing theory in order to be
>> >> >> > allowed to use manufactured equipment.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Not in my opinion
>> >> >
>> >> > It's the same argument used against the code test. Why *must* a
>> >> > ham learn all that theory to use manufactured, approved gear with
>> >> > no critical adjustments? Heck, most ham gear today won't transmit
>> >> > out of band unless modified!
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>Moreover, it can be now, since it has not been required by
>> >> >> >>the ITU for the last six months.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> > FCC will most probably just drop it completely.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I think they will too
>> >> >
>> >> > Unfortunately
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>OK
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate
>> >> >> > class, as has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Can't stand loose ends
>> >> >
>> >> > What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953
>> >> > to 1967 even though no new ones were issued and the license
>> >> > conveyed no additional privileges at all.
>> >
>> > Do those loose ends really cause any problems?
>>
>> Confusion?
>
> Whose? Not FCC's!
>>
>> Besides, Element 4A had most of the harder questions anyway.
>
> Not really. I passed old Element 4A back in 1968, at the age of 14,
> between 8th and 9th grades. I wasn't even intending to try it - I was
> at the FCC for the 13 wpm code, and the examiner said "why not try
> Advanced while you're here?". So I did.
>
> How hard could it have really been if I passed it first-time under

> those circumstances?
>>
>> >> >> >>>Techs and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>Not OK in this scenario, given my comments above
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> > Agreed - but why is it OK for Advanceds to get a free upgrade
>> >> >> > to Extra, but not OK for Techs and Tech Pluses to get free
>> >> >> > upgrade to General?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > What is the fundamental difference that makes one freebie OK
>> >> >> > but not the other?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> As I see it, the new Novice would be a replacement for the Tech,
>> >> >> which is already pretty easy
>> >> >
>> >> > Exactly. But that doesn't answer the question. You want Advanceds
>> >> > to get free upgrades to avoid ~82,000 loose ends, but not Techs
>> >> > and Tech pluses, who would
>> >> > amount to ~322,000 loose ends.
>> >> >
>> >> > I don't see why one and not the other.
>> >> >
>> >> >> >>> 'Phone image subbands for 80/40/15 widened slightly
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>Good.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Bad.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > That space is needed for CW and digital modes.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
>> >> >> spectrum to phone
>> >> >
>> >> > Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital
>> >> > voice?
>>
>> It has worse S/N performance than SSB
>
> That depends entirely on the type of encoding and modulation used,
> doesn't it?
> Can you categorically say that digital voice can *never* outperform
> SSB?

No. One day it might. But not yet.

>
>> >> >> >>> Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data
>> >> >> >>> and 'phone subbands on 80/40/15. Novices also get privs on

>> >> >> >>> 6, 2, 222, and 440
>>
>> >> >> >>See above
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Please clarify.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I see no benefit in giving over 7125-7150 to phone.
>> >> >
>> >> > 25 kHz more.
>> >> >
>> >> >> 7075-7100, for example,
>> >> >> would be the same size and in a more useful place. Moreover, it
>> >> >> would harmonise Region 2 US hams with US hams outside R2.
>> >> >
>> >> > Hams outside Region 2 will be getting 7100-7200 anyway. Let them
>> >> > harmonize with us.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> US hams outside R2 already have 7075-7100 phone
>> >
>> > Only because they don't have 7100-7200. US hams outside R2 are rare
>> > enough to be conidered "DX" anyway.
>> >>
>> >> Read it again. *US* hams outside R2
>> >
>> > I did. As they get 7100-7200, any reason to have 'phone below 7100
>> > goes away completely.
>>
>> Only when:-
>>
>> 1 - all the broadcasters have moved, probably circa the year 2100;
>
> Why do they *all* have to move? And the timetable is 2007, IIRC
>
>> and
>>
>> 2 - all the countries have 7100-7200, which might almost take as long
>>
> I think you just want to have 7075-7100 regardless of what would
> happen.

It's phone in the bandplan (IARU not Antiquated Radio Relay League)

>
>> >>
>> >> >> >>> Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure
>> >> >> >>> evaluation
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>OK
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Agreed.

>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics",
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>Not OK
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Why not? Current Element 2 is only 35 questions! And it has a
>> >> >> > lot more ground to cover, including all amateur VHF/UHF bands
>> >> >> > and modes, power up to "meat cooking" levels (love that WK3C
>> >> >> > phrase) and much more.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > By reducing the entry-level privs, 25 questions should be
>> >> >> > enough.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >>
>> >> >> With that power limit you could take out the RF exposure
>> >> >> questions, but I think the test is already easy enough.
>> >> >
>> >> > To a beginner, it's not so easy.
>>
>> My XYL passed Elements 2 and 3A, and she has no real interest in
>> radio.
>
> That's one example.
>
>> >> >> >>> General to be
>> >> >> >>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>>
>> >> >> >>What do you actually think of this proposal yourself, Jim? You
>> >> >> >>don't say here.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > See above. A few good ideas and a few bad ideas. Obviously the
>> >> >> > work of a committee looking to give everyone something they
>> >> >> > want, but not giving anyone everything they want.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > What will FCC do?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > First off, they may just go for the "new Novice", in an effort
>> >> >> > to attract more new hams.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Re-naming the Tech as a Novice would make the test free under
>> >> >> existing law. That has some appeal.
>> >> >
>> >> > See above about the "law".
>> >> >
>> >> >> > Second, they will probably just dump Element 1.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Agreed
>> >> >>
>> >> >> > Third, they will probably not hand out free upgrades because
>> >> >> > it costs them little or nothing to keep the closed-off

>> >> >> > classes.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I think that for some reason their computers are only set up to
>> >> >> handle 5 classes of licence, but I guess that works out as there
>> >> >> won't be two types of Tech anymore (this is also the reason why
>> >> >> they aren't recorded differently right now).
>> >> >
>> >> > Incorrect!
>> >> >
>> >> > Before restructuring, their computers handled 6 classes of
>> >> > license (Novice, Tech, Tech Plus, General, Advanced, Extra). In
>> >> > fact their computers *still* handle 6 classes! So there should be
>> >> > no problem at all.
>> >> >
>> >> > And as Tech Pluses continue to be renewed as Techs, expire, and
>> >> > upgrade, that class will disappear completely.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I personally am not in favour of keeping closed licence classes,
>> >> >> though. I think it is better to move on.
>> >> >
>> >> > I agree, but not at the price of giveaways just to make things
>> >> > look neater.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> Better that than the only possible alternative - taking privileges
>> >> away
>> >
>> > But is there really any reason not to simply continue those license
>> > classes? That's a much, much better option than freebies or removing
>> > privileges.
>>
>> No it's not. If we abolish them we can sort out all the subbands.
>
> Why are the subbands a problem?
>
>> >> > How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams
>> >> > except Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two
>> >> > classes - "Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody
>> >> > else)?
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited
>> >> licence.
>> >
>> > Why would Techs be singled out for a limited license? They have full
>> > privs above 50 MHz.
>> >
>> >> I

>> >> would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence.
>> >
>> > By your reasoning, there's no reason to have the Extra, then. Nor
>> > its test.
>> >
>>
>> Correct.
>
> So you're for reducing the *written test* requirements for a full
> privileges license.
>
> Bad idea.
>>
>> >> Of course, to be
>> >> fair you would have to extend that to Techs with old Element 3.
>> >
>> > Where ya been, Alun?
>> >
>> > Techs with old Element 3 (licensed before March 21, 1987) can get a
>> > General
>> > license *today* with no additional testing. Just show up at a VE
>> > session with
>> > proof of such license, fill out the 605 and pay the VE fee. Instant
>> > General.
>> > And if such a ham can pass the Extra written (might as well try, the
>> > same VE fee buys that test too), they get an Extra.
>> >
>> > Been that way since April 15, 2000.
>> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1506. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 10:50:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buqu9p$i6e@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86282

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401220912.2707111f@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<buoe1p$fj5@library2.airnews.net>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:vcLPb.18937$q4.1844@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > And how would a callsign bring the
> > > ARS one step closer to extinction?
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> Simple - by making the ARS seem to be something many people won't
> want to be a part of - or have their kids be a part of.
>

It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless someone sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then. And, if must "finally realize" anything about a callsign, then it is definitely because they took their own path getting there; not because anyone led them there. To make that a bearer's responsibility to "the community of man" is ridiculous and I don't wear that crap.

>
> Dwight, you previously said you didn't know any parents who would
> keep their kids out of ham radio over a callsign like Kim's. Well,
> I know plenty of parents who would not support their kids' being
> involved in ham radio if their first (or second, or third)
> impression involved such callsigns.
>

Then, they'd best just keep their kids out of sports, school, movies, churches; in fact, just lock 'em up and keep 'em safe. The responsibility of the parent is to teach what is vulgar and what is not. My callsign is not vulgar. The implication that breasts are something to hide, be embarrassed about, think of only in a sexual manner, etc., is the vulgar act.

> >
> > as someone else pointed out, if a kid derives the word
>
> [word deleted]
>

> > from my callsign, it AIN'T because I taught 'em.
>
> That's true. A child who has never seen the word won't learn it
> from your callsign.
>

See first sentence above.

>
> But if the child already knows the word, you will have taught him/her
> something worse. You'll have taught the child that the use of such
> words in public, and in ham radio, is OK. That it's acceptable behavior.
> And you've made it that much harder for them to learn appropriate
> behavior.
>

See second sentence above.

>
> Kids are influenced by what they see and hear adults doing, even though
> they will deny such influence. Kids who see adults smoking, drinking
> irresponsibly, cussing, etc., will be influenced to try the same or
> similar behaviors themselves *IF* those behaviors in adults are
> portrayed as acceptable, "fun", glamorous, etc.
>

And, it is not the responsibility of "the community" to see that a kid
doesn't learn all that stuff and think it's attractive. It's the
responsibility of the parents, family, and anyone personally involved with
the raising and upbringing of a kid. I taught my kids that all "that stuff"
was all over the place. One of them learned that it was not attractive and
lives responsibly, one of them thought most of it was great and barely
accomplishes anything each day. I must have succeeded with one and needed
to work a lot harder with the other. They *both* saw the same "community."

>
> I recall quite clearly how, as a teenager, I and my peers were subjected
> to lectures on the evils of illegal drugs like marijuana, LSD, speed,
> 'ludes, etc. Those lectures were not very convincing when delivered by
> adults who needed two cups of coffee in the morning to get started, a few
> beers or manhattans in the evening to slow down, and cigarettes all day to
> keep going. Same principle applies in any subject - if Coach emphasizes
> fair play and following the rules over winning at any cost, the team is
> much more likely to learn that lesson.
>

That's a copout--to ignore the advice of someone because of what they are
doing. I'd much rather take advice from someone who's been through what
they are preaching against than someone who's never been there. The phrase
"lead by example" has some truth to it. But the phrase "learn from the
mistakes of others" has much more weight, in my opinion. Here, you were
sitting right there listening to those lecturers preaching against the evils

as they partook in something you believed was evil and you still ignored the value they taught--or at least devalued it, it looks like.

> >
> >*Anyone* who thinks
> > kids are still that innocent these days, has not been on a schoolyard or
> > listening in on kids' conversations when they think no one is
around--and
> > I've even heard Kindergartners speaking of some pretty risque topics.
>
> But that does *not* mean it doesn't matter what adults say and do in their
> presence, or in public! The mere fact that you have to listen in when
> they don't know you're there means the kids are learning that not all
> behavior is appropriate in all contexts.
>

The good work of their parents, no doubt. Pffttt. With regard to breasts, they can be a work of art, a tool of health, the target of the expression of love, or represent some evil, twisted, sense of wrongdoing. I choose the beauty of breasts--not the twisted logic. It's exactly like nude art. I would never gasp at a child looking at a nude statue, or painting, or photo, etc. I would ask them what they found beautiful.

>
> Same principle as teaching them it's OK to pull their pants down in the
> bathroom or doctor's office, but *not* OK to do in public! Even though
> everyone knows what's under their clothes, what those body parts are
> called, etc.
>

It's your expression of "those body parts" that, to someone like me, worries me. Those body parts are to be spoken of, not hidden in some closet because they are horrible. "Those" body parts can be beautiful or dangerous, and both must be recognized. When someone is pulling their pants down at the doctor--it is quite OK, at least one would think; when someone is pulling their pants down in public--it is quite not OK. However, in the right circumstances both could be exactly the opposite. If a doctor--and this has been done--is about to rape someone, then it's evil. And, I can think of nothing better I would love to do to someone like Saddam Hussein, than to moon him with a thousand milliion asses; or even just one: mine.

> >
> > Sad but true.
> >
> The reason it's like that is the failure of adults to act appropriately.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yep. You're exactly right. However, it seems that your "act appropriately" and mine are two entirely different things. And, I'm done--sigh, once again--discussing my callsign. It's valid, it's beautiful, it's fun, it's

mine. Period.

Kim W5TIT

1507. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 10:55:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buquir$r3p@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86283

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:Aa2dnS-vlcgdGI3d4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Leo wrote:
>
> >
> > ...and spelling challenged too. Make that 'second' sentence (what the
> > H$%% is a decond?? I dunno).......
> >
>
> Don't worry about it Leo, anyone who can't spell a word more than one
> way simply has no imegintion.
>

ROFLMAO!! Hey, Leo? Another irony...!!!!

Kim W5TIT

1508. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 11:13:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123061337.01692.00000171@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86284
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article <5f4fe4c2.0401211844.16428741@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" wrote in message
>news:...
>> If you thought the "Plan for the 21st Century Ham" by theNCVEC gang of
>> four was lame, wait till you see what the ARRL gang of fifteen is
>> proposing!
>>
>> A warmed over version of incentive licensing with 3 classes, Novice,
>> General, and Extra.
>>
>> Novice is still ghetto-ized and renewable until you assume room
>> temperature.
>>
>> Extra just like today, including 5WPM Morse exam.
>>
>> General just like today except without Morse.
>>
>> Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!!
>
>Stop your lame whining.

Take your own advice, Stew.
>
>> C'mon, BoD, this looks like something cobbled together in a
>> committee-of-fifteen-tired-old-men-afraid-they-won't-be-reelected, not
>> the National Association of Amateur Radio with leadership and a vision
>> for the future.
>>
>> Nasty letter to follow.
>
>Don't you EVER have anything good to say about anything?

Sure - just look at Hans' 2 level license idea. He has plenty of
good things to say about that ;-)

>You have
>been wrong about everything for so long, why should anyone pay any
>attention to your negative ramblings anymore?
>
"wrong about everything"?

>> Love always,
>>

>> de Hans, K0HB
>>
>> I >AM< THE ARRL!!!
>
[expletive deleted]

>You are a throwback to the past, who fails to see the
>obvious need for this move.
>
>The ARRL got it perfect...

Including 5 wpm code test for Extra and free upgrades for Techs, Tech Pluses
and Advanceds?

>I will continue to renew my membership for
>years to come.

That's good - I think...
>
>WE are the ARRL!
>
That means me and Hans and you. There wouldn't be a League or an amateur
radio today for you if it weren't for the old timer hams who kept it going.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1509. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 13:14:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <n79Qb.33290$P%1.26166524@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86285

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns947916F9BF0E5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> I beleive the R2 bandplan allows phone down to 7045, same as R1. In R3
it's
> 7030! R2 hams operatong phone 'on 7050 and lower' are abiding by the ITU
> bandplan unless they go below 7045.

Keep in mind that outside the US, those are just band plans. According to
postings I read elsewhere, they are ignored with some regularity. It
becomes even more common to ignore them during some contests.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1510. 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 13:45:31 UTC
From: Tom W <address.masked@for.no.spam>
Message-ID: <8701887833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 86286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
On 22 Jan 2004 12:19:26 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> "Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701FUD7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> > On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 22:00:25 GMT, Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > "google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
> > > news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > > >
> > > > Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the Incentive
> > > > License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the idea of
> > > the FCC.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > Learn *your* history. It was the ARRL which first proposed incentive
> > licensing.
> >
> > From http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html:
> >
> > "In summary, although the vast number of hams were satisfied, a small
> > minority had complaints. And the ARRL listened. In 1963, acting on
> > complaints they claim they received from members and operators in
> > other countries, the ARRL proposed "Incentive Licensing." In an
> > editorial, the ARRL implied that perhaps it was a mistake when the
> > Class B and Generals were given the 75 and 20 meter phone segments.
> > The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be restored
> > to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the Generals
> > an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that in
> > order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the
> > General class hams."
>
> Unfortunately, that's not quite how it happened.
>
> FCC thought that hams would go for the Extra after 1953 simply
> "because it
> was there". And some did - but not many. ...

Please cite references. I have before me two historical accounts
which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
```

it. Web pages such as "The Wayback Machine" also agree that the League first proposed the changes which were finally implemented in 1967.

In fact, http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page14.html goes on to say:

"On May 3, 1963, the ARRL Board of Directors adopted their official position on incentive licensing. Their proposal would completely take away all General and Conditional class phone privileges on 75, 40, 20, and 15 meters in a two-year phase-in period. In other words, the ARRL's incentive licensing would only allow HF phone operation for Generals and Conditionals on 10 meters and on the small sliver of 160 meters that was available in the days of LORAN Radionavigation. The ARRL also suggested reopening the Advanced class license again to those who held a General or Conditional license for one year. Strangely, the ARRL did not suggest that Extras be given exclusive frequencies, nor did they propose exclusive CW frequencies. Rather, they just wanted exclusive access to the 75 through 15-meter phone segments for the Advanced and Extra class licenses ..."

Based on all of these items, it appears to me that your account could well be someone's revisionist history. I can find nothing in the literature to support it, but can easily find material which refutes it.

1511. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 14:40:04 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94796247DC7AAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86287

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:n79Qb.33290$P%1.26166524@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns947916F9BF0E5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> I beleive the R2 bandplan allows phone down to 7045, same as R1. In R3
>> it's 7030! R2 hams operatong phone 'on 7050 and lower' are abiding by
>> the ITU bandplan unless they go below 7045.
>
> Keep in mind that outside the US, those are just band plans. According
> to postings I read elsewhere, they are ignored with some regularity.
> It becomes even more common to ignore them during some contests.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

I can't speak for hams in every country in the world, but being originally from the UK I would say that most there would be horrified at the idea of operating phone below 7040, for example. The cutoff used to be 7040 before they set aside 7035-7045 for RTTY. That is one aspect of it being voluntary, you will find people who continue to use a frequency after the bandplan is changed. In a similar way, phone is supposed to be above 14.112 on 20, but it used to be 14.100. The RTTY sections were carved out of the top of CW and the bottom of phone.

Phone below 7.040 or below 14.100 is not something I hear when I tune around. It's easy for US hams to form an impression that there are lots of DX hams operating phone on CW frequencies, but there really aren't. It's just that few realise how far down phone extends in the IARU bandplans.

Contests are another matter, but that cuts both ways, i.e. you will also find CW on phone frequencies during CW contests.

73 de Alun, N3KIP (Ex-G8VUK, G0VUK)

1512. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 14:42:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401132C4.E792A379@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86288

Leo wrote:

> The use of one's own moralistic views and beliefs to deny the rights
> of another is "inappropriate" too, Jim.

That's an issue you seem unable to sort out for us, "Leo". Which one of the new "rights" applies in forcing Jim to use her callsign in a newsgroup post?

> But, if you wish to further moralize upon this issue, I refer you to
> the ultimate authority, with all sincerity and best wishes:
>
> God, grant me the serenity
> to accept the things I cannot change;
> the courage to change the things I can
> and the wisdom to know the difference

I salute Jim's wisdom in knowing the difference and his courage in changing the things he can.

Dave K8MN

1513. From the Extra question pool: The dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 15:18:03 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <870EX17833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 86289
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

A coaxial cable lying over the peak of a roof is the same length on each side. It weighs one third of a pound per foot. On one end hangs an Extra holding a dipole, and on the other end a weight equal to the weight of the Extra. The dipole weighs two ounces per inch. The cable is as long (in feet) as the age of the Extra (in years), and the weight of the Extra (in ounces) is the same as the age of the Extra's mother. The combined age of the Extra and his mother is seventy years. One half of the weight of the Extra, plus the weight of the dipole, is one forth as much as the weight of the weight and the weight of the cable. The Extra's mother is half as old as the Extra will be when he is three times as old as his mother was when she she was half as old as the Extra will be when when he is as old as his mother will be when she is four times as old as the Extra was when he was twice as old as his mother was when she was one third as old as the Extra was when he was old as his mother was when she was three times as old as the Extra was when he was one fourth as old as he is now.

How long is the dipole?

1514. Great Idea from BoD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 15:39:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QebQb.24751$zj7.16095@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86290

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/22/2/?nc=1At

Good job, guys.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1515. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 15:47:22 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <rhd210h0srsca8f3bnd67duelhdu49nq0a@4ax.com>
Source record: 86291

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 14:42:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> The use of one's own moralistic views and beliefs to deny the rights
>> of another is "inappropriate" too, Jim.
>
>That's an issue you seem unable to sort out for us, "Leo". Which one of
>the new "rights" applies in forcing Jim to use her callsign in a
>newsgroup post?

I'm sorry that you're having difficulty interpreting the generally
accepted concepts of human social interaction, or the precise subject
of my original objection and subsequent discussion on this subject,
"Dave". My intent was to illustrate, not to educate.

>
>> But, if you wish to further moralize upon this issue, I refer you to
>> the ultimate authority, with all sincerity and best wishes:
>>
>> God, grant me the serenity
>> to accept the things I cannot change;
>> the courage to change the things I can
>> and the wisdom to know the difference
>
>I salute Jim's wisdom in knowing the difference and his courage in
>changing the things he can.

Of that I am certain, Dave :)

>
>Dave K8MN

"Never let your sense of morals prevent you from doing what's right."
--Isaac Asimov

73, Leo

1516. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 16:31:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40114C7B.18F9D9A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86292

Leo wrote:
>
> On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 14:42:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >
> >> The use of one's own moralistic views and beliefs to deny the rights
> >> of another is "inappropriate" too, Jim.
> >
> >That's an issue you seem unable to sort out for us, "Leo". Which one of
> >the new "rights" applies in forcing Jim to use her callsign in a
> >newsgroup post?
>
> I'm sorry that you're having difficulty interpreting the generally
> accepted concepts of human social interaction, or the precise subject
> of my original objection and subsequent discussion on this subject,
> "Dave". My intent was to illustrate, not to educate.

Let's be open here, "Leo". You aren't sorry and I'm not having
difficulty. You wrote of denying "rights". I responded to that
comment.
If you didn't really mean "rights", you should have chosen another term.
If you're intent was to illustrate something other than what you stated,
your illustration fails.

> >
> >> But, if you wish to further moralize upon this issue, I refer you to
> >> the ultimate authority, with all sincerity and best wishes:
> >>
> >> God, grant me the serenity
> >> to accept the things I cannot change;
> >> the courage to change the things I can
> >> and the wisdom to know the difference
> >
> >I salute Jim's wisdom in knowing the difference and his courage in
> >changing the things he can.
>
> Of that I am certain, Dave :)

It was kind of you to provide the quote.

Dave K8MN

1517. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 16:44:14 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_9cQb.43621$2L6.27824@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> This day would come, just as I said it would.
>
> Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing
you
> can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> A Time Lord Always wins in the end!

You studied code for 10 years and still are not "coded"?

.....no further comment.

J
>
>

1518. Re: AMATEUR DONATIONS NEEDED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:02:14 UTC
From: JYT <jyt@exjytlic.org>
Message-ID: <burk2f$j1k$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Piss on you LIMARC assholes! I used to travel in your
area on business a lot. You are a bunch of rude lids, and if
anybody is not in your "in crowd," you ignore them on your
repeaters. Moreover, you don't offer an iota of hospitality
on your repeaters to out-of-town hams. You totally ignore
anyone who you don't know and is not a part of your closed
little circle of LIMARC lids. Errrr, what I am trying to
say is FUCK YOU LIMARC assholes!

JYF

"N2ION" <n2ion@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040123092130.20644.00000351@mb-m21.aol.com...
> Long Island Mobile Amateur Radio Club (LIMARC), is looking for DONATIONS
of
> "Ham" gear, like triband beams, rigs, and towers, to be used for our
Emergency
> Communication Stations, and Field Day.
>
> If you have any old equipment that you're not using anymore, and would
like to
> donate it to our cause, we will make sure that you get a nice letter,
being
> that we have 503 c(3) status with the I.R.S. ,for a tax deduction, from
our
> club.
> We really need your help, so please try to assist us in any way that you
can.
>
> Thanks in advance

1519. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:08:11 UTC
From: JYT <jyt@exjytlic.org>
Message-ID: <burkdojmd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86295
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Gastonia, NC = Arm Pit of the Eastern U.S.
Slum dwellers, run down mobile home parks, and
public housing projects.

JYT

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:_9cQb.43621$2L6.27824@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> > My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> > This day would come, just as I said it would.
> >
> > Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing
> you
> > can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm
sure
> > with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
> >
> >
> > Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> > A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
>
>
> You studied code for 10 years and still are not "coded"?
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ....no further comment.
>
>
> J
> >
> >
>
>

1520. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:11:59 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <01k2101qjji6991foj3r553jo3h4n6v81p@4ax.com>
Source record: 86296

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 16:31:56 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 14:42:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>> >
>> >> The use of one's own moralistic views and beliefs to deny the rights
>> >> of another is "inappropriate" too, Jim.
>> >
>> >That's an issue you seem unable to sort out for us, "Leo". Which one of
>> >the new "rights" applies in forcing Jim to use her callsign in a
>> >newsgroup post?
>>
>> I'm sorry that you're having difficulty interpreting the generally
>> accepted concepts of human social interaction, or the precise subject
>> of my original objection and subsequent discussion on this subject,
>> "Dave". My intent was to illustrate, not to educate.
>
>Let's be open here, "Leo".

Um, we weren't being open before, "Dave"? :)

>You aren't sorry and I'm not having difficulty.

I most certainly am, Dave - and you most certainly are!

>>You wrote of denying "rights". I responded to that
>comment.
>If you didn't really mean "rights", you should have chosen another term.
>If you're intent was to illustrate something other than what you stated,
>your illustration fails.

My point, again, is that Kim, as a fellow amateur, has every right to
expect to be treated as an equal by her fellow amateurs. Omitting just
her call in the list was not a fair thing to do . Period. I have
not, and would not, insist that Jim use her call in any of his posts,
as it violates his standards. But, leaving only hers out treated her
as less than equal. Period.

I cannot illustrate the point clearer than that for you, Dave. If you
want me to explain it any simpler than this, I'll have to use crayons
and stick people.

>
>> >
>> >> But, if you wish to further moralize upon this issue, I refer you to
>> >> the ultimate authority, with all sincerity and best wishes:
>> >>
>> >> God, grant me the serenity
>> >> to accept the things I cannot change;
>> >> the courage to change the things I can
>> >> and the wisdom to know the difference
>> >
>> >I salute Jim's wisdom in knowing the difference and his courage in
>> >changing the things he can.
>>
>> Of that I am certain, Dave :)
>
>It was kind of you to provide the quote.

You're very welcome, Dave. I hope you benefited from it in some way!

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

1521. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:15:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <aKudnc1e1ID5yozdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86298

Kim W5TIT the Texas twit wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:Aa2dnS-vlcgdGI3d4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>...and spelling challenged too. Make that 'second' sentence (what the
>>>H$%% is a decond?? I dunno).......
>>>
>>
>>Don't worry about it Leo, anyone who can't spell a word more than one
>>way simply has no imegintion.
>>
>
>
> ROFLMAO!! Hey, Leo? Another irony...!!!!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
It's a joke stupid.

1522. Re: From the Extra question pool: The dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:16:38 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <4-SdnY3x9u2Zyozd4p2dnA@crocker.com>
Source record: 86297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:870EX17833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> A coaxial cable lying over the peak of a roof is the same length on each
side.
> It weighs one third of a pound per foot. On one end hangs an Extra
holding a
> dipole, and on the other end a weight equal to the weight of the Extra.
The
> dipole weighs two ounces per inch. The cable is as long (in feet) as the
age
> of the Extra (in years), and the weight of the Extra (in ounces) is the
same as
> the age of the Extra's mother. The combined age of the Extra and his
mother is
> seventy years. One half of the weight of the Extra, plus the weight of
the
> dipole, is one forth as much as the weight of the weight and the weight of
the
> cable. The Extra's mother is half as old as the Extra will be when he is
three
> times as old as his mother was when she she was half as old as the Extra
will
> be when when he is as old as his mother will be when she is four times as
old
> as the Extra was when he was twice as old as his mother was when she was
one
> third as old as the Extra was when he was old as his mother was when she
was
> three times as old as the Extra was when he was one fourth as old as he is
now.
>
> How long is the dipole?

that can't be from the question pool... they are all multiple guess and you
didn't give me 4 answers with 3 stupid looking ones to throw out!

1523. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:19:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86300

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless someone
> sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.

Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the reference
to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
other reason?

1524. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:21:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4011582F.6000609@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86299

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> I operated on 7.010 and received
>a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
>band for my class of license.
>
>
Was there a fine or some other penalty involved? Or did they understand
that it was an oversight and told them you won't do that again? I once
did a
similar mistake (I was in band for my license but was a wrong mode,
i.e., SSB
in the CW/data segment answering some DX on 40) but soon spotted it
and stopped doing it. Haven't heard anything from the FCC, I think they
know people occasionally make such mistakes. But if someone keeps doing
it then watch out.

1525. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:28:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <401159AE.5040806@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86201

Brian Kelly wrote:

>>
>>
>
>That's incorrect Dan. I was an early '50s kid Novice. The OFs of those
>days more than just occasionally bent over backwards to make sure that
>I knew that I was at the bottom of the totem pole. In retrospect no
>doubt some of it involved the usual compulsive cocky male
>pubescent/male adult conflict which had nothing to do with ham radio.
>
>
I would guess that most of those OFs had nothing better than their ham
license on their
resume. "I am big ham, you a worthless kid".... I don't expect kids
to kiss my ass
like some adults wanted me to when I was a kid. Respect is a 2 way
street.

1526. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:31:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40115A82.5060401@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86202
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

JYT wrote:

>Gastonia, NC = Arm Pit of the Eastern U.S.
>Slum dwellers, run down mobile home parks, and
>public housing projects.
>
>
>
Doesn't compare to Newark NJ or Camden NJ! Talk about toilets...
;-)

Anyway, even I learned code in about a month, and I'm no good at
such motor skill learning tasks.

1527. Re: From the Extra question pool: The dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:32:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40115ACA.6050506@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86203
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>
>How long is the dipole?
>
>
Easy, it's his phone number divided by his address. :-)

1528. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:33:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wVcQb.21140$q4.3388@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike" wrote:
> (snip) Yet, I still would like to
> know where the idea came from
> about grandfathering techs with
> no test.

I think you meant to say no "additional" written test, Mike. I suspect the idea comes from the fact that the current Technician license already allows HF access with the simple addition of the code test. In other words, the current Technician license exam already covers much of the material needed for HF access. Therefore, it makes more sense to grandfather them into a license class with HF access than into one without. Of course, that's just my take on it. If you really want to know why ARRL decided to do so, ask them.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1529. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 17:42:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40115D04.7040507@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>
> What I see as the REAL problem are those "veterans" in the HOBBY
>who have become so obsessed with their own ideas of whom is superior to
>whom that they will deliberately make life on the air miserable for
>anyone who doesn't measure up to their own standards. I think such
>people would be doing much better to offer polite-but-firm correction to
>operating errors, and be willing to SHARE their knowlege as opposed to
>zealously guarding it like some grumpy dragon guarding their hoard.
>
When I got my "extra lite" :-) I made a number of "newbie" type errors,
but soon learned.
What I don't like is when, years before on learning my way around packet
on 2m, I made
some newbie errors and then learned, but some other packet operator
assumed that
I would always make such errors and got banned off his maibox BBS. (I
hadn't distingushed
between private mailboxes and more public BBSs just yet, and posted a
general ham interest
article). A polite but firm correction would have been enough. Turns
out other people
had some problems with him....

>
> You may not like the ARRL for whatever reason. Fine. That's your
>choice (I'm proud to be a 'Lifer' myself). But would you find it so very
>hard to remember and respect "The Amateur's Code" that they publish? It
>dates all the way back to the League's founding, and the days of Hiram
>Percy Maxim (without whom we wouldn't even HAVE Amateur Radio).
>
> Chill out. The only things that will truly kill amateur radio are
>forgetting its origins, WHY we have it today, and more anger and hatred
>at newbies just because they have an easier time getting licensed than
>some of us did.
>
>
>
>

1530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:07:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401231007.789685ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86206

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<buqu9p$i6e@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0401220912.2707111f@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<buoe1p$fj5@library2.airnews.net>...
> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > > news:vcLPb.18937$q4.1844@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > And how would a callsign bring the
> > > > ARS one step closer to extinction?
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > >
> > > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > Simple - by making the ARS seem to be something many people won't
> > want to be a part of - or have their kids be a part of.
>
> It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless someone
> sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.

Others disagree with that. And I think if you really believed it were
"totally
innocuous unless some sat there and thought about it for a bit", you
would
not have chosen it, because you've said it was chosen in part for the
reactions it would get.

> And, if must
> "finally realize" anything about a callsign, then it is definitely because
> they took their own path getting there; not because anyone led them there.

I disagree. The callsign starts them on the path. Otherwise you would
not
have chosen it.

> To make that a bearer's responsibility to "the community of man" is
> ridiculous and I don't wear that

[expletive deleted]

You may refuse to "wear" it, Kim, but communities live and die on how
well
their members accept their responsibilities to the community. One
reason for
so many laws that seem silly or stupid is that they are an attempt to

get
people to take on their responsibilities to the community.

> > Dwight, you previously said you didn't know any parents who would
> > keep their kids out of ham radio over a callsign like Kim's. Well,
> > I know plenty of parents who would not support their kids' being
> > involved in ham radio if their first (or second, or third)
> > impression involved such callsigns.
>
> Then, they'd best just keep their kids out of sports, school, movies,
> churches; in fact, just lock 'em up and keep 'em safe.

Why? In my experience, they will not encounter things like your
callsign
from adults in sports, school, or church. At least not in any of them
that
I have been a part of in the last 10-15 years. Movies are not only
rated
by content but kids under certain ages are not permitted to see
certain
movies because of content - a good example of the community taking
responsibility.

> The responsibility
> of the parent is to teach what is vulgar and what is not.

Not just the parents. (Each child has at least two). It's also the
community's responsibility - meaning everyone in the community.

> My callsign is not vulgar.

Not to you. Others differ on that.

I say it's inappropriate.

> The implication that

[body parts]

> are something to hide, be
> embarrassed about, think of only in a sexual manner, etc., is the vulgar
> act.

Would you then say that they are no different from, say, a hand or a
nose?
Would you say that it's always appropriate to display them, talk about
them,
etc., regardless of the context or the situation? That's where you're
argument
leads.

> > > as someone else pointed out, if a kid derives the word
> > >
> > [word deleted]

> >
> > > from my callsign, it AIN'T because I taught 'em.
> >
> > That's true. A child who has never seen the word won't learn it
> > from your callsign.

> See first sentence above.
>
You mean the one about it being totally innocuous? See my response.
> >
> > But if the child already knows the word, you will have taught him/her
> > something worse. You'll have taught the child that the use of such
> > words in public, and in ham radio, is OK. That it's acceptable behavior.
> > And you've made it that much harder for them to learn appropriate
> > behavior.
> >
>
> See second sentence above.
>
The one about the path? See my response.

> > Kids are influenced by what they see and hear adults doing, even though
> > they will deny such influence. Kids who see adults smoking, drinking
> > irresponsibly, cussing, etc., will be influenced to try the same or
> > similar behaviors themselves *IF* those behaviors in adults are
> > portrayed as acceptable, "fun", glamorous, etc.

>
> And, it is not the responsibility of "the community" to see that a kid
> doesn't learn all that stuff and think it's attractive.

Yes, it is. That's one major reason to be a part of a community - so
that
the next generation can be raised in an environment that passes on the
best of the previous generation's values and standards.

Communities can only exist and thrive if the people in them are better
off
being a part of them, *and* realize and fullfil their responsibilities
to the community, as well as demanding their rights.

> It's the
> responsibility of the parents, family, and anyone personally involved with
> the raising and upbringing of a kid.

How can they do that if the community works against them? It's
everyone's
responsibility, in varying degrees.

> I taught my kids that all "that stuff"
> was all over the place. One of them learned that it was not attractive and
> lives responsibly, one of them thought most of it was great and barely
> accomplishes anything each day. I must have succeeded with one and needed

> to work a lot harder with the other.

You just proved what I'm saying is valid.

It's clear that they were both exposed to things that were
inappropriate or even
potentially harmful, but one was able to resist and the other wasn't.

Here's an analogy:

Almost everyone has an "Aunt Edna" who has smoked three packs of
Camels a day since he was 12 and who is now hale and healthy in his
90s. And almost everyone also has an "Uncle Bill" who passed away at a
young age from a combination of health problems brought about by
smoking. A lot of people - particularly smokers - remember Aunt Edna
and forget all about Uncle Bill. Some even claim
that Aunt Edna somehow proves that smoking isn't that bad for you.

But what the Aunt Edna/Uncle Bill story proves is that a few people
are very
resistant to, and a few others very susceptible to, health problems
caused by smoking. And most people are somewhere in the middle. More
important, you can't tell ahead of time who is going to wind up like
Aunt Edna and who is going to wind up like Uncle Bill. So the
intelligent, reasonable, logical, human thing to do is to act as if
everyone has Uncle Bill's susceptibility, not Aunt Edna's resistance.

> They *both* saw the same "community."

No, they did not. Communities are constantly changing. I suspect what
really happened was that one was simply more resistant to certain
things and the other more susceptible.

> > I recall quite clearly how, as a teenager, I and my peers were subjected
> > to lectures on the evils of illegal drugs like marijuana, LSD, speed,
> > 'ludes, etc. Those lectures were not very convincing when delivered by
> > adults who needed two cups of coffee in the morning to get started, a few
> > beers or manhattans in the evening to slow down, and cigarettes all day to
> > keep going. Same principle applies in any subject - if Coach emphasizes
> > fair play and following the rules over winning at any cost, the team is
> > much more likely to learn that lesson.
>
> That's a copout--to ignore the advice of someone because of what they are
> doing.

No, it isn't! Regardless, it's what kids do. Kids see such behaviors
as hypocrisy on the part of the lecturer - and their right, because
the 'adult' is really saying "Do as I say, not as I do".

Would *you* accept "Do as I say, not as I do".

> I'd much rather take advice from someone who's been through what
> they are preaching against than someone who's never been there.

The adults were preaching against stuff they hadn't done (smoke
grass). Their argument was against "using drugs as a crutch" and told
how they were "bad for you" and "addicting" - while they themselves
ingested substances that were all those things.

> The phrase "lead by example" has some truth to it.

Exactly! Adults must set the example of how to live responsibly.

> But the phrase "learn from the
> mistakes of others" has much more weight, in my opinion.

That's fine when it's about things like falling off a ladder. Not when
it's about things that appear to be "fun". And not when the lecturer
keeps on making the mistakes.

> Here, you were
> sitting right there listening to those lecturers preaching against the evils
> as they partook in something you believed was evil and you still ignored the
> value they taught--or at least devalued it, it looks like.

That's *exactly* how *kids* think! Once they detect "do as I say, not
as I do",
they use the adult's behavior as an excuse. That's not mature, adult
reasoning, but it's what many if not most kids do - particularly when
someone is telling them not to do something that they think might be a
lot of fun.

You cannot always treat children as if they are adults in smaller
bodies. To do so is inappropriate and potentially very harmful.

> > >*Anyone* who thinks
> > > kids are still that innocent these days, has not been on a schoolyard or
> > > listening in on kids' conversations when they think no one is
> > > around--and
> > > I've even heard Kindergartners speaking of some pretty risque topics.
> >
> > But that does *not* mean it doesn't matter what adults say and do in their
> > presence, or in public! The mere fact that you have to listen in when
> > they don't know you're there means the kids are learning that not all
> > behavior is appropriate in all contexts.
>
> The good work of their parents, no doubt.

And their community.

> Pfftt.

What does that mean? Would you rather have them talk that way all the
time, in all contexts?

> With regard to

[body parts]

> they can be a work of art, a tool of health, the target of the expression of
> love, or represent some evil, twisted, sense of wrongdoing.

Yep - it all depends on the context. In some contexts their
appropriate, in others their not.

A thumb is usually innocuous. A nose is usually innocuous. Thumbing
one's nose isn't.

> I choose the
> beauty of

[body parts]

.--not the twisted logic. It's exactly like nude art. I
> would never gasp at a child looking at a nude statue, or painting, or photo,
> etc. I would ask them what they found beautiful.

It's not about gasping. It's about what is appropriate. Is it
appropriate for children to see each other naked? Naked adults? To let
adults see them naked? All depends on the context. For example, health
care is a different context
than trying on clothes.
>
> > Same principle as teaching them it's OK to pull their pants down in the
> > bathroom or doctor's office, but *not* OK to do in public! Even though
> > everyone knows what's under their clothes, what those body parts are
> > called, etc.
> >
>
> It's your expression of "those body parts" that, to someone like me, worries
> me.

Why?

> Those body parts are to be spoken of, not hidden in some closet because
> they are horrible.

They're not "horrible". They're PRIVATE.

>"Those" body parts can be beautiful or dangerous, and
> both must be recognized. When someone is pulling their pants down at the
> doctor--it is quite OK, at least one would think; when someone is pulling
> their pants down in public--it is quite not OK.

Why? It's the same action, isn't it? The same beautiful body parts
that you say must be spoken of, right?

Could it be that what may be appropriate in the doctor's office is not
usually appropriate in public?

> However, in the right
> circumstances both could be exactly the opposite. If a doctor--and this has
> been done--is about to rape someone, then it's evil.

Of course. But that's not the point. The action described is only
appropriate in a doctor's office if it's medically required.

> And, I can think of
> nothing better I would love to do to someone like Saddam Hussein, than to
> moon him with a thousand milliion asses; or even just one: mine.

Again, an extreme that proves *my* point.
>
> > > Sad but true.
> > >
> > The reason it's like that is the failure of adults to act appropriately.

> Yep. You're exactly right.

Well, there you have it.

> However, it seems that your "act appropriately"
> and mine are two entirely different things.

I sure hope so!

> And, I'm done--sigh, once
> again--discussing my callsign.

Maybe.

> It's valid, it's beautiful, it's fun, it's
> mine.

That's your opinion. Here's mine:

It's inappropriate for the ARS.

It helps the ARS move one step closer to extinction.

Period.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1531. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:11:06 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86207

In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has never
>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea for
>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
>>decide to do anything at all.
>>
>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!

>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue came
>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech Pluses to
>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no
>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their database.

>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>everybody's time.

>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.

>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)

>73 de Jim, N2EY

I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer. Rather, it is just one of
the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

1532. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:17:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6zdQb.21185$q4.3117@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86208

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Dwight, you previously said you didn't
> know any parents who would keep
> their kids out of ham radio over a
> callsign like Kim's. Well, I know plenty
> of parents who would not support their
> kids' being involved in ham radio if their
> first (or second, or third) impression
> involved such callsigns. (snip)

Really? Can you show even one example of someone who has kept their kid out of Amateur Radio because of Kim's callsign, or any of the callsigns I've listed over the last couple of days? I haven't seen one person of the child rearing age group voice a single complaint about this in this newsgroup. Instead, I see old men, some too old to even have young, impressionable, grandkids, in a newsgroup acting like hearing the word "tit" was the shock of their life. I'm not buying it, Jim. This whole debate has a ring of false indignation around it. Kim's callsign is only as vulgar as you, the person hearing it, makes it. I don't think tits are vulgar, and I hope kids don't think that (if they do, someone certainly failed to educate them properly).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1533. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:32:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iNdQb.21192$q4.1080@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86209

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Both you and Dwight must lead
> sheltered lives. More people use
> the word "tit" in the derogatory,
> vulgar manner than use it in the
> neutral, clinical (snip)

You're absolutely right, Dee. I do live in an environment where tits, breasts, and other words to describe the human body are not outright, and immediately, derogatory or vulgar - only a certain context makes them so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1534. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:35:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OPdQb.21193$q4.10478@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86210

"Leo" wrote:
>
> Well said, Dwight!

As was intended. Thank you, Leo.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1535. Re: Great Idea from BoD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:36:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401231036.61777776@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86211

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<QebQb.24751$zj7.16095@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/22/2/?nc=1At
>
> Good job, guys.

Yupper.

I'd add a piece: A searchable ARRL web page(s) which lists all
available mentors/Elmers, their locales, and experience/interests. A
sort of mini-QRZ.com anybody could dip into for help.

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

1536. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 18:38:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fSdQb.21197$q4.451@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86212

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> With all that pure dielectric around,
> it is a wonder that the Puritans can
> conduct themselves properly...enough
> to get a circulating electric current. :-)

LOL! One of your best yet, Len.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1537. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 19:00:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nbeQb.21234$q4.2608@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86213
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:8701887833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> On 22 Jan 2004 12:19:26 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> > "Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701FUD7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> > > On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 22:00:25 GMT, Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the
Incentive
> > > > > License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the
idea of
> > > > the FCC.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > Learn *your* history. It was the ARRL which first proposed incentive
> > > licensing.
> > >
> > > From http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html:
> > >
> > > "In summary, although the vast number of hams were satisfied, a small
> > > minority had complaints. And the ARRL listened. In 1963, acting on
> > > complaints they claim they received from members and operators in
> > > other countries, the ARRL proposed "Incentive Licensing." In an
> > > editorial, the ARRL implied that perhaps it was a mistake when the
> > > Class B and Generals were given the 75 and 20 meter phone segments.
> > > The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be restored
> > > to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the Generals
> > > an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that in
> > > order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the
> > > General class hams."
> >
> > Unfortunately, that's not quite how it happened.
> >
> > FCC thought that hams would go for the Extra after 1953 simply
> > "because it

> > was there". And some did - but not many. ...
>
> Please cite references. I have before me two historical accounts
> which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
> licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
> it. Web pages such as "The Wayback Machine" also agree that the
> League first proposed the changes which were finally implemented in
> 1967.
>
> In fact, http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page14.html goes on to say:
>
> "On May 3, 1963, the ARRL Board of Directors adopted their official
> position on incentive licensing. Their proposal would completely take
> away all General and Conditional class phone privileges on 75, 40, 20,
> and 15 meters in a two-year phase-in period. In other words, the
> ARRL's incentive licensing would only allow HF phone operation for
> Generals and Conditionals on 10 meters and on the small sliver of 160
> meters that was available in the days of LORAN Radionavigation. The
> ARRL also suggested reopening the Advanced class license again to
> those who held a General or Conditional license for one year.
> Strangely, the ARRL did not suggest that Extras be given exclusive
> frequencies, nor did they propose exclusive CW frequencies. Rather,
> they just wanted exclusive access to the 75 through 15-meter phone
> segments for the Advanced and Extra class licenses ..."
>
> Based on all of these items, it appears to me that your account could
> well be someone's revisionist history. I can find nothing in the
> literature to support it, but can easily find material which refutes
> it.

Thank you for all the refrences. I also 'remember' it that way. As I stated to Dee D in another post.

73

Dan/W4NTI

1538. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 19:06:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <FgeQb.21240$q4.7658@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86214

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:4011582F.6000609@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > I operated on 7.010 and received
> >a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
> >band for my class of license.
> >
> >
> Was there a fine or some other penalty involved? Or did they understand
> that it was an oversight and told them you won't do that again? I once
> did a
> similar mistake (I was in band for my license but was a wrong mode,
> i.e., SSB
> in the CW/data segment answering some DX on 40) but soon spotted it
> and stopped doing it. Haven't heard anything from the FCC, I think they
> know people occasionally make such mistakes. But if someone keeps doing
> it then watch out.
>
Since you asked....I called the office in Cleveland that issued the notice.
During the conversation I was asked 'where have you been not to know of this
change?', or something to that effect. My response was that I had just got
back from Nam and wanted to play radio again. The notice was thrown out,
no fines or warnings other than to use a higher crystal..hi.

Dan/W4NTI

1539. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 19:10:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ykeQb.33348$P%1.26214464@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86215
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:nbeQb.21234$q4.2608@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
> news:8701887833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> > On 22 Jan 2004 12:19:26 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> > > "Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
> news:<8701FUD7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> > > > On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 22:00:25 GMT, Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the
> Incentive
> > > > > > License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely
the
> idea of
> > > > > the FCC.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > > > Learn *your* history. It was the ARRL which first proposed
incentive
> > > > licensing.
> > > >
> > > > From http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html:
> > > >
> > > > "In summary, although the vast number of hams were satisfied, a
small
> > > > minority had complaints. And the ARRL listened. In 1963, acting on
> > > > complaints they claim they received from members and operators in
> > > > other countries, the ARRL proposed "Incentive Licensing." In an
> > > > editorial, the ARRL implied that perhaps it was a mistake when the
> > > > Class B and Generals were given the 75 and 20 meter phone segments.
> > > > The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be
restored
> > > > to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the
Generals

> > > > an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that
in
> > > > order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the
> > > > General class hams."
> > >
> > > Unfortunately, that's not quite how it happened.
> > >
> > > FCC thought that hams would go for the Extra after 1953 simply
> > > "because it
> > > was there". And some did - but not many. ...
> >
> > Please cite references. I have before me two historical accounts
> > which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
> > licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
> > it. Web pages such as "The Wayback Machine" also agree that the
> > League first proposed the changes which were finally implemented in
> > 1967.
> >
> > In fact, http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page14.html goes on to say:
> >
> > "On May 3, 1963, the ARRL Board of Directors adopted their official
> > position on incentive licensing. Their proposal would completely take
> > away all General and Conditional class phone privileges on 75, 40, 20,
> > and 15 meters in a two-year phase-in period. In other words, the
> > ARRL's incentive licensing would only allow HF phone operation for
> > Generals and Conditionals on 10 meters and on the small sliver of 160
> > meters that was available in the days of LORAN Radionavigation. The
> > ARRL also suggested reopening the Advanced class license again to
> > those who held a General or Conditional license for one year.
> > Strangely, the ARRL did not suggest that Extras be given exclusive
> > frequencies, nor did they propose exclusive CW frequencies. Rather,
> > they just wanted exclusive access to the 75 through 15-meter phone
> > segments for the Advanced and Extra class licenses ..."
> >
> > Based on all of these items, it appears to me that your account could
> > well be someone's revisionist history. I can find nothing in the
> > literature to support it, but can easily find material which refutes
> > it.
>
> Thank you for all the refrences. I also 'remember' it that way. As I
> stated to Dee D in another post.
>
> 73
>

I too appreciate the detailed references. Facts are always good to have. I
was unaware that the initial concept was put out by the ARRL. I was looking
only at the final version that the FCC developed, which was substantially
different than the ARRL's proposal and which the ARRL then opposed due to
these significant differences.

FYI, in conversation, I prefer Dee rather than Dee D even though I use more formal signature.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1540. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 19:21:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iveQb.21256$q4.15379@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86216
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:ykeQb.33348$P%1.26214464@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

> I too appreciate the detailed references. Facts are always good to have.
I
> was unaware that the initial concept was put out by the ARRL. I was
looking
> only at the final version that the FCC developed, which was substantially
> different than the ARRL's proposal and which the ARRL then opposed due to
> these significant differences.
>
> FYI, in conversation, I prefer Dee rather than Dee D even though I use
more
> formal signature.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Thats what I like about you Dee, your ability to recognize constructive
comments and not fly off the handle.

Dan/W4NTI

1541. Re: Great Idea from BoD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 19:32:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <401176B4.5000707@psu.edu>
Source record: 86217

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/22/2/?nc=1At
>
> Good job, guys.

Yes, it IS a good idea. I'll make sure we discuss it at the next board meeting.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1542. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:04:25 UTC
From: Dummy Load <License@CBers.org>
Message-ID: <40117dab$0$10674$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86218
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in
news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net:

> Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be
> nothing you can do to stop it. I am so happy.

Ten-Four on that Good-Buddy!! :-)

1543. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:11:12 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040123151112.767$uw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 86219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Dummy Load <License@CBers.org> wrote:
> "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in
> news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net:
>
> > Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be
> > nothing you can do to stop it. I am so happy.
>
> Ten-Four on that Good-Buddy!! :-)
>
"Can ya hear me now?..Good."

1544. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:28:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ktfQb.25026$zj7.6106@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86220

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

| > That's the problem though, isn't it? What we need is the statute,
not the
| > rules, which prove nothing in the absence of Novice testing.
|
| So if I understand your view, you'd like to see a statute as proof
that
| the statute does not exist. Does that sum it up?

It's clear he doesn't wish to be confused with any facts which spoil his
rant.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1545. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:29:10 UTC
From: n2ah@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <774a2c02.0401231229.7d062d59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tom W" wrote:

> In fact, http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page14.html goes on to say:
>
> "On May 3, 1963, the ARRL Board of Directors adopted their official
> position on incentive licensing. Their proposal would completely take
> away all General and Conditional class phone privileges on 75, 40, 20,
> and 15 meters in a two-year phase-in period. In other words, the
> ARRL's incentive licensing would only allow HF phone operation for
> Generals and Conditionals on 10 meters and on the small sliver of 160
> meters that was available in the days of LORAN Radionavigation.

Great article! Thanks for posting that link. I learned a few things I never knew before. (I was just starting to get interested in radio in 1963.)

It's amazing that ham radio has survived at all when you consider how much needless tinkering with the license structure has gone on over the years, and how much discontent it has created.

Art Harris N2AH

1546. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:33:37 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94799E3861B38elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86222

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:ktfQb.25026$zj7.6106 @newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
>
>| > That's the problem though, isn't it? What we need is the statute,
>| > not the rules, which prove nothing in the absence of Novice testing.
>|
>| So if I understand your view, you'd like to see a statute as proof
>| that the statute does not exist. Does that sum it up?
>
> It's clear he doesn't wish to be confused with any facts which spoil his
> rant.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
```

Not atall. I just haven't seen anything convincing.

1547. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:34:58 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <1zfQb.4444$L04.344@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86223
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bonzi" <s@asds.com> wrote in message
news:7u01101itf7h33s9rkihvf7hm6qlj9edrf@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 08:23:39 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
> <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
> >My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> >This day would come, just as I said it would.
> >
> >Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing
you
> >can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> >with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
> >
> >
> >Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> >A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
> >
> How you going to get a signal out of that HUD apartment, fatboy?

STFU, you nerd!

(Now go and see Roger Wiseman over the Shipwreck lounge, I hear you and him
had a good time last week)

1548. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:36:05 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <4AfQb.4448$L04.1193@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:_0fPb.16899$q4.4613@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Yes LLLlllloooooyyyyyddddddd, please, OH PLEASE come to HF. I'll be
> waiting.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan,

My fights are no longer with you.

Why keep it up?

Lloyd

1549. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:38:45 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <40118654.E396D26B@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 86225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd, Lloyd... how do I get that Lordship? Gots to have it!

Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD wrote:

> "Bonzi" <s@asds.com> wrote in message
> news:7u01101itf7h33s9rkihvf7hm6qlj9edrf@4ax.com...
> > On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 08:23:39 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
> > <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
> >
> > >My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long years.
> > >This day would come, just as I said it would.
> > >
> > >Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be nothing
> you
> > >can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm sure
> > >with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
> > >
> > >
> > >Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> > >A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
> > >
> > How you going to get a signal out of that HUD apartment, fatboy?
>
> STFU, you nerd!
>
> (Now go and see Roger Wiseman over the Shipwreck lounge, I hear you and him
> had a good time last week)

1550. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 20:55:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40118A3F.9000304@psu.edu>
Source record: 86226

Leo wrote:

> My point, again, is that Kim, as a fellow amateur, has every right to
> expect to be treated as an equal by her fellow amateurs. Omitting just
> her call in the list was not a fair thing to do . Period. I have
> not, and would not, insist that Jim use her call in any of his posts,
> as it violates his standards. But, leaving only hers out treated her
> as less than equal. Period.

Leo, what about those that don't want to play the game? Kim stated in her post of 05/23/2000:

<From Kim's post>

Kim> Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the call?
Kim> The fact that it would get the attention of the male ego...just as it has.
Kim> And that's all. No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
Kim> thoughts the three letters t-i-t would have on the male persona.

Back to me:

Sooooo, you and Jim and all the others carrying on with this simply allows Kim to achieve her stated goal. She's cast the line, and quite frankly, you all have swallowed the hook gut deep.

While we are being frank, I must commend Kim for what is a permanent, and apparently irresistible troll. There is no doubt that this one subject may overtake the Morse code subject if Kim hangs around here long enough!

And although it would appear that Kim says that her callsign is not based on some body parts, earlier in the same post she writes:

Kim> I told them one day about how virtually boring they were being and couldn't
Kim> they come up with *anything* but initials! Well, the first sarcastic remark
Kim> was a question about what I would get if I were to get a vanity callsign. I
Kim> was actually in deep thought, as one of them keyed up and said that my
Kim> vanity was in my chest so how could "we" come up with a callsign that would
Kim> be related to that? HA! I keyed up and simply told them, that I would get
Kim> K5TIT if I could.

Back to me:

There it is. Kim might be better able to explain the difference, I read it as a body part related to the chest, but it doesn't matter. The callsign is a troll regardless of whether it refers to body parts or small birds. (Tifted tutmouses) 8^). And Kim enjoys better success with it than Lenover21 does with his "designed to engage" posts.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1551. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 21:00:28 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <LXfQb.9373$v05.6943@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 86227
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

I don't think a batch of newcomers can unleash any more unholy blasphemy onto the HF bands then what has already been said and done.

Most of the conversations I've heard on HF sound like rowdy barroom talk or a bunch old maids sitting around on deflated hemorrhoid cushions complaining about poor health and cat food.

1552. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 21:30:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <w5SdnU2B9ZiUCIzdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86229

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>>Both you and Dwight must lead
>>sheltered lives. More people use
>>the word "tit" in the derogatory,
>>vulgar manner than use it in the
>>neutral, clinical (snip)
>
>
>
> You're absolutely right, Dee. I do live in an environment where tits,
> breasts, and other words to describe the human body are not outright, and
> immediately, derogatory or vulgar - only a certain context makes them so.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

And in kim's case, where the callsign was choosen specifically to get a
reaction to the word "tit", that puts it in that context.

1553. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 21:38:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZugQb.25152$zj7.14293@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86228

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

< Not atall. I just haven't seen anything convincing.

With all due respect, you're the one that advanced the notion that Barry Goldwater had authored some legislation the give Novices free examinations, but have no evidence of that other than you "read something". Strike #1.

The FCC rules allow ALL exams to be free, so there'd be no need for a separate legislation to give free exams to Novice applicants. Strike #2.

There is media evidence contemporary to the era which shows one VEC trying to persuade the FCC to REQUIRE all other VEC's to charge a fee for the Novice exam. Strike #3.

Looks to me that YOU'RE the one who needs to show US something "convincing".

Good luck on this one now.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1554. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 22:02:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <db33101hred2eu05c31j8iod5qra1jbm63@4ax.com>
Source record: 86230

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 15:55:27 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> My point, again, is that Kim, as a fellow amateur, has every right to
>> expect to be treated as an equal by her fellow amateurs. Omitting just
>> her call in the list was not a fair thing to do . Period. I have
>> not, and would not, insist that Jim use her call in any of his posts,
>> as it violates his standards. But, leaving only hers out treated her
>> as less than equal. Period.
>
> Leo, what about those that don't want to play the game? Kim stated in
>her post of 05/23/2000:
>
><From Kim's post>
>
>Kim> Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the
>call?
>Kim> The fact that it would get the attention of the male ego...just as
>it has.
>Kim> And that's all. No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
>Kim> thoughts the three letters t-i-t would have on the male persona.
>
>Back to me:
>
> Sooooo, you and Jim and all the others carrying on with this simply
>allows Kim to achieve her stated goal. She's cast the line, and quite
>frankly, you all have swallowed the hook gut deep.
>
> While we are being frank, I must commend Kim for what is a permanent,
>and apparently irresistible troll. There is no doubt that this one
>subject may overtake the Morse code subject if Kim hangs around here
>long enough!
>
>
>And although it would appear that Kim says that her callsign is not
>based on some body parts, earlier in the same post she writes:
>
>Kim> I told them one day about how virtually boring they were being and
>couldn't
>Kim> they come up with *anything* but initials! Well, the first
>sarcastic remark
>Kim> was a question about what I would get if I were to get a vanity
>callsign. I

>Kim> was actually in deep thought, as one of them keyed up and said that my
>Kim> vanity was in my chest so how could "we" come up with a callsign
>that would
>Kim> be related to that? HA! I keyed up and simply told them, that I
>would get
>Kim> K5TIT if I could.
>
>Back to me:
>
> There it is. Kim might be better able to explain the difference, I read
>it as a body part related to the chest, but it doesn't matter. The
>callsign is a troll regardless of whether it refers to body parts or
>small birds. (Tifted tutmouses) 8^). And Kim enjoys better success with
>it than Lenover21 does with his "designed to engage" posts.

Tifted tutmouses? I think I saw one of them last summer!

Mike, you may well be correct in your analysis - a callsign such as that one could well be used in many different ways (troll being one of them). Troll itself has different connotations - it could be an icebreaker ,convesation starter, or usenet WMD - depending on its use, and the actions of the user.

My arguement has from the beginning focussed on a very specific part of this overall issue - the exclusion of only one call from a list, while leaving the others intact. The reason being - if the folks who complain so vehemently here believe that Kim's call/behaviour/language/whatever are obscene, inappropriate, high in transfats or otherwise detrimental to the sanctity of the group, then the appropriate thing to do would be to ignore or killfile her, and be done with it. Why would anyone wilfully and intentionally annoy her by intentionally removing her call from each post time and time again? Unless there are other agendas....like to elicit a predictable reaction, perhaps.....

I suspect that some of the folks here are using the issue of her call as a springboard to voice their pedantic, didactic, sanctimonious, gynomammarophobic [that last one's a Leo word :)] and occasionally bombastic beliefs and viewpoints. The net result is similar to pouring gasoline on a fire - Kim responds in defense, ups the ante, and the PDSG&OB gang goes at her for another round, etc. etc. A chain reaction, in the truest sense.

The only reason that I personally have continued with this for so long is to attempt to stick with and get across my original point. Which ain't easy, given the back and forth exchanges between Kim and the boys since this thread began......and the countless attempts to divert attention from it off onto related (and easily defended) issues.

Anywho, my philosophy is that if you treat someone fairly and they behave inappropriately, you have a good reason to fault them for it. If, on the other hand, you pi&& them off first and get them good and

angry, you forfeit that "hey, I'm innocent!" defense - and share in the blame.

Trolled? Perhaps! But I really don't recall Kim doing anything incorrect or inappropriate at the outset of this, other than the reediting of Jim's posts - she seems to have simply wanted to be treated equally as an amateur. Mike, I believe that you yourself redid the pool to reduce it to all first names at one point - an intelligent and compromising way to diffuse the situation. But diffused it would not be (and not beacuse of Kim's actions...) - so here we are.

Forgetting for the purpose of this issue the past - um - interchanges on this subject between Kim and the resident keepers of order and decorum in this forum, the gross anatomy lessons came later....when this thread was already running hot!

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

1555. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 22:06:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401231406.203c7507@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86231

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040121164302.15923.00003341@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <5ujr00tcqhfs22tceeo1jjf72119nl3tej@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>

> >Much appreciated!
>
> If you need some links, let me know...preferrably in private...that
> way it isn't messed up by the hecklers. :-)

Of course, "in private", Lennie...

What's "surprising" here?

An "anonymous" poster appears to "support" Lennie, and Lennie
"replies" to several of his posts by re-quoting the entie post without
comment.

Uh huh...Proabably first cousing to "MegHz", and "Harvey the
Rabbit", among others.

Lennie's slipping, folks...Let's bid him adieu while he's still
"aware" enough of his surroundings to appreciate it.

Steve, K4YZ

1556. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 22:08:03 UTC
From: Jud Blowmaster <jud@jerkmeter.org>
Message-ID: <bus5vslba0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Looks like N2EY needs to get his "facts" together.

Jud Blowmaster

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401221219.6a11a473@posting.google.com...
> "Tom W" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701FUD7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> > On Wed, 21 Jan 2004 22:00:25 GMT, Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > "google blogger" <nasa3dave@wans.net> wrote in message
> > > news:e4f3b$400e7ca9$d1cc7cd3$8059@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > > >
> > > > Looks like the Ivy League also has **finally** realized that the
Incentive
> > > > License disaster of the 1960's pretty much trashed ham radio.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Learn your history. ARRL fought that proposal. That was solely the
idea of
> > > the FCC.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > Learn *your* history. It was the ARRL which first proposed incentive
> > licensing.
> >
> > From http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html:
> >
> > "In summary, although the vast number of hams were satisfied, a small
> > minority had complaints. And the ARRL listened. In 1963, acting on
> > complaints they claim they received from members and operators in
> > other countries, the ARRL proposed "Incentive Licensing." In an
> > editorial, the ARRL implied that perhaps it was a mistake when the
> > Class B and Generals were given the 75 and 20 meter phone segments.
> > The ARRL's stand was now clear. Exclusive frequencies must be restored
> > to the Advanced and Extra class amateurs in order to give the Generals
> > an "incentive" to upgrade. Of course, what was left unsaid was that in
> > order to do so, frequencies would have to be taken away from the
> > General class hams."
>
> Unfortunately, that's not quite how it happened.
>
> FCC thought that hams would go for the Extra after 1953 simply

> "because it
> was there". And some did - but not many.
>
> As early as 1958, FCC asked why there were so few Extras. They were
> concerned about certain trends in amateur radio they didn't care
> for, such as increasing use of manufactured equipment whose inner
> workings the ham-owner had only a vague concept of.
>
> FCC asked ARRL for proposals in 1958, and again in 1963. ARRL put
> together a
> very simple proposal in 1963, *in response to* FCC's request. It
> consisted
> of just two items:
>
> 1) Reopen the Advanced class license to new applicants (it had been
> closed
> at the end of 1952)
>
> 2) Require an Advanced or Extra class license to use 'phone on the 80,
> 40,
> 20 and 15 meter ham bands. (back then 30, 17 and 12 meters were not
> ham bands).
>
> That was the whole proposal. No additional code testing would be
> needed to
> retain full privileges. No subbands-by-license-class except those
> already
> in place for Novices. No new limitations on CW. Existing Advanceds
> wouldn't have to do a thing. Existing Generals and Conditionals would
> have to take
> one additional written test to get their 80 thru 15 'phone privileges
> back.
>
> This proposal was nothing new - it was essentially a return to the old
> "ABC" system that had existed from the mid '30s to February 1953, and
> which FCC
> had revised in 1951 by adding Novice, Tech and Extra and renaming the
> ABC classes of license.
>
> The 1963 ARRL proposal got an RM number and the commentary began...
>
> FCC looked at that simple proposal, and then asked for more. They got
> quite
> a bit of response from the amateur committee, and at least 10 of the
> proposals were assigned RM numbers. There were at least 11 proposals
> with
> RM numbers by 1965.
>
> Commentary to ARRL was mixed, to say the least, but a slight majority
> were

> in favor of "incentive licensing" changes. ARRL and FCC took that as a
> mandate...
>
> Out of all these proposals FCC put together ideas and came up with a
> proposed
> scheme that bore little resemblance to the 1963 ARRL proposal. It was
> far more
> draconian, restrictive and encompassing than anything ARRL proposed,
> and was strongly opposed. Finally a compromise was announced in 1967.
>
> Over 6000 comments were received by FCC on the matter, even though the
> number
> of hams back then was less than a quarter million and there were no
> online
> comment systems. The whole process took years (1963-1967).
>
> Most hams then and today are not aware that FCC asked first. But they
> did.
>
> And I'll ask the question again:
>
> How did incentive licensing "trash ham radio"?
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1557. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 23:21:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401231521.5adee5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86233

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<400F2B9B.EAA76DD7@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40096083.8796BBBB@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > Why not admit that you fall short of being able to read and understand?
> >
> > At the end of the day, we learn that only Dave has understanding and
> > everyone else has problems.
>
> Not really. All we've learned is that someone who isn't sure of his
> name believes that he is "everyone else".
>
> Dave K8MN

He does? He doesn't believe that he is Kim, he doesn't believe that
he is Mike, he doesn't believe that he is Len. He doesn't believe
that he is Leo.

But Dave still has problems relating to other people.

1558. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 23:34:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401231534.6d2f0ff8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86234
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401200338.67a31d70@posting.google.com>...
> "Tom Winston" <address.masked@for.no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701BA78IE33.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> > On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> > >
> > > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
> >
> > That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
> > passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
> > Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
> > -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.
>
> Uhhhh...in what universe?
>
> The only "Advanced" class licensees that I know of that took an
> Extra written test but didn't upgrade were one's who failed the 20WPM.

Then he didn't pass the Extra exam.

1559. Re: Don't work the legal ones, work the bootleggers!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 23:46:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401231546.4306e3ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86235

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<400F2C49.A4BF2789@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
>
> > I know about you, Dave.
>
> It would be difficult to accept this one. From your previous posts, it
> isn't clear that you know much about anything.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ah, more smugness.

You don't have to accept it. Your acceptance or rejection alters nothing.

Thinking that it does is just smug.

1560. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-23 23:57:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401231557.49982caa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86236

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<zUbPb.20566$zj7.13000@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
> > We'll mark you down with Dave as knowingly and willingly working
> > stations out of band.
>
> Dear Willy Weeper,
>
> Mark me down as the spirit moves you. It was a dump huck trolling
> question from someone without the balls to even identify himself, and I
> delight in toying with idiots like that.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: Just to reinforce my previous answers, and to dispell your
> deliberate lies above, I have never operated an amateur station outside
> the allocations granted in Part 97. I have no knowledge of the
> allocations of French amateurs, so I cannot comment on whether all
> French stations that I've worked have obeyed the rules of their
> administration. For further details on this matter, see
> http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

Hansel, you were asked IF you would knowingly work an amateur that was
out of band. You were not asked if you knew what the French amateur
allocations were.

Your reply indicates that, YES, you would knowingly work another
amateur if he were out of band.

Would you like to change your answer at this time?

Thanks

1561. Re: Little Billy Beeper/no confusion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:00:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401231600.53f73142@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86237

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401201436.5494fd5e@posting.google.com>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<zUbPb.20566$zj7.13000@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
> >
> > > We'll mark you down with Dave as knowingly and willingly working
> > > stations out of band.
> >
> > Dear Willy Weeper,
> >
> > Mark me down as the spirit moves you. It was a
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> > trolling
> > question from someone without the
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> > to even identify himself, and I
> > delight in toying with idiots like that.
> >
> Aw, c'mon, Hans - even I could tell in the very first post
> who "William" is.

His name is "Brian" and he tires of having his normal e-mail account
rendered useless by spambots.

1562. Re: Little Billy Beeper seems confused

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:05:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401231605.3ea611db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86238

danielmorlan@yahoo.com (Daniel J. Morlan) wrote in message
news:<a7dee37b.0401201250.394eceb@posting.google.com>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fmXOb.19588$zj7.18688@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
> >
> > <
> > < I understand that you would -knowingly- work a ham out of band.
> > <
> >
> > Dear Little Billy Beeper,
> >
> > Does Captain Code know you're working us here? (Go to
> > http://www.handiham.org/local/blind/beeper.txt for details.)
> >
> > I will not go out of my band allocation to work anyone, but I will work
> > anyone with an amateur radio callsign who calls me inside my band
> > allocations.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> I hope that was meant to be funny. I laughed off my hind quarters.
> DJM

No, Dan, no laughing matter. He was serious about working other
amateurs out of band.

73, Brian

1563. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:26:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123192622.05957.00000123@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86241

In article <6zdQb.21185$q4.3117@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Dwight, you previously said you didn't
>> know any parents who would keep
>> their kids out of ham radio over a
>> callsign like Kim's. Well, I know plenty
>> of parents who would not support their
>> kids' being involved in ham radio if their
>> first (or second, or third) impression
>> involved such callsigns. (snip)
>
>
> Really? Can you show even one example of someone who has kept their kid
>out of Amateur Radio because of Kim's callsign, or any of the callsigns I've
>listed over the last couple of days?

Nope. I do know parents who would steer their kids away
if they knew, though.

> haven't seen one person of the child
>rearing age group voice a single complaint about this in this newsgroup.

Yes, you have.

>Instead, I see old men, some too old to even have young, impressionable,
>grandkids,

How do you know how old somebody's grandchildren or children are, Dwight?

How old are these "old men"?

> in a newsgroup acting like hearing the word

[word deleted]

>was the shock of their life.

Well, that leaves me out. I'm not shocked by it at all. Heard it plenty of
times.
In fact, years ago National Lampoon did a canonical list of the various slang
names for certain body parts. Ran to hundreds of words.

I simply say it's inappropriate for ham radio, that's all.

Do you think it's appropriate?

>I'm not buying it, Jim. This whole debate has a ring of false
>indignation around it. Kim's callsign is only as vulgar as you, the person
>hearing it, makes it.

Have I *ever* said it was vulgar?

>I don't think

[word deleted]

>are vulgar, and I hope kids don't
>think that (if they do, someone certainly failed to educate them properly).
>
So your values have to be everyone else's?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1564. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:26:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123192624.05957.00000124@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86242

In article <ir%Pb.20455$i4.5394@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040122194026.12501.00005702@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20040121215552.06226.00002526@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> >> In article <ILDPb.18295$i4.7447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> >"Dan/W4NTI"
>> >> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >The point I have is the ARRL has proven beyond a doubt they are a
>bunch
>> >> >of world class hypocrites.
>> >>
>> >> And who elected the directors, Dan?
>>
>> >I don't know who 'elected' the directors. I know I didn't.
>>
>> Every member with a license gets a ballot. If you didn't vote...
>> >
>
>
>I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE Director has
>run un-opposed for the last several elections.

That's bad, IMHO.

>Which explains why I don't
>remember having voted for a Director recently.

Either he does such a good job nobody wants to oppose him, or nobody wants to
do the job in the first place.
>
>Also since I have NOT seen the results of his voting I don't know how he
>stands.
>
Email him and ask. That's how I find out how Bernie voted.

>> >> >They trash ham radio with 'Incentive Licensing' to
>> >> >FORCE hams to upgrade and 'improve'.
>> >>

>> >> How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
>> >> and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.
>> >
>> >It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
>> >seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
>> >inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.
>>
>> There were "class distinctions" before IL, Dan. I heard folks say, way
>> back then, that Novices and Techs weren't "real hams".
>>
>> People who look down on others because of license class usually look down
>> for
>> other reasons too. There were the Collins owners who looked down on the
>> Drake
>> folks, etc. The SSB-vs-AM stuff. The appliance ops vs, the homebrewers. DX
>> vs. traffic handlers, contesters vs. ragchewers, etc. That sort of thing
comes
>> from the person, not the system.
>
>Totally different situation compaired to mandatory class difference based on
>license.

How is it totally different?

If anything, the license system was fairer because it was based on knowledge
and skill rather than how many $$ you could throw at the local radio store.

Heck, as a high school kid there was no way I could have had a Collins, Drake
or even a Heath/SB station. Even if by some miracle I'd gotten the money, it
was needed for other things. There was *no way* I could join some of their
ranks. But I could earn the highest class of license.

>> >The FCC did not propose Incentive Licensing. It was the ARRL back about
>> >1963 or so. The FCC followed up on it and 'modified' it and it was
>> >implemented beginning November of 1968.
>> >
>> >Why do I know this? Because I read QST cover to cover while stateside in
>> >the military. And when I went overseas I lost track due to military
>> >activities. I returned to the USA in 1968.
>>
>> I was a ham back then, too, Dan, and I read the same mags.
>>
>> We're not going to agree on who started it, but I think we can agree on
>> these things:
>>
>> 1) Whoever started it, the ARRL BoD pushed IL from 1963 onwards
>> 2) What the FCC finally enacted in 1967 was very different from what
>> ARRL proposed in 1963
>> 3) ARRL claimed that a majority of hams at the time supported IL. Others
>> claim a majority opposed it. Nobody *really* knows, just as nobody
>> knows what would have happened otherwise.

>> 4) There's still a lot of bad feeling about the whole thing.
>> 5) The present ARRL BoD and Hq folks are a completely different lot
>> than was there in the '60s
>
>True....but the bottom line on this particular commentary is the ARRL
>initiated the incentive stuff.

ARRL did make the first formal proposal - but only *after* asking what hjams thought.

> If not for that....the FCC would have not
>done what they did. Period.

How does anyone know what would have happened if ARRL had left things alone?

>> >I operated on 7.010 and received
>> >a notice of violation from the Cleveland Ohio FCC monitor. I was out of
>> >band for my class of license.
>>
>> And if the original 1963 ARRL proposal had been enacted, you would not
>> have been in violation.
>> >>
>> >> >Then 40 years later they totally
>> >> >reverse themselves.
>> >>
>> >> Who? I don't think there's a single person at Hq or in the Board of
>> >> Directors today who was a League official of any kind back in the
>> >> '60s. Most of the '60s BoD and Hq folks are dead.
>> >>
>> >> So it's a completely different bunch that reversed the policies.
>> >>
>> So what *should* be done, Dan? Do you support Hans' 2-level idea?
>>
>It makes no difference what I support. The ARRL and the FCC will do as they
>please.

If all we do is keep quiet, that could happen.

> But I DO RESERVE my RIGHTS to bitch about it.
>
Of course!

So do I

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1565. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:26:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123192625.05957.00000125@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86239

In article <d22b54c3.0401222232.6caaacc3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<AZTPb.19525$i4.5931@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>
>> > How did "incentive licensing" trash ham radio? btw, it was FCC's idea,
>> > and they made it clear they weren't going to leave the system alone.
>>
>> It trashed ham radio by creating a CLASS system in our ranks, forcing
>> seperation by license class, making one feel superior and others thus
>> inferior. This was NOT THERE before Incentive Licensing.
>
>That's incorrect Dan. I was an early '50s kid Novice. The OFs of those
>days more than just occasionally bent over backwards to make sure that
>I knew that I was at the bottom of the totem pole. In retrospect no
>doubt some of it involved the usual compulsive cocky male
>pubescent/male adult conflict which had nothing to do with ham radio.
>But it was also obvious that those OFs were also ticked off about the
>recent emergence of the 5 wpm code test which allowed us weenies to
>get on the air without having to go thru the same pushups they had to
>go thru to get on the air. There were neighborhood radio clubs which
>didn't allow full voting memberships to Novices and Techs.

And in the mid-60s there were still some who did similar things. Indeed, there were Advanceds who looked down on Generals, Generals who looked down on Conditionals, Conditionals who looked down on Techs, and Techs who looked down on Novices. Etc.

And it wasn't just kids vs. adults, either.

Then as now, they were few - but noisy.

Maybe it was different where you were, Dan.

>It's all just cycles Dan and the 1968 maneuver was not the first cycle
>by any means and welcome to the current cycle. There will be others.

Circle Game.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1566. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:26:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123192626.05957.00000126@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86240

In article <8701887833.2458F8789@taranews.net>, "Tom W"
<address.masked@for.no.spam> writes:

>Please cite references. I have before me two historical accounts
>which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
>licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
>it. Web pages such as "The Wayback Machine" also agree that the
>League first proposed the changes which were finally implemented in
>1967.

First off, recall that the reasons given for "incentive licensing" were things like the trend towards decreased homebrewing/experimenting and increased 'appliance operating', use of HF DX bands for local communications, perceived lack of technical knowhow and operating skills, etc.

>I have before me two historical accounts
>which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
>licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
>it.

Which 1963 QST editorial on the subject? There were several of them, not just one. February, March, June, July, and November. The early ones ask what members think, the later ones tell what the ARRL BoD proposed and why.

Here's the first reference I found - not the only one, just the first:

QST, June 1963, page 9, in the editorial:

"A number of persons highly-placed in the communications regulatory field, thoroughly experienced in international conference matters, and amateurs themselves, have joined us in expressing concern over the recent trends in amateur radio. They agree we must adhere to our basic principles more closely if we are to keep any semblance of our frequency assignments. They feel that amateur radio has been built on a sound basis, and is largely in a healthy condition, but is tending to move in the wrong direction. They predict that a conitnuation of the present trend will most certainly cause us severe difficulty".

Now, who are these "persons"? Obviously they're folks at the FCC, saying in so many words that they're concerned about the way things were going and that if the something wasn't done, we'd be in "severe difficulty".

Was ARRL's proposal the first? Yes! But it's clear to me that FCC passed the word along that *something* had to change, or there'd be big problems ahead for hams.

It is also interesting to read the "Correspondence" section. Lots of folks for and against any sort of license changes. There were some who were extremely ticked off that ARRL even asked the question - and this was *before* any decision was reached by the BoD.

Most interesting of all was a 5 page article in QST for October, 1963, called "Two Plus Two Equals Four". It's basically about how amateur radio had to justify its existence as more than "just a hobby" in order to survive as a service, and which subtly but clearly pushes the IL agenda. The author was known as W0DCA, W4CXA - and also as A. Prose Walker.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1567. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 00:55:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040123195530.11022.00003709@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86243

In article <40118A3F.9000304@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Leo, what about those that don't want to play the game? Kim stated in
>her post of 05/23/2000:
>
><From Kim's post>
>
>Kim> Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the
>call?
>Kim> The fact that it would get the attention of the male ego...just as
>it has.
>Kim> And that's all. No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
>Kim> thoughts the three letters

[letters deleted]

> would have on the male persona.
>
>Back to me:
>
> Sooooo, you and Jim and all the others carrying on with this simply
>allows Kim to achieve her stated goal.

Exactly.

Which is why, a few posts back, I quoted Maximus:

"ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED?!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

1568. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 01:27:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bSjQb.25318$zj7.18395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86244

"Dan/W4NTI" writes:

|
| I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE Director
has
| run un-opposed for the last several elections. Which explains why I
don't
| remember having voted for a Director recently.
|

There's a reason for that. Frank is, IMNSHO, is among the top 3 best Director's who ever wore the red badge. He understands ham radio, he understands that he was elected to be a leader, not a manager, and he has the courage to look beyond the popularity surveys and support what is best for Amateur Radio (which isn't always what is most popular with the vocal minority).

The SE Division is a lucky bunch.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1569. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 01:29:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3UjQb.25323$zj7.2840@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86245

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

| >I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE
Director has
| >run un-opposed for the last several elections.
|
| That's bad, IMHO.
|

Then you don't know Frank Butler.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1570. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 01:31:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wVjQb.22234$i4.18091@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86246

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040123192626.05957.00000126@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <8701887833.2458F8789@taranews.net>, "Tom W"
> <address.masked@for.no.spam> writes:
>
> >Please cite references. I have before me two historical accounts
> >which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
> >licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
> >it. Web pages such as "The Wayback Machine" also agree that the
> >League first proposed the changes which were finally implemented in
> >1967.
>
> First off, recall that the reasons given for "incentive licensing" were
things
> like the trend towards decreased homebrewing/experimenting and increased
> 'appliance operating', use of HF DX bands for local communications,
perceived
> lack of technical knowhow and operating skills, etc.
>
> >I have before me two historical accounts
> >which both agree that the ARRL first broached the subject of incentive
> >licensing, as well as the QST editorial from 1963 which rationalized
> >it.
>
> Which 1963 QST editorial on the subject? There were several of them, not
just
> one. February, March, June, July, and November. The early ones ask what
members
> think, the later ones tell what the ARRL BoD proposed and why.
>
> Here's the first reference I found - not the only one, just the first:
>
> QST, June 1963, page 9, in the editorial:
>
> "A number of persons highly-placed in the communications regulatory field,
> thoroughly experienced in international conference matters, and amateurs
> themselves, have joined us in expressing concern over the recent trends in
> amateur radio. They agree we must adhere to our basic principles more
closely
> if we are to keep any semblance of our frequency assignments. They feel
that
> amateur radio has been built on a sound basis, and is largely in a healthy
> condition, but is tending to move in the wrong direction. They predict
that a

> conitnuation of the present trend will most certainly cause us severe
> difficulty".
>
> Now, who are these "persons"? Obviously they're folks at the FCC, saying
in so
> many words that they're concerned about the way things were going and that
> if the something wasn't done, we'd be in "severe difficulty".
>
> Was ARRL's proposal the first? Yes! But it's clear to me that FCC passed
the
> word along that *something* had to change, or there'd be big problems
ahead for
> hams.
>
> It is also interesting to read the "Correspondence" section. Lots of folks
for
> and against any sort of license changes. There were some who were
extremely
> ticked off that ARRL even asked the question - and this was *before* any
> decision was reached by the BoD.
>
> Most interesting of all was a 5 page article in QST for October, 1963,
called
> "Two Plus Two Equals Four". It's basically about how amateur radio had to
> justify its existence as more than "just a hobby" in order to survive as a
> service, and which subtly but clearly pushes the IL agenda. The author was
> known as W0DCA, W4CXA - and also as A. Prose Walker.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

All very interesting and sanitized I am sure. IMHO the reality of it all
was the 'CLASS A' crowd were pissed because of the Technican and Novice
licenses and wanted a return to the pure days of pre war USA.

So they tried to hornswaggle to FCC and the amateur community. It didnt
work then....and it won't work now. Hams are not that dumb.

Dan/W4NTI

1571. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 01:37:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <C%jQb.22248$i4.16463@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:4AfQb.4448$L04.1193@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:_0fPb.16899$q4.4613@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Yes LLLllllooooooyyyyyddddddd, please, OH PLEASE come to HF. I'll be
> > waiting.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Dan,
>
> My fights are no longer with you.
>
> Why keep it up?
>
> Lloyd
>
>

Could it be because I think you are a puke ?

Dan/W4NTI

1572. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 01:38:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <I0kQb.22253$i4.9251@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

You send in 25 bucks and a pin feather from a Australian mongoose and a
Captain Vidio decoding machine to Lllllloooooyyyyydddd the loser.

Dan/W4NTI

"N8KDV" <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net> wrote in message
news:40118654.E396D26B@nospam.iserv.net...
> Lloyd, Lloyd... how do I get that Lordship? Gots to have it!
>
> Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD wrote:
>
> > "Bonzi" <s@asds.com> wrote in message
> > news:7u01101itf7h33s9rkihvf7hm6qlj9edrf@4ax.com...
> > > On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 08:23:39 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
> > > <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >My prayers are coming true! I have studied code for over 10 long
years.
> > > >This day would come, just as I said it would.
> > > >
> > > >Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be
nothing
> > you
> > > >can do to stop it. I am so happy. I know it's just s step, but I'm
sure
> > > >with wisdom of the ARRL, it will soon be reality.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> > > >A Time Lord Always wins in the end!
> > > >
> > > How you going to get a signal out of that HUD apartment, fatboy?
> >
> > STFU, you nerd!
> >
> > (Now go and see Roger Wiseman over the Shipwreck lounge, I hear you and
him
> > had a good time last week)
>

1573. Re: Little Billy Beeper seems confused

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 01:39:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_0kQb.25333$zj7.6011@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86249

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com>

|
| No, Dan, no laughing matter. He was serious about working other
| amateurs out of band.
|

Dear Willy Weeper,

I have never worked an amateur outside of the amateur bands, and I have
no intention of ever doing so.

You are a dump huck liar. Deal with it.

And you're back in my killfile until you come up with another gutless
anonymous email address which slips past.

>>PLONK<<

With warmest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1574. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 02:07:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86250

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> >
> >
> > It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
someone
> > sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
>
> Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the reference
> to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
> other reason?
>

Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to drop my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before she gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the public. Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...

Kim W5TIT

1575. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 02:31:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <u72dnQJYJsE2Q4zd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86304

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>
>>>It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
>
> someone
>
>>>sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
>>
>>Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the reference
>>to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
>>other reason?
>>
>
>
> Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to drop
> my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before she
> gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the public.
> Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
You stated in a previous post that you knew the callsign would get a
reaction, that is why the T-I-T part of your callsign was chosen. If it
is just another call sign, why did you expect a reaction?
Why didn't you choose some other suffix? Why TIT? Here is why in your
own words.

"I jokingly told my fellow hams one day (all men, of course) that it was
silly to get initials for a vanity callsign--one should put some real
punch into a vanity callsign."

You wanted some "punch" in your callsign, thus the suffix "TIT" as it
references your breasts, thus getting the attention and reaction you so
desperately want.

You also stated, "The fun that evolves out of it is a great bonus." In other words you new the reactions it would give, and you enjoy the comments about your callsign and it's reference to your breasts. If it were just a callsign like any other, there wouldn't be any fun that evolves out of it and a great bonus would it?

Extremely poor taste.

1576. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 02:37:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <KuudnS9lUZ37R4zdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86301

N2EY wrote:
> In article <40118A3F.9000304@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>> Leo, what about those that don't want to play the game? Kim stated in
>>her post of 05/23/2000:
>>
>><From Kim's post>
>>
>>Kim> Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the
>>call?
>>Kim> The fact that it would get the attention of the male ego...just as
>>it has.
>>Kim> And that's all. No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
>>Kim> thoughts the three letters
>
>
> [letters deleted]
>
>
>>would have on the male persona.
>>
>>Back to me:
>>
>> Sooooo, you and Jim and all the others carrying on with this simply
>>allows Kim to achieve her stated goal.
>
>
> Exactly.
>
> Which is why, a few posts back, I quoted Maximus:
>
> "ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED?!"

A little bit, for a little while.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1577. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 02:43:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <busm3k$95g@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86302

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401231007.789685ba@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<buqu9p$i6e@library2.airnews.net>...
> >
> > It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
someone
> > sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
>
> Others disagree with that. And I think if you really believed it were
> "totally
> innocuous unless some sat there and thought about it for a bit", you
> would
> not have chosen it, because you've said it was chosen in part for the
> reactions it would get.
>

From those friends and associates, Jim...who were in on why the callsign,
etc.

>
> > The implication that
>
> [body parts]
>
> > are something to hide, be
> > embarrassed about, think of only in a sexual manner, etc., is the vulgar
> > act.
>
> Would you then say that they are no different from, say, a hand or a
> nose?
> Would you say that it's always appropriate to display them, talk about
> them,
> etc., regardless of the context or the situation? That's where you're
> argument
> leads.
>

No, they are no different than a hand, a nose, a foot, all of which could be
sexual appendages at some point. But, *in the right context* they (tits)
are just as bland and boring as a nose, a foot, or whatever.

And, as to displaying them, I personally have no problem at all with nudity
in general. I am not prone to "automatically" assume a nude body is for
sex, or something vulgar as you may describe it. I think it's darned unfair

that men can run around showing their tits, when a man is just as likely to get aroused by someone playing with their nipples as any woman is. What's the difference whether a man goes topless or a woman goes topless?

> > I taught my kids that all "that stuff"
> > was all over the place. One of them learned that it was not attractive and
> > lives responsibly, one of them thought most of it was great and barely
> > accomplishes anything each day. I must have succeeded with one and needed
> > to work a lot harder with the other.
>
> You just proved what I'm saying is valid.
>

I don't think I did at all. But have it your way...

> >
> > That's a copout--to ignore the advice of someone because of what they are
> > doing.
>
> No, it isn't! Regardless, it's what kids do. Kids see such behaviors
> as hypocrisy on the part of the lecturer - and their right, because
> the 'adult' is really saying "Do as I say, not as I do".
>
> Would *you* accept "Do as I say, not as I do".
>

What do you mean "would you"? I did. My parents morals, objective lessons, words of wisdom, etc., were never questioned by me. I knew that they were right because, as my mother would tell me "if you start smoking now, it will be extremely difficult for you to quit when you learn how bad it is," as she was puffing on her cigarette--I knew how much she wanted to quit smoking. I saw no contradiction whatever in what she was saying. She was right. Did you go around expecting everyone to live as they preached? I certainly didn't. I learned far more things by observing that maybe there was a reason for the lecturer lecturing against something while they were "doing it."

> >
> > I'd much rather take advice from someone who's been through what
> > they are preaching against than someone who's never been there.
>
> The adults were preaching against stuff they hadn't done (smoke
> grass). Their argument was against "using drugs as a crutch" and told
> how they were "bad for you" and "addicting" - while they themselves
> ingested substances that were all those things.
>

Not sure why you felt like you had to elaborate. I knew where you were coming from.

> >
> > The phrase "lead by example" has some truth to it.
>
> Exactly! Adults must set the example of how to live responsibly.
>
> > But the phrase "learn from the
> > mistakes of others" has much more weight, in my opinion.
>
> That's fine when it's about things like falling off a ladder. Not when
> it's about things that appear to be "fun". And not when the lecturer
> keeps on making the mistakes.
>

Your philosophy is different than mine, then. Either it is or it ain't. If I believe the phrase "learn from the mistakes of others" is pertinent and that I've learned more from it than those who tried to lead by example, then I believe it across the board--not selectively. And, I believe it.

> >
> > Here, you were
> > sitting right there listening to those lecturers preaching against the
evils
> > as they partook in something you believed was evil and you still ignored
the
> > value they taught--or at least devalued it, it looks like.
>
> That's *exactly* how *kids* think! Once they detect "do as I say, not
> as I do",
> they use the adult's behavior as an excuse.
>

Please don't use "they" in the vernacular. I did not. Oh, and lots of my friends did not.

>
> That's not mature, adult
> reasoning, but it's what many if not most kids do - particularly when
> someone is telling them not to do something that they think might be a
> lot of fun.
>

How could someone who sees a parent smoking, hacking, stinking up the place, chained to the cigarette, ever think smoking could be a lot of fun?! I used to smoke, but not because I thought it was fun. I think I probably started to get in trouble--get the attention of my mom so she'd quit. Heh heh...but it didn't work. I just quit about seven years ago.

Sex? Oh, no way that could be any fun. I grew up in a town of less than a thousand people and I saw teen-aged girls getting pregnant at like 13!! Wasn't no way that was fun.

>
> .--not the twisted logic. It's exactly like nude art. I
> > would never gasp at a child looking at a nude statue, or painting, or
photo,
> > etc. I would ask them what they found beautiful.
>
> It's not about gasping. It's about what is appropriate. Is it
> appropriate for children to see each other naked? Naked adults? To let
> adults see them naked? All depends on the context. For example, health
> care is a different context
> than trying on clothes.
> >

I think it's appropriate and natural to have children see each other nekked. By the way, why are you so huffy about not printing a callsign (all inclusive with its prefix and suffix) but you'll bring up and print the subject of "naked adults?" I mean, really...where is your logic in *that*?

Anyway, and as to adults being naked, I used to take showers with my kids (sons) when they were little, stopped probably when they were--oh I don't know--3 or 4. Was that, in your opinion, vulgar?! Good grief, I hope not. But, as I said, have it your way. And, why *is* it OK for nudity when one is, presumably, an infant or toddler and then, just as they are probably quite comfortable with the nude body--we suddenly decide "OHMYGAWD...you can't see me *THAT* way!!!" Whaddup wid dat?

>
> Why?
>
> > Those body parts are to be spoken of, not hidden in some closet because
> > they are horrible.
>
> They're not "horrible". They're PRIVATE.
>

Maybe to you. And that's your right to believe like that. But, don't make a judgement call--and you have--about someone who thinks it differently than you. And, by the way...leaving my callsign off the list has nothing (for me anyway) to do with how you think of my callsign. Either leave me off altogether, as you could have done; or put it up with the same import as each and every other ham. And, by the way, I am pretty much going to quit debating the topic because it's pretty darned obvious that we disagree--wholeheartedly--on this. You've turned it into a debate about my callsign. The issue isn't *why*, it is that you did and that you could have handled it differently. Don't whine about, "but you are trying to tell me I have to use a callsign I find objectionable...wa wa wa." I am not at all, neither is Leo, or anyone else. The point is you could have left my name completely *off* the list.

> >
> >"Those" body parts can be beautiful or dangerous, and
> > both must be recognized. When someone is pulling their pants down at
the

> > doctor--it is quite OK, at least one would think; when someone is
pulling
> > their pants down in public--it is quite not OK.
>
> Why? It's the same action, isn't it? The same beautiful body parts
> that you say must be spoken of, right?
>

Hey! Now you're talking!

>
> Could it be that what may be appropriate in the doctor's office is not
> usually appropriate in public?
>

Well, there may be patients who wouldn't mind exams in public...I would,
though.

> >
> > However, in the right
> > circumstances both could be exactly the opposite. If a doctor--and this
has
> > been done--is about to rape someone, then it's evil.
>
> Of course. But that's not the point. The action described is only
> appropriate in a doctor's office if it's medically required.
>
> > And, I can think of
> > nothing better I would love to do to someone like Saddam Hussein, than
to
> > moon him with a thousand milliion asses; or even just one: mine.
>
> Again, an extreme that proves *my* point.
> >
> > > > Sad but true.
> > > >
> > > The reason it's like that is the failure of adults to act
appropriately.
>
> > Yep. You're exactly right.
>
> Well, there you have it.
>
> > However, it seems that your "act appropriately"
> > and mine are two entirely different things.
>
> I sure hope so!
>
> > And, I'm done--sigh, once
> > again--discussing my callsign.
>

> Maybe.
>
> > It's valid, it's beautiful, it's fun, it's
> > mine.
>
> That's your opinion. Here's mine:
>
> It's inappropriate for the ARS.
>
> It helps the ARS move one step closer to extinction.
>
> Period.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And, you're incorrect...

Kim W5TIT

1578. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 02:46:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <busm9s$1kf@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86303

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40118A3F.9000304@psu.edu...
> Leo wrote:
>
> > My point, again, is that Kim, as a fellow amateur, has every right to
> > expect to be treated as an equal by her fellow amateurs. Omitting just
> > her call in the list was not a fair thing to do . Period. I have
> > not, and would not, insist that Jim use her call in any of his posts,
> > as it violates his standards. But, leaving only hers out treated her
> > as less than equal. Period.
>
> Leo, what about those that don't want to play the game? Kim stated in
> her post of 05/23/2000:
>
> <From Kim's post>
>
> Kim> Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the
> call?
> Kim> The fact that it would get the attention of the male ego...just as
> it has.
> Kim> And that's all. No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
> Kim> thoughts the three letters t-i-t would have on the male persona.
>
> Back to me:
>
> Sooooo, you and Jim and all the others carrying on with this simply
> allows Kim to achieve her stated goal. She's cast the line, and quite
> frankly, you all have swallowed the hook gut deep.
>
> While we are being frank, I must commend Kim for what is a permanent,
> and apparently irresistible troll. There is no doubt that this one
> subject may overtake the Morse code subject if Kim hangs around here
> long enough!
>
>
> And although it would appear that Kim says that her callsign is not
> based on some body parts, earlier in the same post she writes:
>
> Kim> I told them one day about how virtually boring they were being and
> couldn't
> Kim> they come up with *anything* but initials! Well, the first
> sarcastic remark
> Kim> was a question about what I would get if I were to get a vanity
> callsign. I

> Kim> was actually in deep thought, as one of them keyed up and said that
my
> Kim> vanity was in my chest so how could "we" come up with a callsign
> that would
> Kim> be related to that? HA! I keyed up and simply told them, that I
> would get
> Kim> K5TIT if I could.
>
> Back to me:
>
> There it is. Kim might be better able to explain the difference, I read
> it as a body part related to the chest, but it doesn't matter. The
> callsign is a troll regardless of whether it refers to body parts or
> small birds. (Tifted tutmouses) 8^). And Kim enjoys better success with
> it than Lenover21 does with his "designed to engage" posts.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Hmmm, body parts that are vulgar, Mike. And, I don't think there's a vulgar body part. Oh, maybe the tongue...

Kim W5TIT

1579. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 03:25:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <EAlQb.25430$zj7.8681@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86305

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

| I personally have no problem at all with nudity
| in general. I am not prone to "automatically"
| assume a nude body is for sex...

Here's how you can tell..... if a person is 'nude', that means they aren't wearing any clothing. On the other hand, if a person is 'nekkid', that means they aren't wearing any clothing and they're up to something.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1580. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 04:14:08 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <j1s310lit2srb88gqqcf695t9r61eb4ffj@4ax.com>
Source record: 86306

On 23 Jan 2004 14:06:20 -0800, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040121164302.15923.00003341@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <5ujr00tcqhfs22tceeo1jjf72119nl3tej@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>
>> >Much appreciated!
>>
>> If you need some links, let me know...preferrably in private...that
>> way it isn't messed up by the hecklers. :-)
>
> Of course, "in private", Lennie...
>
> What's "surprising" here?
>
> An "anonymous" poster appears to "support" Lennie, and Lennie
>"replies" to several of his posts by re-quoting the entie post without
>comment.
>
> Uh huh...Proabably first cousing to "MegHz", and "Harvey the
>Rabbit", among others.
>
> Lennie's slipping, folks...Let's bid him adieu while he's still
>"aware" enough of his surroundings to appreciate it.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

rotflmfao!!

This is definitely a first - somebody flaming somebody because they
missed an opportunity to flame somebody else.

Somebody get the Guinness Book of Records people on the phone -
quick!!

73 es LOL still, Leo

1581. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 04:18:56 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <QImQb.2122$dY6.1800@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86307
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:C%jQb.22248$i4.16463@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> Could it be because I think you are a puke ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Golly gosh,

I thought we both had burried the hatchet a while back. We put aside some differences in our battles with Roger Wiseman. I never had alot against you. I am sorry I can't please everyone, Dan.

I am sorry you cannot see past yourself on this ARRL proposal. In the long run, it'll be the best thing. I felt exactly the opposite, before the proposal. I was debating on wheather to renew or not. But the ARRL had great news. I am sorry that you will not benefit like I will.

At least I tried.

Lloyd

1582. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 04:33:21 UTC
From: Rodney <NoARRLHere@Nope.com>
Message-ID: <bussih$50n$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86308
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:I0kQb.22253$i4.9251@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
You send in 25 bucks and a pin feather from a Australian mongoose and a
Captain Vidio decoding machine to Lllllloooooyyyyydddd the loser.

Dan/W4NTI

Will Roger Wiseman vouch for me? Heck, he has retested more times than most
of us have so that makes him an authority, don't it?
I wanna be jus like Lloyd and Roger.
Or do I?

1583. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 04:37:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401232037.2a3404e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86309

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<401159AE.5040806@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >>
> >>
> > >That's incorrect Dan. I was an early '50s kid Novice. The OFs of those
> > >days more than just occasionally bent over backwards to make sure that
> > >I knew that I was at the bottom of the totem pole. In retrospect no
> > >doubt some of it involved the usual compulsive cocky male
> > >pubescent/male adult conflict which had nothing to do with ham radio.
> > >
> > >
> > I would guess that most of those OFs had nothing better than their ham
> > license on their
> > resume. "I am big ham, you a worthless kid"....

Bad guess. A couple examples were EEs who were too old to serve in WW2
but who put in 70 hrs/week at the submarine communications lab here
"for the duration", another was an M.D. and some others of their ilk
who twisted me six ways from Sunday about being a Novice just to see
what would happen. Which I probably deserved quite frankly. Those were
also the days when the door prizes at company functions were cartons
of Luckies passed out by "the prettiest secretary". Check yer
extrapolaton methods Casey, some of of those curves are horizontal
lines (beasting on 5 wpm newbies in 1953 and in 2004 is one) and some
AIN'T.

> I don't expect kids
> to kiss my ass
> like some adults wanted me to when I was a kid. Respect is a 2 way
> street.

Yer lecturing the choir, I have three thirty-something daughters . .
Dunno if they're still card-carrying NOW members or not . .

Good night.

w3rv

1584. Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 04:40:35 UTC
From: So Phuk'em <No.m@il.here>
Message-ID: <7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01>
Source record: 86310
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things worse. So Phuk'em

1585. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 05:26:17 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <EinQb.12887$lh3.6485@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86311
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
>
> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times
> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
> worse. So Phuk'em

I have a completly different opinion!

Join the ARRL today! There is no better time than now, to join the ONLY
voice that Ham Radio has. If you don't like what you, Mr I have no balls,
than turn your radio off! You are not helping anyone!

Like I said, my membership had paid off!!!!!!

1586. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 05:29:50 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <ZlnQb.12915$lh3.3417@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86313
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:wVcQb.21140$q4.3388@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Mike" wrote:
> > (snip) Yet, I still would like to
> > know where the idea came from
> > about grandfathering techs with
> > no test.
>
>
> I think you meant to say no "additional" written test, Mike. I suspect
the
> idea comes from the fact that the current Technician license already
allows
> HF access with the simple addition of the code test. In other words, the
> current Technician license exam already covers much of the material needed
> for HF access. Therefore, it makes more sense to grandfather them into a
> license class with HF access than into one without. Of course, that's just
> my take on it. If you really want to know why ARRL decided to do so, ask
> them.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I agree with that answer. I had to take both the Novice and Tech written to
get my Tech no-code. So what? I think it's a great idea to get on HF!!

1587. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 05:30:13 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton.T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a7ba2be372b598d989c1d@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 86312
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

In article <7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01>, No.m@il.here says...

<Nothing of consequence>

PLONK!

--
Dr. Anton Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)
kyrrin a/t bluefeathertech d-o=t c&o&m
Motorola Radio Programming & Service Available -
http://www.bluefeathertech.com/rf.html
"Quando Omni Flunkus Moritati" (Red Green)

1588. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 06:15:23 UTC
From: N2OBY <n2oby@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <%3oQb.11466$O22.5484462@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 86314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Actually, it's jerks like you that are intent on destroying everyone's enjoyment of the hobby. FYI - it's the hams that have entered the hobby over the last 17 years that have boosted and improved the effectiveness of the service in times of national emergency. Everyone's sick of listening to whiners like you with your prognostications of doom and gloom.

Do the hobby at large a favor and go phuk yourself...

"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
>
> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times
> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
> worse. So Phuk'em
>

1589. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 11:44:39 UTC
From: TL Fort <beerbarrelnospam@cox.net>
Message-ID: <hem410pne8o5eslj68sbabsdtjd58bvio4@4ax.com>
Source record: 86315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 12:22:11 -0500, "chocolate rabbit"
<bunnyears3003@yahoo.com> wrote:

>Burt and Wayne Green are right on this one I am afraid.
>Even new 2 Meter radios are going for under $200.00
>at HRO and AES. Nobody's buying ham gear except
>for on e-Bay where you chances of getting "E-screwed"
>on that "perfect condition used radio" are better than 7 to 1.
>

Actually, I got 2 Icom handhelds for that price from HRO. They sure
beat FRS for keeping contact withs the kids. Getting a tech liscense
for the kids isn't too hard either. You get a whole family of hams
that don't need to pick of a cell phone around town. They don't need
FRS with it's crowded bands and you get much greater range.

Tracy

1590. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 11:48:37 UTC
From: TL Fort <beerbarrelnospam@cox.net>
Message-ID: <4sm410dsnvfhgpst554kg77ls6phbo237a@4ax.com>
Source record: 86316
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

I joined last week....

Tracy

On Sat, 24 Jan 2004 04:40:35 GMT, "So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote:

>
>All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
>directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
>the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times
>of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
>CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
>worse. So Phuk'em

1591. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 12:48:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <butpjf$pfa@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86317

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:u72dnQJYJsE2Q4zd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>
> >>>It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
> >
> > someone
> >
> >>>sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
> >>
> >>Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the reference
> >>to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
> >>other reason?
> >>
> >
> >
> > Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to
drop
> > my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before
she
> > gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the
public.
> > Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> You stated in a previous post that you knew the callsign would get a
> reaction, that is why the T-I-T part of your callsign was chosen. If it
> is just another call sign, why did you expect a reaction?
> Why didn't you choose some other suffix? Why TIT? Here is why in your
> own words.
>

You're correct, I chose T-I-T for the suffix of my callsign; however, I did
not choose the name "tit," the nickname "tit," or the *word* "tit." I also

did not choose the *callsign* W5TIT for vulgar, sexual, or otherwise negative reasons. All of you who feel it is have dreamed that one up on your own.

> "I jokingly told my fellow hams one day (all men, of course) that it was
> silly to get initials for a vanity callsign--one should put some real
> punch into a vanity callsign."
>
> You wanted some "punch" in your callsign, thus the suffix "TIT" as it
> references your breasts, thus getting the attention and reaction you so
> desperately want.
>

So, boring, mundane, random, etc., is your way of defining what is "right." Again, you've dreamed that one up on your own.

> You also stated, "The fun that evolves out of it is a great bonus." In
> other words you new the reactions it would give, and you enjoy the
> comments about your callsign and it's reference to your breasts. If it
> were just a callsign like any other, there wouldn't be any fun that
> evolves out of it and a great bonus would it?
>
> Extremely poor taste.
>

Oh, so you know of others who don't have "fun" callsigns. Gosh...maybe you should get yourself, and them, into something a whole lot more fun. Because, for you to be so obsessed over an innocuous callsign just lends itself to your misery of being in the hobby around such questionable, deranged characters such as me.

Kim W5TIT

1592. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 12:51:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <butpng$f1j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86318

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:EAlQb.25430$zj7.8681@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> | I personally have no problem at all with nudity
> | in general. I am not prone to "automatically"
> | assume a nude body is for sex...
>
>
> Here's how you can tell..... if a person is 'nude', that means they
> aren't wearing any clothing. On the other hand, if a person is
> 'nekkid', that means they aren't wearing any clothing and they're up to
> something.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Ummmm, Hans, there's a lot easier way to tell if people without clothes on are "up to something" or not. :o

Kim W5TIT

1593. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 13:47:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124084743.07155.00000239@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86319

In article <wVjQb.22234$i4.18091@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>All very interesting and sanitized I am sure. IMHO the reality of it all
>was the 'CLASS A' crowd were

[expletive deleted]

> because of the Technican and Novice
>licenses and wanted a return to the pure days of pre war USA.

Dan,

Why would the "Class A" folks be angry about Techs and Novices? The Techs were all on VHF/UHF, and the Novices were limited to little bits of three HF bands with CW only, plus a bit of 2 meters.

It would make much more sense that they were still grumbling about the Great Giveaway of December 1952, which gave all privs to Generals and Conditionals. Previously, if you wanted to work 'phone on any ham band between 2 and 25 MHz you needed an Advanced (Class A) or Extra. Opening up the 'phone bands in early 1953 flooded them folks who had taken much easier written tests than the Class A crowd.
>
>So they tried to hornswaggle to FCC and the amateur community.

Well, they *said* they had majority support, and if you look at reports of the time about FCC comments it seems that they did - a very slight majority.

When you've got folks like A. Prose Walker saying something needs to be done or the ham allocations will be in big trouble, should he simply be ignored?

>It didnt
>work then....and it won't work now.

It seems to me that what happened then was that they raised the number of steps and the requirements for a full privs license. Now, it seems that most proposals, including ARRL's want to *lower* the number of steps and the requirements for a full privs license. (Isn't that what happened in 2000?)

But I'll agree with you on this: Monkeying with the license requirements will have only slight effects in what hams actually do. Did taking all those IL cause lots of hams to suddenly put down the checkbook and pick up the sodder arn? NOPE!

73 de Jim, N2EY

Hams are not that dumb.

>

1594. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 14:55:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86320

In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040121185526.22081.00003566@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0401211125.5e2b5ead@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >order" crappola. Call 'em "Tech IIs", call 'em anything which doesn't
>> >infer that a 30 year Novice is just a newbie getting his feet wet in
>> >ham radio.
>> >
>> >Asinine.
>> >
>> Yep, that's what arguing over the name really is.
>
>As long as they don't tag you as a "Novice"eh? . . the word outta HQ
>is that they're gonna change it anyway so we'll see what they come up
>with.

Basic/Limited/Full
C/B/A

Tyros/Middles/Knowitalls

whatever.
>
>> >> >All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
>> >>
>> >> Extra.
>> >>
>> >> Another very bad idea.
>> >
>> >WHY??
>>
>> Because if they want the privs, let 'em take the tests.
>>
>> Heck, any Advanced who wants an Extra need only take Element 4.
>> Is it *really* that hard? Heck, the old Extra was earned by an 8 year old
>> in 3rd grade. Obviously a bright kid, but c'mon - how hard can the test
>> really be?
>
>Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
>license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.

The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.

The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.

The record keeping is trivial - one field in the database. N/T/P/G/A/E

It's a needless pushup to combine the classes.

>There
>are little to no differences in the levels of difficulty between the
>Extra and Advanced writtens and they both cover the same general
>material in the same depth.

Then any Advanced who wants an Extra should have no trouble passing the test.

>Both have passed at least 5 wpm code
>tests. All of which has clearly rendered the Advanced redundant today
>so it should be done away with if we expect any significant
>streamlining of the regs.

Coupla lines in the regs say what an Advanced can do and what element credits
an Advanced gets. Your streamlining would eliminate maybe two paragraphs.

>If it takes a one-shot giveaway to clean up
>the mess fine, do it.
>
How about free Generals for all Techs?

>> >It's obvious, at least to me, that one major bottom line intent of the
>> >proposal is to foster more activity on the HF phone bands.
>>
>> Why? Do they need it?
>
>Who is "they"?

The 'phone bands. Are they empty?
>
>> Why not foster activity on *all* bands and modes?
>
>The new entry-level ticket should do a good job of just that. Give 'em
>a taste of HF phone beyond just 10M and the activity level ought to go
>up.

Better yet, give 'em a taste of more modes and bands.

>Particularly since we're on the downside of the spots count curve.
>The other bands and modes will take care of themselves. The
>restrictions on the entry-level ticket provide realistic incentives to
>upgrade. I like it.
>
Me too, but I say give 'em good slices of 160 thru 10, including 20 and WARC,
not just the same old 80/40/15/10. In fact I see no reason not to give 'em all
of WARC and most if not all of 160.

>> Besides, the problem ain't the license. Plenty of folks with the license
>> but
>> no station set up. I mean, look how complicated and difficult it can be
>> for some folks to put up an end-fed wire...
>
>Yeah, the tests can't filter out the Brainiacs but that's not a
>regulatory issue.

'zactly.
>
>> >If the
>> >proposal is adopted I expect that objective might be met so I support
>> >the basics of the proposal.
>>
>> What parts don't you support?
>
>I'm not convinced that leaving 20M completely out of the picture is a
>good idea.

See above. Good slices of all bands, I say.

>They shoved the "Novices" pretty far up the phone bands
>which will severly limit their opportunities to get into contests
>and/or chase DX. And I'm a bit cool to the concept of expanding the
>phone bands down into the old Novice bands.

Ugh.
>
>> >James I fail miserably to understand why you're so adamantly opposed
>> >to the free passes.
>>
>> Because there's no reason for 'em. Is giving all Advanceds a few more kHz
>on
>> 80/40/20/15 going to get many more of them on the air? I don't think so.
>
>Again that's not the point. The overriding point is getting rid of the
>Advanced class license, has nothing to do with activity levels. The
>only "losers" would be the entrenched Extras who would suddenly have
>to share their exclusive spaces with the dayum low-born new "givaway"
>Extras. Pore babies. .

And how about Techs?
>
>
>> The problem is that the freebies say that there's nothing essential about
>the
>> General and Extra writtens.
>
>That's just plain BS. Let 'em eat cake.

Uh huh.
>
>> And it's unfair to those who come after

>> GiveAwayDay.
>
>Yeah, yeah, and we had to walk uphill both ways in a blizzard to take
>our 20wpm code tests. And now they're giving 'em away for a lousy 5
>wpm. "That ain't fair!" Pfft.
>
>Those who miss "giveaway day" will be faced with some specific much
>more rational regime or another just like those who came before them
>have faced all sorts of different regimes over the years. And they'll
>deal with it as usual. So pfft on them too.

And 40 years later they'll still be moaning about it.
>
>> >Nope. Not if ya expect HF newbies to even try CW. If newbies don't try
>> >it we might as well drive a stake in the mode now and get the pain over
>> >with.
>>
>> You misunderstand. 20 per would be for Extra only, not for all classes.
>
>20 wpm worked when the steps to get there were 5, 13 then 20w wpm.
>Going from zip directly to 20 would be another whole story and I
>expect the results would be dismal. Not to mention the waivers
>problem. I would really go for changing the 5 wpm code test to at
>least one minute solid copy or take it again.

They elimninated the mutiple guess.
>
>> >> >I>AM< THE ARRL!!!
>> >> >
>> >> So am I.
>> >
>> >I wasn't for a few days again and beat 'em out of another free book
>> >for rejoining.
>>
>> I remember..
>
>That was last year. I just done it again.
>
>>
>> Of course, the fact that ARRL put those ideas in a proposal may be the kiss
>of
>> death for
>> them.
>
>Heh.
>
>> They haven't had much success in license restructuring proposalsin the
>> past few years!
>
>They gotta keep thowing stuff at the wall or none of it will stick.

Then they should throw sticky stuff.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1595. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 15:10:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <rNGcnbCzzcdFFo_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 86321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
>
> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times
> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
> worse. So Phuk'em
>
I don't normally respond to anonymous trolls, but I feel compelled to
counter
your statements above.

IF you feel that the ARRL "is intent on destroying (your) enjoyment of the
hobby," you must get your enjoyment purely from a self-delusional sense of
superiority.

I've been licensed for well over 25 years. The ham bands have *not*
"become sounding like CB over the last 17 years" - there have always
been a few bad apples - MANY of them OTs who passed the 20 wpm
Morse test and believe they are some sort of gods.

Yes, new hams may make some operating errors and they may need
a little coaching and immersion in the "culture" of ham radio to get to
the point where they sound experienced. We ALL made such mistakes
when we first got on the air - learning by doing is the best way to learn.

So get off your high horse ...

I was unhappy with the ARRL's policy on Morse testing for a long time,
and I'm still not happy with the aspect of their new proposal that would
keep Morse testing for Extra. (Though I have nothing to gain personally,
since I'm already an Extra.)

HOWEVER, the ARRL does SO much good for ham radio that I finally
decided to take out a life membership - BEFORE their proposal came
out (not knowing what position they'd take on the code test).

If all the OT's bail out on the ARRL over this, they will be cutting off
their noses to spite their face.

I encourage everyone to maintain their ARRL membership. And, I
encourage those who aren't members to join. The best way to influence
the ARRL in a progressive direction is from the inside - join, then talk to
your ARRL Director, make your views known, and let him/her know that

your vote in the next ARRL Director election in your division depends on their performance.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1596. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 15:19:33 UTC
From: slinkie linkie <bbbsun@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <54b1$40128d07$d8536f9e$28080@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86322
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
>
> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in
times
> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding
like
> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making
things
> worse. So Phuk'em

-

0000000000000000##### #####0000000000000000
0000000000000000000####### ########00000000000000000000
00000000000000000000000000##########################0000000000000000000000000
00000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
0000000000000000000 Harvey Ball, 1922-2001 RIP :(000000000000000

1597. Re: 1960's incentive licensing proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 15:46:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PrwQb.25902$zj7.6760@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86323

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
|
| When you've got folks like A. Prose Walker saying something needs to
be done or
| the ham allocations will be in big trouble, should he simply be
ignored?
|

A. Prose Walker, rest his soul, was an ARRL toady who didn't say
anything until it had been blessed by George Hart.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1598. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 16:57:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DtxQb.33544$P%1.26390940@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86324
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:rNGcnbCzzcdFFo_dUSdV9g@ptd.net...
> [snip]
> HOWEVER, the ARRL does SO much good for ham radio that I finally
> decided to take out a life membership - BEFORE their proposal came
> out (not knowing what position they'd take on the code test).
>
> If all the OT's bail out on the ARRL over this, they will be cutting off
> their noses to spite their face.
>
> I encourage everyone to maintain their ARRL membership. And, I
> encourage those who aren't members to join. The best way to influence
> the ARRL in a progressive direction is from the inside - join, then talk
to
> your ARRL Director, make your views known, and let him/her know that
> your vote in the next ARRL Director election in your division depends on
> their performance.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

I agree 100%. If one wants to influence the direction of change, they've got to get in there and do the work. "Taking their marbles and going home" accomplishes nothing except leave the field wide open for people with other viewpoints. It removes the necessary balance and resulting debate that is necessary for progress. Not everyone is going to agree with the direction and result but the effort that goes into it will usually (but not always) yield a better result than when a single point of view is allowed to be put into affect without the scrutiny that comes with such debate.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1599. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:01:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yxxQb.33545$P%1.26391617@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86325

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94796247DC7AAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:n79Qb.33290$P%1.26166524@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns947916F9BF0E5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> I beleive the R2 bandplan allows phone down to 7045, same as R1. In R3
> >> it's 7030! R2 hams operatong phone 'on 7050 and lower' are abiding by
> >> the ITU bandplan unless they go below 7045.
> >
> > Keep in mind that outside the US, those are just band plans. According
> > to postings I read elsewhere, they are ignored with some regularity.
> > It becomes even more common to ignore them during some contests.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> I can't speak for hams in every country in the world, but being
originally
> from the UK I would say that most there would be horrified at the idea of
> operating phone below 7040, for example. The cutoff used to be 7040 before
> they set aside 7035-7045 for RTTY. That is one aspect of it being
> voluntary, you will find people who continue to use a frequency after the
> bandplan is changed. In a similar way, phone is supposed to be above
14.112
> on 20, but it used to be 14.100. The RTTY sections were carved out of the
> top of CW and the bottom of phone.
>
> Phone below 7.040 or below 14.100 is not something I hear when I tune
> around. It's easy for US hams to form an impression that there are lots of
> DX hams operating phone on CW frequencies, but there really aren't. It's
> just that few realise how far down phone extends in the IARU bandplans.
>
> Contests are another matter, but that cuts both ways, i.e. you will also
> find CW on phone frequencies during CW contests.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP (Ex-G8VUK, G0VUK)

As far as the phone goes, I'm reporting what I've read posted by Europeans
rather than my own impressions.

At least for US CW contests, I don't find the CW climbing into the phone portions. In some cases the rules specifically state that the contacts are to be limited to the "traditional" CW portion. In the remainder of the cases, we're just so conditioned to sticking below the split point that we stay there anyway in a contest. Although the contesters do ignore the digital, etc bandplan recommendations.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1600. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:12:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MHxQb.33548$P%1.26393408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86326

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net...
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >
> > >
> > > It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
> someone
> > > sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
> >
> > Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the reference
> > to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
> > other reason?
> >
>
> Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to drop
> my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before
she
> gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the
public.
> Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

Dolly Parton does not make an issue of her breasts. Therefore there is no
vulgarity.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1601. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:20:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124122057.11022.00003715@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86328

In article <bSjQb.25318$zj7.18395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" writes:
>
>|
>| I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE Director
>has
>| run un-opposed for the last several elections. Which explains why I
>don't
>| remember having voted for a Director recently.
>|
>
>There's a reason for that. Frank is, IMNSHO, is among the top 3 best
>Director's who ever wore the red badge. He understands ham radio, he
>understands that he was elected to be a leader, not a manager, and he
>has the courage to look beyond the popularity surveys and support what
>is best for Amateur Radio (which isn't always what is most popular with
>the vocal minority).

IOW he supports code testing for all ham licenses.

Works for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1602. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:20:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124122058.11022.00003716@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86327

In article <3UjQb.25323$zj7.2840@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>| >I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE
>Director has
>| >run un-opposed for the last several elections.
>|
>| That's bad, IMHO.
>|
>
>Then you don't know Frank Butler.
>
No, I don't. And while he's probably a fine fellow, I'm opposed to uncontested
'elections' on general principles.

No disrespect of Mr. Butler intended.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1603. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:20:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124122059.11022.00003717@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86329

In article <rNGcnbCzzcdFFo_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>I've been licensed for well over 25 years.

> I've been licensed for well over 36 years.

>The ham bands have *not*
>"become sounding like CB over the last 17 years" -

Not the CW/digital subbands, anyway. The 'phone bands are another story...

>there have always
>been a few bad apples - MANY of them OTs who passed the 20 wpm
>Morse test and believe they are some sort of gods.

SOME of them, anyway.

But ALL of them passed the written tests, too.
>
>Yes, new hams may make some operating errors and they may need
>a little coaching and immersion in the "culture" of ham radio to get to
>the point where they sound experienced. We ALL made such mistakes

I didn't.

>when we first got on the air - learning by doing is the best way to learn.

Not for everything.
>
>I was unhappy with the ARRL's policy on Morse testing for a long time,
>and I'm still not happy with the aspect of their new proposal that would
>keep Morse testing for Extra. (Though I have nothing to gain personally,
>since I'm already an Extra.)

Nor do I...

>HOWEVER, the ARRL does SO much good for ham radio that I finally
>decided to take out a life membership - BEFORE their proposal came
>out (not knowing what position they'd take on the code test).
>
>If all the OT's bail out on the ARRL over this, they will be cutting off
>their noses to spite their face.

Agree 100%!
>
>I encourage everyone to maintain their ARRL membership. And, I
>encourage those who aren't members to join. The best way to influence

>the ARRL in a progressive direction is from the inside - join, then talk to
>your ARRL Director, make your views known, and let him/her know that
>your vote in the next ARRL Director election in your division depends on
>their performance.

Exactly.

So tell us what you think of the ARRL proposal, Carl. We already know about the code test, so let's just skip that part.

What do you think of:

1) the "NewNovice" idea? (easy entry-level exam, limited power, more HF modes and spectrum, less VHF/UHF)

2) closing Tech to new issues?

3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?

4) free upgrades for Advanceds to Extra?

5) widening of some of the 'phone image subbands?

I say 1) and 2) are good ideas. The rest are bad ideas.

What say you?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1604. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:29:01 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2L2dneMrNeqCMY_dRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86330

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> Oh, so you know of others who don't have "fun" callsigns. Gosh...maybe you
> should get yourself, and them, into something a whole lot more fun.
> Because, for you to be so obsessed over an innocuous callsign just lends
> itself to your misery of being in the hobby around such questionable,
> deranged characters such as me.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
Spin it anyway you want kimmygirl, you chose the suffix tit because of
the reference to breasts, to give your call some "punch" as you put it.

1605. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:38:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2L2dneIrNeo8M4_dRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86332

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net...
>
>>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>>news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
>>
>>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
>>
>>someone
>>
>>>>sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
>>>
>>>Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the reference
>>>to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
>>>other reason?
>>>
>>
>>Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to drop
>>my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before
>
> she
>
>>gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the
>
> public.
>
>>Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>
>
> Dolly Parton does not make an issue of her breasts. Therefore there is no
> vulgarity.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

>
And I doubt if Dolly had a ham license she would apply for a call sign
with the suffix of "TIT", she has more class than that.

1606. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 17:40:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <I6yQb.33553$P%1.26398305@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86331

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040124122058.11022.00003716@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <3UjQb.25323$zj7.2840@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >| >I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE
> >Director has
> >| >run un-opposed for the last several elections.
> >|
> >| That's bad, IMHO.
> >|
> >
> >Then you don't know Frank Butler.
> >
> No, I don't. And while he's probably a fine fellow, I'm opposed to
uncontested
> 'elections' on general principles.
>
> No disrespect of Mr. Butler intended.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And it's not the fault of Mr. Butler if no one chooses to run against him.
It says much more about the members of the organization than it does about
Mr. Butler.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1607. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 19:05:17 UTC
From: Bonzi <s@asds.com>
Message-ID: <aie510hg4eoi1ksk0q97jhe42jh27cp44i@4ax.com>
Source record: 86333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 23:26:17 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
<lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:

>
>"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
>news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
>>
>> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
>> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
>> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times
>> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
>> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
>> worse. So Phuk'em
>
>I have a completly different opinion!
>
>Join the ARRL today! There is no better time than now, to join the ONLY
>voice that Ham Radio has. If you don't like what you, Mr I have no balls,
>than turn your radio off! You are not helping anyone!
>
>Like I said, my membership had paid off!!!!!!
>
>
>
You couldn't get on HF until it was given to you, lardass.

1608. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 19:14:39 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KIYW@zilch.net>
Message-ID: <NuzQb.59621$zs4.22815@fed1read01>
Source record: 86334
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and privileges we do without them.

I am with the poster who sed:

-- >I have a completely different opinion!
> >
> >Join the ARRL today! \

73 From The Wilderness Keyboard

1609. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 19:29:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4012C786.6040008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86335
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

So Phuk'em wrote this troll:

> I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
>CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
>worse. So Phuk'em
>
>
>
Have you actually listened to CB lately? Ignoring the heterodynes from the
AM carriers, it sounds completely different than even a crowded during a
contest ham band.

1610. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 19:36:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4012C940.7040602@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86336

>
>
>>Yes, new hams may make some operating errors and they may need
>>a little coaching and immersion in the "culture" of ham radio to get to
>>the point where they sound experienced. We ALL made such mistakes
>>
>>
>
>I didn't.
>
Sure.... Even the best operators made errors when they first got on.
I don't mean malicious intent errors, but the traditional way of IDing and
such. "N2EY, WA2ISE and the group, 73s."

Also things like not tying up a contest op to get his call right as I
can listen
to subsequent other contacts to get his call right.

>
>
>
>>when we first got on the air - learning by doing is the best way to learn.
>>
>>
>
>Not for everything.
>
Well , this ain't rocket science, and botching the first few contacts
doesn't create
a hazardous condition. Not like learning to fly 747s.

1611. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 19:42:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401241142.275ed9c9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86337

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
> >license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.
>
> The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
>
> The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.

You must not have been listening when I told you that the Technician
license was far too complex to be an entry level license. Maybe I
haven't wasted 17 years of ARRL dues after all.

> The record keeping is trivial - one field in the database. N/T/P/G/A/E

Needless complexity. Ah, thats right, you wanted more license
classes.

> It's a needless pushup to combine the classes.

There need not be classes, but a learners permit would be nice.

1612. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 19:54:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401241154.47f1be2d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86338

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<rhd210h0srsca8f3bnd67duelhdu49nq0a@4ax.com>...
> On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 14:42:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >
> >> The use of one's own moralistic views and beliefs to deny the rights
> >> of another is "inappropriate" too, Jim.
> >
> >That's an issue you seem unable to sort out for us, "Leo". Which one of
> >the new "rights" applies in forcing Jim to use her callsign in a
> >newsgroup post?
>
> I'm sorry that you're having difficulty interpreting the generally
> accepted concepts of human social interaction, or the precise subject
> of my original objection and subsequent discussion on this subject,
> "Dave". My intent was to illustrate, not to educate.

Leo, congrats. You are a small voice in the wilderness when you point
out that Dave is socially retarded and prone to misinterpret what he
reads.

But you are not alone.

bb

1613. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 20:03:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401241203.41b37723@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86339

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040122120129.24678.00000557@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >All this so the top HAMs have something to gloat about.
>
> Heres what so Stupid, there is nothing to prevent you from being a "TOP HAM"

I recall that you weren't going to downgrade to Extra-lite, but then you did.

1614. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 21:17:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124161737.01692.00000192@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86341

In article <busm3k$95g@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0401231007.789685ba@posting.google.com...
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<buqu9p$i6e@library2.airnews.net>...

>> > I taught my kids that all "that stuff"
>> > was all over the place. One of them learned that it was not attractive
>> > and
>> > lives responsibly, one of them thought most of it was great and barely
>> > accomplishes anything each day. I must have succeeded with one and
>> > needed
>> > to work a lot harder with the other.
>>
>> You just proved what I'm saying is valid.

>I don't think I did at all. But have it your way...

The results prove that what I said was valid.
>
>> > That's a copout--to ignore the advice of someone because of what they
>> > are doing.
>>
>> No, it isn't! Regardless, it's what kids do. Kids see such behaviors
>> as hypocrisy on the part of the lecturer - and their right, because
>> the 'adult' is really saying "Do as I say, not as I do".
>>
>> Would *you* accept "Do as I say, not as I do".
>
>What do you mean "would you"? I did.

Then you were different than most children I knew.

>My parents morals, objective lessons,
>words of wisdom, etc., were never questioned by me.

Uh huh.

>I knew that they were
>right because, as my mother would tell me "if you start smoking now, it will
>be extremely difficult for you to quit when you learn how bad it is," as she
>was puffing on her cigarette--I knew how much she wanted to quit smoking. I
>saw no contradiction whatever in what she was saying. She was right.

Of course she was right.

But that didn't stop you from smoking. How many years were you a
smoker, Kim?

Your mother's actions had more influence than her words. Despite what
she said, you smoked anyway. And finally quit when - 10 years ago?

>Did you go around expecting everyone to live as they preached?

Nope. But neither did I think that it made sense to listen to someone
who *unrepentantly* lived one way and preached another.

Living one way and preaching another is a pretty good definition of hypocrisy,
btw.

And the fact remains that, logical or not, children are more influenced by
their parents' actions than their parents' words.

>I certainly didn't.

Yet you smoked for how many years?

> I learned far more things by observing that maybe there was a
>reason for the lecturer lecturing against something while they were "doing
>it."

But when it came to smoking, those words didn't stop you.

>> > I'd much rather take advice from someone who's been through what
>> > they are preaching against than someone who's never been there.

>> The adults were preaching against stuff they hadn't done (smoke
>> grass). Their argument was against "using drugs as a crutch" and told
>> how they were "bad for you" and "addicting" - while they themselves
>> ingested substances that were all those things.
>
>Not sure why you felt like you had to elaborate. I knew where you were
>coming from.

I was teaching by example.

>> > The phrase "lead by example" has some truth to it.
>>
>> Exactly! Adults must set the example of how to live responsibly.
>>
>> > But the phrase "learn from the
>> > mistakes of others" has much more weight, in my opinion.
>>
>> That's fine when it's about things like falling off a ladder. Not when
>> it's about things that appear to be "fun". And not when the lecturer
>> keeps on making the mistakes.
>
>Your philosophy is different than mine, then.

I sure hope so!

>Either it is or it ain't. If
>I believe the phrase "learn from the mistakes of others" is pertinent and
>that I've learned more from it than those who tried to lead by example, then
>I believe it across the board--not selectively. And, I believe it.

You can believe whatever you want - just as "creationists" can believe that the Earth is only about 6000 years old. Your belief doesn't make it true.

>> > Here, you were
>> > sitting right there listening to those lecturers preaching against the
>> > evils
>> > as they partook in something you believed was evil and you still ignored
>> > the
>> > value they taught--or at least devalued it, it looks like.
>>
>> That's *exactly* how *kids* think! Once they detect "do as I say, not
>> as I do", they use the adult's behavior as an excuse.
>
>Please don't use "they" in the vernacular.

I have no idea what you mean by that.

> I did not.

Yes, you *did*. Otherwise you would never have started smoking.

>Oh, and lots of my friends did not.

Maybe. I bet a bunch of them smoked, though.

>> That's not mature, adult
>> reasoning, but it's what many if not most kids do - particularly when
>> someone is telling them not to do something that they think might be a
>> lot of fun.
>
>How could someone who sees a parent smoking, hacking, stinking up the place,
>chained to the cigarette, ever think smoking could be a lot of fun?!

I don't know. But they do. You did.

>I used to smoke, but not because I thought it was fun.
>I think I probably started
>to get in trouble--get the attention of my mom so she'd quit.

And that was how many years ago?

>Heh heh...but
>it didn't work. I just quit about seven years ago.

My point exactly. Your mom's lectures were to no avail - her *actions* got you to start smoking, and to continue for years - decades.

Again, your story confirms the truth of what I'm saying. If your mom had not smoked, you would not have smoked either, because you would not have had to try to get her to quit.

Neither of my parents smoked when I was growing up. There were no lectures against it. Just the example. None of us kids got the habit, either. I tried it when I was 21 - went through two packs in about a week, decided it was no big deal and never had another one.

>
>> .--not the twisted logic. It's exactly like nude art. I
>> > would never gasp at a child looking at a nude statue, or painting, or
>> > photo,
>> > etc. I would ask them what they found beautiful.
>>
>> It's not about gasping. It's about what is appropriate. Is it
>> appropriate for children to see each other naked? Naked adults? To let
>> adults see them naked? All depends on the context. For example, health
>> care is a different context than trying on clothes.
>
>I think it's appropriate and natural to have children see each other nekked.

So it would be OK with you for, say, 10-12 year old boys and girls to see each other naked?

>By the way, why are you so huffy about not printing a callsign (all
>inclusive with its prefix and suffix) but you'll bring up and print the
>subject of "naked adults?" I mean, really...where is your logic in *that*?

Are you saying that the discussion of naked adults is inappropriate?
>
>Anyway, and as to adults being naked, I used to take showers with my kids
>(sons) when they were little, stopped probably when they were--oh I don't
>know--3 or 4.

Why?

>Was that, in your opinion, vulgar?!

Kim - have I ever described *anything* here as vulgar?

I would say that for an adult to shower with children of the opposite sex - at any age - is very inappropriate.

>Good grief, I hope not.

Ask the experts.

>But, as I said, have it your way. And, why *is* it OK for nudity when one
>is, presumably, an infant or toddler and then, just as they are probably
>quite comfortable with the nude body--we suddenly decide "OHMYGAWD...you
>can't see me *THAT* way!!!" Whaddup wid dat?

Who says nudity for infants and toddlers is "OK"? Not me. It's necessary when changing diapers and such - but not after they're toilet trained.
>
>> Why?
>>
>> > Those body parts are to be spoken of, not hidden in some closet because

>> > they are horrible.
>>
>> They're not "horrible". They're PRIVATE.
>
>Maybe to you.

To a lot of people. One can go to jail for hauling them out at an inappropriate time or place.

>And that's your right to believe like that. But, don't make
>a judgement call--and you have--about someone who thinks it differently than
>you.

When you tell me not to make a judgement call, *you* are making a judgement call. What gives you the right to make a judgement call, but not me?

>And, by the way...leaving my callsign off the list has nothing (for me
>anyway) to do with how you think of my callsign.

The what's your beef?

>Either leave me off
>altogether, as you could have done; or put it up with the same import as
>each and every other ham.

You're not on the list anymore - by your own request. Didn't you see that?

>And, by the way, I am pretty much going to quit
>debating the topic because it's pretty darned obvious that we
>disagree--wholeheartedly--on this. You've turned it into a debate about my
>callsign. The issue isn't *why*, it is that you did and that you could have
>handled it differently.

Of course I could have handled it differently. But that would have compromised my standards. Which I would not do. Period.

>Don't whine about, "but you are trying to tell me I
>have to use a callsign I find objectionable...wa wa wa."

Where's the whining? I'm pointing out facts. Look at the posts where I was told what I should do, should have done, should post, should not post. Lotta judgement calls from others about what *I* should do.

>The point is you could have left my name
>completely *off* the list.

And then you would have whined and moaned about how you weren't included.

>> >"Those" body parts can be beautiful or dangerous, and
>> > both must be recognized. When someone is pulling their pants down at
>> > the
>> > doctor--it is quite OK, at least one would think; when someone is
>> > pulling
>> > their pants down in public--it is quite not OK.
>>

>> Why? It's the same action, isn't it? The same beautiful body parts
>> that you say must be spoken of, right?
>
>Hey! Now you're talking!

Exactly. So why will I get arrested if I do it in most public places?

>> Could it be that what may be appropriate in the doctor's office is not
>> usually appropriate in public?

>Well, there may be patients who wouldn't mind exams in public...I would,
>though.

Why? You said you have no problem with "nudity in general". Can't get
any more "general" than at high noon on Main Street.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1615. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 21:17:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124161738.01692.00000194@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86340

In article <lq9Pb.25785$Xq2.14841@fed1read07>, "K7JEB"
<k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net> writes:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> That makes more sense to me, Alun - I don't see why the ARRL would
>> propose moving almost 400,000 people to a higher licence class just
>> because the ITU made morse code testing optional.
>
>You can thank BPL for that. If we can't lick them on the
>egress issue, we'll add multi-hundred-thousands of HF ops
>to provide a plethora of additional ingress points and let
>the BPL system ops assess their network reliability from that.

This must be where I saw that idea! And it makes perfect sense.
>
>I don't think we'll be hearing any protests over this proposal
>from Yaecomwood either.
>
Not at all.

But the amateur market is tiny compared to consumer electronics. Even if FT-1000s were $1000, how many would Yaesu sell in the USA per year?

One "problem" rigmakers have is that ham gear tends to have a fairly long useful life. A ten-year-old computer is generally considered to be almost useless today, even if it was top of the line when it was made. But a ten year old ham rig may be barely broken in. Going back still futher, not many people are still watching TVs made in the early '60s, but many 40 year old Drake or Collins lines are in daily use by hams - not out of nostalgia or technical inertia, but because they were and are pretty good rigs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1616. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 21:17:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86344

In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
>
>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
>never
>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea for
>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
>>>decide to do anything at all.
>>>
>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>
>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue
>came
>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech Pluses
>to
>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no
>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their database.
>
>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>>everybody's time.
>
>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>
>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.

Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?

>Rather, it is just one of
>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like

>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>
I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or bad idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?

More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such a burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element 3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1617. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 21:17:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124161739.01692.00000195@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86343

In article <BLjPb.32604$P%1.25744842@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0401201523.1e42a6da@posting.google.com...
>>
>> Oddly enough, in the years following "incentive licensing", the number
>> of US hams grew like mad after having been flat through most of the
>> 1960s.
>>
>> Go figure - they upped the requirements and ham radio grew...
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>The why is actually quite simple. The potential ham viewed it as being able
>to take the trip into ham radio in small, manageable, bitesize chunks
>instead of having to swallow the entire steak in one gulp. That perception
>is what caused the growth whether or not it represented reality.

Excellent point! And it explains the appeal of the old Novice, becaue it made the first step less of a stretch.

And of course anyone who wanted to take bigger bites could do it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1618. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 21:17:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124161740.01692.00000196@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86342

In article <I6yQb.33553$P%1.26398305@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040124122058.11022.00003716@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> In article <3UjQb.25323$zj7.2840@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>> >
>> >| >I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE
>> >Director has
>> >| >run un-opposed for the last several elections.
>> >|
>> >| That's bad, IMHO.
>> >|
>> >
>> >Then you don't know Frank Butler.
>> >
>> No, I don't. And while he's probably a fine fellow, I'm opposed to
>uncontested
>> 'elections' on general principles.
>>
>> No disrespect of Mr. Butler intended.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>And it's not the fault of Mr. Butler if no one chooses to run against him.
>It says much more about the members of the organization than it does about
>Mr. Butler.
>
Exactly!

You said it much better than I did, Dee.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1619. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:12:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401241412.5c5a129e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86345

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<j1s310lit2srb88gqqcf695t9r61eb4ffj@4ax.com>...

> rotflmfao!!
>
> This is definitely a first - somebody flaming somebody because they
> missed an opportunity to flame somebody else.
>
> Somebody get the Guinness Book of Records people on the phone -
> quick!!

I missed the point where this had anything to do with flaming
anyone, Lennie...I mean Leo...(yeah...right...)

Steve, K4YZ

1620. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:29:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IlCQb.23375$i4.9756@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86346
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:EinQb.12887$lh3.6485@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
>
> "So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
> news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
> >
> > All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> > directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment
of
> > the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in
times
> > of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding
like
> > CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making
things
> > worse. So Phuk'em
>
> I have a completly different opinion!
>
> Join the ARRL today! There is no better time than now, to join the ONLY
> voice that Ham Radio has. If you don't like what you, Mr I have no
balls,
> than turn your radio off! You are not helping anyone!
>
> Like I said, my membership had paid off!!!!!!
>
>
>
>

Anything that Lllllllooooyyyyydddd supports has to be world class crap.
If you and your ilk are the 'new wave' I want nothing to do with it.

Dan/W4NTI

1621. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:30:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lmCQb.23379$i4.21418@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86347
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Bonzi" <s@asds.com> wrote in message
news:aie510hg4eoi1ksk0q97jhe42jh27cp44i@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 23:26:17 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
> <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
> >news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
> >>
> >> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board
of
> >> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment
of
> >> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in
times
> >> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding
like
> >> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making
things
> >> worse. So Phuk'em
> >
> >I have a completly different opinion!
> >
> >Join the ARRL today! There is no better time than now, to join the ONLY
> >voice that Ham Radio has. If you don't like what you, Mr I have no
balls,
> >than turn your radio off! You are not helping anyone!
> >
> >Like I said, my membership had paid off!!!!!!
> >
> >
> >
> You couldn't get on HF until it was given to you, lardass.

And when he gets there he is gonna feel like chum at a shark feeding.

Dan/W4NTI

1622. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:31:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <unCQb.23381$i4.18369@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Keyboard In The Wilderness" <KIYW@zilch.net> wrote in message
news:NuzQb.59621$zs4.22815@fed1read01...
> And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and
> privileges we do without them.
>
> I am with the poster who sed:
>
> -- >I have a completely different opinion!
> > >
> > >Join the ARRL today! \
>
> 73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
>
>

Which is the only reason they are worth hanging with. The gang of fifteen
really stepped on their you know whats on this one. Just watch how the core
membership dumps them.

Dan/W4NTI

1623. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:34:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SpCQb.23385$i4.15706@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86349
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Oh man is that rich. So your saying the 'new hams in the last 17 years' are the only ones that have made advancements in the art and/or provided emergency communications?

What a idiot and a conceited one at that.

Do yourself a favor, go buy a copy of 200 meters and down, then read 50 years of the ARRL. Then come back and say the same thing goof.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2OBY" <n2oby@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:%3oQb.11466$O22.5484462@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> Actually, it's jerks like you that are intent on destroying everyone's
> enjoyment of the hobby. FYI - it's the hams that have entered the hobby
> over the last 17 years that have boosted and improved the effectiveness of
> the service in times of national emergency. Everyone's sick of listening
to
> whiners like you with your prognostications of doom and gloom.
>
> Do the hobby at large a favor and go phuk yourself...
>
> "So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
> news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
> >
> > All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> > directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment
of
> > the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in
times
> > of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding
like
> > CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making
things
> > worse. So Phuk'em
> >
>
>

1624. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:41:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hwCQb.23389$i4.10663@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86350
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:rNGcnbCzzcdFFo_dUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
> "So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
> news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
> >
> > All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
> > directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment
of
> > the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in
times
> > of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding
like
> > CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making
things
> > worse. So Phuk'em
> >
> I don't normally respond to anonymous trolls, but I feel compelled to
> counter
> your statements above.
>
> IF you feel that the ARRL "is intent on destroying (your) enjoyment of the
> hobby," you must get your enjoyment purely from a self-delusional sense of
> superiority.
>
> I've been licensed for well over 25 years. The ham bands have *not*
> "become sounding like CB over the last 17 years" - there have always
> been a few bad apples - MANY of them OTs who passed the 20 wpm
> Morse test and believe they are some sort of gods.
>
> Yes, new hams may make some operating errors and they may need
> a little coaching and immersion in the "culture" of ham radio to get to
> the point where they sound experienced. We ALL made such mistakes
> when we first got on the air - learning by doing is the best way to learn.
>
> So get off your high horse ...
>
> I was unhappy with the ARRL's policy on Morse testing for a long time,
> and I'm still not happy with the aspect of their new proposal that would
> keep Morse testing for Extra. (Though I have nothing to gain personally,
> since I'm already an Extra.)
>
> HOWEVER, the ARRL does SO much good for ham radio that I finally

> decided to take out a life membership - BEFORE their proposal came
> out (not knowing what position they'd take on the code test).
>
> If all the OT's bail out on the ARRL over this, they will be cutting off
> their noses to spite their face.
>
> I encourage everyone to maintain their ARRL membership. And, I
> encourage those who aren't members to join. The best way to influence
> the ARRL in a progressive direction is from the inside - join, then talk
to
> your ARRL Director, make your views known, and let him/her know that
> your vote in the next ARRL Director election in your division depends on
> their performance.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

Well Carl, our Director . Frank Butler don't even answer e-mails on the subject, and others.

Knowing the gang of 15 is so on high I can only assume they have their noses in the clouds that they can't hear us lowley constituits.

Most people I have talked to, on the air, and on the internet, think the proposal is terrible. Most of which are/were ARRL members. And all to the man saying they are dropping it.

Dream on. The ARRL does not listen. But its members read it loud and clear . Its called money. And to hell with what the members really want.

Dan/W4NTI

1625. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:43:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NyCQb.23393$i4.18674@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86351

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:bSjQb.25318$zj7.18395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" writes:
>
> |
> | I researched the question. It seems that Frank Butler the SE Director
> has
> | run un-opposed for the last several elections. Which explains why I
> don't
> | remember having voted for a Director recently.
> |
>
> There's a reason for that. Frank is, IMNSHO, is among the top 3 best
> Director's who ever wore the red badge. He understands ham radio, he
> understands that he was elected to be a leader, not a manager, and he
> has the courage to look beyond the popularity surveys and support what
> is best for Amateur Radio (which isn't always what is most popular with
> the vocal minority).
>
> The SE Division is a lucky bunch.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
Hans,

He don't even bother to answer e-mails about what his vote and or opinion was on the matter.

Dan/W4NTI

1626. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:50:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1FCQb.33609$P%1.26451311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86353

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0401241142.275ed9c9@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > >Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
> > >license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.
> >
> > The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
> >
> > The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
>
> You must not have been listening when I told you that the Technician
> license was far too complex to be an entry level license. Maybe I
> haven't wasted 17 years of ARRL dues after all.
>

I disagree, the information required to receive a Tech license is not too complex. I've taught classes and have seen people pass that were "dumber than a box of rocks" as they say. Of course, maybe I'm the world's greatest teacher but that's unlikely. Naturally I teach with enthusiasm and take the time to explain whatever needs further development. And I do explain why they need to know this and discuss real world applications from my own experience so that they can see the usefulness of this knowledge. However if the material were too complex, more of these people would have failed. The few who failed admitted right up front that they had not studied the material.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1627. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:50:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eFCQb.23399$i4.16961@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86352
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:QlmQb.2122$dY6.1800@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:C%jQb.22248$i4.16463@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> > Could it be because I think you are a puke ?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Golly gosh,
>
> I thought we both had burried the hatchet a while back. We put aside some
> differences in our battles with Roger Wiseman. I never had alot against
> you. I am sorry I can't please everyone, Dan.
>
> I am sorry you cannot see past yourself on this ARRL proposal. In the
long
> run, it'll be the best thing. I felt exactly the opposite, before the
> proposal. I was debating on wheather to renew or not. But the ARRL had
> great news. I am sorry that you will not benefit like I will.
>
> At least I tried.
>
> Lloyd
>
>

And failed, and failed, and failed, then rubbed it in with your assinine
comments about you coming to HF. Your a puke Lllllllooooooyyyyyddddd.

Dan/W4NTI

1628. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 22:53:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <4ICQb.23401$i4.7503@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86354

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040124161739.01692.00000195@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <BLjPb.32604$P%1.25744842@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0401201523.1e42a6da@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >> Oddly enough, in the years following "incentive licensing", the number
> >> of US hams grew like mad after having been flat through most of the
> >> 1960s.
> >>
> >> Go figure - they upped the requirements and ham radio grew...
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >The why is actually quite simple. The potential ham viewed it as being
able
> >to take the trip into ham radio in small, manageable, bitesize chunks
> >instead of having to swallow the entire steak in one gulp. That
perception
> >is what caused the growth whether or not it represented reality.
>
> Excellent point! And it explains the appeal of the old Novice, becaue it
made
> the first step less of a stretch.
>
> And of course anyone who wanted to take bigger bites could do it.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Oh balderdash. The 70s brought Dick Bash and multiple guess, and no cw
sending, and easier tests, and Volunteer Examiners. Balderdash.

Dan/W4NTI

1629. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 23:08:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <y7mdnY17qLedZo_dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86355

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40118A3F.9000304@psu.edu...
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>My point, again, is that Kim, as a fellow amateur, has every right to
>>>expect to be treated as an equal by her fellow amateurs. Omitting just
>>>her call in the list was not a fair thing to do . Period. I have
>>>not, and would not, insist that Jim use her call in any of his posts,
>>>as it violates his standards. But, leaving only hers out treated her
>>>as less than equal. Period.
>>
>>Leo, what about those that don't want to play the game? Kim stated in
>>her post of 05/23/2000:
>>
>><From Kim's post>
>>
>>Kim> Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the
>>call?
>>Kim> The fact that it would get the attention of the male ego...just as
>>it has.
>>Kim> And that's all. No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
>>Kim> thoughts the three letters t-i-t would have on the male persona.
>>
>>Back to me:
>>
>>Sooooo, you and Jim and all the others carrying on with this simply
>>allows Kim to achieve her stated goal. She's cast the line, and quite
>>frankly, you all have swallowed the hook gut deep.
>>
>>While we are being frank, I must commend Kim for what is a permanent,
>>and apparently irresistible troll. There is no doubt that this one
>>subject may overtake the Morse code subject if Kim hangs around here
>>long enough!
>>
>>
>>And although it would appear that Kim says that her callsign is not
>>based on some body parts, earlier in the same post she writes:
>>
>>Kim> I told them one day about how virtually boring they were being and
>>couldn't
>>Kim> they come up with *anything* but initials! Well, the first

>>sarcastic remark
>>Kim> was a question about what I would get if I were to get a vanity
>>callsign. I
>>Kim> was actually in deep thought, as one of them keyed up and said that
>
> my
>
>>Kim> vanity was in my chest so how could "we" come up with a callsign
>>that would
>>Kim> be related to that? HA! I keyed up and simply told them, that I
>>would get
>>Kim> K5TIT if I could.
>>
>>Back to me:
>>
>>There it is. Kim might be better able to explain the difference, I read
>>it as a body part related to the chest, but it doesn't matter. The
>>callsign is a troll regardless of whether it refers to body parts or
>>small birds. (Tifted tutmouses) 8^). And Kim enjoys better success with
>>it than Lenover21 does with his "designed to engage" posts.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Hmmm, body parts that are vulgar, Mike. And, I don't think there's a vulgar
> body part. Oh, maybe the tongue...

I don't think any body parts are vulgar, Kim. Where did I say that? All
body parts are beautiful, regardless what we call them. I sure as gitout
ain't the Victorian morality police.

If you are talking about my saying you would be better able to explain
the difference, I'm talking about what I read as a minor discrepancy
between your posting:

>>No body parts, nothing about it at all, except what
>>thoughts the three letters t-i-t would have on the male persona.

and:

>>>I was actually in deep thought, as one of them keyed up and said that
>>> my vanity was in my chest so how could "we" come up with a callsign
>>>that would be related to that? HA! I keyed up and simply told
them, >>>that I would get K5TIT if I could.

One part of the post seems to say that no body parts are involved, and
the other says elswise.

I don't really care much about your callsign one way or the other. But
I do recognize that some people do. And you do too, according to:

>>>Oh, yeah. The best part. What DID I have in mind when I chose the
>>>call? The fact that it would get the attention of the male
ego...just >>>as it has.

And Jim and Larry and Dwight and Leo and JJ and Dave and the others are indulging you quite nicely, wouldn't you say?

I would only wish that there were *no* more attention paid to your callsign than mine.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1630. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 23:28:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YdidneVPfbceYo_dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86356

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Oh balderdash. The 70s brought Dick Bash and multiple guess, and no cw
> sending, and easier tests, and Volunteer Examiners. Balderdash.

BalderBash?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1631. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-24 23:32:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YdidneRPfbcMnY7dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86357

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0401241142.275ed9c9@posting.google.com...
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>
> news:<20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
>>>In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>,
>
> kelly@dvol.com
>
>>>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>>>>Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
>>>>license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.
>>>
>>>The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
>>>
>>>The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
>>
>>You must not have been listening when I told you that the Technician
>>license was far too complex to be an entry level license. Maybe I
>>haven't wasted 17 years of ARRL dues after all.
>>
>
>
> I disagree, the information required to receive a Tech license is not too
> complex. I've taught classes and have seen people pass that were "dumber
> than a box of rocks" as they say. Of course, maybe I'm the world's greatest
> teacher but that's unlikely. Naturally I teach with enthusiasm and take the
> time to explain whatever needs further development. And I do explain why
> they need to know this and discuss real world applications from my own
> experience so that they can see the usefulness of this knowledge. However
> if the material were too complex, more of these people would have failed.
> The few who failed admitted right up front that they had not studied the
> material.

Seems like the Technician license is just about the right level of
difficulty. In my area about 80 percent seem to pass it the first time
around.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1632. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 00:17:31 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <2d3edbd42071508d524750563950cda3@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 86358
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <ZlnQb.12915$lh3.3417@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
"LARDASS Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
whined:
>
>
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:wVcQb.21140$q4.3388@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Mike" wrote:
> > > (snip) Yet, I still would like to
> > > know where the idea came from
> > > about grandfathering techs with
> > > no test.
> >
> >
> > I think you meant to say no "additional" written test, Mike. I suspect
> the
> > idea comes from the fact that the current Technician license already
> allows
> > HF access with the simple addition of the code test. In other words, the
> > current Technician license exam already covers much of the material needed
> > for HF access. Therefore, it makes more sense to grandfather them into a
> > license class with HF access than into one without. Of course, that's just
> > my take on it. If you really want to know why ARRL decided to do so, ask
> > them.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> I agree with that answer. I had to take both the Novice and Tech written to
> get my Tech no-code. So what? I think it's a great idea to get on HF!!

Yeah, you have tried for over 10 frigging years and you are too
lazy and stupid to apply yourself to learn either the code or
the General theory, so you just want it given to you because of
your mental disability.

1633. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 00:45:42 UTC
From: harvey's carmel balls <vvveevvee@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <48610$401311b6$d1cc79b6$4950@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:llCQb.23375$i4.9756@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Anything that Lllllllooooyyyyydddd supports has to be world class crap.
> If you and your ilk are the 'new wave' I want nothing to do with it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

"Lloyd" is just stirring the shit as usual.

He did this on 14.313 quite often too.

(Hint: wonder why "Lloyd" is in quotes
above, cause my info says it ain't been Lloyd Davies
making these postings all this time over past months. It is
someone else. Someone who has a colorful
past and still likes to stir the shit on 14.313 even today)

1634. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 01:54:28 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0401241754.7be87301@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86360

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040123192625.05957.00000125@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> In article <d22b54c3.0401222232.6caaacc3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >go thru to get on the air. There were neighborhood radio clubs which
> >didn't allow full voting memberships to Novices and Techs . . .

> And in the mid-60s there were still some who did similar things. Indeed, there
> were Advanceds who looked down on Generals, Generals who looked down on
> Conditionals, Conditionals who looked down on Techs, and Techs who looked down
> on Novices. Etc.
>
> And it wasn't just kids vs. adults, either.

Yessir, It's 2004 and it's **still** out there. Guy was up late last
year for the vote on approving his membership application into The
Group (the 43rd & Kingsessing "Group" we're both familair with yes?)
and somebody asked "what license class does he have?" His sponser:
"Uhhh . . Advanced." Then he ducked. Immediate 180dBA noise level from
the Back Benchers, "what the hell is this guy's problem?"

> Then as now, they were few - but noisy.
>
> Maybe it was different where you were, Dan.
>
> >It's all just cycles Dan and the 1968 maneuver was not the first cycle
> >by any means and welcome to the current cycle. There will be others.
>
> Circle Game.

Dit-dit!

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1635. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 04:56:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040124235601.12631.00004499@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 86361

In article <4ICQb.23401$i4.7503@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040124161739.01692.00000195@mb-m18.aol.com...
>> In article <BLjPb.32604$P%1.25744842@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0401201523.1e42a6da@posting.google.com...
>> >>
>> >> Oddly enough, in the years following "incentive licensing", the number
>> >> of US hams grew like mad after having been flat through most of the
>> >> 1960s.
>> >>
>> >> Go figure - they upped the requirements and ham radio grew...
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >The why is actually quite simple. The potential ham viewed it as being
>able
>> >to take the trip into ham radio in small, manageable, bitesize chunks
>> >instead of having to swallow the entire steak in one gulp. That
>perception
>> >is what caused the growth whether or not it represented reality.
>>
>> Excellent point! And it explains the appeal of the old Novice, becaue it
>made
>> the first step less of a stretch.
>>
>> And of course anyone who wanted to take bigger bites could do it.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Oh balderdash.

No, it's true. The number of US hams stalled at around a quarter million for
most of the '60s. Then it started to grow again about 1969.

The greatest period of growth was from 1929 to 1935, when the number of US hams
almost tripled in about 5 years.

The second greatest period of growth was from 1951 to 1962, when the number of
US hams increased 2-1/2 times (from about 100K to 250K)

>The 70s brought Dick Bash and multiple guess, and no cw
>sending, and easier tests, and Volunteer Examiners.

Timeline:

1960: FCC eliminates the last "draw a diagram" and essay questions from the writtens and goes to full multiple choice.

1967: Novice becomes two years and loses 2m 'phone, Advanced reopened to new issues.

1968: First set of subband restrictions due to IL

1969: Second set of subband restrictions due to IL

Early 1970s: First Bash books appear.

1977: Code sending test waived

1984: VE system takes over license testing: Q&A pools published.

> Balderdash.

Well, of the items you mentioned, only the Bash books and the end of sending tests occurred in the 1970s.

Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to say if they were "harder" or "easier"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1636. Re: Penny Cunningham gets in trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 05:14:28 UTC
From: Hamguy <hamguy@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <UgIQb.77196$Su5.6098@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 86362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's truly a sad day in America when a person can't partake in a wet T-shirt contest without getting fired!

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message news:buvetq$80u$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Penny C" <PC@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:8701PENY7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> http://www.themoradioshow.net/cb_files/index17.html is a perfect
> example of a Northern girl gone wrong when she visits Key West, FL.
> Not only did she get noticed by the people in Key West, but she also
> lost her job as a news anchor back up North.
>
> To add insult to injury, Letterman, Leno, and O'Reilly all mentioned
> the Key West dancing incident, adding to her embarrassment.
> Fortunately, the ARRL has started to lobby the FCC to give her a code
> free Extra class license so that she can stay in broadcasting on
> 14.313 MHz.
>
> God bless the ARRL. They defend the downtrodden.
>
> Poor gal....and her husband was right there with her...here is a bit more
> about her...
>
> CORRECTION: Ohio Anchor Resigns Over Nude Photos
> CORRECTION: A headline on this website erroneously reported Tuesday that
> Youngstown anchor Catherine Bosley, of WKBN-TV, was fired from her job after
> nude photographs of her surfaced on the Internet. The story was provided by
> our partner website, NewsNet5.com in Cleveland. Bosley, in fact, resigned
> from her position at WKBN. We regret the error.
>
>
> YOUNGSTOWN, Ohio -- Members of the media are expected to represent the
> community with the utmost class and respect, Cleveland TV station WEWS
> reported.
>
> But one northeast Ohio news anchor went to an extreme she never thought
> would catch up to her -- until she made national news -- on the wrong side
> of the camera.
>
> Catherine Bosley, a news anchor for 10 years at WKBN in Youngstown, Ohio,

> was used to having her picture taken.
>
> However, someone took pictures of her after she stripped naked during a
wet
> T-shirt contest while she was vacationing in Key West, Fla., last year
with
> her husband.
>
> "It was just a spur of the moment, silly, irresponsible thing to do that I
> regretted a great deal the next morning," Bosley said.
>
> She lived with the secret for 10 months until the pictures showed up on
the
> Internet about a week ago. Now she's out of a job.
>
>
>

1637. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 05:29:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GuIQb.26667$zj7.856@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86363

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

|
| Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to
say if
| they were "harder" or "easier"?
|

Those of us who took them.

The material today is somewhat more difficult, since it covers a much
broader range of technology than the 1960's stuff.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1638. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 10:12:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IEMQb.23928$i4.14261@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86364

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > (snip) haven't seen one person of the
>> child rearing age group voice a single
> > complaint about this in this newsgroup.
>
> Yes, you have.

Okay, how about in the "typical" child rearing age group. How old are you now? 49? How many young, impressionable, children do you have running around your house? Larry is not exactly a young spring chicken either.

> How do you know how old somebody's
> grandchildren or children are, Dwight?

Speculation based on typical child birth trends in this country.

> How old are these "old men"?

Lets see. You're about 49. Larry has to be pushing about 50. I'm 50. Who else?

> I simply say it's inappropriate for
> ham radio, that's all.
>
> Do you think it's appropriate?

Kim's callsign or the word alone?

> > Kim's callsign is only as vulgar as you,
> > the person hearing it, makes it.
>
> Have I *ever* said it was vulgar?

And I didn't say you said it was vulgar.

> So your values have to be everyone
> else's?

Don't be silly. I never said that either.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1639. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 10:21:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9NMQb.23929$i4.7236@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86365

"starwars" wrote:
>
> "Lloyd Davies" whined:
> > I agree with that answer. I had to take
> > both the Novice and Tech written to
> > get my Tech no-code. So what? I
> > think it's a great idea to get on HF!!
>
> Yeah, you have tried for over 10 frigging
> years and you are too lazy and stupid to
> apply yourself to learn either the code or
> the General theory, so you just want it
> given to you because of your mental
> disability.

Good grief. I hadn't noticed this was being cross posted to "rec.radio.amateur.misc." If I had, I wouldn't have wasted time writing a serious comment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1640. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 11:58:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401250358.26b499e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86366

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GuIQb.26667$zj7.856@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> |
> | Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to
> say if
> | they were "harder" or "easier"?
> |
>
> Those of us who took them.
>
> The material today is somewhat more difficult, since it covers a much
> broader range of technology than the 1960's stuff.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

That should be obvious.

1641. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 12:08:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401250408.5b1e9434@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86367

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<1FCQb.33609$P%1.26451311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0401241142.275ed9c9@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > > In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com
> > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > > >Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
> > > >license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.
> > >
> > > The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
> > >
> > > The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
> >
> > You must not have been listening when I told you that the Technician
> > license was far too complex to be an entry level license. Maybe I
> > haven't wasted 17 years of ARRL dues after all.
> >
>
> I disagree,

Oh, no! It would appear then that you have your very first
disagreement with the ARRL. They are the ones proposing a new entry
level license.

the information required to receive a Tech license is not too
> complex. I've taught classes and have seen people pass that were "dumber
> than a box of rocks" as they say. Of course, maybe I'm the world's greatest
> teacher but that's unlikely. Naturally I teach with enthusiasm and take the
> time to explain whatever needs further development. And I do explain why
> they need to know this and discuss real world applications from my own
> experience so that they can see the usefulness of this knowledge. However
> if the material were too complex, more of these people would have failed.
> The few who failed admitted right up front that they had not studied the
> material.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

You always have the right answers, Dee, and you're always right.

Why does anyone else even bother?

1642. Re: Little Billy Beeper seems confused

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 12:29:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401250429.15bc89c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86368

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_0kQb.25333$zj7.6011@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com>
>
> |
> | No, Dan, no laughing matter. He was serious about working other
> | amateurs out of band.
> |
>
> Dear Willy Weeper,
>
> I have never worked an amateur outside of the amateur bands, and I have
> no intention of ever doing so.

That was not my question, so I'll ask it again.

Would you work another amateur that you knew was out of band?

bb

1643. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 13:18:36 UTC
From: Arthur Harris <n2ah@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <MmPQb.18612$O22.12606471@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 86369
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Keyboard In The Wilderness" wrote:

> And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and
> privileges we do without them.

So you would support the League no matter what they do because they are the "only game in town?"

By that logic, if you were living in Iraq you would have supported Saddam Hussein (or Hitler in Germany).

There comes a time when you have to think and act for yourself. If the League is going to pander to the "give me a free upgrade" crowd, then let that crowd support them. I dropped my membership a few years ago after seeing the League's "re-structuring" proposal.

Art Harris N2AH

1644. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 13:35:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <gCPQb.33707$P%1.26573893@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86372
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Arthur Harris" <n2ah@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:MmPQb.18612$O22.12606471@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Keyboard In The Wilderness" wrote:
>
> > And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and
> > privileges we do without them.
>
> So you would support the League no matter what they do because they are
the
> "only game in town?"
>
> By that logic, if you were living in Iraq you would have supported Saddam
> Hussein (or Hitler in Germany).
>
> There comes a time when you have to think and act for yourself. If the
> League is going to pander to the "give me a free upgrade" crowd, then let
> that crowd support them. I dropped my membership a few years ago after
> seeing the League's "re-structuring" proposal.
>
> Art Harris N2AH

You can only fight the undesirable changes from the inside. By bailing out, you've let the people with ideas you don't like have free rein. Why didn't you get in there and oppose it? Run for office? Solicit the support of like minded people in a letter writing campaign? Or if you didn't want to do the work, find someone who thinks like you and push them to do the work? Work for ARRL rule changes that wouldn't let the ARRL submit FCC petitions without getting a confirming vote of the membership?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1645. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 13:36:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125083607.13960.00000259@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 86371

In article <IEMQb.23928$i4.14261@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > (snip) haven't seen one person of the
>>> child rearing age group voice a single
>> > complaint about this in this newsgroup.
>>
>> Yes, you have.
>
> Okay, how about in the "typical" child rearing age group.

What age group is that? I know people ranging in age from '20s to '50s who are raising small children.

The days when the nests were all empty by the time Mom and Dad hit 50 are long gone, Dwight. And that's in "typical" America.

>How old are you now? 49?

Yup. My birthday is qrz.com.

>How many young, impressionable, children do you have running
>around your house?

Why does that matter? You may have noticed that I don't talk about my domestic situation here.

Suppose, just suppose, that I have 5 children ranging in age from toddlers to teenagers. (I don't, but that's not the point). Would you then say I was right and Kim's call was inappropriate?

>Larry is not exactly a young spring chicken either.

He's a little older. So what? And Larry and I are not the only ones.

People have all kids of family situations these days. Blended families, "second" families, adoptions, people raising or helping to raise their grandchildren, etc. etc. etc.

>> How do you know how old somebody's
>> grandchildren or children are, Dwight?
>
> Speculation based on typical child birth trends in this country.

And your source is?

>> How old are these "old men"?

> Lets see. You're about 49. Larry has to be pushing about 50. I'm 50. Who
>else?

Do you consider that to be "old"? I don't. I consider it to be "middle aged".

I run 35-40 minutes every morning. Last week my running log shows 268 minutes
for the week. You know any "old men" who do that?

>> I simply say it's inappropriate for
>> ham radio, that's all.
>>
>> Do you think it's appropriate?

> Kim's callsign or the word alone?

Both. I say neither is appropriate.
>
>> > Kim's callsign is only as vulgar as you,
>> > the person hearing it, makes it.
>>
>> Have I *ever* said it was vulgar?
>
> And I didn't say you said it was vulgar.
>
You and Kim keep using the term "vukgar" rather than addressing whether it's
"appropriate".

>> So your values have to be everyone
>> else's?
>
> Don't be silly. I never said that either.
>
It's implied by your statements.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1646. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 13:36:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125083608.13960.00000260@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 86370

In article <GuIQb.26667$zj7.856@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>|
>| Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to
>say if
>| they were "harder" or "easier"?
>|
>
>Those of us who took them.

Like me.
>
>The material today is somewhat more difficult, since it covers a much
>broader range of technology than the 1960's stuff.

That's not necessarily true.

A broad range of material covered at a basic level may or may not be as
"difficult" as a narrower range of material covered in more depth.

And how material is tested has a large effect on the perceived difficulty.

IOW, it's possible to write a test on an entire book that is "easier" than a
different test written on just one chapter. Unless the actual tests and methods
are available for comparison, such claimes are TMDAIPORTM

73 de Jim, N2EY

1647. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 14:32:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <paednV0vF4H4To7dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86373

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" writes:
>>
>>>(snip) haven't seen one person of the
>>>child rearing age group voice a single
>>>complaint about this in this newsgroup.
>>
>>Yes, you have.
>
>
>
> Okay, how about in the "typical" child rearing age group. How old are you
> now? 49? How many young, impressionable, children do you have running
> around your house? Larry is not exactly a young spring chicken either.
>
>
>
>>How do you know how old somebody's
>>grandchildren or children are, Dwight?
>
>
>
> Speculation based on typical child birth trends in this country.
>
>
>
>>How old are these "old men"?
>
>
>
> Lets see. You're about 49. Larry has to be pushing about 50. I'm 50. Who
> else?
>

Sorry you consider that old, Dwight!

>
>>I simply say it's inappropriate for
>>ham radio, that's all.
>>
>>Do you think it's appropriate?
>
>

>
> Kim's callsign or the word alone?
>
>
>
>>>Kim's callsign is only as vulgar as you,
>>>the person hearing it, makes it.
>>
>>Have I *ever* said it was vulgar?
>
>
>
> And I didn't say you said it was vulgar.

>
>
>>So your values have to be everyone
>>else's?
>
>
>
> Don't be silly. I never said that either.

You know, Dwight, I'm not so sure. I don't recall Jim ever making an issue of the issue, except for ommitting the callsign. He's not doing anything except omitting what he finds inappropriate. He isn't calling Kim names, and he Is engaging her in posts here in the group.

And as pointed out, the callsign was indeed chosen so that some people WOULD find it inappropriate.

What would *you* have him do? I'm a little confused about what some people want out of this thread. Jim HAS to use Kim's callsign? Jim has to apologize to Kim for finding her callsign inappropriate? Jim has to have his posts approved for content before posting?

What do you think of her reasoning behind getting that callsign? I don't care one way or the other, aside from an acceptance of it, and for discussion of the callsign to go away, even though that would probably be dissapointing to the owner, who has stated that the callsign was designed to get attention, and which people are giving attention to the callsign in what must be an immensely gratifying amount to her.

Mike KB3EIA -

1648. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 14:54:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <rMQQb.23548$q4.4637@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86374

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
> <pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>
> >In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:
> >
> >
> >>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
D.
> >>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> >>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means
that
> >>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
> >never
> >>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
> >>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
for
> >>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if
they
> >>>decide to do anything at all.
> >>>
> >>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
> >
> >>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the
issue
> >came
> >>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
Pluses
> >to
> >>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had
no
> >>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
database.
> >
> >>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
> >>everybody's time.
> >
> >>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
> >
> >>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
> >

> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
> >thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
> >at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
> >for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>
> Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?

Here's your options:

We currently have essentially a 6 license system in place (even though
several licenses are no longer issued). To go from that system
to the one proposed by ARRL leaves three options as I see it:

1. The one-time free upgrade process as put forth by ARRL which takes
nothing away from anyone and immediately gets everyone into the
new 3 license system, or

2. Go to the new system but "grandfather" those on current but no
longer to be issued license classes which takes nothing from anyone but
presents a dual system of licenses, rules and regulations which would
likly exist for decades until those with licenses no longer being issued
as new ended up SK or otherwise dropped from our ranks or,

3. Implement the ARRL 3 licnense system and downgrade some
folks to new Novice (i.e. the Techs) or General (i.e the Advanced).
This last scenario takes away privileges and we all know how well
that went down in the late 60's Incentive Licensing implementation.

To me the answer is clear...and, I suspect so is it also to ARRL which
is why the proposal includes free upgrades.

> >Rather, it is just one of
> >the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
> >consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
> >Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
> >band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
> >desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
> >but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
> >is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>
> I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
bad
> idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
> release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>
> More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such
a
> burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element
3,
> in order to get the next higher grade of license?

See options 2 and 3 above.

Cheersm
Bill K2UNK

1649. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 14:57:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HPQQb.23549$q4.447@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"TL Fort" <beerbarrelnospam@cox.net> wrote in message
news:hem410pne8o5eslj68sbabsdtjd58bvio4@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 20 Jan 2004 12:22:11 -0500, "chocolate rabbit"
> <bunnyears3003@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
> >Burt and Wayne Green are right on this one I am afraid.
> >Even new 2 Meter radios are going for under $200.00
> >at HRO and AES.

What's wrong with that?

> Nobody's buying ham gear except
> >for on e-Bay where you chances of getting "E-screwed"
> >on that "perfect condition used radio" are better than 7 to 1.

So if no one is buying new gear, how does HRO, AES, etc
stay in business.

> Actually, I got 2 Icom handhelds for that price from HRO. They sure
> beat FRS for keeping contact withs the kids. Getting a tech liscense
> for the kids isn't too hard either. You get a whole family of hams
> that don't need to pick of a cell phone around town. They don't need
> FRS with it's crowded bands and you get much greater range.

Nothing wrong with that either.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1650. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 15:04:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <OVQQb.23556$q4.11451@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86376

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040121185526.22081.00003566@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0401211125.5e2b5ead@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >order" crappola. Call 'em "Tech IIs", call 'em anything which doesn't
> >> >infer that a 30 year Novice is just a newbie getting his feet wet in
> >> >ham radio.
> >> >
> >> >Asinine.
> >> >
> >> Yep, that's what arguing over the name really is.
> >>
> >> >As long as they don't tag you as a "Novice"eh? . . the word outta HQ
> >> >is that they're gonna change it anyway so we'll see what they come up
> >> >with.
>
> Basic/Limited/Full
> C/B/A
>
> Tyros/Middles/Knowitalls
>
> whatever.
> >
> >> >> >All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
> >> >>
> >> >> Extra.
> >> >>
> >> >> Another very bad idea.
> >> >
> >> >WHY??
> >>
> >> Because if they want the privs, let 'em take the tests.
> >>
> >> Heck, any Advanced who wants an Extra need only take Element 4.
> >> Is it *really* that hard? Heck, the old Extra was earned by an 8 year
old

> >> in 3rd grade. Obviously a bright kid, but c'mon - how hard can the test
> >> really be?
> >
> >Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
> >license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.
>
> The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.

So changing to Novice, General, Extra shouldn't be a big deal
for the FCC.

> The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.

Ditto my last.

> The record keeping is trivial - one field in the database. N/T/P/G/A/E

It's not just record keeping, it is also maintaining a dual
set of rules and regulations that apply to those
"grandfathered" licennses such as Novice and Advanced today...
or are you suggesting they lose their unique privileges (i.e.
be effectively downgraded)?

> It's a needless pushup to combine the classes.

In your opinion.

> >There
> >are little to no differences in the levels of difficulty between the
> >Extra and Advanced writtens and they both cover the same general
> >material in the same depth.
>
> Then any Advanced who wants an Extra should have no trouble passing the
test.
>
> >Both have passed at least 5 wpm code
> >tests. All of which has clearly rendered the Advanced redundant today
> >so it should be done away with if we expect any significant
> >streamlining of the regs.
>
> Coupla lines in the regs say what an Advanced can do and what element
credits
> an Advanced gets. Your streamlining would eliminate maybe two paragraphs.

The other side or rules is enforcement. That is likly the more important
issue to the FCC (IMHO).

> >If it takes a one-shot giveaway to clean up
> >the mess fine, do it.
> >
> How about free Generals for all Techs?

That is what ARRL is proposing.

(SNIP)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1651. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 15:07:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <PYQQb.23561$q4.14163@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86377

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:GuIQb.26667$zj7.856@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> |
> | Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to
> say if
> | they were "harder" or "easier"?
> |
>
> Those of us who took them.
>
> The material today is somewhat more difficult, since it covers a much
> broader range of technology than the 1960's stuff.

Hans is correct. The late 50's Tech was the same as General.
Additionally, there were plenty of smaple tests around via AMECO
and other study guides even before Bash.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1652. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 15:09:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv0t97$jq4@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86380

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:MHxQb.33548$P%1.26393408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net...
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
> > someone
> > > > sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
> > >
> > > Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the
reference
> > > to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
> > > other reason?
> > >
> >
> > Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to
drop
> > my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before
> she
> > gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the
> public.
> > Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Dolly Parton does not make an issue of her breasts. Therefore there is no
> vulgarity.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>

Huh? Well, I don't make an issue of my breasts, either. And, in addition, I've heard many interviews and giggles wherein Dolly was either alluding to or answering direct questions pertaining to her breasts.

Kim W5TIT

1653. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 15:27:44 UTC
From: KeyBoard In The Wilderness <TM@primo.net>
Message-ID: <ggRQb.60595$zs4.6202@fed1read01>
Source record: 86378
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

> "Keyboard In The Wilderness" wrote:
>
> > And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and
> > privileges we do without them.
>
> So you would support the League no matter what they do because they are
the
> "only game in town?"

No I support them because they have the horsepower to get things done.
I may not agree with them on all issues, but it is a place to make our
voices heard.
Enough of us writing the League can make a difference.
Squabbling on the NG's and dropping out will accomplish little.
>
> By that logic, if you were living in Iraq you would have supported Saddam
> Hussein (or Hitler in Germany).

I live in Kansas Toto. Poor logic on your part.
Like don't support the US government because they passed a law you don't
agree with.
I write my government reps and the ARRL regularly -- do you ??

>
> There comes a time when you have to think and act for yourself. If the
> League is going to pander to the "give me a free upgrade" crowd, then let
> that crowd support them. I dropped my membership a few years ago after
> seeing the League's "re-structuring" proposal.

Well you can drop out and scream on the NG's or you can work with and thru
the ARRL to get things done.
I doubt the ARRL reads this NG.

The ARRL has accomplihed much in the interests of Amateur Radio.

KTW

1654. Re: Penny Cunningham gets in trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 15:58:31 UTC
From: Pinkslapper <3xxxxx00@nostrills.com>
Message-ID: <40ccf$4013e7af$d1cc5a2f$16171@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Penny C" <PC@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:8701PENY7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> http://www.themoradioshow.net/cb_files/index17.html is a perfect
> example of a Northern girl gone wrong when she visits Key West, FL.
> Not only did she get noticed by the people in Key West, but she also
> lost her job as a news anchor back up North.

....and she's also reportedly has open invitation to appear on
the Howard Stern Show, MTV and E! Networks, among others,
with combined financial offers from the same that
would, at the very least, triple her previous earnings as an anchor
at WKBN. If I were her I'd tell WKBN and the prudish a-h's
who deride her to go hit the road. Take the money and run with it
girl - Not bad in the long term from a financial standpoint iffen U ask me!
I give her credit. If you got a body that men like, FLAUNT IT
and SHOW IT OFF BABY(!) and just watch the cash start
rolling in. It's a proven formulae that's worked for centuries.

I mean look at Jessica Haan for example. Before she became a
multi-millionaire she was a typist making $5.00 an hour typing
up letters for the PTL Club in Charlotte. Then one day she gave
Jim Bakker a blo-job in the office and managed to not only crash
one of the biggest televangelism SCAM operations going, but she
now can live comfortably for the rest of her life. (and all for just a
little "fun" with Jimmy in Charlotte...rotflmao) Heck, even Tammy Faye
Messner has wised up, dumped her looser hubby and now she's
doing great with celebrity appearances.

So bunkie, before you go pointing fingers at people, calling them a
"...perfect example(s) of a Northern girl gone wrong", better do
your homework. They are all driving around in 2004 Range Rovers
or Caddy Esclades, while I'll bet your still driving around in a
16yo rattle-trap of a Ford F150 pickup, complete with rusting bed
and no rear tailgate someplace down in Alabama or Mississippi.

1655. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 17:27:10 UTC
From: blackm00@cam.org
Message-ID: <6447bcd3.0401250927.6cd68188@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86381

"Dan Mattingly N0FQN" <n0fqn@charter.net> wrote in message
news:<100v15m37nr7cf4@corp.supernews.com>...
> The issue is it was not invented today. So, what's your point??? You could
> say this statement about any subject. It's too, broad in texture. Narrow
> your point or I won't give you a grade.

That's what I find amusing about these threads.

People want to play "what if" but they aren't describing the situation
where ham radio would be invented today. The way I see it, the real
reason they can imagine amateur radio is because it's been around
all these years. Form follows function. The proponents of this
thread can't really explain why amateur radio would arise today,
without the bias of the past, so really they can't define what
would arise if it did.

CB is a good example of something coming later. "Radio for
everyone" or something like that. Came about around sixty years
after people started playing with radio out of the laboratory.
They could only offer up a small slice of the spectrum, and that
by taking from amateur radio. And while technology did limit
things, realistically the only model was that of amateur radio,
ie direct between two stations. Now admittedly early proponents
of CB often came from amateur radio, but practically as soon
as the service was created, it was referred to in hobby terms.
Not "this is a radio service that you can use to help your hobby"
but a hobby in itself. Look in Popular Electronics from the time,
and you'll see articles by Don Stoner and Tom Kneital to this effect.
(And warnings from the FCC that it ain't a hobby band.) If amateur
radio had not existed, what would CB have been like?

It recently occurred to me that far more people are using radio
for communication than at any point in the past. But instead
of radio, they are seen as telephone technology. Yes, cellphones.
It makes good use of the spectrum, it is something relatively familiar,
and realistically, people are more interested in reliable communication
with those they know.

On one hand, we have people lamenting that amateur radio can't compete
with computers and cellphones today. Yet, then others turn around
and wonder what amateur radio would be like if started today. I can't
really conceive of amateur radio starting today, because I'm not sure what
the purpose would be. And once you start with that premise, free of
knowing that amateur radio has existed all these years, only then can
one begin to imagine what (if anything) would be available to such
a hobby if started today.

I also note that the topic wasn't about "what would the world be like without amateur radio" but "what would amateur radio be like if started today". So yes, one can look back and imagine a history of radio without amateurs, but the two are indeed linked. Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really don't see it starting up today.

Michael VE2BVW

1656. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 17:47:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uiTQb.33744$P%1.26627566@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86382

```
"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bv0t97$jq4@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:MHxQb.33548$P%1.26393408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net...
> > > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > > news:paCdnRYhH9DhxYzdRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> > > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > It's my opinion that my callsign would be totally innocuous unless
> > > someone
> > > > > sat there and thought about it for a bit--if even then.
> > > >
> > > > Oh come on! You chose that call sign on a dare because of the
> reference
> > > > to breasts. Are you going to attempt tell us you chose TIT for some
> > > > other reason?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to
> drop
> > > my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up
before
> > she
> > > gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the
> > public.
> > > Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> >
> > Dolly Parton does not make an issue of her breasts. Therefore there is
no
> > vulgarity.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
>
```

> Huh? Well, I don't make an issue of my breasts, either. And, in
addition,
> I've heard many interviews and giggles wherein Dolly was either alluding
to
> or answering direct questions pertaining to her breasts.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Answering a direct question is not making an issue of it. That is addressing other people's issues. Same for alluding to them, she is addressing other people's issues. She is not the one starting it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1657. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 18:08:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dCTQb.27124$zj7.21663@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86383

"Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote

| Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
| don't see it starting up today.

You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically orientated types. That our service continues to exist today is a miracle, attributable mainly to the efforts of RAC, ARRL, DARC, JARL, IARU, RAE, RSGB, and all the other national societies who so far have convinced the regulators to allow us to continue.

The notion of a "start up" amateur radio service or any personal radio service with such broad gifts of spectrum and freedom to experiment as we enjoy wouldn't gain any traction at all in todays technological environment.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1658. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 18:36:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125133635.07155.00000271@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86384

In article <MmPQb.18612$O22.12606471@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Arthur Harris"
<n2ah@hotmail.com> writes:

>"Keyboard In The Wilderness" wrote:
>
>> And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and
>> privileges we do without them.
>
>So you would support the League no matter what they do because they are the
>"only game in town?"
>
>By that logic, if you were living in Iraq you would have supported Saddam
>Hussein (or Hitler in Germany).

Godwin's Law invoked! ;-)

The situations are not comparable at all. SH and AH both had total and absolute control over their respective empires. ARRL doesn't, never had and hopefully never will.

ARRL policy isn't made by "those guys in Newington". It's made by the Board of Directors, who are elected by the membership. Any full member that is sufficiently unhappy with their current director can run for the job and unseat the current holder, or vote to do the same thing. Nonmembers can't. AH and SH didn't have that problem...

"Supporting ARRL" does not mean blind acceptance of everything the BoD proposes. It means being a member, telling them what you think on a regular basis, and pushing for the good stuff and against the bad stuff.

For example, this latest proposal has some good ideas and some bad ones. I've already let the BoD know what I think is good and bad. Now, who should they listen to more - me as a member, or as a nonmember?

If this proposal gets an RM number from FCC, I'll comment, supporting the good ideas and opposing the bad ones. And I'll mention being a member, so FCC knows I'm not just opposing it 'cause it's an ARRL thing.
>
>There comes a time when you have to think and act for yourself.

Sure. Does that mean we don't need a strong national organization for amateur radio? Can we fight battles like BPL as individuals?

>If the
>League is going to pander to the "give me a free upgrade" crowd, then let
>that crowd support them.

And they will, if there's nobody else in the League.

>I dropped my membership a few years ago after
>seeing the League's "re-structuring" proposal.
>
What did you oppose in that proposal? Basically, it had these parts:

1) Reduction to 4 license classes (TGAE)
2) Reduction of code testing (5 wpm G, 12 wpm A and E)
3) Free upgrade to General for Tech Pluses and Novices
4) Techs allowed to use Morse on parts of HF without a test for it.
5) "Better" written tests.

As it turned out, *none* of these points were enacted exactly as proposed. 3), 4) and 5) were totally rejected. 1) and 2) were not only enacted, but FCC went even farther than ARRL requested.

Leaving ARRL because you disagree with some aspects of what the BoD proposes guarantees that the organization will become more homogenized around things you don't agree with, because the opposing viewpoints disappear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1659. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 19:16:19 UTC
From: Arthur Harris <n2ah@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <7CUQb.294$j17.269176@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 86385
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

The anonymous "KeyBoard In The Wilderness" wrote:
> I write my government reps and the ARRL regularly -- do you ??

I did write ARRL when I was a member, and also spoke to their reps at club meetings. But they always seemed more interested in justifying the positions the League was committed to than listening to members' ideas.

> > There comes a time when you have to think and act for yourself. If the
> > League is going to pander to the "give me a free upgrade" crowd, then
let
> > that crowd support them. I dropped my membership a few years ago after
> > seeing the League's "re-structuring" proposal.
>
> Well you can drop out and scream on the NG's or you can work with and thru
> the ARRL to get things done.

I'm not screaming, just stating my opinion. I was a League member for many years. But when they repeatedly take positions on important issues that I think are wrong, why should I continue to support them? If they feel that the long-time hams will always support them no matter what, they will continue to ignore us and take us for granted. Perhaps if enough of the Old Timers drop out, they will get the message.

> I doubt the ARRL reads this NG.

I suspect a few of the ARRL crowd do read these NGs.

> The ARRL has accomplihed much in the interests of Amateur Radio.

Not lately. They've also made some enormous blunders.

Art Harris N2AH

1660. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 19:24:10 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86386

In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>>
>>
>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
>>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
> never
>>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea for
>>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
>>>>decide to do anything at all.
>>>>
>>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>
>>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue
> came
>>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech Pluses
> to
>>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no
>>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their database.
>
>>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>>>everybody's time.
>
>>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>
>>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.

>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?

It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the pros and cons:

Cons:

Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for it.

Pros:

Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to refarm the Advanced phone bands. Alternatively, avoids opening up the Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name). Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/ enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep documentation forever.

>>Rather, it is just one of
>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>
>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or bad
>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?

>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such a
>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element 3,
>in order to get the next higher grade of license?

I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them credit. They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the future."

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

1661. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 19:34:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RSUQb.24346$q4.5642@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86387

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040124235601.12631.00004499@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <4ICQb.23401$i4.7503@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040124161739.01692.00000195@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >> In article <BLjPb.32604$P%1.25744842@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
D.
> >> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >news:c2356669.0401201523.1e42a6da@posting.google.com...
> >> >>
> >> >> Oddly enough, in the years following "incentive licensing", the
number
> >> >> of US hams grew like mad after having been flat through most of the
> >> >> 1960s.
> >> >>
> >> >> Go figure - they upped the requirements and ham radio grew...
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >The why is actually quite simple. The potential ham viewed it as
being
> >able
> >> >to take the trip into ham radio in small, manageable, bitesize chunks
> >> >instead of having to swallow the entire steak in one gulp. That
> >perception
> >> >is what caused the growth whether or not it represented reality.
> >>
> >> Excellent point! And it explains the appeal of the old Novice, becaue
it
> >made
> >> the first step less of a stretch.
> >>
> >> And of course anyone who wanted to take bigger bites could do it.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Oh balderdash.
>
> No, it's true. The number of US hams stalled at around a quarter million

for
> most of the '60s. Then it started to grow again about 1969.
>
> The greatest period of growth was from 1929 to 1935, when the number of US
hams
> almost tripled in about 5 years.
>
> The second greatest period of growth was from 1951 to 1962, when the
number of
> US hams increased 2-1/2 times (from about 100K to 250K)
>
> >The 70s brought Dick Bash and multiple guess, and no cw
> >sending, and easier tests, and Volunteer Examiners.
>
> Timeline:
>
> 1960: FCC eliminates the last "draw a diagram" and essay questions from
the
> writtens and goes to full multiple choice.
>
> 1967: Novice becomes two years and loses 2m 'phone, Advanced reopened to
new
> issues.
>
> 1968: First set of subband restrictions due to IL
>
> 1969: Second set of subband restrictions due to IL
>
> Early 1970s: First Bash books appear.
>
> 1977: Code sending test waived
>
> 1984: VE system takes over license testing: Q&A pools published.
>
> > Balderdash.
>
> Well, of the items you mentioned, only the Bash books and the end of
sending
> tests occurred in the 1970s.
>
> Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to say
if
> they were "harder" or "easier"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Those that took the tests and can read still today.

Dan/W4NTI

1662. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 19:53:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86388
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Arthur Harris" <n2ah@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:7CUQb.294$j17.269176@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> The anonymous "KeyBoard In The Wilderness" wrote:
> > I write my government reps and the ARRL regularly -- do you ??
>
> I did write ARRL when I was a member, and also spoke to their reps at club
> meetings. But they always seemed more interested in justifying the
positions
> the League was committed to than listening to members' ideas.
>

Did you try running for office yourself or, if you lacked time to run,
encouraging others with your views to run for office?

> > > There comes a time when you have to think and act for yourself. If the
> > > League is going to pander to the "give me a free upgrade" crowd, then
> let
> > > that crowd support them. I dropped my membership a few years ago after
> > > seeing the League's "re-structuring" proposal.
> >
> > Well you can drop out and scream on the NG's or you can work with and
thru
> > the ARRL to get things done.
>
> I'm not screaming, just stating my opinion. I was a League member for many
> years. But when they repeatedly take positions on important issues that I
> think are wrong, why should I continue to support them? If they feel that
> the long-time hams will always support them no matter what, they will
> continue to ignore us and take us for granted. Perhaps if enough of the
Old
> Timers drop out, they will get the message.
>

Did you try running for office yourself or, if you lacked time to run,
encouraging others with your views to run for office?

Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new people
coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an even
more unbalanced viewpoint.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1663. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 20:30:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125153019.05957.00000151@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86390

In article <d22b54c3.0401241754.7be87301@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040123192625.05957.00000125@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
>> In article <d22b54c3.0401222232.6caaacc3@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >go thru to get on the air. There were neighborhood radio clubs which
>> >didn't allow full voting memberships to Novices and Techs . . .
>
>
>> And in the mid-60s there were still some who did similar things. Indeed,
>there
>> were Advanceds who looked down on Generals, Generals who looked down on
>> Conditionals, Conditionals who looked down on Techs, and Techs who looked
>down
>> on Novices. Etc.
>>
>> And it wasn't just kids vs. adults, either.
>
>Yessir, It's 2004 and it's **still** out there. Guy was up late last
>year for the vote on approving his membership application into The
>Group (the 43rd & Kingsessing "Group" we're both familair with yes?)

You mean the one where the attendance sheet looks like the DXCC Honor Roll?

>and somebody asked "what license class does he have?" His sponser:
>"Uhhh . . Advanced." Then he ducked. Immediate 180dBA noise level from
>the Back Benchers, "what the hell is this guy's problem?"

Well, what IS his problem?

That group is heavily focused on DX and contesting - particularly DX contesting.
They're "a bit competitive"....

Anything less than an Extra is a big competitive disadvantage in DX contesting. Like not being able to work split. So why doesn't the guy get one? Even if he only works 'phone, all he need do is pass element 4. And he's had almost 4 years.

No, wait, that's not a good reason. Those writtens are really tough. More than 4 years ago, (Jan 19, 2000, to be exact) a certain verbose nonham here said he was going for Extra "right out of the box". But no ham license of any class

yet.
And this nonham says he's a "radio PROFESSIONAL"....

Maybe he should apply to The Group. I'd like to attend that meeting....

>> Then as now, they were few - but noisy.
>>
>> Maybe it was different where you were, Dan.
>>
>> >It's all just cycles Dan and the 1968 maneuver was not the first cycle
>> >by any means and welcome to the current cycle. There will be others.
>>
>> Circle Game.
>
>Dit-dit!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1664. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 20:30:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125153020.05957.00000152@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86389

In article <4012C940.7040602@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>Yes, new hams may make some operating errors and they may need
>>>a little coaching and immersion in the "culture" of ham radio to get to
>>>the point where they sound experienced. We ALL made such mistakes
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I didn't.
>>
>Sure....

That's right.

>Even the best operators made errors when they first got on.

How do you know?

>I don't mean malicious intent errors, but the traditional way of IDing and
>such. "N2EY, WA2ISE and the group, 73s."

Was that meant to be an example of how I would operate? Never happened. One of
the first operating rules I learned was that the transmitting station gives
his/her own call last. Learned that long before I was a ham.

What you will hear from me would be

"WA2ISE and the group, this is N2EY"

although usually on sign-off I'll give the call of everyone in the group.
>
>Also things like not tying up a contest op to get his call right as I
>can listen to subsequent other contacts to get his call right.

That's sloppy operating. Suppose the station you just work QSYs or experiences
equipment failure right after your QSO? Then he thinks he worked you and knows
your call, but you don't know his, and so didn't work him. And if the
logcheckers catch it, you can cost him a QSO and maybe even a multiplier.

The time to get the info of a contest station who's running them is during the
QSO or *before*.

>>>when we first got on the air - learning by doing is the best way to learn.
>>Not for everything.
>>
>Well , this ain't rocket science, and botching the first few contacts
>doesn't create a hazardous condition. Not like learning to fly 747s.

The problem is that too many folks want to just wing it rather than taking a little time to learn the right way. Or worse, they think it doesn't matter what the right way is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint: Has nothing to do with aviation.
>

1665. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 21:02:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <K9WQb.27283$zj7.610@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86391

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

|
| Anything less than an Extra is a big competitive disadvantage in DX
contesting.
| Like not being able to work split.
|

Not able to work split???????????????? That's nonsense.

Actually it's pretty common (almost universal) that DXpeditions park their transmitter in the Advance or Extra class part of the band and listen in the General segment. On 20, for example, DXpeditions usually park at 14.023 (Extra) and listen up 5 on CW. Similarly on Phone they almost universally transmit at 14.195 (Advanced) and listen up. Similar tactics on other bands (transmit on 3795 and listen just up above 3800). 40-meter phone (there isn't even an Extra phone segment there) is almost 100% done working split.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1666. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 21:20:21 UTC
From: tsoris@juno.com
Message-ID: <d83d6953.0401251320.585e69e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

If you want to stop this, join the ARRL and start a recall of all of
the current directors and vice directors.

"Keyboard In The Wilderness" <KIYW@zilch.net> wrote in message
news:<NuzQb.59621$zs4.22815@fed1read01>...
> And the ARRL is the only game in town -- we might NOT have the bands and
> privileges we do without them.
>
> I am with the poster who sed:
>
> -- >I have a completely different opinion!
> > >
> > >Join the ARRL today! \
>
> 73 From The Wilderness Keyboard

1667. OT HUMOR: signs you were born yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 21:49:44 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0401251349.946278b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86393

1. Vacuum tubes are ancient.
2. Incentive licensing is ancient.
3. What in the world did Oldsmobile stand for?
4. GM executives have always had IQs under 50.
5. You think a manual choke is strangulation, not something that you're supposed to adjust when you start a car.
6. There have always been Interstate highways.
7. You can't remember the Vietnam War.
8. Neither you nor any of your peers built crystal radios in your youths.
9. I thought the dangers of smoking have always been well-known.
10. Gasoline has always been unleaded.
11. You don't remember 8-tracks. (Thank goodness my family never had one.)
12. Cassette tapes have always been around.
13. There have always been FM radio stations.
14. Studebakers have always been antique cars.
15. Why did people buy cars with a padded vinyl roof? They looked tacky, and they peeled like crazy after just a few short years.
16. Chicago's stockyards have always been history, not open for business.
17. Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley has always been dead.
18. "Saturday Night Live" has always been around. And taped, not live.
19. June Allyson is the Depends Undergarment lady, not a movie star.
20. "The Tonight Show" has always been with Jay Leno or Johnny Carson.
21. Michael Jackson has always been at least 25 years old. The Jackson 5 is ancient history.
22. Janet Jackson is the pop singer who sang "Nasty Boys", not the little girl in "Good Times".
23. Bob Dole was always old.
24. "Colored" and "white" drinking fountains and rest rooms are as ancient as the Spanish Inquisition. (Thank goodness.)
25. The KKK has always been a racist fringe group, not a mainstream organization like the Rotary Club. (Thank goodness.)
26. McDonald's, Burger King, and Kentucky Fried Cholesterol have always been around.
27. There have always been James Bond movies.
28. You never had to wait in long lines at the gas pump.
29. Treasury Bills have never yielded more than about 6%.
30. Inflation has always been below 4%.
31. The Dow Jones Industrials Average has always been at least 3000.
32. When _Business Week_ magazine ran its famous cover story "The

Death of Equities" in 1979, you were too busy watching Sesame Street to buy stocks. :(
33. Financial advisors have ALWAYS been bullish on stocks.
34. Gold has always been a crummy investment.
35. The stock market has always been a great investment.
36. You learned about how banks work as a result of the S&L bailout. (Thank goodness this wasn't from direct experience.)
37. Ronald Reagan was always a Republican.
38. You can't name a single movie that Ronald Reagan was in.
39. George Bush Senior has always been against abortion and for supply-side economics.
40. Sirens have always been used to warn of tornadoes, not air raids.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAATTTT jasonhsu.com

1668. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 22:44:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401251444.4090894f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

> Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new people
> coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an even
> more unbalanced viewpoint.

Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
hams to drop out.

1669. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 22:51:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401251451.3335c01e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86395

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040124235601.12631.00004499@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>
> The greatest period of growth was from 1929 to 1935, when the number of US hams
> almost tripled in about 5 years.

Thank Hoover for that. He had the right formula to grow the ARS.

1670. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 22:59:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0401251444.4090894f@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new
people
> > coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an
even
> > more unbalanced viewpoint.
>
> Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
> hams to drop out.

Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the experience
to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas that
have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1671. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 23:14:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WfKdnUD-hL1X0IndRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86397

Michael Black wrote:
> "Dan Mattingly N0FQN" <n0fqn@charter.net> wrote in message
news:<100v15m37nr7cf4@corp.supernews.com>...
>
>>The issue is it was not invented today. So, what's your point??? You could
>>say this statement about any subject. It's too, broad in texture. Narrow
>>your point or I won't give you a grade.
>
>
> That's what I find amusing about these threads.
>
> People want to play "what if" but they aren't describing the situation
> where ham radio would be invented today. The way I see it, the real
> reason they can imagine amateur radio is because it's been around
> all these years. Form follows function. The proponents of this
> thread can't really explain why amateur radio would arise today,
> without the bias of the past, so really they can't define what
> would arise if it did.

Go back and read the initial message in the thread and the modifications
in the next couple posts.
If you don't want to play along, DON'T! I gave an inital situation, in
which nothing was given back to amateur radio after WW1 and it died out.
I then added some more qualifications after N2EY asked for them.

<snip>

> I also note that the topic wasn't about "what would the world be
> like without amateur radio" but "what would amateur radio be like
> if started today". So yes, one can look back and imagine a history
> of radio without amateurs, but the two are indeed linked. Take out
> that history from amateur radio, and I really don't see it starting
> up today.

Umm, yeah. Sorry to bother you with the thread. DLTDHYOTAOTWO!

Other good reasons for not participating in the thread:

Well, amateur radio didn't go away after WW1, so why are we talking
about this?

Well, things wouldn't be like they are now, so how do we know how they
would be?

Well, what if there were no hypothetical situations?

Well, this is all well and good, but what does it have to do with Morse Code or Kim's callsign?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1672. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 23:24:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <x-ydncHFgb66zYndRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86398

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote
>
> | Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
> | don't see it starting up today.
>
> You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
> sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
> orientated types. That our service continues to exist today is a
> miracle, attributable mainly to the efforts of RAC, ARRL, DARC, JARL,
> IARU, RAE, RSGB, and all the other national societies who so far have
> convinced the regulators to allow us to continue.
>
> The notion of a "start up" amateur radio service or any personal radio
> service with such broad gifts of spectrum and freedom to experiment as
> we enjoy wouldn't gain any traction at all in todays technological
> environment.

In one of the first posts, I cam up with the spectrum we would recieve.

Me in an earlier life:

>>> Aww, don't make me define too much Jim! Okay, lets say that in the
>>> rebirth, fueled by concerns for homeland security, that a a loosely
>>> organized group of non-professional communication savvy people that
>>> might be able to respond to disasters or the <like> is made.

>>> Assume that it is decided that this group should have some technical
>>> abilities, so that if need be, they might stand a chance of getting a
>>> station operational under adverse conditions.

>>> The philosophy is that these people would pursue the service as a
>>> hobby, working for enjoyment while honing operational skills.

>>> Let's say that amateurs are allocated some frequencies. I'll assume
>>> that the bands I not will be similar in width to what we have now:

>>> 2 meters
>>> 10 meters
>>> 20 meters
>>> 40 meters - or nearby, away from broadcasting frequencies
>>> 80 meters

>>> The various frequencies are chosen to take advantage of propagation
>>> characteristics.

>>> No UHF or above, no 160 meters.

Seems like a reasonable starting point to me.

Obviously things would be different, there would be plenty of
differences, and the idea was that there might be some discussion of that.

So you and Mr Black just say there wouldn't be any such thing. Thanks
for the input! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1673. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-25 23:31:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QuWdnTLiJ69xzIndRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86399
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

William wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>
>>Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new people
>>coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an even
>>more unbalanced viewpoint.
>
>
> Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
> hams to drop out.

HA! Good one!

This is Brian, right?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1674. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 00:02:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv1ldj$31v@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86400

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:uiTQb.33744$P%1.26627566@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
> Answering a direct question is not making an issue of it. That is
> addressing other people's issues. Same for alluding to them, she is
> addressing other people's issues. She is not the one starting it.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

'SCUSE ME????? And, how exactly do you think *I* started this? Oh...wait, I got the callsign. Well, we've had that debate in here before and my equivalent to that is that it's like saying someone who wears skimpy clothes, or looks sexy, etc., is just asking to get raped.

So, excuse me, but I beg to differ--emphatically--with you, Dee.

Kim W5TIT

1675. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 00:16:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125191634.01019.00000185@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 86401

In article <RSUQb.24346$q4.5642@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to say
>> if they were "harder" or "easier"?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Those that took the tests and can read still today.

Well, that includes me. Perhaps we need another list...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1676. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 00:16:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040125191636.01019.00000186@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 86402

In article <OVQQb.23556$q4.11451@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040124095526.01692.00000187@mb-m18.aol.com...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0401221716.5c847a70@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040121185526.22081.00003566@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0401211125.5e2b5ead@posting.google.com>,
>> >kelly@dvol.com
>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >order" crappola. Call 'em "Tech IIs", call 'em anything which doesn't
>> >> >infer that a 30 year Novice is just a newbie getting his feet wet in
>> >> >ham radio.
>> >> >
>> >> >Asinine.
>> >> >
>> >> Yep, that's what arguing over the name really is.
>> >
>> >As long as they don't tag you as a "Novice"eh? . . the word outta HQ
>> >is that they're gonna change it anyway so we'll see what they come up
>> >with.
>>
>> Basic/Limited/Full
>> C/B/A
>>
>> Tyros/Middles/Knowitalls
>>
>> whatever.
>> >
>> >> >> >All Advanced (currently about 82,000) would get a free pass to
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Extra.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Another very bad idea.
>> >> >
>> >> >WHY??
>> >>
>> >> Because if they want the privs, let 'em take the tests.
>> >>

>> >> Heck, any Advanced who wants an Extra need only take Element 4.
>> >> Is it *really* that hard? Heck, the old Extra was earned by an 8 year
>old
>> >> in 3rd grade. Obviously a bright kid, but c'mon - how hard can the test
>> >> really be?
>> >
>> >Has nothing to do with it. The point of the propsal is to simplify the
>> >license structure, the testing process and the record keeping.
>>
>> The structure for new hams is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
>
>So changing to Novice, General, Extra shouldn't be a big deal
>for the FCC.

Exactly - just like keeping the closed-off license classes.
>
>> The testing process is already simplified - Tech/General/Extra.
>
>Ditto my last.

So it's really not an issue.
>
>> The record keeping is trivial - one field in the database. N/T/P/G/A/E
>
>It's not just record keeping, it is also maintaining a dual
>set of rules and regulations that apply to those
>"grandfathered" licennses such as Novice and Advanced today...

No dual set of rules and regulations. Only difference is a bit of
spectrum on 4 HF bands. And the rules defining those subbands
are already in Part 97.

>or are you suggesting they lose their unique privileges (i.e.
>be effectively downgraded)?

Not at all! Let everyone keep what privs they have now, except
Novices and Techs (see below)

>> It's a needless pushup to combine the classes.
>
>In your opinion.

Yep.
>
>> >There
>> >are little to no differences in the levels of difficulty between the
>> >Extra and Advanced writtens and they both cover the same general
>> >material in the same depth.
>>
>> Then any Advanced who wants an Extra should have no trouble passing the
>> test.
>>

>> >Both have passed at least 5 wpm code
>> >tests. All of which has clearly rendered the Advanced redundant today
>> >so it should be done away with if we expect any significant
>> >streamlining of the regs.
>>
>> Coupla lines in the regs say what an Advanced can do and what element
>> credits
>> an Advanced gets. Your streamlining would eliminate maybe two paragraphs.
>
>The other side or rules is enforcement. That is likly the more important
>issue to the FCC (IMHO).

All it means is that there a few kHz on 80, 40 20 and 15 where an
Advanced can't go. How many violations of those rules has FCC
had to enforce in the past 10 years?
>
>> >If it takes a one-shot giveaway to clean up
>> >the mess fine, do it.
>> >
>> How about free Generals for all Techs?
>
>That is what ARRL is proposing.
>
Do you think it's a good idea? I don't.

The only "giveaway" that I support is that if a new entry level
license is created (whatever name it is called), that any
privs it has should also apply to existing Novices and Techs
wherever the new license class has privs those classes
don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1677. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 01:33:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <rgr810tlekq87vdfr47bjoljp9kmp0drk8@4ax.com>
Source record: 86403

On Sun, 25 Jan 2004 18:14:17 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>DLTDHYOTAOTWO

Mike - you've piqued my curiosity - Was ist los?

73, Leo

1678. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 01:38:16 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <irr8109vru234sivctt2kmkrpgjinm2ah1@4ax.com>
Source record: 86404

On 25 Jan 2004 20:30:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint:
>Has nothing to do with aviation.

From the theatre, where impromptu performances were given by actors
who received prompts from the wings.

73, leo

1679. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 02:04:14 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <NNGdnVKeLuZA64ndRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86405

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>>
>
> Huh? Well, I don't make an issue of my breasts, either.

Except every time you use your call sign, which is exactly why you chose it.

1680. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 02:08:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zE_Qb.33948$P%1.26740564@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86406

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bv1ldj$31v@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:uiTQb.33744$P%1.26627566@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> >
> > Answering a direct question is not making an issue of it. That is
> > addressing other people's issues. Same for alluding to them, she is
> > addressing other people's issues. She is not the one starting it.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> 'SCUSE ME????? And, how exactly do you think *I* started this?
Oh...wait,
> I got the callsign. Well, we've had that debate in here before and my
> equivalent to that is that it's like saying someone who wears skimpy
> clothes, or looks sexy, etc., is just asking to get raped.
>

No not quite the same thing at all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1681. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now! Free lobotomy included!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 02:34:48 UTC
From: Screw'em <am@teur.radio>
Message-ID: <c1%Qb.118600$5V2.616514@attbi_s53>
Source record: 86407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

```
>> I am with the poster who sed:
>>
>> -- >I have a completely different opinion!
>> > >
>> > >Join the ARRL today! \
>>
>> 73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
>
```

I won't join the ARRL because full membership now requires a frontal lobotomy. If you see your section manager or Division director at a meeting or Hamfest, ask them how their surgury went, then slap the shit out of them for me.

Screw'em

1682. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 02:37:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401251837.16e5ed3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86408

blackm00@cam.org (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<6447bcd3.0401250927.6cd68188@posting.google.com>...

> "Dan Mattingly N0FQN" <n0fqn@charter.net> wrote in message
news:<100v15m37nr7cf4@corp.supernews.com>...

> > The issue is it was not invented today. So, what's your point??? You could
> > say this statement about any subject. It's too, broad in texture. Narrow
> > your point or I won't give you a grade.
>
> That's what I find amusing about these threads.
>
> People want to play "what if" but they aren't describing the situation
> where ham radio would be invented today. The way I see it, the real
> reason they can imagine amateur radio is because it's been around
> all these years. Form follows function. The proponents of this
> thread can't really explain why amateur radio would arise today,
> without the bias of the past, so really they can't define what
> would arise if it did.

This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
looking to make a buck...nothing else.

He often fancies himself the Knowledge Guru since he's very adept
at cut-and-paste.

His favorite technique is to favor you with his presence, but
then when you dare to disagree with him at any level, you are a
"jack-booted thug", an "elitist", a "Nazi", or any number of other
adjectives that he cares to endear Amateurs with. It's especially
worse if you happen to be an Amateur Extra.

> CB is a good example of something coming later. "Radio for
> everyone" or something like that. Came about around sixty years
> after people started playing with radio out of the laboratory.
> They could only offer up a small slice of the spectrum, and that
> by taking from amateur radio. And while technology did limit
> things, realistically the only model was that of amateur radio,
> ie direct between two stations. Now admittedly early proponents
> of CB often came from amateur radio, but practically as soon
> as the service was created, it was referred to in hobby terms.
> Not "this is a radio service that you can use to help your hobby"
> but a hobby in itself. Look in Popular Electronics from the time,
> and you'll see articles by Don Stoner and Tom Kneital to this effect.

> (And warnings from the FCC that it ain't a hobby band.) If amateur
> radio had not existed, what would CB have been like?

CB's "hobby terms" were created by those who found out that the
FCC's rules against "distance" communications were foolhearty against
Mother Nature. The 11 meter allocation was foolish from the start for
a "low-power, personal, short range" communications service. Amateurs
back then told the FCC that the 11 meter band would enjoy the same
propagation that the 10 meter band did, and low-power/long distance
communications were quite common.

The results were predictable. That the FCC would thrown it's
hands up and NOT police that which it had created was not.

> It recently occurred to me that far more people are using radio
> for communication than at any point in the past. But instead
> of radio, they are seen as telephone technology. Yes, cellphones.
> It makes good use of the spectrum, it is something relatively familiar,
> and realistically, people are more interested in reliable communication
> with those they know.

It is only as reliable as the infrastructure that supports it.
No cell tower, no cellphone. An adept hacker could interrupt the
cellphone net. A well-funded group of terrorists or other malcontents
could create a lot of damage without a single bullet or carbomb.

> On one hand, we have people lamenting that amateur radio can't compete
> with computers and cellphones today. Yet, then others turn around
> and wonder what amateur radio would be like if started today. I can't
> really conceive of amateur radio starting today, because I'm not sure what
> the purpose would be. And once you start with that premise, free of
> knowing that amateur radio has existed all these years, only then can
> one begin to imagine what (if anything) would be available to such
> a hobby if started today.

Amateur Radio's present allocations exist, for the most part, as
a legacy of Amateur Radio's history, but is sustained today based upon
it's ability to consistently meet the "basis and purpose" of it's
enabling regulations (at least in the United States), part of which is
public service and emergency communications...Again, a point of fact
that the originator of this thread insists on ignoring or trying to
dismiss as "regulatory language" drafted for the sole purpose of
satisfying some bureaucrat's need to be verbose.

> I also note that the topic wasn't about "what would the world be
> like without amateur radio" but "what would amateur radio be like
> if started today". So yes, one can look back and imagine a history
> of radio without amateurs, but the two are indeed linked. Take out
> that history from amateur radio, and I really don't see it starting
> up today.

Take Amateurs out of the history of radio altogether and radio
today would be a different place. Can you imagine a "radio" today

that was solely base upon commercial influence and control?

73

Steve, K4YZ

1683. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 02:40:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401251840.3d881490@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86409

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040119225731.12501.00005668@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> Somebody said that ham licenses would be available in cereal
> boxes. Is that true? [I don't think Rev. Jimmie said that...]

I thought it was YOU, Sir Putzalot...

After all, it WAS you who said he was getting an "Extra Lite out of the box..."

The box has been open for three years now...What's holding you back now?

Steve, K4YZ

1684. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 02:45:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401251845.5055d25c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86410

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040121181448.08626.00002728@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> >Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do?
>
> Here's a few suggestions on what they "should" do -

Once again the Newsgroup Antagonist barrages us with yet another
satiric and vile dousing of his vile, anti-amateur rhetoric.

None of which had anyhting to do with "Morse Code testing", of
which he swore was his ONLY interest in this forum.

Uh huh...we believe THAT.

steve, K4YZ

1685. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 03:14:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040125221426.05957.00000153@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86412

In article <IEMQb.23928$i4.14261@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > (snip) haven't seen one person of the
>>> child rearing age group voice a single
>> > complaint about this in this newsgroup.
>>
>> Yes, you have.
>
>
> Okay, how about in the "typical" child rearing age group. How old are you
>now? 49? How many young, impressionable, children do you have running
>around your house? Larry is not exactly a young spring chicken either.
>
>
>> How do you know how old somebody's
>> grandchildren or children are, Dwight?
>
>
> Speculation based on typical child birth trends in this country.
>
>
>> How old are these "old men"?
>
>
> Lets see. You're about 49. Larry has to be pushing about 50. I'm 50. Who
>else?

Dwight:

I was born Oct. 31, 1952, which makes me 51 years young. I don't feel
a day over 30, however!

>> I simply say it's inappropriate for
>> ham radio, that's all.
>>
>> Do you think it's appropriate?
>
>
> Kim's callsign or the word alone?

The suffix of Kim's call sign spells out a word which is commonly
regarded as a vulgar reference to a woman's breasts. Therefore,

her call sign is very inappropriate for a family-oriented activity such as the amateur radio service.

>> > Kim's callsign is only as vulgar as you,
>> > the person hearing it, makes it.
>>
>> Have I *ever* said it was vulgar?
>
>
> And I didn't say you said it was vulgar.
>
>
>> So your values have to be everyone
>> else's?
>
>
> Don't be silly. I never said that either.

The "vulgarity" of Kim's call sign would be open to the perceptions of other hams. Riley Hollingsworth said it best when he said that a parent, grandparent, uncle or aunt of a young person who was also a prospective ham would likely be put off by her call, and choose a more appropriate activity for that young person to pursue. Thus, it has the potential to bring the ARS "…one step closer to extinction." I won't presume to speak for Kim, but I, for one, wouldn't want that hanging over my head!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1686. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 03:14:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040125221427.05957.00000154@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86411

In article <paednV0vF4H4To7dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

> You know, Dwight, I'm not so sure. I don't recall Jim ever making an
>issue of the issue, except for ommitting the callsign. He's not doing
>anything except omitting what he finds inappropriate. He isn't calling
>Kim names, and he Is engaging her in posts here in the group.
>
> And as pointed out, the callsign was indeed chosen so that some people
>WOULD find it inappropriate.
>
>
> What would *you* have him do? I'm a little confused about what some
>people want out of this thread. Jim HAS to use Kim's callsign? Jim has
>to apologize to Kim for finding her callsign inappropriate? Jim has to
>have his posts approved for content before posting?
>
> What do you think of her reasoning behind getting that callsign? I
>don't care one way or the other, aside from an acceptance of it, and for
>discussion of the callsign to go away, even though that would probably
>be dissapointing to the owner, who has stated that the callsign was
>designed to get attention, and which people are giving attention to the
>callsign in what must be an immensely gratifying amount to her.
>
> Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Very well said. I have no doubt that Kim chose her callsign with the specific intent of inciting controversy. However, in so doing, she has left herself open to others forming the opinion that she is simply a no-class slag with absolutely no taste, self-respect, or sense of propriety whatsoever. Unfortunately, there is no way that she can possibly dispel that perception unless she does the right thing and changes her call sign to something more appropriate for a family-oriented activity like amateur radio. Only time will tell whether or not she takes this advice to heart, and acts accordingly. However, if she intends to keep her present call sign, then she will always be in the position of having to defend the indefensible. And as long as there are still good, decent people involved in the ARS, her arguments will fall on deaf ears.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1687. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 03:21:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <T9KdnRuVlKQ-Gond4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86413

Leo wrote:
> On Sun, 25 Jan 2004 18:14:17 -0500, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
>>DLTDHYOTAOTWO
>
>
> Mike - you've piqued my curiosity - Was ist los?

Don't Let The Door Hit You On The Way Out (a little paraphrased, you'll get the other OTA in the middle, I think! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1688. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 03:43:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <z10Rb.26993$1e.25468@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86414

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

|
| This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
| who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
| Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
| looking to make a buck...nothing else.
|

Mike Coslo isn't a ham? What's this "KB3EIA" business he puts in his
signature then?

73, de Hans, K0HB

1689. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 04:39:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tS0Rb.25744$q4.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86415

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> The days when the nests were all
> empty by the time Mom and Dad
> hit 50 are long gone, Dwight. And
> that's in "typical" America.

That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single 40 or 50 year old recently with a young child. In fact, I only remember meeting one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the case, I haven't seen it to be commonplace.

> Why does that matter? You may have
> noticed that I don't talk about my
> domestic situation here.

It matters only in the context of the discussion - how many in our age group have young children.

> Suppose, just suppose, that I have 5
> children ranging in age from toddlers to
> teenagers. (I don't, but that's not the
> point). Would you then say I was right
> and Kim's call was inappropriate?

Have those supposed children also talked to Kim on the radio, hearing her callsign and making something out of it? Lets not discuss hypothetical situations, Jim. Anything can be justified or condemned using that.

> And your source is?

Fifty years of life, meeting thousands in that period.

> Do you consider that to be "old"?
> I don't. I consider it to be "middle
> aged".

Forty or fifty is certainly not young.

> Both. I say neither is appropriate.

Appropriate for what? As I said earlier, it's not my job to decide what is appropriate for others in this world, or demand they conform to my ideas of what is appropriate.

> You and Kim keep using the term
> "vukgar" rather than addressing
> whether it's "appropriate".

I've addressed the issue of appropriateness several times.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1690. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 04:52:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%11Rb.25790$q4.13238@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86416

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> You know, Dwight, I'm not so sure.
> I don't recall Jim ever making an
> issue of the issue, except for ommitting
> the callsign. (snip)

By omitting the callsign, he made it an issue to be discussed. Were we all supposed to notice it and say nothing?

> What would *you* have him do? I'm
> a little confused about what some
> people want out of this thread. (snip)

I wouldn't "have him do" anything. There has been no demands made of him from me. He's free to do what he wants, just as we're free to comment on what he does.

> What do you think of her reasoning
> behind getting that callsign? (snip)

As I've stated several times, I don't really care what her reasonings were. It's simply not my job to judge Kim. I've told Kim what I think, and that is enough. I don't see any reason to keep repeating myself. And I certainly don't see any reason to repeat myself over and over through a several year period as some in this newsgroup have done.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1691. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 04:56:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <161Rb.25802$q4.24753@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86417

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> The suffix of Kim's call sign spells
> out a word which is commonly
> regarded as a vulgar reference to
> a woman's breasts. Therefore,
> her call sign is very inappropriate
> for a family-oriented activity such
> as the amateur radio service.

By whose standards of inappropriateness, Larry? And who made that person the judge of what is appropriate in this radio service? The FCC issued the callsign. As far as I'm concerned, that is the only "judge" that matters in this regard.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1692. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 05:21:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9t1Rb.27100$1e.14183@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86418

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote

|
| So you and Mr Black just say there wouldn't be any such thing.
|

That's correct. If amateur radio did not already exist there is Zero point Zero Zero Zero (and I'm rounding upwards) probability that it would be created today.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1693. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 09:16:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401260925450.3932@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 86419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Mon, 19 Jan 2004, Tom Winston wrote:
> On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>
> That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
> passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
> Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
> -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.
>
> Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
> higher standards than the current crop of Extras.
>
> So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make
> that decision.

But one can still tell: The PRIOR CLASS field will still say "A".

> Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.

That part I agree with; they can't seem to leave anything alone without screwing
it up.

1694. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 09:58:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401260158.6d269569@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86420

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<z10Rb.26993$1e.25468@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> |
> | This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
> | who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
> | Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
> | looking to make a buck...nothing else.
> |
>
> Mike Coslo isn't a ham? What's this "KB3EIA" business he puts in his
> signature then?

You're just a bit too eager to jump into someones Wheaties, Your
One-Upmanship.

That thread was ORIGINATED by Lennie.

Please refer to:

>Message 1 in thread
>From: Len Over 21 (lenover21@aol.com)
>Subject: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

For YOUR benefit, Master Chief, I point out the words "MESSAGE 1
IN THREAD" and the "FROM" line.

Now...Next time you find yourself a bit over-anxious to try and
humilate someone with your dazzling self righteousness, I hope you'll
be sure you have your facts right...

Steve, K4YZ

1695. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 10:08:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv2pre$66a@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86423

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040125221426.05957.00000153@mb-m26.aol.com...
>
> The "vulgarity" of Kim's call sign would be open to the perceptions of
> other hams. Riley Hollingsworth said it best when he said that a parent,
> grandparent, uncle or aunt of a young person who was also a prospective
> ham would likely be put off by her call, and choose a more appropriate
> activity for that young person to pursue. Thus, it has the potential to
> bring the ARS ".one step closer to extinction." I won't presume to
> speak for Kim, but I, for one, wouldn't want that hanging over my head!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, you are one of the most vulgar persons I've ever been witness to.

Kim W5TIT

1696. OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 10:09:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86421

There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.

While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the sake of sales/membership.

My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.

Other than hurl epithets and insults, is anyone else going to do anything remotely constructive? Or is this pretty much the usual "I-ain't-gonna-do-nuttin-but-whine-like-a-pig" RRAP rhetoric being bantied about?

73

Steve, K4YZ

1697. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 10:18:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv2prf$66a@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86422

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040125221427.05957.00000154@mb-m26.aol.com...
>
> Mike:
>
> Very well said. I have no doubt that Kim chose her callsign with the
> specific intent of inciting controversy. However, in so doing, she has
> left herself open to others forming the opinion that she is simply a
> no-class slag with absolutely no taste, self-respect, or sense of
> propriety whatsoever.
>

From people such as yourself?! That's a joke!

>
> Unfortunately, there is no way that she can
> possibly dispel that perception unless she does the right thing and
> changes her call sign to something more appropriate for a family-
> oriented activity like amateur radio.
>

My callsign is as appropriate as anyone else's. Oh, I know you feel
differently but, like I have implied, people such as yourself just don't get
it. What of your rude, crude, obnoxious behavior, Larry? Oh, wait, you
think that's OK! ROFLMAO.

>
> Only time will tell whether or
> not she takes this advice to heart, and acts accordingly.
>

Time's told. It won't be changed, unless I ever decide to get K5TIT, but I
doubt I will.

>
> However,
> if she intends to keep her present call sign, then she will always
> be in the position of having to defend the indefensible.
>

Y'know...you almost make that sound like you think having this callsign is
some kind of punishment or something. I don't defend my callsign at
all...why would the need arise? On the other hand, it's rather comical
people such as yourself are so compelled to react to a callsign, when your
very actions against other people are quite despicable and rather
embarrassing to the ARS. My callsign *may* be offensive to some people.

However, there's nothing equal to some of the personalities I see displayed in this newsgroup and one can only hope they don't act like that on the air!

> And as long
> as there are still good, decent people involved in the ARS, her
> arguments will fall on deaf ears.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Isn't that something?! The people I consider good, decent folks in the ARS, don't have an issue with my callsign at all. Oh, by the way, isn't it around that time of year that this thread get dropped again, Larry? ROFLMAO!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

1698. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 10:28:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv2q41$cqu@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86424

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:tS0Rb.25744$q4.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > The days when the nests were all
> > empty by the time Mom and Dad
> > hit 50 are long gone, Dwight. And
> > that's in "typical" America.
>
> That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single 40 or
> 50 year old recently with a young child. In fact, I only remember meeting
> one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the case,
I
> haven't seen it to be commonplace.
>

I know one guy from work that has his granddaughter living with him. Whew!
Man, that would be hell on earth in my opinion! I have raised kids and it
ain't happenin' again--at least not unless there are extremely unusual
circumstances. And, if the parents think they're moving back in...pah!!!!

There's one gal I know, who might even be a couple of years older than me,
who has around a nine year old daughter. And, it was deliberate! But, even
of people who are just acquaintences, that's all I know.

> >
> > Why does that matter? You may have
> > noticed that I don't talk about my
> > domestic situation here.
>
> It matters only in the context of the discussion - how many in our age
> group have young children.
>
> > Suppose, just suppose, that I have 5
> > children ranging in age from toddlers to
> > teenagers. (I don't, but that's not the
> > point). Would you then say I was right
> > and Kim's call was inappropriate?
>
> Have those supposed children also talked to Kim on the radio, hearing
her
> callsign and making something out of it? Lets not discuss hypothetical
> situations, Jim. Anything can be justified or condemned using that.
>

I'd only answer that my callsign is not inappropriate under any
circumstance. The word tit is (for the air on the ARS); however, the word
tit is never used by me...and I've never heard it used by anyone else.

>
> > And your source is?
>
>
> Fifty years of life, meeting thousands in that period.
>

I've a feeling if it ain't issued from some form of almanac, governmental
statistic, or otherwise recorable device, it ain't acceptable as fact.

>
> > Do you consider that to be "old"?
> > I don't. I consider it to be "middle
> > aged".
>
>
> Forty or fifty is certainly not young.
>

I don't think it's old, either, Dwight...and good heavens I certainly don't
act it! ;)

>
> > Both. I say neither is appropriate.
>
>
> Appropriate for what? As I said earlier, it's not my job to decide what
is
> appropriate for others in this world, or demand they conform to my ideas
of
> what is appropriate.
>
>
> > You and Kim keep using the term
> > "vukgar" rather than addressing
> > whether it's "appropriate".
>
>
> I've addressed the issue of appropriateness several times.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Yeah, I'd lay odds that this thread was "awakened" again this (late last)
year by Larry, mid-Winter boredom or whatever, and it's about the usual time
for it to be dying down.

Kim W5TIT

1699. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 10:35:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv2qhs$63q@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86425

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:%11Rb.25790$q4.13238@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> > You know, Dwight, I'm not so sure.
> > I don't recall Jim ever making an
> > issue of the issue, except for ommitting
> > the callsign. (snip)
>
>
> By omitting the callsign, he made it an issue to be discussed. Were we
all
> supposed to notice it and say nothing?
>

Ya wouldn't believe who pointed it out to me! LOL

>
> > What would *you* have him do? I'm
> > a little confused about what some
> > people want out of this thread. (snip)
>
>
> I wouldn't "have him do" anything. There has been no demands made of him
> from me. He's free to do what he wants, just as we're free to comment on
> what he does.
>

The only thing I'd suggest, but it's far too liberal for Jim, I'm sure, is
that if he has a problem with my callsign and has a "list" with peoples'
amateur radio callsigns in it, then it would have been far more appropriate
(at least in my opinion) to either just leave my submission out of the list
(could have even sent me a private email or posted why--this debate could
have been had for the umpteenth million time under another thread
altogether); or he could have put everyone in the list with just their name.

But, "have" him do? While Jim has found it handy to feel that things are
being *demanded* of him, no one has demanded a thing.

>
> > What do you think of her reasoning
> > behind getting that callsign? (snip)
>
>
> As I've stated several times, I don't really care what her reasonings
> were. It's simply not my job to judge Kim. I've told Kim what I think, and

> that is enough. I don't see any reason to keep repeating myself. And I
> certainly don't see any reason to repeat myself over and over through a
> several year period as some in this newsgroup have done.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Yeah, and it was probably me (shudder to think), but the issue with the omission of my callsign from the list isn't the issue; the issue is the editing of the post that was made by Jim, even though he edits things from my posts--NOT only my callsign, but words. I see no difference at all. He does. Some others see no difference at all. Some others do. So, what's different about this thread than any other thread in the newsgroup? :o

Kim W5TIT

1700. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 10:46:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv2r52$6ur@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 86426

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com...
> There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.
>
> While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
> poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
> Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
> sake of sales/membership.
>
> My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT
> a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur
> Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.
>
> Other than hurl epithets and insults, is anyone else going to do
> anything remotely constructive? Or is this pretty much the usual
> "I-ain't-gonna-do-nuttin-but-whine-like-a-pig" RRAP rhetoric being
> bantied about?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

You know the group so well, Steve! ;)

73/88, Kim W5TIT

1701. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 12:15:45 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <261a10hb90kasdspc79u51v4ehlal7h2og@4ax.com>
Source record: 86427

Now I got it!

73, Leo

On Sun, 25 Jan 2004 22:21:05 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>> On Sun, 25 Jan 2004 18:14:17 -0500, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>DLTDHYOTAOTWO
>>
>>
>> Mike - you've piqued my curiosity - Was ist los?
>
>Don't Let The Door Hit You On The Way Out (a little paraphrased, you'll
>get the other OTA in the middle, I think! 8^)
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

1702. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 12:35:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HQ7Rb.26628$q4.19830@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86428

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:tS0Rb.25744$q4.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > The days when the nests were all
> > empty by the time Mom and Dad
> > hit 50 are long gone, Dwight. And
> > that's in "typical" America.
>
> That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single 40 or
> 50 year old recently with a young child. In fact, I only remember meeting
> one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the case,
I
> haven't seen it to be commonplace.

Depends on how you define "young." When I was 50 my yongest
daughter was only 8. More and more couples today are getting
married later and having kids later. When I was going to "back-to-school"
night for my youngest, some of the other parents could have been
my kids if my wife and I had married and had kids when we were
20. By the same tokenn, I was not the only "senior" parent there.

(SNIP)

> > Do you consider that to be "old"?
> > I don't. I consider it to be "middle
> > aged".
>
> Forty or fifty is certainly not young.

Speak for yourself. These days 60 isn't
consider old in the same way it was years ago.

Cheers,
Bll K2UNK

1703. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:06:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401260506.5543a92e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<QuWdnTLiJ69xzIndRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> >
> >>Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new people
> >>coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an even
> >>more unbalanced viewpoint.
> >
> >
> > Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
> > hams to drop out.
>
>
> HA! Good one!
>
> This is Brian, right?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Yup. Got tired of my real email account getting loaded with spam.

1704. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:08:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401260508.ba2c84e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0401251444.4090894f@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> > > Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new
> people
> > > coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an
> even
> > > more unbalanced viewpoint.
> >
> > Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
> > hams to drop out.
>
> Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
> The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the experience
> to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas that
> have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Here we go again with the demographics. The ARS is a geriatric service.

Too bad they took the birth date out of the database.

1705. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:12:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401260512.1e435e4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86431

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040125153019.05957.00000151@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0401241754.7be87301@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >and somebody asked "what license class does he have?" His sponser:
> >"Uhhh . . Advanced." Then he ducked. Immediate 180dBA noise level from
> >the Back Benchers, "what the hell is this guy's problem?"
>
> Well, what IS his problem?

Why does he have to have a problem? Why cannot a lowly Advanced enjoy DX?

bb

1706. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:16:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401260516.4d6f662a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86432

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040122195927.07984.00000146@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> There were "class distinctions" before IL, Dan. I heard folks say, way back
> then,
> that Novices and Techs weren't "real hams".

But for the last 8 years you've tried to tell us that there was no
discrimination in the ARS.

"Where never is heard a discouraging word..."

1707. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:44:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ac6dnXOknbhYhljdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86433

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>You know, Dwight, I'm not so sure.
>>I don't recall Jim ever making an
>>issue of the issue, except for ommitting
>>the callsign. (snip)
>
>
>
> By omitting the callsign, he made it an issue to be discussed. Were we all
> supposed to notice it and say nothing?

Victim mentality, Dwight! You and Jim get into a wizzing contest, and
Kim gets her amusement by reading the posts.

It's really too bad that you cannot avoid it, but I think Kim is right.
That callsign seems to have some irresistable effect on some people. And
you just can't help it. You don't have the power to resist.

>
>>What would *you* have him do? I'm
>>a little confused about what some
>>people want out of this thread. (snip)
>
>
>
> I wouldn't "have him do" anything. There has been no demands made of him
> from me. He's free to do what he wants, just as we're free to comment on
> what he does.

>>What do you think of her reasoning
>>behind getting that callsign? (snip)
>
>
> As I've stated several times, I don't really care what her reasonings
> were. It's simply not my job to judge Kim. I've told Kim what I think, and
> that is enough. I don't see any reason to keep repeating myself. And I
> certainly don't see any reason to repeat myself over and over through a
> several year period as some in this newsgroup have done.
>

Then it should be a null argument. You should not care why Jim omits
her callsign, and it isn't your job to judge Jim.

Some people might just care what the reasonings are though.

And as for repeating ones self, you shouldn't "have to", but you are.
The power of of that callsign is simply too much to resist.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1708. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:54:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AuednZVJ-JOdgYjdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86434

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>The days when the nests were all
>>empty by the time Mom and Dad
>>hit 50 are long gone, Dwight. And
>>that's in "typical" America.
>
>
>
> That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single 40 or
> 50 year old recently with a young child. In fact, I only remember meeting
> one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the case, I
> haven't seen it to be commonplace.

Depends on where you are at, I guess. Most people I know have postponed
having children until thier mid 30's. That puts them into their 50's
when the kids leave the nest. A few even wait until their 40's, although
they have found out that that doesn't work very well.

Hopefully people don't age too fast where you come from, Dwight, but
I'm 49 and don't feel the least bit old.

>>Why does that matter? You may have
>>noticed that I don't talk about my
>>domestic situation here.
>
>
>
> It matters only in the context of the discussion - how many in our age
> group have young children.
>
>
>
>>Suppose, just suppose, that I have 5
>>children ranging in age from toddlers to
>>teenagers. (I don't, but that's not the
>>point). Would you then say I was right
>>and Kim's call was inappropriate?
>
>
>
> Have those supposed children also talked to Kim on the radio, hearing her
> callsign and making something out of it? Lets not discuss hypothetical

> situations, Jim. Anything can be justified or condemned using that.

Dwight, Take your average year old boy. He hears ANYTHING that can be taken out of context, and he'll be all giggly for quite a while. That's what they do. Anything gross or something that can be twisted in meaning, they will do it.

>>And your source is?
>
>
>
> Fifty years of life, meeting thousands in that period.
>
>
>
>>Do you consider that to be "old"?
>>I don't. I consider it to be "middle
>>aged".
>
>
>
> Forty or fifty is certainly not young.

Middle aged is 60's. Congrat's Dwight, you've been moved down the scale and are officially younger! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1709. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 13:56:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <NYqdnRJA_IVsgYjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 86435

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040124122059.11022.00003717@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <rNGcnbCzzcdFFo_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >The ham bands have *not*
> >"become sounding like CB over the last 17 years" -
>
> Not the CW/digital subbands, anyway. The 'phone bands are another story...

I haven't seen it ... and you know I don't choose to operate CW.
YMMV ... but I doubt it's the broad reality.

> >there have always
> >been a few bad apples - MANY of them OTs who passed the 20 wpm
> >Morse test and believe they are some sort of gods.
>
> SOME of them, anyway.
>
> But ALL of them passed the written tests, too.

So? I think it's a given that NO test filters out lids ... no way to fix
that.
Bad behavior is an enforcement issue, not something that can be dealt
with "up front" through licensing requirements.

[snip]

> So tell us what you think of the ARRL proposal, Carl. We already know
about the
> code test, so let's just skip that part.

OK, we agree that NCI will not support keeping Morse tests for ANY class of
license.

> What do you think of:

My *personal* views, NOT necessarily "NCI policy" ...

> 1) the "NewNovice" idea? (easy entry-level exam, limited power, more HF
modes
> and spectrum, less VHF/UHF)

Good idea ... we need to give newcomers a better taste of all of ham radio.
Power
restrictions make sense, and I don't see a big enforcement issue - the
Novice

license had power restrictions and I don't believe that ever presented a
real problem.

> 2) closing Tech to new issues?

OK by me, given a more sensible beginner class license as proposed.

> 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?

I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
written
element should be a requirement. However, I've read Ed Hare's excellent
personal, not ARRL policy comments on this from eham, and find that
they make sense to me - a compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.

> 4) free upgrades for Advanceds to Extra?

As #3 above ... Ed's argument are pretty persuasive if you think them
through with an open mind. The tests between Tech/General and
Advanced/Extra are *really* not ALL that different ...

> 5) widening of some of the 'phone image subbands?

While I've stated many times that I would not support wholesale
proliferation of SSB/SSTV to the detriment of CW/digital modes,
the "refarming" of the (largely unused) "Novice bands" as proposed,
is modest and I can tolerate it ... if it doesn't happen, the proposal
can be tweaked a bit to allow for the increased access to HF for
the "new Novices".

> I say 1) and 2) are good ideas. The rest are bad ideas.
>
> What say you?

As I said above. Note again, these are my *personal* views after
considering Ed's excellent and persuasive explaination of why he
supports the proposal (of course, Ed knows that I will NOT support
keeping code testing for Extra).

73,
Carl - wk3c

1710. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 14:01:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t6udnVad1_RIgIjdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86436
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

William wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>news:1e4e3692.0401251444.4090894f@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>
>> news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>>
>>>>Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new
>>
>> people
>>
>>>>coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an
>>
>> even
>>
>>>>more unbalanced viewpoint.
>>>
>>>Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
>>>hams to drop out.
>>
>>Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
>>The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the experience
>>to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas that
>>have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Here we go again with the demographics. The ARS is a geriatric service.
>
> Too bad they took the birth date out of the database.

She's *kind* of right, Brian. I'd modify it that the oldsters should be
the helpful type, not the ones spitting bile about how awful or stupid
everyone is anymore. 8^) I really enjoy talking with old timers about
ham radio and radio in general as long as I don't get an earful of vitriol.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1711. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 15:17:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86437

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...
> There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.

Also a lot of positivism.
>
> While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
> poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
> Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
> sake of sales/membership.

I disagree! I think it has some good ideas and some bad ideas.

For example, even before 1991 the Tech was essentially the "entry
level" license - which was never the intent of that license class.
Because the
privileges focus so much on VHF/UHF, the entry path for many new hams
shifted from HF to VHF/UHF. And to many new hams, ham radio became
more
locally-oriented than regionally-, nationally- or
internationally-oriented.

Also, since homebrewing VHF/UHF gear can be more difficult than HF
gear, even more newcomers went with manufactured equipment from Day 1
rather than kit of homebrew gear.

If the newcomer passes Element 1, all he/she gets in additional privs
is a few tiny CW-only slices of three HF ham band, plus some 10 meter
SSB and CW. While lots of great stuff can be done with a simple setup
on 10 when the band is open, it becomes more like a VHF band when the
band isn't open.

On top of all this, the Tech written (Element 2) is full of arcane
stuff like RF exposure calculations, which displaces more basic stuff
that would serve a newcomer better.

The retooling of the old Novice license is an attempt to equalize
HF-VHF-UHF in the entry-level license. And that's a good idea, I
think.
>
> My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT
> a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur
> Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.

What about your Director and Vice Director - or better yet, the entire
BoD? And let 'em know exactly what's good and bad, and why.
>

> Other than hurl epithets and insults, is anyone else going to do
> anything remotely constructive?

I've already let the BoD know what I think of their proposal. Plus some ideas of my own. In fact, I did that before the BoD meeeting.

If/when the proposal becomes an RM, it'll be comment time......

73 de Jim, N2EY

1712. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 15:55:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uLaRb.27368$1e.24311@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86438

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

| That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single
40 or
| 50 year old recently with a young child.

1713. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now! Free lobotomy included!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 16:36:39 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <rmbRb.27293$q4.26694@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Screw'em" <am@teur.radio> wrote in
news:c1%Qb.118600$5V2.616514@attbi_s53:

>>> I am with the poster who sed:
>>>
>>> -- >I have a completely different opinion!
>>> > >
>>> > >Join the ARRL today! \
>>>
>>> 73 From The Wilderness Keyboard
>>
>
>
> I won't join the ARRL because full membership now requires a frontal
> lobotomy. If you see your section manager or Division director at a
> meeting or Hamfest, ask them how their surgury went, then slap the
> shit out of them for me.

I'm afraid you *will* need to slap them in order to get their attention.
The BOD doesn't listen to members or hams like me anymore.

If the ARRL leadership had cared about the state of amateur radio and the
quality of its operators, they never would have made the proposals that
they've made over the last 11 years. To them its let us get more morons
licensed so we can get more money in the ole bank account. The ARRL
leadership doesn't care for quality, capable operators. But their plan
will back fire on them and ham radio has and will suffer. When you hand
free licenses to everyone, those people don't appreciate it and probably
won't buy a membership. You always appreciate something more when you
had to work harder to get it and you'll take care of it. But to the ARRL
it's all about money and I'll bet anyone in this group that if they get
their way with their proposal they will offer a 12 dollar discount to new
ham non-members like they did at the last restructuring. "Take a ham
test, and we'll discount new membership on the price of your VEC test
fee!"

Oh well, Nuff said. Most of you don't care anyway. Back to listening to
the lids and CBer type behavior on the bands. 73

KB7ADL

1714. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now! Free lobotomy included!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 17:25:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126122552.26428.00000991@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 86440

Heres something better: From the ARRLs FAG:

"Did ARRL poll its members on this proposal? How was it formulated?

Because ARRL is a representative democracy, ARRL Directors listened to members in their respective divisions while considering these issues. Directors heard from many amateurs in their divisions, and some directors conducted their own surveys. The final proposal represents the Board's best effort at changes to the Amateur Radio licensing structure needed to carry us through the next 10 to 15 years."

Now this makes one wonder how many members did they get Info from. Was it 5, 10, 20, or even 100. The point being before the ARRL puts forth such a proposal, it would be well Advised to determine what a Majority of there MEMBERSHIP was thinking. Untill the ARRL provides actuall figures, I can no longer see where they represent there MEMBERS WISHES.
As for me, with 25 Years as a Member, they will never get 1 more RED PENNY from me for anything.

1715. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 17:39:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ZIqdnY5u-8F6zIjdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86441

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>
> That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single 40 or
> 50 year old recently with a young child. In fact, I only remember meeting
> one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the case, I
> haven't seen it to be commonplace.

You must live in a different world then or don't get out much, my son is
39 and has two daughtgers age 11 and a son age 9, my daughter is 41 and
has a daughter age 6 and a son age 4 and one on the way. I suggest you
go to your local kindergarten school and see how many parents are there
in their late 30's early 40's with small children.

1716. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 18:23:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <TWcRb.27619$1e.13336@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86442

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

| > 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?
|
| I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
| written element should be a requirement. However, I've read
| Ed Hare's excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments
| on this from eham, and find that they make sense to me - a
| compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
| make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.

I haven't seen Ed Hare's argument, so I can't comment on it. If the "adjustment" were some minor clean-up to sweep up the remnants of a long abandoned legacy class and the number of licenses involved was trivial (under 10,000), then I'd have no problem with it.

But we aren't dealing with some trival number, we are dealing with almost 2/3rds of existing licensees.

The message ARRL sends with this proposal is "our General (and Extra) qualifications" are more strenuous than need be. Such a free-pass would establish that all these hundreds of thousands of licensees have been qualified for General (or Extra) all along. At that moment it is established, ipso facto, that the current Technician examination is sufficient for the 'new General' and that the last Advanced examination is sufficient for the 'new Extra'.

Up until now I have never raised the cry of "dumbing down", but such a mass give-away would set a new lower bar for all future qualification levels in the Amateur Radio service, and your position allegedly in support of strenuous technical qualification standards rings hollow indeed.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1717. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 18:52:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <FldRb.27659$1e.10393@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86443

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote

| Because ARRL is a representative democracy, ARRL Directors listened to
members
| in their respective divisions while considering these issues.
Directors heard
| from many amateurs in their divisions, and some directors conducted
their own
| surveys. The final proposal represents the Board's best effort at
changes to
| the Amateur Radio licensing structure needed to carry us through the
next 10 to
| 15 years."

I, for one, suggest that popularity polls and beauty contests are not a particularly good method for influencing and guiding the evolution of the Amateur Radio service.

This is particularly true for the National Association for Amateur Radio, which in my not-so-humble-opinion is abdicating its responsibility to show leadership and vision, but has cobbled together an unimaginative proposal lacking both, and copping out by passing it off as "listened to members"

An example of an alternative is at http://tinyurl.com/wce9

73, de Hans, K0HB

1718. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 19:06:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nzdRb.34043$P%1.26924274@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86444
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:t6udnVad1_RIgIjdRVn-hg@adelphia.com...
> William wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> >>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> >>news:1e4e3692.0401251444.4090894f@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >> news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >>
> >>>>Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new
> >>
> >> people
> >>
> >>>>coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with
an
> >>
> >> even
> >>
> >>>>more unbalanced viewpoint.
> >>>
> >>>Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
> >>>hams to drop out.
> >>
> >>Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still
needed.
> >>The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the
experience
> >>to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas
that
> >>have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and
new.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> > Here we go again with the demographics. The ARS is a geriatric service.
> >
> > Too bad they took the birth date out of the database.

>
> She's *kind* of right, Brian. I'd modify it that the oldsters should be
> the helpful type, not the ones spitting bile about how awful or stupid
> everyone is anymore. 8^) I really enjoy talking with old timers about
> ham radio and radio in general as long as I don't get an earful of
vitriol.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Keep in mind also that the vitriolic ones tend to be highly vocal and
noticeable thus giving people the impression that there are a lot of them
when in reality they are only a handful.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1719. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 19:09:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <PBdRb.34045$P%1.26924721@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86445

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:ZIqdnY5u-8F6zIjdRVn-vg@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > That may be typical in your world. However, I haven't met a single 40
or
> > 50 year old recently with a young child. In fact, I only remember
meeting
> > one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the
case, I
> > haven't seen it to be commonplace.
>
> You must live in a different world then or don't get out much, my son is
> 39 and has two daughtgers age 11 and a son age 9, my daughter is 41 and
> has a daughter age 6 and a son age 4 and one on the way. I suggest you
> go to your local kindergarten school and see how many parents are there
> in their late 30's early 40's with small children.
>

And don't forget the children being raised by their grandparents rather than
their parents.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1720. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 19:13:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <401566CD.2030402@psu.edu>
Source record: 86446

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<z10Rb.26993$1e.25468@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>|
>>| This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
>>| who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
>>| Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
>>| looking to make a buck...nothing else.
>>|
>>
>>Mike Coslo isn't a ham? What's this "KB3EIA" business he puts in his
>>signature then?
>
>
> You're just a bit too eager to jump into someones Wheaties, Your
> One-Upmanship.
>
> That thread was ORIGINATED by Lennie.
>
> Please refer to:
>
>
>>Message 1 in thread
>>From: Len Over 21 (lenover21@aol.com)
>>Subject: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)
>
>
> For YOUR benefit, Master Chief, I point out the words "MESSAGE 1
> IN THREAD" and the "FROM" line.
>
> Now...Next time you find yourself a bit over-anxious to try and
> humilate someone with your dazzling self righteousness, I hope you'll
> be sure you have your facts right...

Ahh, the confusion lies in that I originated the thread, and then Lenover21 - for reasons unknown - perhaps not to taint himself with replying to a thread I started, then started a new thread that was titled the same, save for the "reprise".

- Mike KB3EIA -

1721. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 19:36:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126143602.23011.00000908@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86447

>I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>| written element should be a requirement. However, I've read
>| Ed Hare's excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments
>| on this from eham, and find that they make sense to me - a
>| compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>| make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
>

I missed this, but as usual Mr CBplusser himself backs down. How many times
has Karl stated that he would fight to the end if what is about to happens.

1722. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 19:39:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126143906.21457.00003643@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 86448

In article <TWcRb.27619$1e.13336@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>| > 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?
>|
>| I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>| written element should be a requirement. However, I've read
>| Ed Hare's excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments
>| on this from eham, and find that they make sense to me - a
>| compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>| make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
>
>I haven't seen Ed Hare's argument, so I can't comment on it.

Me neither - can you post a link?

>If the
>"adjustment" were some minor clean-up to sweep up the remnants of a long
>abandoned legacy class and the number of licenses involved was trivial
>(under 10,000), then I'd have no problem with it.

>But we aren't dealing with some trival number, we are dealing with
>almost 2/3rds of existing licensees.

??

Let's see - as of January 15, 2004:

Novice - 32,718
Technician - 259,949
Technician Plus - 62,714
General - 141,443
Advanced - 81,961
Extra - 104,946
Total - 683,731

Total Technicians and Pluses: 322,663

322,663/683,731 = about 47.2% of existing hams getting a free upgrade to General
81,961/683,731 = about 11.9% of existing hams getting a free upgrade to Extra

Total of about 59.1% getting a free upgrade - wow!

>The message ARRL sends with this proposal is "our General (and Extra)
>qualifications" are more strenuous than need be. Such a free-pass would

>establish that all these hundreds of thousands of licensees have been
>qualified for General (or Extra) all along. At that moment it is
>established, ipso facto, that the current Technician examination is
>sufficient for the 'new General' and that the last Advanced examination
>is sufficient for the 'new Extra'.

I agree 100%. And that's not the only message. Such giveaways also say that the tests are so difficult that existing hams cannot be reasonably expected to pass them on their own - but new hams have to!

>Up until now I have never raised the cry of "dumbing down", but such a
>mass give-away would set a new lower bar for all future qualification
>levels in the Amateur Radio service, and your position allegedly in
>support of strenuous technical qualification standards rings hollow
>indeed.

Remember what I was talking about some weeks back, Hans - and Carl asked me to be quiet in case someone got the idea?

There's no good reason I can see to give existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Advanceds a bye on the writtens for the next license class.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1723. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 19:39:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126143907.21457.00003644@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 86449

In article <yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
>The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the experience
>to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas that
>have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.

Well said, Dee!

There's also the need to recognize that newer is not always better, yet if you never try anyhting different you may never get anything different.

"The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to preserve change amid order." - Alfred North Whitehead

73 de Jim, N2EY

1724. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 21:01:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2ffRb.34074$P%1.26947148@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86450

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040126143907.21457.00003644@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
> >The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the
experience
> >to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas
that
> >have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.
>
> Well said, Dee!
>
> There's also the need to recognize that newer is not always better, yet if
> you never try anyhting different you may never get anything different.
>
> "The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to preserve
change
> amid order." - Alfred North Whitehead
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The quote says it even better though.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1725. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 21:14:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401261314.5a6c5f0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86501

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...
> > There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.
>
> Also a lot of positivism.
> >
> > While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
> > poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
> > Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
> > sake of sales/membership.
>
> I disagree! I think it has some good ideas and some bad ideas.
>
> For example, even before 1991 the Tech was essentially the "entry
> level" license - which was never the intent of that license class.

Nope. The Novice was the entry level license prior to 1991.

> Because the
> privileges focus so much on VHF/UHF, the entry path for many new hams
> shifted from HF to VHF/UHF.

Post 1991.

And to many new hams, ham radio became
> more
> locally-oriented than regionally-, nationally- or
> internationally-oriented.

Heaven forbid an entry level license that's internationally-oriented!

It's been said that Advanced licensees have a "problem" where DX
chasing is concerned.

1726. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 21:15:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40158379.9080403@psu.edu>
Source record: 86503

William wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040125153019.05957.00000151@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <d22b54c3.0401241754.7be87301@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>
>>>and somebody asked "what license class does he have?" His sponser:
>>>"Uhhh . . Advanced." Then he ducked. Immediate 180dBA noise level from
>>>the Back Benchers, "what the hell is this guy's problem?"
>>
>>Well, what IS his problem?
>
>
> Why does he have to have a problem? Why cannot a lowly Advanced enjoy DX?

Short of actual discrimination, it takes at least two people to make a person inferior. The person that sets themselves up as superior, and the other person that accepts their superiority and therefore their own inferiority.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1727. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 21:15:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401261315.1498909b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86502
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<t6udnVad1_RIgIjdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> >>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> >>news:1e4e3692.0401251444.4090894f@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >> news:<L8VQb.33855$P%1.26657258@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >>
> >>>>Old timers dropping out will not do a thing. There are enough new
> >>
> >> people
> >>
> >>>>coming in that they won't even notice. Instead we will be left with an
> >>
> >> even
> >>
> >>>>more unbalanced viewpoint.
> >>>
> >>>Depends on your point of view. I'm going to encourage more cranky old
> >>>hams to drop out.
> >>
> >>Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
> >>The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the experience
> >>to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas that
> >>have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> > Here we go again with the demographics. The ARS is a geriatric service.
> >
> > Too bad they took the birth date out of the database.
>
> She's *kind* of right, Brian. I'd modify it that the oldsters should be
> the helpful type, not the ones spitting bile about how awful or stupid
> everyone is anymore. 8^) I really enjoy talking with old timers about
> ham radio and radio in general as long as I don't get an earful of vitriol.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I kind of miss W0EX.

1728. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 21:56:29 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <h2gRb.8160$w41.4761910@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 86504

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0401261315.1498909b@posting.google.com...

> I kind of miss W0EX.

Funny you should say that. I was just looking at his QSL card wondering how he is. I sent him a few e-mails to both addresses known to work...and no reply. Hope he's ok.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1729. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 22:47:35 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <bOgRb.66553$f97.8011@fe3.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 86505

Well you people have done such a fantastic job of destroying the hobby, I say it's time to fire up NTI (No Test International) and just finish it off.

Face it, you people killed Ham Radio, it's over.

Ham Radio, RIP

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com...
> There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.
>
> While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
> poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
> Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
> sake of sales/membership.
>
> My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT
> a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur
> Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.
>
> Other than hurl epithets and insults, is anyone else going to do
> anything remotely constructive? Or is this pretty much the usual
> "I-ain't-gonna-do-nuttin-but-whine-like-a-pig" RRAP rhetoric being
> bantied about?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

1730. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 23:23:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <1oadnVYG54LkP4jdRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86506

Bert Craig wrote:

>
> Funny you should say that. I was just looking at his QSL card wondering how
> he is. I sent him a few e-mails to both addresses known to work...and no
> reply. Hope he's ok.

Speaking of QSL cards, I just received one today from the 5 land qsl
burro from an OH station in Finland I worked on September 26, *1981*.
Better late than never I suppose.

1731. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 23:34:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401261534.103d6d7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86507

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040126143906.21457.00003643@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <TWcRb.27619$1e.13336@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> >
> >| > 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?
> >|
> >| I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
> >| written element should be a requirement. However, I've read
> >| Ed Hare's excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments
> >| on this from eham, and find that they make sense to me - a
> >| compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
> >| make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
> >
> >I haven't seen Ed Hare's argument, so I can't comment on it.
>
> Me neither - can you post a link?

eham's "speakout" site can be found at

http://www.eham.net/speakout/opinions/299

There is no w1rfi nor w1aw posting, but the topic is correct.

bb

1732. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 23:53:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qMhRb.27923$q4.18319@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86508

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > Forty or fifty is certainly not young.
>
>
> I don't think it's old, either, Dwight...and
> good heavens I certainly don't act it! ;)

Amazing how our concepts of "old" changes as we age. Decades ago, all of us thought 30 was old. Now "old" is something we're not. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1733. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-26 23:58:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <eQhRb.27944$q4.4797@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86509

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Forty or fifty is certainly not young.
>
> Middle aged is 60's. Congrat's Dwight,
> you've been moved down the scale
> and are officially younger! 8^)

Sixty is "middle" aged? How many people have you met in this country that
are 120 years old?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1734. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:09:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <x_hRb.27980$q4.17852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86510

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> It's really too bad that you cannot avoid
> it, but I think Kim is right. That callsign
> seems to have some irresistable effect
> on some people. And you just can't help
> it. You don't have the power to resist.

Nobody said anything about not being able to resist, Mike. It was an issue (no more than any other issue discussed in this newsgroup), and I simply responded to it.

> Then it should be a null argument. You
> should not care why Jim omits her
> callsign, and it isn't your job to judge
> Jim. (snip)

And I've been careful not to judge Jim. If Jim feels otherwise, he's sadly mistaken.

> (snip) The power of of that callsign is
> simply too much to resist.

You're posting to this thread. Do you find the callsign too much to resist?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1735. Is it True that ARRL Joined NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:19:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126191948.13622.00000508@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86511

I

1736. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:23:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xI2dnafes50VMojd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86512

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>> Forty or fifty is certainly not young.
>>
>>Middle aged is 60's. Congrat's Dwight,
>>you've been moved down the scale
>>and are officially younger! 8^)
>
>
>
> Sixty is "middle" aged? How many people have you met in this country that
> are 120 years old?

It's a big bell curve, IMO

- Mike KB3EIA -

1737. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:25:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xl2dnabes51tMojd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86513

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>It's really too bad that you cannot avoid
>>it, but I think Kim is right. That callsign
>>seems to have some irresistable effect
>>on some people. And you just can't help
>>it. You don't have the power to resist.
>
>
>
> Nobody said anything about not being able to resist, Mike. It was an issue
> (no more than any other issue discussed in this newsgroup), and I simply
> responded to it.
>
>
>
>>Then it should be a null argument. You
>>should not care why Jim omits her
>>callsign, and it isn't your job to judge
>>Jim. (snip)
>
>
>
> And I've been careful not to judge Jim. If Jim feels otherwise, he's sadly
> mistaken.
>
>
>
>>(snip) The power of of that callsign is
>>simply too much to resist.
>
>
>
> You're posting to this thread. Do you find the callsign too much to
> resist?

I pop in and out of the thread as need be. Remember I'm kind of the
group Cassandra! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1738. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:29:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126192904.11022.00003765@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86515

In article <irr8109vru234sivctt2kmkrpgjinm2ah1@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 25 Jan 2004 20:30:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint:
>>Has nothing to do with aviation.
>
>From the theatre, where impromptu performances were given by actors
>who received prompts from the wings.
>
BINGO!

Hey, this guy's good!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1739. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:29:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126192906.11022.00003766@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86514

In article <NYqdnRJA_IVsgYjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040124122059.11022.00003717@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> In article <rNGcnbCzzcdFFo_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >The ham bands have *not*
>> >"become sounding like CB over the last 17 years" -
>>
>> Not the CW/digital subbands, anyway. The 'phone bands are another story...
>
>I haven't seen it ... and you know I don't choose to operate CW.

So you really don't know, then.

>YMMV ... but I doubt it's the broad reality.

Why? If you don't operate CW, what facts drive that doubt?

Could it be that you don't want to say *anything* about the
mode's advantages over other modes, for fear that doing so could
somehow justify a test?
>
>> >there have always
>> >been a few bad apples - MANY of them OTs who passed the 20 wpm
>> >Morse test and believe they are some sort of gods.
>>
>> SOME of them, anyway.
>>
>> But ALL of them passed the written tests, too.
>
>So?

So one of the main purposes of the written tests is to insure knowledge of the
rules
and regs.

>I think it's a given that NO test filters out lids ...

I disagree!

No test filters out *all* violators. But well designed testing can help reduce
violations. Otherwise, what's the point of testing, if it doesn't reduce
violations?

>no way to fix that.

>Bad behavior is an enforcement issue, not something that can be dealt
>with "up front" through licensing requirements.

Faulty premise!

While no test can be a perfect "filter", well designed testing
can reduce violations by making sure that those tested know the rules and what
constitutes a violation, and by requiring an "investment" of themselves to join
the amateur community.

Of course enforcement is needed. But even with very low levels of enforcement,
most amateurs follow the rules. Yet in another service (cb), the level of rules
compliance has been historically much lower, even with much higher levels of
enforcement.
>
Or, to put it simply: If tests don't have an effect on rules compliance, why
have tests at all? The "21st Century" paper(NOT the ARRL proposal!)
proposes that the entry-level license test have few or no "radio law"
questions!

>[snip]
>
>> So tell us what you think of the ARRL proposal, Carl. We already know
>> about the code test, so let's just skip that part.

>> What do you think of:
>
>My *personal* views, NOT necessarily "NCI policy" ...
>
>> 1) the "NewNovice" idea? (easy entry-level exam, limited power, more HF
>> modes and spectrum, less VHF/UHF)
>
>Good idea ... we need to give newcomers a better taste of all of ham radio.
>Power restrictions make sense, and I don't see a big enforcement issue - the
>Novice license had power restrictions and I don't believe that ever presented
a
>real problem.
>
Exactly - in fact, a whole series of manufactured, kit and homebrew rigs were
developed to meet that power limit.

>> 2) closing Tech to new issues?
>
>OK by me, given a more sensible beginner class license as proposed.
>
>> 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?
>
>I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>written element should be a requirement. However, I've read Ed Hare's
> excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments on this from eham,
> and find that

>they make sense to me - a compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.

Link, please? See also other post in this thread.

Nobody loses anything if Tech, Tech Plus and Advanced stay just as they are, or maybe Techs and Tech Pluses get the sum of their existing privs and those of the "NewNovice", rather than a free upgrade to General.

Consider the practical ramifications of this free upgrade stuff.

Suppose FCC sez yes to the ARRL proposal just as written except for the 5 wpm Extra test. From what you write, it sounds like you'd support that.

And suppose they announced that effective June 1, the new rules would go into effect. This would give time to formulate a new question pool for the NewNovice,
etc. (Or pick some other date if you don't like June 1).

Anyone interested in getting a ham license, or any existing Novices, would have a big incentive to get a Tech between now and May 31, because on June 1 they'd get a freebie upgrade.

And anyone who already has a Tech, Tech Plus or Advanced would have a *disincentive* to upgrade, because they'd be getting a free ride come June 1 anyway.

The first group totals maybe 50,000 people, tops, and probably a lot less. The second group totals over 322,000.
>
>> 4) free upgrades for Advanceds to Extra?
>
>As #3 above ... Ed's argument are pretty persuasive if you think them
>through with an open mind.

Let the readers be the judge of that, please. Perhaps a stronger case can be made for Advanced because it's been closed off for almost 4 years now.

>The tests between Tech/General and
>Advanced/Extra are *really* not ALL that different ...

Then you are arguing that they're not needed. You may not see it that way, but others will. Remember how you wanted me to be quiet on this subject some time back? Now you're unintentionally promoting it!

If someone can get a Tech on May 31 and then get a free upgrade to General on June 1, doesn't that *prove* there's nothing essential in the General test? Why not just dump the General test and use the existing Tech test for General, if someone who only passed Tech can get a free upgrade?
>
>> 5) widening of some of the 'phone image subbands?
>
>While I've stated many times that I would not support wholesale
>proliferation of SSB/SSTV to the detriment of CW/digital modes,

>the "refarming" of the (largely unused) "Novice bands" as proposed,

If you choose not to use CW, how do you know they're largely unused?

>is modest and I can tolerate it ... if it doesn't happen, the proposal
>can be tweaked a bit to allow for the increased access to HF for
>the "new Novices".

Part of the whole NewNovice concept is lots more HF access.

The problem with widening the US phone bands is more than just the obvious reduction of CW/digital space. Foreign 'phones tend to hang out below the US 'phone subbands to avoid high power US 'phone QRM (as you know, most countries don't allow as much power as the USA). So widening the US phone bands will push the DX 'phones further into the CW/digital subbands.
>
>> I say 1) and 2) are good ideas. The rest are bad ideas.
>>
>> What say you?
>
>As I said above. Note again, these are my *personal* views after
>considering Ed's excellent and persuasive explaination of why he
>supports the proposal (of course, Ed knows that I will NOT support
>keeping code testing for Extra).
>
Well, I'm sure we;d all like to see that "excellent and persuasive explanation".

Because I sure can't see what the downside is of simply keeping the Advanced as it is, and letting Techs and Tech Pluses have their exisitng privs plus whatever "NewNovices" get.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

1740. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:36:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4oydnT7kefsBL4jd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86516

N2EY wrote:

> In article <TWcRb.27619$1e.13336@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>>| > 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?
>>|
>>| I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>>| written element should be a requirement. However, I've read
>>| Ed Hare's excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments
>>| on this from eham, and find that they make sense to me - a
>>| compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>>| make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
>>
>>I haven't seen Ed Hare's argument, so I can't comment on it.
>
>
> Me neither - can you post a link?
>
>
>>If the
>>"adjustment" were some minor clean-up to sweep up the remnants of a long
>>abandoned legacy class and the number of licenses involved was trivial
>>(under 10,000), then I'd have no problem with it.
>
>
>>But we aren't dealing with some trival number, we are dealing with
>>almost 2/3rds of existing licensees.
>
>
> ??
>
> Let's see - as of January 15, 2004:
>
> Novice - 32,718
> Technician - 259,949
> Technician Plus - 62,714
> General - 141,443
> Advanced - 81,961
> Extra - 104,946
> Total - 683,731

>
> Total Technicians and Pluses: 322,663
>
> 322,663/683,731 = about 47.2% of existing hams getting a free upgrade to
> General
> 81,961/683,731 = about 11.9% of existing hams getting a free upgrade to Extra
>
> Total of about 59.1% getting a free upgrade - wow!

Too bad no one saw that coming, eh?

>>The message ARRL sends with this proposal is "our General (and Extra)
>>qualifications" are more strenuous than need be. Such a free-pass would
>>establish that all these hundreds of thousands of licensees have been
>>qualified for General (or Extra) all along. At that moment it is
>>established, ipso facto, that the current Technician examination is
>>sufficient for the 'new General' and that the last Advanced examination
>>is sufficient for the 'new Extra'.
>
>
> I agree 100%. And that's not the only message. Such giveaways also say that
> the tests are so difficult that existing hams cannot be reasonably expected to
> pass them on their own - but new hams have to!
>
>
>>Up until now I have never raised the cry of "dumbing down", but such a
>>mass give-away would set a new lower bar for all future qualification
>>levels in the Amateur Radio service, and your position allegedly in
>>support of strenuous technical qualification standards rings hollow
>>indeed.
>
>
> Remember what I was talking about some weeks back, Hans - and Carl asked me to
> be quiet in case someone got the idea?

Way to GO, Jim! *You* gave people that idea, and now you made a real
mess for us! ;^) Wait, that really isn't funny, is it?

> There's no good reason I can see to give existing Techs, Tech Pluses and
> Advanceds a bye on the writtens for the next license class.

No there isn't. But the reasons don't have to be good ones do they?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1741. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 00:45:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv4cb4$c6q@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86517

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ac6dnXOknbhYhIjdRVn-vA@adelphia.com...
>
> Victim mentality, Dwight! You and Jim get into a wizzing contest, and
> Kim gets her amusement by reading the posts.
>

Well, not amusement...really...Mike. I mean, I wouldn't be in this newsgroup--in general--were it not for the amusement: true. BUT, not amusement specifically about my callsign. In fact, I find the whole issue of debate over my callsign more on the "I can't believe" it side; although I do recognize that, to some people, it really *is* that big a deal. Personally, I feel sorry for those folks.

>
> It's really too bad that you cannot avoid it, but I think Kim is right.
> That callsign seems to have some irresistable effect on some people. And
> you just can't help it. You don't have the power to resist.
>

I think it's just that, Mike. A power thing. I mean, after all, why the chagrin over a callsign; and all the angst; and all the broohaha were it not for wanting to be miserable about something. Call it stupid of me but, again, I really don't see the huge issue with it and never have.

I enjoy the deliberate ignorance of the reason I got the call...which at its root was purely on a dare from some local hams. Never in a million years did I know of this newsgroup, or even really believe it would get the attention that it has. I mean, think about it: I was a fairly new ham and had no real motivation to be on HF so didn't think of it from that perspective (of using it on a wide distribution basis) and hadn't even heard of any such thing as a "newsgroup" so didn't think of that venue, either. For me, ham radio was a "local" sport and everyone already knew me here, so it wasn't like I was setting out to get a callsign to "make a name" for myself. Good grief, ask Jim Haynie or any Section Leadership what a rabble rouser I've been--long before I ever got a callsign to go along with it! :)

>
> Then it should be a null argument. You should not care why Jim omits
> her callsign, and it isn't your job to judge Jim.
>

For me, it wasn't about "omitting the callsign." It was about editing a post and taking out attributes that could (*could* mind you) be important to that specific post. I pointed that out long ago in this particular debate (under "The Pool" I believe), but Jim, et al, chose to ignore that aspect.

Jim made it about my callsign--at least I think he did. I was all about that he'd been taking my callsign out of posts that *I* had posted. I hadn't even noticed this for a long, long time. But, when it was pointed out, I picked a post and took attributes out of it; more to make an immediate point than anything else.

> Some people might just care what the reasonings are though.
>
> And as for repeating ones self, you shouldn't "have to", but you are.
> The power of of that callsign is simply too much to resist.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

The reasonings, as stated above, are quite innocent. The plusses (and, yes, I do consider them plusses--I ain't a liar), are incidental amusements that came along afterward. But, look at it this way: just as every other ham who has a "questionable" callsign and is not in this newsgroup therefore does not entertain the flak, so could I have been. But, I found this newsgroup... LOL

Kim W5TIT

1742. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 01:51:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TsWdnQmO6qWQWYjdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86518

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>
> I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
> written
> element should be a requirement. However, I've read Ed Hare's excellent
> *personal, not ARRL policy* comments on this from eham, and find that
> they make sense to me - a compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
> make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.

Once upon a time you also wrote:

>> I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
>> of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
>> personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
>> "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).

(remember to point out that your quote is about the written tests, not
giving around 60 percent of US Hams a free upgrade) Same difference.

A one time adjustment? That really has to rank as one of the worst
ideas that ever came down the pike!

If the Technicians/now Generals can even be considered to receive the
same privileges as the present Generals, how *Dare* the ARS or FCC even
think of not making it a permanent thing? That isn't even slippery
slope thinking either. The next batch of prospective hams will want to
know why THEY can't get the privileges that the OTHERS got by simply
being in the right place at the right time. What happens then?

And did you know I BELIEVED you when you said that stuff I quoted from you?

Disappointing. 8^(

- Mike KB3EIA -

1743. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 01:54:46 UTC
From: Bonzi <s@asds.com>
Message-ID: <l6hb10d94nqm45n5igost7r49r0ds13kcg@4ax.com>
Source record: 86519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004 23:26:17 -0600, "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD"
<lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:

>
>"So Phuk'em" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
>news:7HmQb.133575$I06.1201849@attbi_s01...
>>
>> All you old timers & O.M.'s, cancel your memberships! The ARRL board of
>> directors and section managers are intent on destroying your enjoyment of
>> the hobby and also in destroying the effectiveness of the service in times
>> of national emergency. I'm sick at how the bands have become sounding like
>> CB over the last 17 years, and the League is still intent on making things
>> worse. So Phuk'em
>
>I have a completly different opinion!
>
>Join the ARRL today! There is no better time than now, to join the ONLY
>voice that Ham Radio has. If you don't like what you, Mr I have no balls,
>than turn your radio off! You are not helping anyone!
>
>Like I said, my membership had paid off!!!!!!
>
>
>
You couldn't get on HF until it was given to you, lardass.

1744. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 01:57:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <x-KdnSvVivUOWIjd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86520

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> The reasonings, as stated above, are quite innocent. The plusses (and, yes,
> I do consider them plusses--I ain't a liar), are incidental amusements that
> came along afterward. But, look at it this way: just as every other ham who
> has a "questionable" callsign and is not in this newsgroup therefore does
> not entertain the flak, so could I have been. But, I found this
> newsgroup... LOL

Oh.... you mean this isn't the aversion therapy meeting? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1745. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 01:59:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <sfhb109s5e9c0l4fh2rme98j4gtldocmf7@4ax.com>
Source record: 86521

On 27 Jan 2004 00:29:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <irr8109vru234sivctt2kmkrpgjinm2ah1@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 25 Jan 2004 20:30:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint:
>>>Has nothing to do with aviation.
>>
>>From the theatre, where impromptu performances were given by actors
>>who received prompts from the wings.
>>
>BINGO!
>
>Hey, this guy's good!

Well, sometimes :)
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1746. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 02:55:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126215511.12501.00005820@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86522

In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0401260925450.3932@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Mon, 19 Jan 2004, Tom Winston wrote:
>> On 19 Jan 2004 10:08:20 -0800, N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>> > Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, ...
>>
>> That's not an upgrade; that's a downgrade. Advanced class licensees
>> passed the Extra class written exam, and passed a 13 wpm code test.
>> Furthermore, most Advanced class licensees took the older Extra exam
>> -- an exam that's a lot tougher than the current Extra exam.
>>
>> Possession of the Advanced class license proves that the holder met
>> higher standards than the current crop of Extras.
>>
>> So thanks, but no thanks. When I want to downgrade, *I* will make
>> that decision.
>
>But one can still tell: The PRIOR CLASS field will still say "A".

Doesn't say that on my entry. Even though it's true.
>
>> Just go away, ARRL, and keep your grimy paws off my license.
>
>That part I agree with; they can't seem to leave anything alone without
>screwing
>it up.
>
OK, let's just leave the structure the way it is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1747. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 02:55:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126215512.12501.00005821@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86523

In article <TsWdnQmO6qWQWYjdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>> I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>> written
>> element should be a requirement. However, I've read Ed Hare's excellent
>> *personal, not ARRL policy* comments on this from eham, and find that
>> they make sense to me - a compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>> make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
>
>Once upon a time you also wrote:
>
>>> I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
>>> of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
>>> personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
>>> "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).

Doncha just love Google?
>
>(remember to point out that your quote is about the written tests, not
>giving around 60 percent of US Hams a free upgrade) Same difference.
>
> A one time adjustment? That really has to rank as one of the worst
>ideas that ever came down the pike!
>
Not if there's a good reason for it - but so far I haven't seen a good reason.

> If the Technicians/now Generals can even be considered to receive the
>same privileges as the present Generals, how *Dare* the ARS or FCC even
>*think* of not making it a permanent thing? That isn't even slippery
>slope thinking either. The next batch of prospective hams will want to
>know why THEY can't get the privileges that the OTHERS got by simply
>being in the right place at the right time. What happens then?

A lot of bad feelings, for one thing. To my knowedge there is no precedent for
this sort of thing.

And the primary question - what is the problem without the freebies?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1748. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 02:55:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126215513.12501.00005822@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86524

In article <2ffRb.34074$P%1.26947148@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040126143907.21457.00003644@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> In article <yTXQb.33911$P%1.26700681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >Although new versus old does cause friction, the balance is still needed.
>> >The new bring fresh enthusiasm and new ideas. The old have the
>experience
>> >to weigh these ideas and modify them so they will work or to spot ideas
>that
>> >have been tried in the past and known to fail. We need both old and new.
>>
>> Well said, Dee!
>>
>> There's also the need to recognize that newer is not always better, yet if
>> you never try anyhting different you may never get anything different.
>>
>> "The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to preserve
>change
>> amid order." - Alfred North Whitehead
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>The quote says it even better though.
>
Agreed. That's why I included it.

You would probably not believe where I first heard that quote, btw.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to preserve
change amid order." - Alfred North Whitehead

1749. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 02:55:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126215515.12501.00005823@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86525

In article <4oydnT7kefsBL4jd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> Let's see - as of January 15, 2004:
>>
>> Novice - 32,718
>> Technician - 259,949
>> Technician Plus - 62,714
>> General - 141,443
>> Advanced - 81,961
>> Extra - 104,946
>> Total - 683,731
>>
>> Total Technicians and Pluses: 322,663
>>
>> 322,663/683,731 = about 47.2% of existing hams getting a free upgrade to
>> General
>> 81,961/683,731 = about 11.9% of existing hams getting a free upgrade to
>> Extra
>>
>> Total of about 59.1% getting a free upgrade - wow!
>
>Too bad no one saw that coming, eh?

I'm sure it's a big part of the plan.
>
>>>The message ARRL sends with this proposal is "our General (and Extra)
>>>qualifications" are more strenuous than need be. Such a free-pass would
>>>establish that all these hundreds of thousands of licensees have been
>>>qualified for General (or Extra) all along. At that moment it is
>>>established, ipso facto, that the current Technician examination is
>>>sufficient for the 'new General' and that the last Advanced examination
>>>is sufficient for the 'new Extra'.

>> I agree 100%. And that's not the only message. Such giveaways also say that
>> the tests are so difficult that existing hams cannot be reasonably expected
>> to pass them on their own - but new hams have to!

"Do as I say, not as I do"

>>>Up until now I have never raised the cry of "dumbing down", but such a
>>>mass give-away would set a new lower bar for all future qualification
>>>levels in the Amateur Radio service, and your position allegedly in
>>>support of strenuous technical qualification standards rings hollow
>>>indeed.

>> Remember what I was talking about some weeks back, Hans - and Carl asked >>
me to be quiet in case someone got the idea?
>
>Way to GO, Jim! *You* gave people that idea, and now you made a real
>mess for us! ;^) Wait, that really isn't funny, is it?

ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED??!!!

Actually, it wasn't my idea. I'm simply the messenger. Others though it up long
before me.
>
>> There's no good reason I can see to give existing Techs, Tech Pluses and
>> Advanceds a bye on the writtens for the next license class.
>
> No there isn't. But the reasons don't have to be good ones do they?
>
Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1750. Re: New ARRL Proposal -- Advanced license downgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:02:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nxkRb.28149$1e.26183@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86526
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote

|
| But one can still tell: The PRIOR CLASS field will still say "A".
|

Not in all cases. My "prior class" was Conditional.

1751. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:12:13 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <hGkRb.10597$w41.6478843@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 86527

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:1oadnVYG54LkP4jdRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >
> > Funny you should say that. I was just looking at his QSL card wondering
how
> > he is. I sent him a few e-mails to both addresses known to work...and no
> > reply. Hope he's ok.
>
> Speaking of QSL cards, I just received one today from the 5 land qsl
> burro from an OH station in Finland I worked on September 26, *1981*.
> Better late than never I suppose.

Wow, and I just recently received one from a 2/03 QSO...and I thought THAT
was an unreasonably long time. <hihi>

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1752. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:16:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 86528

In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
>
>>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>
>>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
>>>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
>> never
>>>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
>for
>>>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
>>>>>decide to do anything at all.
>>>>>
>>>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>>
>>>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue
>> came
>>>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
>Pluses
>> to
>>>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no
>>>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
>database.
>>
>>>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>>>>everybody's time.
>>
>>>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>>
>>>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY

>>>
>>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>
>>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>
>It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
>pros and cons:
>
>Cons:
>
>Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
>it.

That's one. There are others:

- Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which is not taken
is not necessary for the privileges.

- Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than those who didn't. How do we justify that?

- Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.
>
>Pros:
>
>Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
>refarm the Advanced phone bands.

Why does that have to be done at all?

>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).

Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?

>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
>documentation forever.

If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six years, two months and 20 days or so.

Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the "NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database doesn't need to change at all.

>
>>>Rather, it is just one of
>>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>>
>>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>>bad
>>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>
>>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such a
>>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element
>>3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?
>
>I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
>credit.

You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?

How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?

>They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
>a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
>Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
>at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
>past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
>license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
>gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
>future."

Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.

I say they're not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1753. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:17:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <MMOdnR0RxLahRYjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86529

N2EY wrote:

> In article <TsWdnQmO6qWQWYjdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>
>>>I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>>>written
>>>element should be a requirement. However, I've read Ed Hare's excellent
>>>*personal, not ARRL policy* comments on this from eham, and find that
>>>they make sense to me - a compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>>>make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
>>
>>Once upon a time you also wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
>>>>of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
>>>>personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
>>>>"more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
>
>
> Doncha just love Google?

You betchya! Everyone slips up from time to time, and I don't like to
use it to catch people in little mistakes, but this one is right from
Burger King! A Whopper!
>
>>(remember to point out that your quote is about the written tests, not
>>giving around 60 percent of US Hams a free upgrade) Same difference.
>>
>> A one time adjustment? That really has to rank as one of the worst
>>ideas that ever came down the pike!
>>
>
> Not if there's a good reason for it - but so far I haven't seen a good reason.
>
>
>> If the Technicians/now Generals can even be considered to receive the
>>same privileges as the present Generals, how *Dare* the ARS or FCC even
>>*think* of not making it a permanent thing? That isn't even slippery
>>slope thinking either. The next batch of prospective hams will want to

>>know why THEY can't get the privileges that the OTHERS got by simply
>>being in the right place at the right time. What happens then?
>
>
> A lot of bad feelings, for one thing. To my knowedge there is no precedent for
> this sort of thing.

And how! I would not feel any resentment toward hams that came on board
sans Morse code testing. After all they were just taking the tests that
were taken when they upgraded.

But to have the equivalent of a General with just the technician test?
For almost 60 percent of Hams to get the free upgrade?

I make this suggestion in dead seriousness. ARRL needs to consult with
a licensed psychologist stat, if not put one on staff retainer. Perhaps
he or she could explain why this is such a stupid idea.

> And the primary question - what is the problem without the freebies?

How about this scenario:

ARRL is scared witless about the BPL problem. Their (somewhat
necessary) paranoia about these things caused someone at HQ to muse
"yaknow, if all these Technicians were Generals, we could show up at the
FCC with much more impressive numbers of the Hams that would be
negatively impacted by BPL or other spectrum threats". Right now, they
don't have much HF access, so giving it to them allows us to jack those
numbers up by a lot!" It bounces off the restructuring committee, and
viola! A plan that not only P****s off those who came before, but also
those who will come afterward.

It will also make an incredibly good case for - dare I say it?
indisputable running numbing dumbing down of the ARS.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1754. Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:30:51 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0401261930.52c04c71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86530

First, I must praise the ARRL directors for proposing a compromise. No matter what they proposed, they were destined to be buried in hatemail.

Having said this, I think the proposal didn't fix all that was broken (read: Morse Code exam requirement) and also fixed things that didn't need to be fixed.

As far as I can tell, people want the Novice license back so entry-level hams can have some HF privileges. But the proposal would REDUCE the privileges of current Novices, which I don't think is fair (even if 99.9% of Novices are inactive). I think the Novice privileges should be left alone. And I don't see a need for the FCC to issue new Novice licenses again given the fact that most new hams chose the No-Code Tech license over the Novice license during the period when both were available.

I have a better idea: Why not just give all Technicians (include the No-Coders) Tech Plus privileges? This gives the entry-level license class some HF privileges. Like most of you, I disagree with the free upgrade to General. Expanding Novice/Tech Plus HF privileges seems to me to be a better idea. And if the current Novices are such a burden, why not just upgrade them to Tech Plus?

I applaud the ARRL for reducing the Morse Code testing requirement further in the proposal, but it could have proposed a complete elimination. The reasons for eliminating the Morse Code requirement for the General license apply for the Amateur Extra license as well. There's also a practical reason to fully eliminate the Morse Code exam - the need to keep track of which current Technicians and new Generals passed the 5 wpm exam and which did not.

In short, I think that the current license system is mostly OK. The only change I think is necessary is the elimination of the Morse Code testing requirement.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAAATTTTT jasonhsu.com

1755. Why did the FCC merge the Tech and Tech Plus classes in 2000?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:35:37 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0401261935.2626e6b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86531

As a result of the restructuring, there are several different versions of Technician license:
1. The old Tech Plus licensees: Unlike the No-Code Technicians, they have limited operating privileges on HF and do not need to take the 5 wpm exam again to upgrade to General.
2. Old No-Code Techs: They have no HF privileges and must take the 5 wpm exam to upgrade to General.
3. New No-Code Techs: See above.
4. New Technicians with the 5 wpm CSCE within the past year: They are treated the same as the old Tech Plus licensees.
5. New Technicians with the 5 wpm CSCE more than a year old: They have Tech Plus Operating privileges but must pass the 5 wpm exam again to upgrade to General due to the expired CSCE.

Why did the FCC do this? It's a cause for confusion for VEs and prospective upgraders, and it makes it needlessly more difficult to enforce the rules when some Technicians have HF operating privileges and some do not and when some Technicians need to take the 5 wpm exam again to upgrade while some do not. Although I think the restructuring of 2000 was long overdue, I think merging the No-Code Tech and Tech Plus licenses was a boneheaded move. Either the distinction should have continued, or all Technicians should have been given an automatic upgrade to Tech Plus.

The only explanation I can think of is that the FCC intended to completely eliminate the 5 wpm exam requirement and thus make the distinctions between each of the 5 versions of Technician license a moot point.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAATTTT jasonhsu.com

1756. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 03:35:49 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86532

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

|
| - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
is not
| taken is not necessary for the privileges.
|

Here we go again! Damn it Jim, that is patently false and you know that it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact. Allowing a free upgrade isn't "proof" of anything except that a free-pass was given, sort of like a day of amnesty when all overdue library books can be returned without fees. Yes, it's a really bad idea, but it doesn't disprove the need for proper qualification examinations. Go join Carl Stevenson and Ed Hare in the NTI sign-up queue. (I'd mention them by call sign, but I wouldn't want to risk compromising your "standards".)

3333333, Hans, K0-Heavenly-Body

1757. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 04:02:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_olRb.28206$1e.7598@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86533

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote

| But the proposal would REDUCE the privileges of current
| Novices, which I don't think is fair.

?????????? REDUCE ????????????

Maybe I missed something, but to my mind the proposed new priviledges
for the Novice class seem decidedly more generous than the current set.

Several new bands; broader segments on CW; new phone and data privileges
on bands where they currently have only Morse privileges.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1758. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 04:10:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <v7SdnahacZBMeYjdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86534

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> |
> | - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> is not
> | taken is not necessary for the privileges.
> |
>
> Here we go again! Damn it Jim, that is patently false and you know that
> it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact. Allowing a free upgrade
> isn't "proof" of anything except that a free-pass was given, sort of
> like a day of amnesty when all overdue library books can be returned
> without fees. Yes, it's a really bad idea, but it doesn't disprove the
> need for proper qualification examinations. Go join Carl Stevenson and
> Ed Hare in the NTI sign-up queue. (I'd mention them by call sign, but I
> wouldn't want to risk compromising your "standards".)

If the Technicians are given the same privileges as a General, does it not mean that a Technician is capable of those privileges after taking the Technician test? If so then why should any further testing besides Technician level be given for future General class licensees at the old level. All that is needed is a Technician level test.

Amnesty? OY!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1759. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 04:32:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <QRlRb.27088$i4.20981@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86535

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
> <pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>
> >In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:
> >
> >
> >>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
> >><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
> >
> >>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
D.
> >>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >>>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means
that
> >>>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC
has
> >> never
> >>>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that
they
> >>>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another
idea
> >for
> >>>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if
they
> >>>>>decide to do anything at all.
> >>>>>
> >>>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
> >>
> >>>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the
issue
> >> came
> >>>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
> >Pluses
> >> to
> >>>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had
no

> >>>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
> >database.
> >>
> >>>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
> >>>>everybody's time.
> >>
> >>>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
> >>
> >>>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
> >>
> >>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>
> >>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
> >>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes
(take
> >>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
> >>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
> >
> >>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
> >
> >It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
> >pros and cons:
> >
> >Cons:
> >
> >Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
> >it.
>
> That's one. There are others:
>
> - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which is
not
> taken
> is not necessary for the privileges.

Like that hasn't been the case for decades...

> - Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than
those who
> didn't. How do we justify that?

You don't need to justify it. Life's a bitch and then you die.

> - Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.
> >
> >Pros:
> >
> >Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
> >refarm the Advanced phone bands.
>
> Why does that have to be done at all?

To eliminate having a dual set of regulations.

> >Alternatively, avoids opening up the
> >Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
> >in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
> >U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
> >Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).
>
> Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?

The FCC and government prefer simplicity.

> >Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
> >even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
> >enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
> >documentation forever.
>
> If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
> years, two months and 20 days or so.

But all Novices and Advanced won't be gone for decades.

> Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the
> "NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database
> doesn't need to change at all.
> >
> >>>Rather, it is just one of
> >>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until
better
> >>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
> >>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
> >>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC
official's
> >>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
> >>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
> >>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
> >>>
> >>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
> >>bad
> >>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
> >>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
> >>
> >>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really
such a
> >>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass
Element
> >>3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?
> >>
> >I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
> >credit.
>
> You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?
>

> How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?

Feel free to let us know.

> >They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
> >a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
> >Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
> >at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
> >past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
> >license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
> >gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
> >future."
>
> Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.
>
> I say they're not.

So argue with the ARRL then.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1760. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 05:36:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401262136.4f60d263@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86536

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<bOgRb.66553$f97.8011@fe3.columbus.rr.com>...

> Well you people have...(SNIP)

Another anonymous sniper with more antagonistic, slanderous swill
to yet slop the trough with.

Be gone, Scumbag. We already have Lennie...We DON'T need you.

Steve, K4YZ

1761. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 05:42:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401262142.7d74a465@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86537

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<401566CD.2030402@psu.edu>...

> > Now...Next time you find yourself a bit over-anxious to try and
> > humilate someone with your dazzling self righteousness, I hope you'll
> > be sure you have your facts right...
>
>
> Ahh, the confusion lies in that I originated the thread, and then
> Lenover21 - for reasons unknown - perhaps not to taint himself with
> replying to a thread I started, then started a new thread that was
> titled the same, save for the "reprise".

Therein lies some of the reason for confusion...I shudda known
Lennie would have somehting to do with it...But that STILL doesn't
excuse Hans' sniping since the thread group he was quoting from WAS
the one His Putziness had generated...As were the comments I was
refering to...If >>I<< had slipped up like that, the Master Chief and
His Most Putziness would have had a Field Day (with apologies to the
ARRL...)

BTW, Mike, you snowed in? My YL is absolutely livid that we
AREN'T getting any of the snow...I grew up in it so I HAVE had my
fill!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1762. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 09:30:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gdqRb.27263$i4.13279@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86538

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > Sixty is "middle" aged? How many
> > people have you met in this country
> > that are 120 years old?
>
> It's a big bell curve, IMO

LOL. That's one seriously big bell curve. Actually, I was hoping you knew something about the 120 years that I haven't heard about. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1763. BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN for AMATEUR RADIO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 10:13:57 UTC
From: expeditionradio@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127051357.28530.00000852@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 86539

>
> A BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN for AMATEUR RADIO.
> ==
> Please forward this to every amateur radio
> operator you know.

> ARRL's Frequency Plan Was Obsolete
> Before It Was Proposed!

> Our Amateur Bands Should be Defined By Bandwidth,
> Not Mode.

> Digital modulation and processing is changing the
> way we communicate and coexist in the HF frequency
> spectrum. The ARRL frequency proposal is obsolete
> and based on "20th Century Thinking". With the
> multitude of new digital and analog modulation
> schemes, including "digital voice", there are
> compelling reasons to integrate voice, CW, data,
> image, and keyboarding modes.
>
> The old definitions of what a "mode" is are blurred.
> Free us to advance amateur radio into the future
> by simply dividing up the HF bands according to
> "emission bandwidth" for better distribution of
> spectrum activity.
>
> A BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN:
>
> kHz
> 1800 to 2000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 3500 to 4000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth
> 7000 to 7300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 10100 to 10150 any mode <500kHz bandwidth
> 10115 to 10150 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 14000 to 14300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 14075 to 14300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 18068 to 18168 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 18080 to 18168 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 21000 to 21450 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 21100 to 21450 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

> 21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 28000 to 29700 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 28100 to 29700 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 28600 to 29700 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
>
> This is our chance to improve the usable space
> in the HF bands, to build for our future.
> This solves the 40 meter and 80 meter international
> split-band problems.
>
> Please try to convince your ARRL representative not
> to go with the antiquated frequency plan.
>
>..
>
>..
--

1764. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 10:21:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv5e3d$nhd@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86540

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:hGkRb.10597$w41.6478843@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:1oadnVYG54LkP4jdRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> > Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > Funny you should say that. I was just looking at his QSL card
wondering
> how
> > > he is. I sent him a few e-mails to both addresses known to work...and
no
> > > reply. Hope he's ok.
> >
> > Speaking of QSL cards, I just received one today from the 5 land qsl
> > burro from an OH station in Finland I worked on September 26, *1981*.
> > Better late than never I suppose.
>
> Wow, and I just recently received one from a 2/03 QSO...and I thought THAT
> was an unreasonably long time. <hihi>
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

When I read about QSL'ing (I think in the Now You're Talking Book) before I got my ticket, the idea sounded grand. But, I quickly became disinterested when the reality of how long it takes, coupled with the added aggravation of having a bureau, etc. I understand the idea of handling costs, etc. But, it's just too much aggravation for me. There's supposedly some QSL cards waiting for me somewhere up in OK, I think at a QSL Manager or something. Someone posted the information here in the newsgroup one time. They'd probably mean nothing to me any more because I wouldn't even remember the contact! LOL

But, for DXers and paper chasers, it's probably a nicely organized rigmarole. Do you mind the wait, Bert? You must be "into" DXing and contesting, eh?

Kim W5TIT

1765. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 10:26:07 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv5ebb$1uc@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86541

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:MMOdnR0RxLahRYjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>
> I make this suggestion in dead seriousness. ARRL needs to consult with
> a licensed psychologist stat, if not put one on staff retainer. Perhaps
> he or she could explain why this is such a stupid idea.
>

Ha! The ARRL is about nothing but marketing anymore. This is a great marketing effort to them: become the good cop and get hundreds to join, or something along those lines.

Kim W5TIT

1766. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 10:29:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv5ehu$2fn@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86542

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> Here we go again! Damn it [expletive deleted], that is patently false and
you know that
> it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact.
>

'S called barking up a tree...

Kim W5TIT

1767. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 11:55:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127065512.12501.00005844@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86543

In article <qMhRb.27923$q4.18319@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Decades ago, all of
>us thought 30 was old.

Not me!

Now "old" is something we're not. :-)

Well, it's something *I'm* not.

You're the one describing 40 and 50 somethings as "old men" ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY.

1768. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 12:52:33 UTC
From: Harold Burton <hwburton@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <101cnn2d34p9834@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86544

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040127065512.12501.00005844@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <qMhRb.27923$q4.18319@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
> Now "old" is something we're not. :-)
>
> Well, it's something *I'm* not.
>
> You're the one describing 40 and 50 somethings as "old men" ;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY.

At 71, I've got to assume I'm beginnint to get "old". I'm not
ashamed of it, though. Heck, I went to a heluva lot of trouble
to get this old.

Harold
KD5SAK

1769. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 13:42:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401270542.3ec8668b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86545

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>...

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...

> > There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.
>
> Also a lot of positivism.

That they are trying to keep things moving from their
perspective, perhaps. But I don't think this requires a whole lot of
rethinking nor does it require any complex bandplanning.

> > While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
> > poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
> > Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
> > sake of sales/membership.
>
> I disagree! I think it has some good ideas and some bad ideas.

There's good stuff here, Jim, but I'm going to cut to the chase.

> On top of all this, the Tech written (Element 2) is full of arcane
> stuff like RF exposure calculations, which displaces more basic stuff
> that would serve a newcomer better.

I don't think that much of what is "written" is pertinent even if
it were "written" in the next 2 hours. As long as the question pools
are open and the "newcomer" can pick up a verbatim "Q&A study guide",
the tests are relatively irrelevant.

Yes, some "learning" will occur just from reading the question
over and over, but to what legitimate application can THAT kind of
learning be applied?

Repeat after me: "Lopressor is a beta blocker administerd SIVP
for the control of hypertension and AFIB with IVR."

Got that? Now, WHAT is a beta blocker? What was the underlying
etiology of the hypertension or the atrial fibrillation that produced
the irregular ventricular response?

> > My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT
> > a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur
> > Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.
>
> What about your Director and Vice Director - or better yet, the entire

> BoD? And let 'em know exactly what's good and bad, and why.

Perhaps, Jim, but my take is that the FCC has expressed more than
it's fair share of frustration with the numerous licening strategies
that have been offered, all suggesting that "this one" will be the one
to open the flood gates of new licensees.

Each has produced a momentary road bump followed by a rapid
return to a steady-if-unimpressive growth rate.

> If/when the proposal becomes an RM, it'll be comment time......

Ditto.

Hope you're keeping warm Jim! It's embarrassing here...I spent
most of the evening with the back door open to let a cool drizzling
breeze pass through the house.

73

Steve, K4YZ
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1770. Re: BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN for AMATEUR RADIO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 13:52:46 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns947D5A46480C7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86546

expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio) wrote in
news:20040127051357.28530.00000852@mb-m01.aol.com:

>>
>> A BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN for AMATEUR RADIO.
>> ==
>> Please forward this to every amateur radio operator you know.
>
>> ARRL's Frequency Plan Was Obsolete
>> Before It Was Proposed!
>
>> Our Amateur Bands Should be Defined By Bandwidth,
>> Not Mode.
>
>> Digital modulation and processing is changing the
>> way we communicate and coexist in the HF frequency
>> spectrum. The ARRL frequency proposal is obsolete
>> and based on "20th Century Thinking". With the
>> multitude of new digital and analog modulation
>> schemes, including "digital voice", there are
>> compelling reasons to integrate voice, CW, data, image, and
>> keyboarding modes.
>>
>> The old definitions of what a "mode" is are blurred.
>> Free us to advance amateur radio into the future
>> by simply dividing up the HF bands according to
>> "emission bandwidth" for better distribution of
>> spectrum activity.
>>
>> A BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN:
>>
>> kHz
>> 1800 to 2000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 3500 to 4000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth
>> 7000 to 7300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 10100 to 10150 any mode <500kHz bandwidth
>> 10115 to 10150 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 14000 to 14300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 14075 to 14300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 18068 to 18168 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

>> 18080 to 18168 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 21000 to 21450 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 21100 to 21450 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
>> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 28000 to 29700 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 28100 to 29700 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 28600 to 29700 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
>>
>> This is our chance to improve the usable space
>> in the HF bands, to build for our future.
>> This solves the 40 meter and 80 meter international
>> split-band problems.
>>
>> Please try to convince your ARRL representative not
>> to go with the antiquated frequency plan.
>>
>>..
>>
>>..
> --
>
>
>

On the whole I agree with what you propose. However, on 20-10m it gives more phone than the IARU bandplan, and on 40 it gives less. It would make more sense if phone were allowed exactly where the IARU bandplan puts it.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1771. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 14:47:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40167A0A.7070107@psu.edu>
Source record: 86547

Harold Burton wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040127065512.12501.00005844@mb-m04.aol.com...
>
>>In article <qMhRb.27923$q4.18319@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>
> "Dwight
>
>>Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>Now "old" is something we're not. :-)
>>
>>Well, it's something *I'm* not.
>>
>>You're the one describing 40 and 50 somethings as "old men" ;-)
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY.
>
>
> At 71, I've got to assume I'm beginnint to get "old". I'm not
> ashamed of it, though. Heck, I went to a heluva lot of trouble
> to get this old.

Well Harold, You're *starting* to creep up on it! ;^) Don't look at it
as old though, call it "well seasoned".

- Mike KB3EIA -

1772. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 14:56:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40167C00.2090601@psu.edu>
Source record: 86548

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> While I've stated many times that I would not support wholesale
> proliferation of SSB/SSTV to the detriment of CW/digital modes,
> the "refarming" of the (largely unused) "Novice bands" as proposed,
> is modest and I can tolerate it ... if it doesn't happen, the proposal
> can be tweaked a bit to allow for the increased access to HF for
> the "new Novices".
>

Carl, I don't think it matters how many times you've stated *that* anymore.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1773. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 15:09:07 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0401270709.1c5a3c81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86549

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_olRb.28206$1e.7598@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
> Maybe I missed something, but to my mind the proposed new priviledges
> for the Novice class seem decidedly more generous than the current set.
>
> Several new bands; broader segments on CW; new phone and data privileges
> on bands where they currently have only Morse privileges.
>
Some Novice privileges have been reduced. I just think the ARRL
should avoid downgrading privileges. Current Novices would have their
power limits cut and lose 23 cm. Modestly upgrading privileges is OK,
maintaining the same privileges is OK, but downgrading privileges
should be avoided.

I realize the rationale for reducing power limits for new Novices is
to avoid the need for RF safety questions on the new Novice exam. I
think it would be better to have RF safety questions in the exam and
NOT downgrade any Novice privileges. An exam with RF safety questions
shouldn't be that much harder than one without them, and the RF safety
questions have nothing close to the unilateral power of the Morse Code
exam.

If consolidating the license classes into 3 is a concern, I think it
would be better to just upgrade all Novices and Technicians to Tech
Plus than to upgrade Technicians to General.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAAAATTTTTT jasonhsu.com

1774. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 15:09:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127100923.19922.00000826@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86550

>Carl, I don't think it matters how many times you've stated *that* anymore.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I think that was a given from the start. Karl the HEAD CBplusser cant be
trusted. I think the "CBRRL" is run by morons like Karl.

1775. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 15:15:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40168079.8020608@psu.edu>
Source record: 86451

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<401566CD.2030402@psu.edu>...
>
>
>>> Now...Next time you find yourself a bit over-anxious to try and
>>>humilate someone with your dazzling self righteousness, I hope you'll
>>>be sure you have your facts right...
>>
>>
>> Ahh, the confusion lies in that I originated the thread, and then
>>Lenover21 - for reasons unknown - perhaps not to taint himself with
>>replying to a thread I started, then started a new thread that was
>>titled the same, save for the "reprise".
>
>
> Therein lies some of the reason for confusion...I shudda known
> Lennie would have somehting to do with it...But that STILL doesn't
> excuse Hans' sniping since the thread group he was quoting from WAS
> the one His Putziness had generated...As were the comments I was
> refering to...If >>I<< had slipped up like that, the Master Chief and
> His Most Putziness would have had a Field Day (with apologies to the
> ARRL...)

Agreed. I've noticed that Hans seems to get a nasty case of cabin fever
around this time of year, and becomes a hammer in search of nails. It's
his only tool, and *everything* looks like a nail.

> BTW, Mike, you snowed in? My YL is absolutely livid that we
> AREN'T getting any of the snow...I grew up in it so I HAVE had my
> fill!

We have maybe 8 inches on the ground. Roads are slippery enough that I
keep the Jeep in 4WD full time. It isn't too bad, but it isn't a pretty
kind of snow. Yesterday and today most of the schools in the center of
the state are closed. But they are all wusses! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1776. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:43:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127124312.05957.00000171@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86454

In article <z10Rb.26993$1e.25468@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>|
>| This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
>| who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
>| Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
>| looking to make a buck...nothing else.
>|
>
>Mike Coslo isn't a ham? What's this "KB3EIA" business he puts in his
>signature then?

The gunnery nurse seems to think that his PC is infested with an
A.I. virus that masquerades as all kinds of different communicators.
It's getting so that he can't tell reality from his internal fantasy.

Excuse me, I'm going off to practice my K0HB, Billy Beeper, and
Leo posting. :-)

LHA / WMD

1777. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:43:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127124313.05957.00000172@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86453

In article <1e4e3692.0401250408.5b1e9434@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>You always have the right answers, Dee, and you're always right.
>
>Why does anyone else even bother?

It's better than being a homicide suspect! :-)

LHA / WMD

1778. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:43:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127124313.05957.00000173@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86455

In article <40158379.9080403@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Short of actual discrimination, it takes at least two people to make a
>person inferior. The person that sets themselves up as superior, and the
>other person that accepts their superiority and therefore their own
>inferiority.

The latter rarely "accepts" anything when confronted with some
egotistical so-and-so claiming "superiority." That's just an
alternative to NOT being a suspect in a homicide. :-)

LHA / WMD

1779. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:43:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127124316.05957.00000174@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 86456

In article <dCTQb.27124$zj7.21663@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote
>
>| Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
>| don't see it starting up today.
>
>You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
>sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
>orientated types.

"Technically oriented," not 'orientated.'

They were using information on radio hardware theory that was being refined and detailed by commercial, government, and military radio users. Principally that was in the period from 1900 to the mid-1930s. Lots and lots of non-amateurs were very busy trying to get a slice of what appeared to be a lucrative new technology. A similar happening started in personal computing in the late 1970s, many amateurs involved, until the USERS and the makers got going to make the personal computer a tool for everyday life and work.

For a more widened view of early radio development, the text history by Hugh G. J. Aitken, "The Continuous Wave, Technology and American Radio 1900-1932," Princeton University Press 1985 is recommended as a source. The first "driver" of radio technology was the maritime world. Maritime radio was considered indespensible for ocean vessels, giving them something they had never had before - communications beyond the horizon.

Some amateurs, restricted to sources from a CT publisher, will insist that amateurs "discovered short waves" 83 years ago. Not quite since the Marconi Company first noted the long leaps in "short wave" paths 84 years ago. Some 82 years ago a commercial communications carrier was already trying out HF on several wavelengths ("down" to 30 meters) to improve daylight radio transmission paths. Commercial concerns, especially broadcasting, were the drivers of radio technology after WW1.. Those who do 24/7 radio communications are more likely to notice effects than amateurs limited to a few hours each day.

The commercial-industrial-governmental-military users of radio were already migrating upwards iin frequency from the late 1930s and especially so after WW2. However, the "tinkerers,

experimenters, and technically" oriented folks have ALWAYS existed and grew more numerous after the "military surplus" years just following WW2. That is most notable in NON-ham electronics activities such as robotics, personal computing, music systems, security-alarm-control applications. Radio control of model aircraft and other vehicles is a big market (AMA has as many or slightly more members than ARRL). AMA got a large block of frequencies at 72 MHz just for R/C all by itself.

Despite the grousing, bitching, and whining of "experimenters" unable to get the exact parts for copying a magazine article project from Radio Shack, electronic parts remain on the market, as numerous as they were in 1947 or 1967 (actually more so) but are not solely concerned with the so-called alalog radio field. Even the giant and growing Fry's Electronics chain carries a whole aisle of packaged components from capacitors to circuit board blanks. Modern day electronics "experimenters" have gone well beyond radio in the scope of their fun.

While some hams look with distaste, disgust, and some with pejorations of evil upon "CB," the 27 MHz kind of personal communications opened in 1958 (that's a mere 46 years ago) WITHOUT the amateurs and expanded enormously when the offshore designs and manufacturings took off.

Offshore design and manufacture facilities have greatly aided the availability of everything from parts to finished systems at relatively low cost. That allowed the hobbyists to pursue all kinds of areas of electronics design and construction in home workshops.

Had amateur radio remained cut off after WW1, there would have been NO ARRL to lobby or do anything. The club clocks would have been reset to the competition for national memberships of the pre-1914 times...telegrams and telegraphy messages would still have gotten through in the commercial-government world of radio. Broadcasting would have expanded enormously after 1920 despite amateur activities along with receiver development and all the peripheral electronics around "radio" (everything from wireless mikes to radio-coupled phonographs and eventually to stereo-binaural sound and magnetic recording for "hi-fi" sound). HF would still have been a pre-WW2 hotbed of commercial-government communicatios carriers, everything from 4 voice channel width SSB to single-channel RTTY. By 1938 some police departments had been "experimenting" (trying out) mobile FM, with success. Once rocketry had become relatively practical after WW2, the commercial satellite communications "birds" would have existed (Telstar was a US telephone company project). Now the equatorial geosynchrous orbit is FILLED with comm sats (about every 3 degrees or so) and the "long-distance" radio communications goes over them rather than old HF (if not over fiber-optics cables or microwave radio relay having even more bandwidth).

>That our service continues to exist today is a
>miracle, attributable mainly to the efforts of RAC, ARRL, DARC, JARL,
>IARU, RAE, RSGB, and all the other national societies who so far have
>convinced the regulators to allow us to continue.

Ah, but in this hypothetical alternate reality, there would be NO such organizations. They MIGHT form again but there is NOTHING to guarantee that they would be even close to doing what they do now. Evolution of amateur radio organizations happened just as it did to every other radio service...some would survive, others would not.

The "selling job" of these FUTURE clubs (not really "societies") would be difficult since they would have NO "track record" to fall back on, no mythical claims of being necessary in any emergency, or any of the legends they loved to trot out. It would be back to Square One for most of them except for the first one, the Radio Club of America.

Remember that the ARRL began as a local CT radio club with the ideal of serving as a freebie message-forwarding service. In today's world it would be a Hacker club "hacking" on Western Union's and other telegram suppliers' high telegram fees. All the high-sounding PR BS of today hadn't happened and all the ARRL would have to show for itself in this new alternate reality is some nebulous, rationalized message relay Hacking. Not a good thing to expand upon and not something to convince regulators that they should allocate bands and things to amateurs. That could be done in a different way.

But, without the "tradition" and "glory of service" (or whatever) that has been the propaganda tool of the membership organizations' spoon-feeding of What To Do, What To Say, How To Act, the present-day orgs couldn't do it the same way they have for years.

In this alternate reality, the word "ham" might never have caught on. It was a pejorative given by professional telegraphers to amateurs originally (from ARRL's own etymological definition). "Amateur" is not a bad thing since there are many and varied amateur activities of all kinds, especially in sports. "Ham" as a prefix has never been a good label, especially in show business.

My speculation is that HF would definitely be open for allocation for recreational activity. The commercial and government users of HF have vacated much of it, use it primarily for time-frequency standards, broadcasting, much less communications than two to three decades ago. If R/C models can get a block of lower VHF frequencies, I'm sure that amateur radio could get some HF bands for fun and games.

>The notion of a "start up" amateur radio service or any personal radio
>service with such broad gifts of spectrum and freedom to experiment as
>we enjoy wouldn't gain any traction at all in todays technological
>environment.

A quaint notion based almost entirely on the past present reality happenings...not to mention several boatloads of mythology and

legend PR that is more puffery than substance. Sorry, not bought.

There is absolutely NOTHING "wrong" with getting a block of frequencies just for recreation. R/C did it and modelers have NEVER claimed anything close to aiding homeland security or being of some vital and important aid in times of emergency.

27 MHz CB is already 46 years old. FRS and GMRS exists today as do almost innumerable "cordless" and "wireless" low power RF communications devices of many purposes, from VHF on up to C Band (5 GHz) in microwaves. I say there would definitely be a lot of personal communications "radios" in this alternate reality, regardless of amateur claims (in this universe) of pioneering them.

But, in this alternate reality, there might be some bitter and prolonged fighting in urban and semi-urban residential areas as amateur radio folks tried to put up large, ugly wire and tubing structures (beautiful to them, maybe, but a decided eyesore to non-radio neighbors).

Amateur radio, if it came to be, would have a decidedly different scope of activities in this alternate universe. It would BEGIN to evolve, probably to something else, since there was no "tradition" to "preserve" nor any set of 1930s Standards and Practices to uphold 7 decades later. Radio amateurism would begin ANEW.

LHA / WMD

1780. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:43:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401270943.58afa1af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86452

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> |
> | - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> is not
> | taken is not necessary for the privileges.
> |
>
> Here we go again! Damn it Jim, that is patently false and you know that
> it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact. Allowing a free upgrade
> isn't "proof" of anything except that a free-pass was given, sort of
> like a day of amnesty when all overdue library books can be returned
> without fees. Yes, it's a really bad idea, but it doesn't disprove the
> need for proper qualification examinations. Go join Carl Stevenson and
> Ed Hare in the NTI sign-up queue. (I'd mention them by call sign, but I
> wouldn't want to risk compromising your "standards".)
>
> 3333333, Hans, K0-Heavenly-Body

Jim is going down the same path that both Larry Roll and Bruce Benyon
have admitted to taking. If they can't have an ARS that meets their
lofty ideals, then they want to destroy it.

You read it here first.

bb

1781. New page for the hams...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:46:12 UTC
From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20040127124612.22659.00000521@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86457

Move over k1tp

http://hometown.aol.com/niw2004/myhomepage/index.html

1782. Re: Excellent ARRL proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 17:50:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401270950.18618e61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86458

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40158379.9080403@psu.edu>...
> William wrote:
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040125153019.05957.00000151@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >
> >>In article <d22b54c3.0401241754.7be87301@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >>(Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>and somebody asked "what license class does he have?" His sponser:
> >>>"Uhhh . . Advanced." Then he ducked. Immediate 180dBA noise level from
> >>>the Back Benchers, "what the hell is this guy's problem?"
> >>
> >>Well, what IS his problem?
> >
> >
> > Why does he have to have a problem? Why cannot a lowly Advanced enjoy DX?
>
>
> Short of actual discrimination, it takes at least two people to make a
> person inferior. The person that sets themselves up as superior, and the
> other person that accepts their superiority and therefore their own
> inferiority.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

So far, we have unnamed Back Bencher club member(s) and Jim/N2EY
setting themselves up as superior.

I wonder if the inferior amateur was permitted to join the club?

Only Brian Kelly can answer that question.

1783. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 18:03:00 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <hs9d10hqlbt4k6kec1oioiii3gedeqvpk4@4ax.com>
Source record: 86459

On 27 Jan 2004 17:43:12 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <z10Rb.26993$1e.25468@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>|
>>| This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
>>| who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
>>| Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
>>| looking to make a buck...nothing else.
>>|
>>
>>Mike Coslo isn't a ham? What's this "KB3EIA" business he puts in his
>>signature then?
>
> The gunnery nurse seems to think that his PC is infested with an
> A.I. virus that masquerades as all kinds of different communicators.
> It's getting so that he can't tell reality from his internal fantasy.
>
> Excuse me, I'm going off to practice my K0HB, Billy Beeper, and
> Leo posting. :-)
>

Hey! No Leo posting! That's my job! :)

> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1784. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 18:03:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127130348.13622.00000553@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86460

> If they can't have an ARS that meets their
>lofty ideals, then they want to destroy it.
>
>You read it here first.
>
>bb

I have no intention of destroying it, groups like NCI and "CBRRL" are doing a
GREAT JOB without my help.

1785. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 18:52:11 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <4016b2c4$0$99194$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86461

In <20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>>
>>
>>>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>>
>>>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means that
>>>>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
>>> never
>>>>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>>>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
>>for
>>>>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if they
>>>>>>decide to do anything at all.
>>>>>>
>>>>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>>>
>>>>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the issue
>>> came
>>>>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
>>Pluses
>>> to
>>>>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had no
>>>>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
>>database.
>>>
>>>>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>>>>>everybody's time.
>>>
>>>>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>>>
>>>>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>>>

>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>>>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>>
>>>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>>
>>It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
>>pros and cons:
>>
>>Cons:
>>
>>Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
>>it.

>That's one. There are others:

>- Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which is not
>taken is not necessary for the privileges.

To quote from the ARRL's FAQ on their proposal:

http://www.arrl.org/news/restructuring2/faq.html

"The fact is that the examination bar has never been at a uniform height
over ham radio's nearly 100-year history."

Were you also opposed to giving pre-1917 hams a waiver for the 20 WPM
code test?

>- Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than those
>who didn't. How do we justify that?

It's called "grandfathering," which is done in more regulatory contexts
than can possibly be named here. Due to the need for certainty in the
law, it is nearly always based on hard cutoff dates. Technologies,
practices, and people change over the very long timeline that laws and
regulations are required to cover. It is not possible to predict the
future with certainty, so laws and regulations must change to reflect
current knowledge. It is also impractical for society to retest,
recertify, or revalidate every existing entity against current
requirements.

The web site for Malvern Instrumentation gives a good definition of
grandfathering in a technical context:

"Grandfathering is the practice of claiming exemption of older systems
from validation regulations and requirements on the basis that these
systems have proved their reliability by adoption for a long period of
time by a large user base."

Grandfathering in the context of ham radio recognizes that existing hams have not only passed the tests in effect at the time, sometimes topics not covered presently (Morse code, drawing circuit diagrams, etc.), but have also gained experience beyond their initial exam topics. It is a fair, and pragmatic, distinction between existing hams and entry-level ones. Quoting again from the FAQ document:

"Passing any amateur examination does not magically result in a good operator. It's just the key to the kingdom, so to speak. Experience and good mentoring create skillful and knowledgeable operators, not the relative difficulty or ease of the test."

You might argue that not every existing ham has obtained the same degree of experience, or even a minimum necessary level of experience to be given a free upgrade. That would be true, but ultimately would be self-limiting, as experience would correlate with participation. An inactive ham using no privileges today would be using no more privileges if the FCC gave him a free upgrade tomorrow. Free upgrades are not a perfect solution, ideal in all cases, but are a good solution overall.

>- Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.

No proposal is perfect. Weigh this one against the pros.

>>
>>Pros:
>>
>>Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
>>refarm the Advanced phone bands.

>Why does that have to be done at all?

So, are you advocating not refarming the Advanced phone bands even *after* the last Advanced class license expires? Yeah, that's a semantic nit-pick over what you wrote above, but then so is "You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?" that you wrote below.

If you do agree that the Advanced phone bands should be refarmed at some point in the future, at what point would you have it done? Would you leave it to Extras, give it to Generals, or would you otherwise split it up in some way?

>>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
>>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
>>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
>>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
>>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).

>Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?

In this day and age, regulatory agencies seem more eager to simplify regulations. Removing regulations that are obsolete, or cover too small an intended audience to be justified on a cost basis, is likely a top priority for such agencies. Again, what is your timeline for change? Decades in the future, or never?

>>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
>>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
>>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
>>documentation forever.

>If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
>years, two months and 20 days or so.

If by saying, "If the current rules are left alone..." you really meant leaving alone everything *except* the 5 WPM Morse code requirement (which would be eliminated for these General and below under the ARRL proposal), then, and only then, Technician-class hams will assume the HF privileges of Technician-Plus. That's still a long time in FCC enforcement (and VEC administration) years. Even if you argue that FCC action on further restructuring will take most of that six years anyway, there are still all those Novice and Advanced class licenses that will likely exist in the database for decades to come.

>Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the
>"NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database
>doesn't need to change at all.

Did you notice that Novices actually lose privileges? See the FAQ document above for more details. In particular, power limits are lowered from 200 Watts PEP to 100 Watts PEP on HF bands except for 10 meters, and 50 Watts PEP on 10 meters. From the FAQ:

"The reason behind the change in Novice power limits is to avoid having to examine entry-level applicants about how to evaluate amateur stations for RF safety. "

I'm sure that you would argue that Technicians should retain their power limits (1500 Watts PEP) on 6 meters and up, and I would agree, but what about HF? Should Technicians lose privileges on those bands, by having their power limits lowered (from 200 Watts PEP), or should there be separate power limits for Novice and Technician on HF? This is starting to get more complicated than before.

>>
>>>>Rather, it is just one of
>>>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>>>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>>>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>>>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>>>
>>>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>>>bad
>>>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>>>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>>

>>>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such a
>>>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element
>>>3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?
>>
>>I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
>>credit.

>You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?

Yes, I meant the governance of the ARRL when I used the shorthand "ARRL"
in the context of offering an opinion on a BoD decision. Only they can
establish ARRL official policy and petition the FCC in the name of the
ARRL. Who else did you think I meant?

>How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?

You will need more than a rhetorical question to make an argument here.
Instead, why don't you just come right out and say, for the benefit of
the audience, which items in the ARRL proposal got enacted, and which
ones didn't? And, of those that didn't get enacted, which ones you
think have already been given a final "no" answer?

>>They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
>>a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
>>Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
>>at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
>>past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
>>license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
>>gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
>>future."

>Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.

But does address the subject of why they may be politically desirable,
not only by leading to simplified FCC regulations, but also resulting
in a more harmonious and productive amateur radio in the future by
addressing most of the concerns of most factions.

>I say they're not.

So you've said. I'm sure that you will also say this to your
representatives within the ARRL and comment on any future FCC NPRM on
the subject. I will, too. For the record, I'm not in complete
agreement with the ARRL proposal, either. I don't see the regulatory
justification for the retention of 5 WPM Morse code for Extra, and I
remain skeptical that a Novice license (even a restructured one) is
viable today.

>73 de Jim, N2EY

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/

Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

1786. Re: Why did the FCC merge the Tech and Tech Plus classes in 2000?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 19:13:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4016B871.4000200@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86462

Jason Hsu wrote:

>As a result of the restructuring, there are several different versions
>of Technician license:
>1. The old Tech Plus licensees: Unlike the No-Code Technicians, they
>have limited operating privileges on HF and do not need to take the 5
>wpm exam again to upgrade to General.
>
And there's two versions of this group: The very old Tech plus who
passed the general
written and 5 WPM (I was one of these), and a newer post early 1987 tech
plus, who took
an easier written and the 5wpm. The first group can get their general
by only a paperwork
submission (they have to prove that they got their tech plus before
1987), but the newer
tech plusers need to take the general written. While I went for my
paperwork general
upgrade I did the extra writtens (at the time I had advanced 4A and
extra 4B written CSCEs)
and became an "extra lite". Partly to get my "very old tech plus" credit
"locked in" in the
FCC data base, and to get more priv's.

1787. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 20:10:58 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <mynews@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <ulgd10t3090va1is0msq7osaocou17e0kb@4ax.com>
Source record: 86463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal minority complaining. When they came out with the No code tech license there was a vocal minority complaining. Now they are doing away with most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.

WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges. Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international agreements.

"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the character of those coming into the service.

Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of Amateur Radio.

Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.

I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future applicants.

It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied no mater what is done.

Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
(N833R, S/# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
www.rogerhalstead.com

1788. Re: BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN for AMATEUR RADIO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 20:39:54 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <hfydneySZtE8UYvdRVn-sA@crocker.com>
Source record: 86464

"Expeditionradio" <expeditionradio@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040127051357.28530.00000852@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >
> > A REALLY BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN:
> >
> > kHz
> > 1800 to 2000 any mode
> > 3500 to 4000 any mode
> > 5MHz channels - mode stuck on usb i believe
> > 7000 to 7300 any mode
> > 10100 to 10150 any mode
> > 14000 to 14350 any mode
> > 18068 to 18168 any mode
> > 21000 to 21450 any mode
> > 24890 to 24990 any mode
> > 28000 to 29700 any mode

let the modes fight it out and the 'good amateur practice' with voluntary
band plans work it out. they are much easier to adjust than fcc dictated
mode divisions of the bands.

1789. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 20:48:07 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0401271248.28456106@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86465

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0401261930.52c04c71@posting.google.com>...

> As far as I can tell, people want the Novice license back so
> entry-level hams can have some HF privileges.

NO! It has very little to do with HF! It is all about OLD FARTS
wanting to keep Ham Radio an "Old Boy's Club".

> But the proposal would
> REDUCE the privileges of current Novices, which I don't think is fair
> (even if 99.9% of Novices are inactive). I think the Novice
> privileges should be left alone. And I don't see a need for the FCC
> to issue new Novice licenses again given the fact that most new hams
> chose the No-Code Tech license over the Novice license during the
> period when both were available.

Your logic is obviously flawed. These Techs chose NoCode, because
they didn't want to do the code! How many young people (and other
beginners) WOULD have chosen NoCode Novice, IF it had been available?
You don't know (NOBODY KNOWS!), but I can assure you, it would have
been LOTS!

Look; Here is the problem in a nutshell:

When the Novice license was eliminated during the last restructuring,
it actually made it harder for young people to get into the
Service/hobby. The ARRL proposal brings back the entry-level testing
requirements; albiet, without the Morse Code requirement (which is
totally out-of-date, anyway).

With the advent and growth of the Internet, Cell Phones,
FRS/GMRS/MURS, etc., Ham radio privileges and requirements have become
totally out of whack with the times. This proposal brings things up
to date for the 21st Century, and gives the young citizens of this
country back the entry-level license.

It is the RIGHT THING TO DO.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

1790. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 20:57:32 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0401271257.5bef4ded@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86466
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ARRL Philosophy <No.m@il.com> wrote in message
news:<FnTPb.19577$q4.10086@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> I canceled my Leage membership after their first restructuring proposal for
> amateur radio. Now, after seeing their new proposal, I wish I had NEVER
> been a member!

Good, now go and get completely lost, you old fart. We are sick to
death of your whining.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

1791. My alternative to upgrading all Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 21:04:46 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0401271304.2fceffa6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86467

What do you think of my idea? (I'm taking bets on how many people flame my idea.) While I applaud the ARRL for proposing a compromise, I think the proposal goes too far in some areas and not far enough in others. My proposal:
1. Keep the Technician class. No-Code Technicians get free upgrades to Tech Plus privileges instead of General privileges.
2. Eliminate the 5 wpm exam completely. The General license would STILL require the General written exam but NOT the Morse Code exam. The Amateur Extra license would STILL require the Amateur Extra written exam but not the Morse Code exam. There is a pragmatic as well as philosophical reason to eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement: no more need to keep track of which Technicians (and new Generals) passed the 5 wpm exam and which ones did not. (Yes, this is essentially what No Code International proposes.)
3. Keep the current phone bands in place as an incentive to use and develop narrowband modes like CW, PSK-31, etc.
4. If keeping Advanced licenses in the database is too much work, then give Advanced licensees a free upgrade to Amateur Extra.
5. Do NOT reduce Novice privileges. (The ARRL proposal reduces their allowed power output and eliminates their 23 cm privileges.) If keeping Novice licenses in the database is too much work for the FCC, then give all Novices a free upgrade to my proposed new Technician class (Tech Plus).
6. If the entry-level license has too few HF privileges, then expand HF privileges for the new Technician class rather than give all Technicians a free upgrade to General.

I'm surprised the ARRL didn't propose something like this, as it would be simpler. (Or the ARRL could have proposed the exact same thing I propose here but retain the 5 wpm exam for the Amateur Extra class as a compromise.) I think my idea would do more to simplify the FCC's work and be just a continuation of the 2000 restructuring. I'm not sure if the FCC will like the ARRL's proposal due to the added complications. Remember that the restructuring of 2000 kept the same basic license structure in place - the only real changes were eliminating the 13 wpm and 20 wpm exams, keeping the 5 classes in place, and stopping the issuance of new Novice, Tech Plus, and Advanced licenses. Note that my proposal keeps the same basic license structure in place as well. The main change is the elimination of the 5 wpm exam. I believe that the current license system is basically OK. I can't think of a system that would be that much better WITHOUT imposing substantial burdens on the FCC, ARRL, VEs, applicants, etc.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
u s e n e t AT j a s o n h s u . c o m

1792. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 21:26:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127162613.01692.00000260@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86468

In article <bv5ehu$2fn@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>> Here we go again! Damn it [expletive deleted], that is patently false and
>you know that
>> it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact.
>>
>
>'S called barking up a tree...

...or trying to nail jelly to it... :-)

LHA / WMD

1793. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 21:26:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127162615.01692.00000262@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86469

In article <5c01b95b.0401262136.4f60d263@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
>news:<bOgRb.66553$f97.8011@fe3.columbus.rr.com>...
>
>> Well you people have...(SNIP)
>
> Another anonymous sniper with more antagonistic, slanderous swill
>to yet slop the trough with.
>
> Be gone, Scumbag. We already have Lennie...We DON'T need you.

Gotta love the warmth and charm of the legal licensed USA amateur
extra frothing at the mouth! :-) :-) :-)

Must be a sixth definition in 97.1, following something about "unique
ability to enhance good will..." :-)

LHA / WMD

LHA / WMD

1794. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 21:26:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127162615.01692.00000261@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86470

In article <bv5ebb$1uc@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:MMOdnR0RxLahRYjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>>
>> I make this suggestion in dead seriousness. ARRL needs to consult with
>> a licensed psychologist stat, if not put one on staff retainer. Perhaps
>> he or she could explain why this is such a stupid idea.
>
>Ha! The ARRL is about nothing but marketing anymore. This is a great
>marketing effort to them: become the good cop and get hundreds to join, or
>something along those lines.

Just discovered that? :-)

The biggest moneymaker at the ARRL is their Publishing. They break
even with QST but the gold is in the numerous books they have for
sale (shipping charges extra if ordered from Newington but same
prices, no shipping charges if bought over the counter at HRO).

Publishing pays nearly all the bills at ARRL, including all the so-called
membership services that are supposed to be so wonderful and
"cost nothing" to members...renting of banquet rooms for the BoD
get-togethers (and probably travel expenses, too?)...maintenance of
W1AW and the museum...and the legal and lobbying fees in DC.

Membership fees don't go for much directly. That pays for the
"fulfillment services" (mailing lists, printing, distribution of QST) with
the rest of it spread throughout Hq; membership magazine QST
gets its income from advertising charges...just like the other
independent magazines of interest to amateurs.

The 2002 Federal Tax Returns for ARRL showed an operating
budget of around $12 million. Given only 170 thousand or so
memberships, that multiplied by annual dues isn't going to hit any
$12 million.

ARRL stays alive by BEING a business. Their self-promotion is a
necessary thing. Unfortunately, many members don't see that,
preferring the delusion of some altruistic, noble, kind, and good
organization "solely for members." <shrug>

LHA / WMD

1795. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 22:10:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040127171047.27224.00000945@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 86471

>This proposal brings things up
>to date for the 21st Century

This is there Buzz Phrase, what it means is they are to Dumb or to Lazy, take your pick

1796. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 22:47:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401271447.7e59be7d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86472

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040127130348.13622.00000553@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> > If they can't have an ARS that meets their
> >lofty ideals, then they want to destroy it.
> >
> >You read it here first.
> >
> >bb
>
> I have no intention of destroying it, groups like NCI and "CBRRL" are doing a
> GREAT JOB without my help.

Bruce, then you've obviously never read anything you've posted here. bb

1797. Re: BETTER HF FREQUENCY PLAN for AMATEUR RADIO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 22:50:27 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <OWBRb.129931$5V2.659065@attbi_s53>
Source record: 86473

> let the modes fight it out and the 'good amateur practice' with voluntary
> band plans work it out.

I have just met with Herr Hitler and he is a rather nice chap. He only
wants a little lebensraum for his people ...only this and nothing more
....peace has been secured for our lifetime.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

1798. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 22:53:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401271453.2707ac21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86474

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040127124312.05957.00000171@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <z10Rb.26993$1e.25468@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >|
> >| This thread, Michael, was started by a known newsgroup antagonist
> >| who is not, himself, an Amateur Radio licensee...Not even a Novice
> >| Class. His perception of "radio" is strictly from that of a person
> >| looking to make a buck...nothing else.
> >|
> >
> >Mike Coslo isn't a ham? What's this "KB3EIA" business he puts in his
> >signature then?
>
> The gunnery nurse seems to think that his PC is infested with an
> A.I. virus that masquerades as all kinds of different communicators.
> It's getting so that he can't tell reality from his internal fantasy.
>
> Excuse me, I'm going off to practice my K0HB, Billy Beeper, and
> Leo posting. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

'Preciate it, Len. I'm kind of busy this week and do need some
relief. If you ever need a break from WMD postings, just holler.

73, bb

1799. Re: Pathetic lack of leadership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 23:00:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401271500.73d7c9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86475

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040127124313.05957.00000172@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0401250408.5b1e9434@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >You always have the right answers, Dee, and you're always right.
> >
> >Why does anyone else even bother?
>
> It's better than being a homicide suspect! :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Leo, what did I miss? Who is a homicide suspect?

1800. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 23:02:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401271502.2c8f16f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86476

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<sfhb109s5e9c0l4fh2rme98j4gtldocmf7@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Jan 2004 00:29:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <irr8109vru234sivctt2kmkrpgjinm2ah1@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >>On 25 Jan 2004 20:30:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >>
> >>>extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint:
> >>>Has nothing to do with aviation.
> >>
> >>From the theatre, where impromptu performances were given by actors
> >>who received prompts from the wings.
> >>
> >BINGO!
> >
> >Hey, this guy's good!
>
> Well, sometimes :)
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 73, Leo

Len, another extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing nut" come from?

1801. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 23:23:29 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ojsd101thdja78ulddouf3e1pktaqp268f@4ax.com>
Source record: 86477

On 27 Jan 2004 15:02:49 -0800, billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<sfhb109s5e9c0l4fh2rme98j4gtldocmf7@4ax.com>...
>> On 27 Jan 2004 00:29:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <irr8109vru234sivctt2kmkrpgjinm2ah1@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >>On 25 Jan 2004 20:30:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint:
>> >>>Has nothing to do with aviation.
>> >>
>> >>From the theatre, where impromptu performances were given by actors
>> >>who received prompts from the wings.
>> >>
>> >BINGO!
>> >
>> >Hey, this guy's good!
>>
>> Well, sometimes :)
>> >
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>
>Len, another extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing nut" come from?

OK, but don't call me Len!

You have me on that one - I have always taken for granted that the
term came from the appearance of the 'wing nut' itself - that is, the
two projections allowing it to be finger tightened look kinda like
wings.

Where did it come from?

73, Leo

1802. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-27 23:59:32 UTC
From: joe <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <4TCRb.6576$lw6.2810@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86478

Like the 5wpm extras know what the fuck they are doing...

WA8ULX wrote:

>>This proposal brings things up
>>to date for the 21st Century
>
>
> This is there Buzz Phrase, what it means is they are to Dumb or to Lazy, take
> your pick

1803. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 00:55:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ELDRb.1096$zG1.309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86479

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0401271248.28456106@posting.google.com...
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0401261930.52c04c71@posting.google.com>...
>
> > As far as I can tell, people want the Novice license back so
> > entry-level hams can have some HF privileges.
>
> NO! It has very little to do with HF! It is all about OLD FARTS
> wanting to keep Ham Radio an "Old Boy's Club".
>
> > But the proposal would
> > REDUCE the privileges of current Novices, which I don't think is fair
> > (even if 99.9% of Novices are inactive). I think the Novice
> > privileges should be left alone. And I don't see a need for the FCC
> > to issue new Novice licenses again given the fact that most new hams
> > chose the No-Code Tech license over the Novice license during the
> > period when both were available.
>
> Your logic is obviously flawed. These Techs chose NoCode, because
> they didn't want to do the code! How many young people (and other
> beginners) WOULD have chosen NoCode Novice, IF it had been available?
> You don't know (NOBODY KNOWS!), but I can assure you, it would have
> been LOTS!
>
> Look; Here is the problem in a nutshell:
>
> When the Novice license was eliminated during the last restructuring,
> it actually made it harder for young people to get into the
> Service/hobby. The ARRL proposal brings back the entry-level testing
> requirements; albiet, without the Morse Code requirement (which is
> totally out-of-date, anyway).
>
> With the advent and growth of the Internet, Cell Phones,
> FRS/GMRS/MURS, etc., Ham radio privileges and requirements have become
> totally out of whack with the times. This proposal brings things up
> to date for the 21st Century, and gives the young citizens of this
> country back the entry-level license.
>
> It is the RIGHT THING TO DO.
>
> - Stewart
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

TRANSLATION:

I want it all and do nothing for it. I am a product of the non-productive useless jerks in America today.

Dan/W4NTI

1804. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 02:23:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401271823.2bb0af65@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86480

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<ojsd101thdja78ulddouf3e1pktaqp268f@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Jan 2004 15:02:49 -0800, billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<sfhb109s5e9c0l4fh2rme98j4gtldocmf7@4ax.com>...
> >> On 27 Jan 2004 00:29:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >>
> >> >In article <irr8109vru234sivctt2kmkrpgjinm2ah1@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> >> >writes:
> >> >
> >> >>On 25 Jan 2004 20:30:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >>>extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing it" come from? Hint:
> >> >>>Has nothing to do with aviation.
> >> >>
> >> >>From the theatre, where impromptu performances were given by actors
> >> >>who received prompts from the wings.
> >> >>
> >> >BINGO!
> >> >
> >> >Hey, this guy's good!
> >>
> >> Well, sometimes :)
> >> >
> >> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >
> >
> >Len, another extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing nut" come from?
>
> OK, but don't call me Len!

Sorry. I was just trying to feed Steve's paranoia.

> You have me on that one - I have always taken for granted that the
> term came from the appearance of the 'wing nut' itself - that is, the
> two projections allowing it to be finger tightened look kinda like
> wings.
>
> Where did it come from?
>
> 73, Leo

I have no idea. I was in the Air Force, and the grunts always
referred to us as wingnuts. So I thought you might know.

I should ask Dee. She knows everything and she's always right.

bb

1805. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 02:27:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401271827.4d582e05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86481

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040127162615.01692.00000261@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <bv5ebb$1uc@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:MMOdnR0RxLahRYjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
> >>
> >> I make this suggestion in dead seriousness. ARRL needs to consult with
> >> a licensed psychologist stat, if not put one on staff retainer. Perhaps
> >> he or she could explain why this is such a stupid idea.
> >
> >Ha! The ARRL is about nothing but marketing anymore. This is a great
> >marketing effort to them: become the good cop and get hundreds to join, or
> >something along those lines.
>
> Just discovered that? :-)
>
> The biggest moneymaker at the ARRL is their Publishing. They break
> even with QST but the gold is in the numerous books they have for
> sale (shipping charges extra if ordered from Newington but same
> prices, no shipping charges if bought over the counter at HRO).
>
> Publishing pays nearly all the bills at ARRL, including all the so-called
> membership services that are supposed to be so wonderful and
> "cost nothing" to members...renting of banquet rooms for the BoD
> get-togethers (and probably travel expenses, too?)...maintenance of
> W1AW and the museum...and the legal and lobbying fees in DC.
>
> Membership fees don't go for much directly. That pays for the
> "fulfillment services" (mailing lists, printing, distribution of QST) with
> the rest of it spread throughout Hq; membership magazine QST
> gets its income from advertising charges...just like the other
> independent magazines of interest to amateurs.
>
> The 2002 Federal Tax Returns for ARRL showed an operating
> budget of around $12 million. Given only 170 thousand or so
> memberships, that multiplied by annual dues isn't going to hit any
> $12 million.
>
> ARRL stays alive by BEING a business. Their self-promotion is a
> necessary thing. Unfortunately, many members don't see that,
> preferring the delusion of some altruistic, noble, kind, and good
> organization "solely for members." <shrug>

>
> LHA / WMD

Len, wasn't it Mike Deignan that used to beat the "publishing" drum?

Don't forget the advertising sales in all those publications, and of course, the endowment funds.

bb

1806. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 03:12:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127221220.29815.00002957@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86482

In article <%11Rb.25790$q4.13238@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>
> As I've stated several times, I don't really care what her reasonings
>were. It's simply not my job to judge Kim.

Dwight:

Fine, then leave it up to me. I am an intelligent, educated, mature and responsible person, and thus highly qualified to make judgements on things like Kim's callsign -- and based on the evidence provided thereby, her character.

>I've told Kim what I think, and
>that is enough. I don't see any reason to keep repeating myself. And I
>certainly don't see any reason to repeat myself over and over through a
>several year period as some in this newsgroup have done.

The main purpose of the "repetition" is to keep the issue on the "front burner" as it were. Kim has acted irresponsibly by choosing a call sign which incites controversy. Well, that's what she wanted, now she will have to deal with it. Twice today, she has posted suggestions that she wants this thread to go away. Well, only she can make that happen. And she knows how.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 03:12:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127221220.29815.00002958@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86486

In article <161Rb.25802$q4.24753@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> The suffix of Kim's call sign spells
>> out a word which is commonly
>> regarded as a vulgar reference to
>> a woman's breasts. Therefore,
>> her call sign is very inappropriate
>> for a family-oriented activity such
>> as the amateur radio service.
>
>
> By whose standards of inappropriateness, Larry? And who made that person
>the judge of what is appropriate in this radio service? The FCC issued the
>callsign. As far as I'm concerned, that is the only "judge" that matters in
>this regard.

Dwight:

My own, and several other regular participants of this newsgroup, not to mention a handful of lurkers who communicate me regularly to let me know I'm right on track. In fact, one of them just posted here recently, and quite unexpectedly.

The fact that the FCC issued the callsign is totally irrelevant. The FCC is a governmental agency which is driven by a total commitment to political correctness and the need to keep it's ass out of drafts. If they would decline to issue a call sign such as Kim's, they could be sued for big bucks for any number of reasons, most likely the violation of her First Amendment rights. Therefore, it is not the FCC's onus to take responsibility for an objectionable call sign. That is the responsibility of the person to whom it was assigned, if a sequentially-assigned call, or the person requesting a specific Vanity Call Sign. If I were to request a new, sequentially-assigned call, and got something like K3KKK or K3FUK, I would immediately return that license to the FCC and demand a reassignment which did not contain that particularly objectionable suffix. If Kim had any class at all, that is precisely what she would do with her present call. This is on Kim, not the FCC. The FCC is not in a position to sanction or disapprove any particular call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1808. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 03:12:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127221221.29815.00002960@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86484

In article <bv2pre$66a@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Larry, you are one of the most vulgar persons I've ever been witness to.

Kim:

Certainly not. Anyone who knows me personally would be very quick to
set you straight on that! I will not even dignify the scurrilous accusation
you just made by asking you to explain it, because your opinion of other
people's character is irrelevant, due to the untoward display of vulgarity
demonstrated by your call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1809. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 03:12:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127221221.29815.00002959@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86485

In article <bv2prf$66a@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Isn't that something?! The people I consider good, decent folks in the ARS,
>don't have an issue with my callsign at all. Oh, by the way, isn't it
>around that time of year that this thread get dropped again, Larry?
>ROFLMAO!!!!!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

There you go again, begging for this thread to be dropped! Whassamatta?
Getting tired of defending the indefensible? Running out of arguments?
Feeling like you're at the end of your rope? I thought so. Well, as it
happens, you know how to make this thread go away. Start acting like
an intelligent, mature, and decent human being, and get rid of that
obnoxious call sign!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1810. "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 03:12:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127221222.29815.00002961@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86483

In article <bv2q41$cqu@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Yeah, I'd lay odds that this thread was "awakened" again this (late last)
>year by Larry, mid-Winter boredom or whatever, and it's about the usual time
>for it to be dying down.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

That sounds like wishful thinking. However, you asked for it, and as long
as you've got it, you're gonna get it! This thread has a life of it's own, and
as long as I am a participant in this newsgroup, it will always pop up
whenever you least expect it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1811. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 03:58:24 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <mynews@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>
Source record: 86492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Well... I'm gonna try again. I posted this over 8 hours ago and it's not shown up on my server yet so my apologies if it turns up twice.

When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal minority complaining. When they came out with the No code tech license there was a vocal minority complaining. Now they are doing away with most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.

WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges. Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international agreements.

"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the character of those coming into the service.

Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of Amateur Radio.

Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.

I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future applicants.

It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied no mater what is done.

The move proposed by the League is consistent with international treaty and world policy.

Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
(N833R, S/# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
www.rogerhalstead.com
Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
(N833R, S/# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
www.rogerhalstead.com

1812. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 04:28:07 UTC
From: Stephen Cowell <scowell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <rTGRb.11849$ac4.4518@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:ZlnQb.12915$lh3.3417@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:wVcQb.21140$q4.3388@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Mike" wrote:
> > > (snip) Yet, I still would like to
> > > know where the idea came from
> > > about grandfathering techs with
> > > no test.
> >
> >
> > I think you meant to say no "additional" written test, Mike. I suspect
> the
> > idea comes from the fact that the current Technician license already
> allows
> > HF access with the simple addition of the code test. In other words, the
> > current Technician license exam already covers much of the material
needed
> > for HF access. Therefore, it makes more sense to grandfather them into a
> > license class with HF access than into one without. Of course, that's
just
> > my take on it. If you really want to know why ARRL decided to do so, ask
> > them.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> I agree with that answer. I had to take both the Novice and Tech written
to
> get my Tech no-code. So what? I think it's a great idea to get on HF!!

I heartily agree... read on.

If you ever had to struggle through the period
of no-voice novice, you might never wish that
particular chore on anyone. I got my first Novice
in '75, and let it lapse due primarily to the lack
of voice priviliges (and no manuals for the
boatanchors I'd been given). CB was just a lot
more fun.

I got my second novice in '89, man, what a
difference! Sunspots were coming on, 10M
was hopping, and I worked for a commercial
radio shop. That's what Ham Radio is all about,
for me.... not hazing, but graduated challenges.

The greatest concern, and one which I don't think
has been addressed in this thread yet, is the fact
that our spectrum is in danger. We need more
occupants to help occupy it... and HF voice
priviliges are the only carrot left to put on the stick.
This is a graying hobby.

--
Steve
KI5YG
.

1813. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 04:39:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127233937.29815.00002964@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86490

In article <buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to drop
>my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before she
>gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the public.
>Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Ms. Parton has a lot more going for her than an exceptionally well-rounded
figure. She has a very attractive face (once you get over the big, bleached
blonde hair and the stage makeup), an exceptionally engaging personality,
and she is an exceptionally talented and entertaining singer, songwriter,
and actress. And while her exceptionally large breasts may be, as she
herself once said, "bought and paid for," they are nevertheless all hers, and
she does make humorous, but always tastefully self-depricating, references
to them as part of her act. However, I tend to doubt that if she were an
amateur radio operator, that she would consider requesting a Vanity Call
sign such as "W4TIT."

Dolly Parton is the real thing -- beautiful, talented, and successful. Stop
comparing yourself to her until you write a song like "Jolene" and several
dozen others that are just as good.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1814. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 04:39:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127233938.29815.00002965@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86488

In article <iNdQb.21192$q4.1080@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> You're absolutely right, Dee. I do live in an environment where tits,
>breasts, and other words to describe the human body are not outright, and
>immediately, derogatory or vulgar - only a certain context makes them so.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Let's try a little experiment that would serve to prove what you just said. Sometime within the course of going about your daily duties, locate and approach an attractive woman with a particularly voluptious bustline. Say something like, "Hey, lady, I think you have a really nice set of tits there!" Do not duck, cut and run, hold a police riot shield over your face, or anything like that. Just stand there and take the consequences. Bring a witness, then report back on what happens, if and when you regain consciousness. (BTW, I don't recommend that you perform this experiment on a woman who is escorted by a particularly large male companion.)

Anyone care to speculate on what the outcome may be?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1815. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 04:39:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127233938.29815.00002966@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86489

In article <bv0t97$jq4@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Huh? Well, I don't make an issue of my breasts, either. And, in addition,
>I've heard many interviews and giggles wherein Dolly was either alluding to
>or answering direct questions pertaining to her breasts.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You don't make an issue of your breasts? Then what is your call sign
all about? I clearly recall that you stated that since you consider yourself
to be particularly "well endowed," you took up some sort of challenge to
request that particular Vanity Call Sign for the purpose of creating interest
directed toward your breasts. Of course, I can understand your need to
create confusion over this issue, but an out-and-out lie like you made
above only serves to weaken your already thin credibility.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1816. Re: From the Extra question pool: The dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 04:39:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040127233939.29815.00002967@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86491

In article <870EX17833.2458F8789@taranews.net>, "Lloyd" <lloyd@no.spammmmm>
writes:

>
>A coaxial cable lying over the peak of a roof is the same length on each
>side.
>It weighs one third of a pound per foot. On one end hangs an Extra holding a
>dipole, and on the other end a weight equal to the weight of the Extra. The
>dipole weighs two ounces per inch. The cable is as long (in feet) as the age
>of the Extra (in years), and the weight of the Extra (in ounces) is the same
>as
>the age of the Extra's mother. The combined age of the Extra and his mother
>is
>seventy years. One half of the weight of the Extra, plus the weight of the
>dipole, is one forth as much as the weight of the weight and the weight of
>the
>cable. The Extra's mother is half as old as the Extra will be when he is
>three
>times as old as his mother was when she she was half as old as the Extra will
>be when when he is as old as his mother will be when she is four times as old
>as the Extra was when he was twice as old as his mother was when she was one
>third as old as the Extra was when he was old as his mother was when she was
>three times as old as the Extra was when he was one fourth as old as he is
>now.
>
>How long is the dipole?

All depends on what band it's cut for and whether it's a half-wave, three-
quarter wave, or full-wave dipole. All the rest of the stuff is just nonsense,
which is no more than we expect from you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1817. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 05:11:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SvHRb.30606$zj7.25153@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86493

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

|
| Dolly Parton is the real thing -- beautiful, talented, and successful.
Stop
| comparing yourself to her until you write a song like "Jolene" and
several
| dozen others that are just as good.
|

I'm an agnostic, but I'm a sucker for anything seen through the eyes of
a child, and despite it's Christian overtones the best piece ever
written and performed by DP is "My Coat of Many Colors". Second place
goes to "Apple Jack".

73, de Hans, K0HB

1818. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 05:30:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lb6dnZEnQdo-z4rdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86494

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> If Kim had any class at all,
> that is precisely what she would do with her present call.

If kim had any class at all she would never have chosen such a call.

1819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 05:32:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lb6dnZAnQdquzordRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86495

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> Ms. Parton has a lot more going for her than an exceptionally well-rounded
> figure. She has a very attractive face (once you get over the big, bleached
> blonde hair and the stage makeup)

As Dolly once commented, "it takes a lot of money to look this cheap".

1820. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 06:30:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128013008.08626.00002813@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86497

In article <ELDRb.1096$zG1.309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>I want it all and do nothing for it. I am a product of the non-productive
>useless jerks in America today.

Dan, you shouldn't talk about yourself so much ...

LHA / WMD

1821. Re: From the Extra question pool: The dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 06:30:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128013008.08626.00002812@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86499

In article <20040127233939.29815.00002967@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>How long is the dipole?
>
>All depends on what band it's cut for and whether it's a half-wave, three-
>quarter wave, or full-wave dipole. All the rest of the stuff is just
>nonsense, which is no more than we expect from you.

Larrah, you are hopeless for ever getting a sense of humor. :-)

All that Human Resources schooling must have dulled your
senses. I can understand why you chose to become a bus
driver instead...

LHA / WMD

1822. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 06:30:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128013010.08626.00002814@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86496

In article <1e4e3692.0401271827.4d582e05@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040127162615.01692.00000261@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> In article <bv5ebb$1uc@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
>> >news:MMOdnR0RxLahRYjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>> >>
>> >> I make this suggestion in dead seriousness. ARRL needs to consult with
>> >> a licensed psychologist stat, if not put one on staff retainer. Perhaps
>> >> he or she could explain why this is such a stupid idea.
>> >
>> >Ha! The ARRL is about nothing but marketing anymore. This is a great
>> >marketing effort to them: become the good cop and get hundreds to join, or
>> >something along those lines.
>>
>> Just discovered that? :-)
>>
>> The biggest moneymaker at the ARRL is their Publishing. They break
>> even with QST but the gold is in the numerous books they have for
>> sale (shipping charges extra if ordered from Newington but same
>> prices, no shipping charges if bought over the counter at HRO).
>>
>> Publishing pays nearly all the bills at ARRL, including all the
>so-called
>> membership services that are supposed to be so wonderful and
>> "cost nothing" to members...renting of banquet rooms for the BoD
>> get-togethers (and probably travel expenses, too?)...maintenance of
>> W1AW and the museum...and the legal and lobbying fees in DC.
>>
>> Membership fees don't go for much directly. That pays for the
>> "fulfillment services" (mailing lists, printing, distribution of QST)
>with
>> the rest of it spread throughout Hq; membership magazine QST
>> gets its income from advertising charges...just like the other
>> independent magazines of interest to amateurs.
>>
>> The 2002 Federal Tax Returns for ARRL showed an operating
>> budget of around $12 million. Given only 170 thousand or so
>> memberships, that multiplied by annual dues isn't going to hit any

>> $12 million.
>>
>> ARRL stays alive by BEING a business. Their self-promotion is a
>> necessary thing. Unfortunately, many members don't see that,
>> preferring the delusion of some altruistic, noble, kind, and good
>> organization "solely for members." <shrug>
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>
>Len, wasn't it Mike Deignan that used to beat the "publishing" drum?
>
>Don't forget the advertising sales in all those publications, and of
>course, the endowment funds.

Mike who?!? :-)

QST's advertising "card" is on the League website and anyone who
has more time than they can spend on something useful can grab
an issue of QST and figure out the approximate income from QST
ads each month. That's enough to pay for the staff salaries of QST,
the paper-printing-binding costs, and some of the Fullfillment
services (list maintenance, distribution, delivery)

Since ARRL controls QST, they can get FREE advertising for
whatever else ARRL is publishing. They do. It's an all-around
money-winner since they don't pay much for submitted work by
others. Since ARRL arranges to OWN first rights to all articles in
QST, they can reprint that material in Handbooks or anything else
as much and as many times as they wish without giving a cent
more in compensation to authors. Fabulous setup for making a
bit of money for the League. They've got it sewn up tight. :-)

Note: Retail outlets for League publications make a small profit
on publishing sales, yet the price for each one is the same whether
one buys it in HRO or orders from Newington. The difference is
that anyone ordering from Newington has to ALSO pay shipping
charges! Double profits...no cost to them for shipping and they
make the retailer's discount difference for themselves! Lovely.

"Endowment funds?" I doubt there are many millionaires out
there bequeathing large sums to the League. Nowhere close to
Kroc endowments. It is a kind of crock, though.

[now watch all the ARRL syncophants come out, panting with rage
and vitriol for Telling It Like It Really Is...:-)]

LHA / WMD

1823. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 06:30:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128013010.08626.00002815@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86500

In article <1e4e3692.0401271502.2c8f16f5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> 73, Leo
>
>Len, another extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing nut"
>come from?

Ahem...that's LEO, Brian... :-)

But, you have to admit that the A.I. message program is a darn
good one! :-)

The term "wing nut" probably came from within the USAF before
Larrah signed off the Form 1 on his desk. [that's what he was
called when trying to "wing it" with rationalizations of how and why
he did what he did]

LHA / WMD

1824. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 06:30:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128013011.08626.00002816@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86551

In article <20040127221220.29815.00002958@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>The fact that the FCC issued the callsign is totally irrelevant.

Ooooo! I'll bet that will excite someone in a clearing in the silicon forest!!! :-)

Larrah, did you issue your "Little Thing" call to yourself?!?

>The FCC is
>a governmental agency which is driven by a total commitment to political
>correctness and the need to keep it's ass out of drafts. If they would
>decline to issue a call sign such as Kim's, they could be sued for big bucks
>for any number of reasons, most likely the violation of her First Amendment
>rights. Therefore, it is not the FCC's onus to take responsibility for an
>objectionable call sign.

Larrah, are you admitted to the Bar Association or did you just get admitted to a bar that had a brass rail? :-)

>That is the responsibility of the person to whom it
>was assigned, if a sequentially-assigned call, or the person requesting a
>specific Vanity Call Sign. If I were to request a new, sequentially-
>assigned call, and got something like K3KKK or K3FUK, I would immediately
>return that license to the FCC and demand a reassignment which did not
>contain that particularly objectionable suffix. If Kim had any class at all,
>that is precisely what she would do with her present call. This is on Kim,
>not the FCC.

Hans ought to reassign the most stupidest posting title to Larrah for this year for the above! :-)

>The FCC is not in a position to sanction or disapprove any
>particular call sign.

Oooooo! Care to back that up in a federal court?!? :-)

The FCC giveth and the FCC taketh away, sweetums.

Sunnavagun!

LHA / WMD

1825. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 06:30:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128013012.08626.00002817@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86498

In article <20040127221220.29815.00002957@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <%11Rb.25790$q4.13238@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight >Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>> As I've stated several times, I don't really care what her reasonings >>were. It's simply not my job to judge Kim.
>
>Dwight:
>
>Fine, then leave it up to me. I am an intelligent, educated, mature and >responsible person, and thus highly qualified to make judgements on >things like Kim's callsign -- and based on the evidence provided thereby, >her character.

Yes, we all KNOW how you bragged about those wonderful grades and class standings while becoming a Human Resources (personnel) professional, could get your pick of jobs, etc., etc., etc., ...and then became a bus driver. :-)

All that while telling us of your distinguished, vital, important USAF career where you always knew more than your officers, were more smarts, noble, self-sacrificing to learn how to do 20 WPM morse...just like hams did in the 1930s before you were born.

Sunnavagun!

>>I've told Kim what I think, and >>that is enough. I don't see any reason to keep repeating myself. And I >>certainly don't see any reason to repeat myself over and over through a >>several year period as some in this newsgroup have done.
>
>The main purpose of the "repetition" is to keep the issue on the "front >burner" as it were. Kim has acted irresponsibly by choosing a call sign >which incites controversy. Well, that's what she wanted, now she will >have to deal with it. Twice today, she has posted suggestions that she >wants this thread to go away. Well, only she can make that happen. >And she knows how.

Heh...I thought it was to remind certain folks to Step To The BACK Of The Bus. :-)

LHA / WMD

1826. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 10:14:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv8223$4sg@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86552

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040127221221.29815.00002959@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bv2prf$66a@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Isn't that something?! The people I consider good, decent folks in the
ARS,
> >don't have an issue with my callsign at all. Oh, by the way, isn't it
> >around that time of year that this thread get dropped again, Larry?
> >ROFLMAO!!!!!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> There you go again, begging for this thread to be dropped! Whassamatta?
> Getting tired of defending the indefensible? Running out of arguments?
> Feeling like you're at the end of your rope? I thought so. Well, as it
> happens, you know how to make this thread go away. Start acting like
> an intelligent, mature, and decent human being, and get rid of that
> obnoxious call sign!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

OMYGAWD!!! "Begging for this thread to be dropped!"?????????? Larry,
puhleeze. You're not that stupid.

A) I do not defend my callsign: I like my callsign
B) No "arguments" needed for my callsign. It's mine. Period.
C) End of my rope?? Over a phucking callsign?

Now, I *DARE* you to keep this callsign going beyond your usual
"time-of-year" spin with it. But, just to let you know up front, the I have
no intention of changing my callsign and I don't think I could get any
more decent a human than I am. As to learning, I do that every day--thank
goodness. As to being intelligent, I think I speak too lofty for you now as
it is!

Gads, you're getting hilarious. Only thing is: we're packing to move so
this is the last I'll be on for a while!. I'll be back on sometime around
the first of March. Gonna have this thread still going, there, big fella?
If not, tell ya what, I'll drag it up again! ROFLMAO!!!

Kim W5TIT

1827. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 10:15:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv8241$2in@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86553

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040127221222.29815.00002961@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bv2q41$cqu@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Yeah, I'd lay odds that this thread was "awakened" again this (late last)
> >year by Larry, mid-Winter boredom or whatever, and it's about the usual
time
> >for it to be dying down.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> That sounds like wishful thinking. However, you asked for it, and as long
> as you've got it, you're gonna get it! This thread has a life of it's
own, and
> as long as I am a participant in this newsgroup, it will always pop up
> whenever you least expect it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I think you're beyond "popping up," Larry...

Kim W5TIT

1828. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 10:19:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv82ad$2vh@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86554

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040127233937.29815.00002964@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <buskjj$ne@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Ummmmm, I did not choose T-I-T, I chose *W* *5* T-I-T. Wishing me to
drop
> >my callsign would be about like telling Dolly Parton to cover up before
she
> >gets on stage. Her boobs are one of her trademarks--at least to the
public.
> >Oh, wait, you may find her vulgar also...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Ms. Parton has a lot more going for her than an exceptionally well-rounded
> figure. She has a very attractive face (once you get over the big,
bleached
> blonde hair and the stage makeup), an exceptionally engaging personality,
> and she is an exceptionally talented and entertaining singer, songwriter,
> and actress. And while her exceptionally large breasts may be, as she
> herself once said, "bought and paid for," they are nevertheless all hers,
and
> she does make humorous, but always tastefully self-depricating, references
> to them as part of her act. However, I tend to doubt that if she were an
> amateur radio operator, that she would consider requesting a Vanity Call
> sign such as "W4TIT."
>
> Dolly Parton is the real thing -- beautiful, talented, and successful.
Stop
> comparing yourself to her until you write a song like "Jolene" and several
> dozen others that are just as good.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Dolly is a great entertainer, to be sure. Not so sure about the singing,
though...she's "ok" to me. I'm also great at what I do, and am beautiful
and successful. So, you're correct...there's no comparing needed!

Kim W5TIT

1829. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 10:21:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv82ed$569@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86555

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040127233938.29815.00002965@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <iNdQb.21192$q4.1080@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > You're absolutely right, Dee. I do live in an environment where tits,
> >breasts, and other words to describe the human body are not outright, and
> >immediately, derogatory or vulgar - only a certain context makes them so.
> >
> >
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight:
>
> Let's try a little experiment that would serve to prove what you just
said.
> Sometime within the course of going about your daily duties, locate and
> approach an attractive woman with a particularly voluptious bustline.
> Say something like, "Hey, lady, I think you have a really nice set of
> tits there!" Do not duck, cut and run, hold a police riot shield over
your
> face, or anything like that. Just stand there and take the consequences.
> Bring a witness, then report back on what happens, if and when you
> regain consciousness. (BTW, I don't recommend that you perform this
> experiment on a woman who is escorted by a particularly large male
> companion.)
>
> Anyone care to speculate on what the outcome may be?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I'd start laughing my ass off and tell Dwight that he was really desperate!
;o

Kim W5TIT

1830. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 10:26:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bv82n6$14l@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 86556

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040127221222.29815.00002961@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bv2q41$cqu@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Yeah, I'd lay odds that this thread was "awakened" again this (late last)
> >year by Larry, mid-Winter boredom or whatever, and it's about the usual
time
> >for it to be dying down.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> That sounds like wishful thinking. However, you asked for it, and as long
> as you've got it, you're gonna get it! This thread has a life of it's
own, and
> as long as I am a participant in this newsgroup, it will always pop up
> whenever you least expect it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

By the way, Larry, *this* is the original thread, so be sure it's this one
you keep going!

Kim W5TIT

1831. Re: Do yourself a favor. Join the arrl now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 12:27:32 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <UUNRb.3437$6J6.973245@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 86557

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bv5e3d$nhd@library1.airnews.net...
> But, for DXers and paper chasers, it's probably a nicely organized
> rigmarole. Do you mind the wait, Bert? You must be "into" DXing and
> contesting, eh?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Nah, I'm neither a DXer nor a contester, Kim. I mostly like to ragchew. One of my Elmers taught me that "a QSL is the final courtesy of a QSO." I guess it kinda stuck with me.

Most of the folks I've QSO'd with have sent me their card direct and right away. W0EX's card actually arrived the same day I mailed his out.

There is one fellow R.R.A.Per who owes me a card tho...ahem. <hihi> ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1832. Re: My alternative to upgrading all Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 13:07:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128080731.07155.00000322@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86559

In article <f7d9a152.0401271304.2fceffa6@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>My proposal:
>1. Keep the Technician class. No-Code Technicians get free upgrades
>to Tech Plus privileges instead of General privileges
>2. Eliminate the 5 wpm exam completely. The General license would
>STILL require the General written exam but NOT the Morse Code exam.

If 2) is done, then 1) happens automatically, because the only difference
is the code test.

>The Amateur Extra license would STILL require the Amateur Extra
>written exam but not the Morse Code exam.

So what you're really proposaing is to just dump the code test and
nothing else.

That's already been propososed to the FCC by at least two different groups.

>There is a pragmatic as
>well as philosophical reason to eliminate the Morse Code testing
>requirement: no more need to keep track of which Technicians (and new
>Generals) passed the 5 wpm exam and which ones did not. (Yes, this is
>essentially what No Code International proposes.)

It's exactly what NCI and NCVEC have proposed. And it doesn't save FCC
anything, because it's not FCC that has to keep track of who is a Tech Plus.

>3. Keep the current phone bands in place as an incentive to use and
>develop narrowband modes like CW, PSK-31, etc.

Agreed!

>4. If keeping Advanced licenses in the database is too much work,
>then give Advanced licensees a free upgrade to Amateur Extra.

Why? What work is involved in keeping them in the database? It's just a
computer system,

>5. Do NOT reduce Novice privileges. (The ARRL proposal reduces their
>allowed power output and eliminates their 23 cm privileges.)

Do you propose reopening Novice to new licensees?

How many Novices today will be adversely affected by the loss of 23 cm and the
slight power reduction?

>If
>keeping Novice licenses in the database is too much work for the FCC,
>then give all Novices a free upgrade to my proposed new Technician
>class (Tech Plus).

Why? What work is involved in keeping them in the database? It's just a
computer system,

>6. If the entry-level license has too few HF privileges, then expand
>HF privileges for the new Technician class rather than give all
>Technicians a free upgrade to General.
>
That, too, has been proposed.

>I'm surprised the ARRL didn't propose something like this, as it would
>be simpler.

It also doesn't address what ARRL's BoD was trying to address.

> (Or the ARRL could have proposed the exact same thing I
>propose here but retain the 5 wpm exam for the Amateur Extra class as
>a compromise.) I think my idea would do more to simplify the FCC's
>work and be just a continuation of the 2000 restructuring. I'm not
>sure if the FCC will like the ARRL's proposal due to the added
>complications. Remember that the restructuring of 2000 kept the same
>basic license structure in place - the only real changes were
>eliminating the 13 wpm and 20 wpm exams, keeping the 5 classes in
>place, and stopping the issuance of new Novice, Tech Plus, and
>Advanced licenses. Note that my proposal keeps the same basic license
>structure in place as well. The main change is the elimination of the
>5 wpm exam. I believe that the current license system is basically
>OK. I can't think of a system that would be that much better WITHOUT
>imposing substantial burdens on the FCC, ARRL, VEs, applicants, etc.
>
Here's the problem:

ARRL's BoD thinks that the license structure has two main problems:

1) Entry level license is too hard to get for raw beginners

2) Entry level license privileges are too focused on VHF/UHF and not enough HF

Their solution is to simplify the entry level exam and give it a more balanced
set of privileges. Personally I think they should include more HF bands, like
30 meters, in the entry level license.

You may not think that the Tech written is very difficult, but the BoD thinks
differently. And if someone wants significant HF privileges, they have to get
at least a General.

I can't see what all the fuss is about keeping the 5 wpm code test. Is it
really that difficult?

The problem with your proposals, Jason, is that they don't do very much.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1833. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 13:07:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128080732.07155.00000323@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86558

In article <rTGRb.11849$ac4.4518@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>, " Stephen Cowell" <scowell@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>If you ever had to struggle through the period
>of no-voice novice, you might never wish that
>particular chore on anyone.

I had a no-voice, nonrenewable, nonretakeable Novice back in 1967.

Had a great time with it.

>I got my first Novice
>in '75, and let it lapse due primarily to the lack
>of voice priviliges (and no manuals for the
>boatanchors I'd been given). CB was just a lot
>more fun.

I've never been on cb. Ham radio seemed like way more fun.

>I got my second novice in '89, man, what a
>difference! Sunspots were coming on, 10M
>was hopping, and I worked for a commercial
>radio shop. That's what Ham Radio is all about,
>for me.... not hazing, but graduated challenges.

Hazing?
>
>The greatest concern, and one which I don't think
>has been addressed in this thread yet, is the fact
>that our spectrum is in danger.

It's always been in danger. Other services have always looked at our allocations and asked why they couldn't have some.

> We need more
>occupants to help occupy it... and HF voice
>priviliges are the only carrot left to put on the stick.

We have 683,000 US hams today. That's about 2-1/2 times what there were back when I got started in 1967. If the bands aren't crowded, it's because existing hams aren't on the air, not because there aren't enough hams.

>This is a graying hobby.

Think about why.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1834. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 14:23:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <OBPRb.231$GO6.56@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86560
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

"Roger Halstead" <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> wrote in message
news:5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com...
>
> Well... I'm gonna try again. I posted this over 8 hours ago and it's
> not shown up on my server yet so my apologies if it turns up twice.
>
> When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal
> minority complaining. When they came out with the No code tech license
> there was a vocal minority complaining. Now they are doing away with
> most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.
>
> WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did
> away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges.
> Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs
> on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away
> with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international
> agreements.
>
> "To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech
> heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the
> character of those coming into the service.
>
> Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming
> this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of
> Amateur Radio.
>
> Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should
> run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such
> there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.
>
> I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my
> license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future
> applicants.
>
> It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a
> mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other
> operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied
> no mater what is done.
>
> The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
> treaty and world policy.
>
> Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)

> (N833R, S# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
> www.rogerhalstead.com
> Roger Halstead (K8RI & ARRL life member)
> (N833R, S# CD-2 Worlds oldest Debonair)
> www.rogerhalstead.com

Great post. Propose anything and there will be that minority that
opposes it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
ARRL and NCI

1835. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 14:55:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128095524.22081.00003703@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86561

In article <5c01b95b.0401270542.3ec8668b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>...
>
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...
>
>> > There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.
>>
>> Also a lot of positivism.
>
> That they are trying to keep things moving from their
>perspective, perhaps. But I don't think this requires a whole lot of
>rethinking nor does it require any complex bandplanning.

I'm not sure what you mean, Steve.

The ARRL proposal focuses mostly on the entry-level license and the license
classes closed off to new issues. There's not a lot of bandplanning in it.
>
>> > While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
>> > poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
>> > Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
>> > sake of sales/membership.
>>
>> I disagree! I think it has some good ideas and some bad ideas.
>
> There's good stuff here, Jim, but I'm going to cut to the chase.

OK

>> On top of all this, the Tech written (Element 2) is full of arcane
>> stuff like RF exposure calculations, which displaces more basic stuff
>> that would serve a newcomer better.
>
> I don't think that much of what is "written" is pertinent even if
>it were "written" in the next 2 hours. As long as the question pools
>are open and the "newcomer" can pick up a verbatim "Q&A study guide",
>the tests are relatively irrelevant.

And that's not going to change. Been that way for 20 years, and FCC isn't
going to take back the work that it now gets done for free by unpaid
volunteers.

So the *only* answer is to make the test pools so big that it's easier for 99% of new hams to just learn the material than to word-associate and rote-memorize their way to a passing grade. And, in my experience, most newcomers really want to learn the material. YMMV.

> Yes, some "learning" will occur just from reading the question
>over and over, but to what legitimate application can THAT kind of
>learning be applied?

Some questions are pure memorization, like the band edges and other regs.
>
> Repeat after me: "Lopressor is a beta blocker administerd SIVP
>for the control of hypertension and AFIB with IVR."
>
"Lopressor is a beta blocker administered SIVP for the control of hypertension and AFIB with IVR."

Got it - sort of.

> Got that? Now, WHAT is a beta blocker?

Some kind of drug. Has to do with the mechanisms that cause high blood pressure and /or hear attacks. Administered intravenously.

>What was the underlying
>etiology of the hypertension or the atrial fibrillation that produced
>the irregular ventricular response?

Something to do with too much beta. Whatever beta is in this context.

I figured out all that from context and a hazy layman's exposure to cardiac medicine. Do I really understand it? Of course not!
>
>> > My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT
>> > a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur
>> > Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.
>>
>> What about your Director and Vice Director - or better yet, the entire
>> BoD? And let 'em know exactly what's good and bad, and why.
>
> Perhaps, Jim, but my take is that the FCC has expressed more than
>it's fair share of frustration with the numerous licening strategies
>that have been offered, all suggesting that "this one" will be the one
>to open the flood gates of new licensees.

I don't see that. What I do see is the FCC taking its time and letting everyone propose all sorts of stuff, and comment on same. NPRM? Maybe some months down the road. Actual rules changes? Don't hold your breath or you'll need more than beta blockers ;-)
>
> Each has produced a momentary road bump followed by a rapid
>return to a steady-if-unimpressive growth rate.
>
That's because none of them address, or can address, the underlying problems

that limit growth in amateur radio.

>> If/when the proposal becomes an RM, it'll be comment time......
>
> Ditto.
>
> Hope you're keeping warm Jim! It's embarrassing here...I spent
>most of the evening with the back door open to let a cool drizzling
>breeze pass through the house.

We've had 3 winter storms in the past 4 days. Last night was an ice storm followed by several inches of new snow. Also lots of flu in this house despite flu shots. Not pretty. See what you're missing?

Time to dig out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1836. Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 15:17:59 UTC
From: Morbeius <willitfloat500@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <f47$4017d2ad$d8536f03$31366@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Code? Schmode! (what a load?)

You "hams" want to keep the pride and technical prowess
within Amateur Radio into the new Century? Then do this:

1) Eliminate ALL code testing for ALL License classes.

2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
exam questions.

(and now for the rub)

3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !

If someone wants an Amateur License, then they should have a
working technical and theoretical knowledge of RF Theorems and
all related aspects of electrical and electronic practice.

It used to be that if you were an Amateur Operator you had to demonstrate
a degree of professionality and knowledge

Having an Extra Class licence should be *almost equal* to someone
who has a BSEE. Both should be able to answer questions on varied
topics of Electrical Engineering with a reasonable degree of competence.

Until something along these lines is attempted, Amateur Radio will
be nothing more than glorified CB radio. I've been to enough club
meetings and hamfests where I've seen holders of Extra Class tickets
who couldn't comprehend even the most basic of electronics theory.
It didn't used to be this way!

1837. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 15:25:50 UTC
From: Nitespark <nitespark@cox.net>
Message-ID: <ZvQRb.1003$gl2.693@lakeread05>
Source record: 86563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Morbeius wrote:

>
> 2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
> exam questions.
>
> (and now for the rub)
>
> 3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !

It used to be that way. Remember the "Dick Bash" books. These came out when the FCC was still administering Amateur tests. The FCC didn't release the question pool or the answers. Ham applicants would send the questions in the remembered from the tests and Bash would publish them.

Andy
WD4KDN

>

"People sleep peaceably in their beds at night only
because rough men stand ready to do violence on their behalf."

George Orwell

1838. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 15:53:39 UTC
From: Mike in San Antonio <big@mikeantons.org>
Message-ID: <bv8lu0$2lu$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86564
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Nitespark" <nitespark@cox.net> wrote in message
news:ZvQRb.1003$gl2.693@lakeread05...
>
> It used to be that way. Remember the "Dick Bash" books. These came out
> when the FCC was still administering Amateur tests. The FCC didn't
> release the question pool or the answers. Ham applicants would send the
> questions in the remembered from the tests and Bash would publish them.
>
> Andy
> WD4KDN
>

Dick Bash was and still is one of the finest ham radio operators to
ever key a microphone. A true gentlman & a scholar. A pillar
of the ham radio community.

Mike in San Antonio

1839. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 15:55:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128105511.12631.00004593@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 86565

In article <f47$4017d2ad$d8536f03$31366@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>, "Morbeius"
<willitfloat500@yahoo.com> writes:

>Code? Schmode! (what a load?)
>
>You "hams" want to keep the pride and technical prowess
>within Amateur Radio into the new Century? Then do this:
>
>1) Eliminate ALL code testing for ALL License classes.

Why?
>
>2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
> exam questions.
>
Done by whom?

>(and now for the rub)
>
>3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !

How?
>
>If someone wants an Amateur License, then they should have a
>working technical and theoretical knowledge of RF Theorems and
>all related aspects of electrical and electronic practice.

Why?
>
>It used to be that if you were an Amateur Operator you had to demonstrate
>a degree of professionality and knowledge

No, you had to display a basic understanding of practical radio as it applies
to
what amateurs do on the amateur bands.

>Having an Extra Class licence should be *almost equal* to someone
>who has a BSEE.

Why?

I've got BSEE and MSEE, and lemme tellya, if the requirements for a ham
ticket get anywhere near those levels, it won't be pretty.

>Both should be able to answer questions on varied
>topics of Electrical Engineering with a reasonable degree of competence.

Why?

Radio - all of radio - is but a small part of electrical engineering. There's
no
reason to require such broad knowledge for an amateur radio license.

>Until something along these lines is attempted, Amateur Radio will
>be nothing more than glorified CB radio. I've been to enough club
>meetings and hamfests where I've seen holders of Extra Class tickets
>who couldn't comprehend even the most basic of electronics theory.

Here's a clue: The folks you see at hamfests and club meetings aren't
all there is to amateur radio.

>It didn't used to be this way!

How do you know?

1840. Re: My alternative to upgrading all Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 16:36:37 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc1fphv.jsu.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 86566

In article <f7d9a152.0401271304.2fceffa6@posting.google.com>, Jason Hsu wrote:
> What do you think of my idea? (I'm taking bets on how many people
> flame my idea.) While I applaud the ARRL for proposing a compromise,
> I think the proposal goes too far in some areas and not far enough in
> others. My proposal:
> 1. Keep the Technician class. No-Code Technicians get free upgrades
> to Tech Plus privileges instead of General privileges.

Agreed.

> 2. Eliminate the 5 wpm exam completely. The General license would
> STILL require the General written exam but NOT the Morse Code exam.
> The Amateur Extra license would STILL require the Amateur Extra
> written exam but not the Morse Code exam. There is a pragmatic as
> well as philosophical reason to eliminate the Morse Code testing
> requirement: no more need to keep track of which Technicians (and new
> Generals) passed the 5 wpm exam and which ones did not. (Yes, this is
> essentially what No Code International proposes.)

Agree here also.

> 3. Keep the current phone bands in place as an incentive to use and
> develop narrowband modes like CW, PSK-31, etc.

Interesting, but I would prefer to split up the bandplans based on actual
bandwidth of the mode in question.

> 4. If keeping Advanced licenses in the database is too much work,
> then give Advanced licensees a free upgrade to Amateur Extra.

Should not be a real problem to keep Advanced holders in the database.
It would probably be more difficult to upgrade them to Extra. The easiest
thing to do would be to make the Advanced and Extra priveleges the same --
no database changes that way, only paperwork changes.

> 5. Do NOT reduce Novice privileges. (The ARRL proposal reduces their
> allowed power output and eliminates their 23 cm privileges.) If
> keeping Novice licenses in the database is too much work for the FCC,
> then give all Novices a free upgrade to my proposed new Technician
> class (Tech Plus).

See above, probably easier to equate Novice, Technician and Tech-Plus
priveleges.

> 6. If the entry-level license has too few HF privileges, then expand
> HF privileges for the new Technician class rather than give all
> Technicians a free upgrade to General.

Agreed, there should be no automatic upgrades, expansion of priveleges would be my prefered method.

Alex / AB2RC

1841. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 16:55:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128115555.12501.00005862@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86569

In article <4016b2c4$0$99194$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>In <20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>
>>>In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>D.
>>>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means
>that
>>>>>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
>>>> never
>>>>>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>>>>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
>>>for
>>>>>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if
>they
>>>>>>>decide to do anything at all.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>>>>
>>>>>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the
>issue
>>>> came
>>>>>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
>>>Pluses
>>>> to
>>>>>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had
>no

>>>>>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
>>>database.
>>>>
>>>>>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>>>>>>everybody's time.
>>>>
>>>>>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>>>>
>>>>>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>>>>
>>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>
>>>>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>>>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>>>>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>>>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>>>
>>>>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>>>
>>>It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
>>>pros and cons:
>>>
>>>Cons:
>>>
>>>Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
>>>it.
>
>>That's one. There are others:
>
>>- Allowing a free upgrade

can be taken as

>>proof that the material in the test which is not
>>taken is not necessary for the privileges.
>
>To quote from the ARRL's FAQ on their proposal:
>
>http://www.arrl.org/news/restructuring2/faq.html
>
>"The fact is that the examination bar has never been at a uniform height
>over ham radio's nearly 100-year history."

And I say: "So what? The question is whether there is any good reason to
give almost 60% of existing hams a free upgrade to the next license class,
even though the upgrade to that class requires only a written test from a
published pool.

>Were you also opposed to giving pre-1917 hams a waiver for the 20 WPM
>code test?

No such waiver ever existed. What *was* waived were the 20 wpm receiving and sending code tests, plus the Extra written test. The person who got the waiver had to hold at least a General license, too.

That was long before my time, too. And it affected maybe 2% of the licensed hams at the time.

>>- Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than those
>>who didn't. How do we justify that?
>
>It's called "grandfathering," which is done in more regulatory contexts
>than can possibly be named here. Due to the need for certainty in the
>law, it is nearly always based on hard cutoff dates. Technologies,
>practices, and people change over the very long timeline that laws and
>regulations are required to cover. It is not possible to predict the
>future with certainty, so laws and regulations must change to reflect
>current knowledge. It is also impractical for society to retest,
>recertify, or revalidate every existing entity against current
>requirements.

None of which is proposed.
>
>The web site for Malvern Instrumentation gives a good definition of
>grandfathering in a technical context:
>
>"Grandfathering is the practice of claiming exemption of older systems
>from validation regulations and requirements on the basis that these
>systems have proved their reliability by adoption for a long period of
>time by a large user base."
>
>Grandfathering in the context of ham radio recognizes that existing hams
>have not only passed the tests in effect at the time, sometimes topics
>not covered presently (Morse code, drawing circuit diagrams, etc.), but
>have also gained experience beyond their initial exam topics. It is a
>fair, and pragmatic, distinction between existing hams and entry-level
>ones. Quoting again from the FAQ document:
>
>"Passing any amateur examination does not magically result in a good
>operator. It's just the key to the kingdom, so to speak. Experience and
>good mentoring create skillful and knowledgeable operators, not the
>relative difficulty or ease of the test."

I disagree with that assessment. YMMV.
>
>You might argue that not every existing ham has obtained the same degree
>of experience, or even a minimum necessary level of experience to be
>given a free upgrade. That would be true, but ultimately would be
>self-limiting, as experience would correlate with participation. An
>inactive ham using no privileges today would be using no more privileges
>if the FCC gave him a free upgrade tomorrow. Free upgrades are not a
>perfect solution, ideal in all cases, but are a good solution overall.

I disagree. What's wrong with simply allowing Techs, Tech Pluses and Advanceds to upgrade in their own time?

What is the sudden need to eliminate those license classes? The Novice and Advanced have been closed off to new issues for almost 4 years, and their numbers have declined. And from 1953 to 1967, no new Advanceds were issued. Did any of that cause problems?

What's the rush?

Are the written tests too hard?
>
>>- Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.
>
>No proposal is perfect. Weigh this one against the pros.
>
I have. The cons win.

>>>Pros:
>>>
>>>Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
>>>refarm the Advanced phone bands.
>
>>Why does that have to be done at all?
>
>So, are you advocating not refarming the Advanced phone bands even
>*after* the last Advanced class license expires? Yeah, that's a
>semantic nit-pick over what you wrote above, but then so is "You mean
>the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?" that you wrote below.

You're avoiding the question.

Why do the Advanced class subbands have to be "refarmed" at all? Who or what would they be "refarmed" to? What's the longterm plan?
>
>If you do agree that the Advanced phone bands should be refarmed at some
>point in the future, at what point would you have it done? Would you
>leave it to Extras, give it to Generals, or would you otherwise split it
>up in some way?

Why does it need to be done at all? Is the Extra written that hard?
>
>>>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
>>>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
>>>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
>>>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
>>>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).
>
>>Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?
>
>In this day and age, regulatory agencies seem more eager to simplify
>regulations. Removing regulations that are obsolete, or cover too small
>an intended audience to be justified on a cost basis, is likely a top

>priority for such agencies. Again, what is your timeline for change?
>Decades in the future, or never?

I don't see any reason to "refarm" them at all. Not at this time, anyway.

Note that in 4 years, the number of Advanceds has dropped by only about 16%.
Seems to be a pretty popular license even today.

It sounds to me like you want all Advanceds to become Extras so that the
Advanced subbands can become General bandspace. That's not part of the ARRL
proposal, though.

>>>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
>>>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
>>>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
>>>documentation forever.
>
>>If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
>>years, two months and 20 days or so.
>
>If by saying, "If the current rules are left alone..." you really meant
>leaving alone everything *except* the 5 WPM Morse code requirement
>(which would be eliminated for these General and below under the ARRL
>proposal), then, and only then, Technician-class hams will assume the
>HF privileges of Technician-Plus.

Whatever. I don't see why the 5 wpm code test is such a big deal as a
requirement.

>That's still a long time in FCC
>enforcement (and VEC administration) years.

Why? It's been almost 4 years since the last restructuring took effect. Look at
the enforcement letters - Techs without code masquerading as Tech Pluses isn't
a
big problem, from what I see.

>Even if you argue that FCC
>action on further restructuring will take most of that six years anyway,
>there are still all those Novice and Advanced class licenses that will
>likely exist in the database for decades to come.

It makes sense to grandfather existing Novices to the "NewNovice" (or whatever
it is called). There are only about 32,000 Novices left now, down from just
under 50,000 after restructuring.

What *is* the problem with Advanceds just staying as they are? Have you not
read from the Advanceds who say they *don't want* to become Extras?
>
>>Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the
>>"NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database
>>doesn't need to change at all.
>

>Did you notice that Novices actually lose privileges? See the FAQ
>document above for more details. In particular, power limits are
>lowered from 200 Watts PEP to 100 Watts PEP on HF bands except for 10
>meters, and 50 Watts PEP on 10 meters.

Is that really much of a problem? How many Novices are on the air today running
more than those power levels?

> From the FAQ:
>
>"The reason behind the change in Novice power limits is to avoid having
>to examine entry-level applicants about how to evaluate amateur stations
>for RF safety. "
>
>I'm sure that you would argue that Technicians should retain their power
>limits (1500 Watts PEP) on 6 meters and up, and I would agree, but what
>about HF? Should Technicians lose privileges on those bands, by having
>their power limits lowered (from 200 Watts PEP), or should there be
>separate power limits for Novice and Technician on HF? This is starting
>to get more complicated than before.

Not at all! Where an existing ham has greater privs, those privs would be
retained. This has been done with Tech Pluses for almost 4 years now. FCC
proposed it and enacted it, btw. Why can't it be done for existing Novices and
Techs?

The 1998 proposal from ARRL Hq was for Tech Pluses and Novices to get a freebie
to General - and FCC said no. What has changed that suddenly makes free
upgrades a good idea?

>>>>>Rather, it is just one of
>>>>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>>>>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>>>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>>>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>>>>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>>>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>>>>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>>>>
>>>>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>>>>bad
>>>>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>>>>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>>>
>>>>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such
>a
>>>>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element
>>>>3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?
>>>
>>>I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
>>>credit.
>

>>You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?
>
>Yes, I meant the governance of the ARRL when I used the shorthand "ARRL"
>in the context of offering an opinion on a BoD decision. Only they can
>establish ARRL official policy and petition the FCC in the name of the
>ARRL. Who else did you think I meant?

Those folks are elected and paid for by members like *me*. They supposedly
make those proposals in *my* name and with *my* support.

Well, I don't support everything in that proposal.
>
>>How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?
>
>You will need more than a rhetorical question to make an argument here.
>Instead, why don't you just come right out and say, for the benefit of
>the audience, which items in the ARRL proposal got enacted, and which
>ones didn't? And, of those that didn't get enacted, which ones you
>think have already been given a final "no" answer?

All right.

Fact is, almost nothing proposed by ARRL Hq in 1998 got enacted. 5 wpm for
General, that's about it. On everything else, FCC either:

- said no: free upgrades, better written tests, Techs on HF CW without a formal
test

- went far beyond what was requested: 5 wpm Extra, Advanced closed off, written
testing reduced dramatically

>>>They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
>>>a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
>>>Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
>>>at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
>>>past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
>>>license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
>>>gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
>>>future."
>
>>Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.
>
>But does address the subject of why they may be politically desirable,
>not only by leading to simplified FCC regulations, but also resulting
>in a more harmonious and productive amateur radio in the future by
>addressing most of the concerns of most factions.

I don't see that at all. Are the written tests so difficult, and the VE test
process so onerous, that free upgrades are the only answer?
>
>>I say they're not.
>
>So you've said. I'm sure that you will also say this to your

>representatives within the ARRL and comment on any future FCC NPRM on
>the subject.

Already have. In detail. More to come, too.

>I will, too. For the record, I'm not in complete
>agreement with the ARRL proposal, either. I don't see the regulatory
>justification for the retention of 5 WPM Morse code for Extra,

I do. Morse code is a big part of amateur radio, and having no code test at all simply denies the reality of that.

>and I
>remain skeptical that a Novice license (even a restructured one) is
>viable today.

What we have now is a system that tends to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF amateur radio, and manufactured equipment. And away from HF and homebrewing. A restructured Novice could change that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1842. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 16:55:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128115557.12501.00005863@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86568

In article <MMOdnR0RxLahRYjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <TsWdnQmO6qWQWYjdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>>>>I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
>>>>written
>>>>element should be a requirement. However, I've read Ed Hare's excellent
>>>>*personal, not ARRL policy* comments on this from eham, and find that
>>>>they make sense to me - a compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
>>>>make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.

>>>Once upon a time you also wrote:

>>>>>I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
>>>>>of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
>>>>>personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
>>>>>"more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).

>> Doncha just love Google?

> You betchya! Everyone slips up from time to time, and I don't like to
>use it to catch people in little mistakes, but this one is right from
>Burger King! A Whopper!

>>>(remember to point out that your quote is about the written tests, not
>>>giving around 60 percent of US Hams a free upgrade) Same difference.

It *is* the same difference, because what it does is to remove a whole level of
written testing for a large number of existing hams.

>>> A one time adjustment? That really has to rank as one of the worst
>>>ideas that ever came down the pike!

>> Not if there's a good reason for it - but so far I haven't seen a good
>> reason.

>>> If the Technicians/now Generals can even be considered to receive the
>>>same privileges as the present Generals, how *Dare* the ARS or FCC even
>>>*think* of not making it a permanent thing? That isn't even slippery
>>>slope thinking either. The next batch of prospective hams will want to
>>>know why THEY can't get the privileges that the OTHERS got by simply
>>>being in the right place at the right time. What happens then?

>> A lot of bad feelings, for one thing. To my knowledge there is no precedent
>> for this sort of thing.

> And how! I would not feel any resentment toward hams that came on board

>sans Morse code testing. After all they were just taking the tests that
>were taken when they upgraded.

> But to have the equivalent of a General with just the technician test?
>For almost 60 percent of Hams to get the free upgrade?

> I make this suggestion in dead seriousness. ARRL needs to consult with
>a licensed psychologist stat, if not put one on staff retainer. Perhaps
>he or she could explain why this is such a stupid idea.

I'd like to see what W1RFI's argument is. I'm still waiting for a link...
>
>> And the primary question - what is the problem without the freebies?
>
> How about this scenario:
>
> ARRL is scared witless about the BPL problem.

K7JEB came up with this some time back. It makes sense.

>Their (somewhat
>necessary) paranoia about these things caused someone at HQ to muse
>"yaknow, if all these Technicians were Generals, we could show up at the
>FCC with much more impressive numbers of the Hams that would be
>negatively impacted by BPL or other spectrum threats". Right now, they
>don't have much HF access, so giving it to them allows us to jack those
>numbers up by a lot!" It bounces off the restructuring committee, and
>viola! A plan that not only P****s off those who came before, but also
>those who will come afterward.

Perhaps. Weigh that against the fact that if BPL is ever deployed at
anything like a large scale, license tests for HF won't matter because
HF will be pretty much unusable for ham communications of the type
we're used to.

> It will also make an incredibly good case for - dare I say it?
>indisputable running numbing dumbing down of the ARS.
>
(devil's advocate mode = ON)

Back in the 1960s, we got something called "incentive licensing", which
was the result of concern that US hams weren't keeping up with techo-
change and were turning into "appliance operators", etc., etc.

Did any of those trends really change because of IL?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1843. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 16:55:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128115558.12501.00005864@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 86567

In article <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>, Roger Halstead
<mynews@rogerhalstead.com> writes:

>When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal
>minority complaining.

Were they complaining that it was needed or were they against it?
This isn't a trivial question. Some folks claim the majority were for it,
while others claim the majority were against it. Some say it was a good
idea, some say it trashed amateur radio.

What say you?

>When they came out with the No code tech license
>there was a vocal minority complaining.

Which way?

The FCC tried to get a nocodetest license as early as 1975, and again in 1983,
but clear majorities of hams were against it. They funally pushed it through in
1990. Some folks claim the majority were for it, while others claim the
majority were against it. Some say it was a good idea, some say it trashed
amateur radio.

What say you?

>Now they are doing away with
>most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.

Which way? And how do you know they're a minority?

Survey after survey shows that there is still majority support for at least
some code testing. Indeed, the comments to FCC back in 1999 show that not only
was there majority support for code testing, but a majority of commenters
wanted at least two code test speeds. The folks wanting only 5 wpm or no code
test were the minority. But that minority got its way.

>WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did
>away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges.

Late 1952. Went into effect Feb, 1953.

>Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs
>on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away
>with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international
>agreements.
>
>"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech

>heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the
>character of those coming into the service.
>
>Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming
>this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of
>Amateur Radio.

That's one way to look at it. Here's another: Some look at the trend since about 1975 and see a gradual reduction in the qualifications for a license, and a gradual reduction in the "quality" of the ARS. YMMV. No one event or change sticks out - just a slow, gradual change that is barely noticeable unless you step back and compare over a long period of time.
>
>Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should
>run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such
>there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.
>
>I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my
>license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future
>applicants.

I do.
>
>It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a
>mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other
>operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied
>no mater what is done.

So it makes sense to please the majority, doesn;t it?
>
>The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
>treaty and world policy.
>
Some of it does.

But do you support free upgrades of all Techs and Tech Pluses to General, and all Advanceds to Extra?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1844. Re: Do we really need a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 18:08:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <WUSRb.411$jH6.20@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86570

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040128013008.08626.00002813@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <ELDRb.1096$zG1.309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I want it all and do nothing for it. I am a product of the
non-productive
> >useless jerks in America today.
>
> Dan, you shouldn't talk about yourself so much ...
>
> LHA / WMD

Good to hear from you again. I see the 'useless jerk' think got ya, eh?
Oh, BTW....get a license yet useless jerk?

Dan/W4NTI

1845. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 18:31:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128133122.01692.00000275@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86572

In article <Xns947917F3AA9BDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>>> It has worse S/N performance than SSB
>>
>> That depends entirely on the type of encoding and modulation used,
>> doesn't it?
>> Can you categorically say that digital voice can *never* outperform
>> SSB?
>
>No. One day it might. But not yet.

Even if the data rate is slowed down?

If there's anything that deserves spectrum space for experimentation,
it's digital modes, not analog voice modes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1846. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 18:31:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128133124.01692.00000276@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86571

In article <rMQQb.23548$q4.4637@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com...
>> In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>> <pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>>
>> >In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>> >
>> >
>> >>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>D.
>> >>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>> >
>> >>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means
>that
>> >>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
>> >never
>> >>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>> >>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
>for
>> >>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if
>they
>> >>>decide to do anything at all.
>> >>>
>> >>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>> >
>> >>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the
>issue
>> >came
>> >>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
>Pluses
>> >to
>> >>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had
>no
>> >>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
>database.
>> >
>> >>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>> >>everybody's time.
>> >
>> >>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.

>> >
>> >>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>> >
>> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>> >thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>> >at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>> >for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>>
>> Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>
>Here's your options:
>
>We currently have essentially a 6 license system in place (even though
>several licenses are no longer issued). To go from that system
>to the one proposed by ARRL leaves three options as I see it:
>
>1. The one-time free upgrade process as put forth by ARRL which takes
>nothing away from anyone

Hold on a sec.

Right now there are about 105,000 Extras. And we have a few slices of
choice kHz on 4 HF bands. In my experience, QRM in these subbands is usually
less than elsewhere in the same band because relatively few US hams have access
to them.

If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have access to
those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So giving them
a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.

Same situation for Generals.
elsewhere in the same band

>and immediately gets everyone into the
>new 3 license system,

But nobody says why that is such a big priority, when it wasn't 4 years ago.

>or
>
>2. Go to the new system but "grandfather" those on current but no
>longer to be issued license classes which takes nothing from anyone but
>presents a dual system of licenses, rules and regulations which would
>likly exist for decades until those with licenses no longer being issued
>as new ended up SK or otherwise dropped from our ranks

or upgraded! Have you forgotten that any of the closed off classes can
upgrade with the required tests? The fact that so few Advanceds have
upgraded in almost 4 years is quite interesting, don't you think? Number
of Advanceds is down by only about 16%, and that includes both upgrades
and expirations.

> or,
>
>3. Implement the ARRL 3 licnense system and downgrade some
>folks to new Novice (i.e. the Techs) or General (i.e the Advanced).
>This last scenario takes away privileges and we all know how well
>that went down in the late 60's Incentive Licensing implementation.

Or

4. Do something else.
>
> To me the answer is clear...and, I suspect so is it also to ARRL which
>is why the proposal includes free upgrades.

Why should FCC allow free upgrades today, when they said no in 1999? What has
changed?
>
>> >Rather, it is just one of
>> >the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>> >consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>> >Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>> >band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>> >desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>> >but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>> >is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>
>> I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>> bad
>> idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>> release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>>
>> More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such
>> a
>> burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element
>> 3,
>> in order to get the next higher grade of license?
>
>See options 2 and 3 above.
>
The rules for the 6 license classes are already in place. So what's the
problem?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1847. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 18:31:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128133124.01692.00000277@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86573

In article <p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>|
>| - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
>is not
>| taken is not necessary for the privileges.
>|
>
>Here we go again!

Where, Hans?

[expletive deleted]

> it Jim, that is patently false and you know that
>it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact.

What is false?

Here's the quote:

"Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
is not taken is not necessary for the privileges."

How is that patently false?

Perhaps it would be clearler stated thusly:

"If a free upgrade is allowed, some will say that
such an upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
is not taken is not necessary for the privileges."

>Allowing a free upgrade
>isn't "proof" of anything except that a free-pass was given, sort of
>like a day of amnesty when all overdue library books can be returned
>without fees.

Not the same thing at all! Fee-amnesty is a forgiveness of a violation.
Free upgrade isn't.

Consider this scenario:

FCC says new rules will go into effect on R-day (R for Restructuring)

Our Hero gets Tech on R-day minus 1

Our Hero gets free upgrade to General on R-day.

General written test not needed by Our Hero.

QED

>Yes, it's a really bad idea, but it doesn't disprove the
>need for proper qualification examinations.

IF the free upgrades are actually done, don't you think some
will say there's no reason for the General test?

It's called logic, Hans. Try it sometime.

>Go join Carl Stevenson and
>Ed Hare in the NTI sign-up queue. (I'd mention them by call sign, but I
>wouldn't want to risk compromising your "standards".)

You mean WK3C and W1RFI?

Why are you so afraid of dissenting opinions, Hans?
What are you so afraid of?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1848. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 18:41:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <InTRb.492$GO6.284@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86574

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040128115558.12501.00005864@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>, Roger Halstead
> <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> writes:
>
> >When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal
> >minority complaining.
>
> Were they complaining that it was needed or were they against it?
> This isn't a trivial question. Some folks claim the majority were for it,
> while others claim the majority were against it. Some say it was a good
> idea, some say it trashed amateur radio.
>
> What say you?
>
> >When they came out with the No code tech license
> >there was a vocal minority complaining.
>
> Which way?
>
> The FCC tried to get a nocodetest license as early as 1975, and again in
1983,
> but clear majorities of hams were against it. They funally pushed it
through in
> 1990. Some folks claim the majority were for it, while others claim the
> majority were against it. Some say it was a good idea, some say it trashed
> amateur radio.
>
> What say you?
>
> >Now they are doing away with
> >most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.
>
> Which way? And how do you know they're a minority?
>
> Survey after survey shows that there is still majority support for at
least
> some code testing. Indeed, the comments to FCC back in 1999 show that not
only
> was there majority support for code testing, but a majority of commenters
> wanted at least two code test speeds. The folks wanting only 5 wpm or no
code
> test were the minority. But that minority got its way.

Water over the dam or under the bridge.

Fact is, there has NOT been any
credible survey done of late which would take into account
the realities of change going on and the change that has gone on.
Additionally, for the umpteenth time, the rules and
regulations of amateur radio are NOT the sole province of
already licensed amateurs. The mere fact that a majority of amateurs
does or doesn't want code testing is NOT sufficient cause for
the FCC to make the rules according to only those already
licensed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> >WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did
> >away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges.
>
> Late 1952. Went into effect Feb, 1953.
>
> >Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs
> >on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away
> >with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international
> >agreements.
> >
> >"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech
> >heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the
> >character of those coming into the service.
> >
> >Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming
> >this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of
> >Amateur Radio.
>
> That's one way to look at it. Here's another: Some look at the trend since
> about 1975 and see a gradual reduction in the qualifications for a
license, and
> a gradual reduction in the "quality" of the ARS. YMMV. No one event or
change
> sticks out - just a slow, gradual change that is barely noticeable unless
you
> step back and compare over a long period of time.

Fact is that a General in 1957 had all privileges and the test was
probably easier then than now..other than the code test.

> >Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should
> >run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such
> >there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.
> >
> >I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my
> >license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future
> >applicants.
>

> I do.

20wpm? Yet neither you nor anyone else was able to
convince the FCC that even 13wpm was justifiable
for any license class. And that was 5 years ago.

> >It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a
> >mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other
> >operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied
> >no mater what is done.
>
> So it makes sense to please the majority, doesn;t it?

Read my lips...this isn't a vote as to what is best!
In the end it is the FCC that decides based on individual and
group input from ALL that wish to do so....amateurs and non-amateurs
alike. There is NO decision based on a majority of anything.

> >The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
> >treaty and world policy.
> >
> Some of it does.

What part of it doesn't?

> But do you support free upgrades of all Techs and Tech Pluses to General,
and
> all Advanceds to Extra?

It doesn't bother me at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1849. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 18:50:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9wTRb.499$GO6.325@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86575

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0401270542.3ec8668b@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>...
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > There's a lot of negativism in this group about the ARRL proposal.
> >
> > Also a lot of positivism.
>
> That they are trying to keep things moving from their
> perspective, perhaps. But I don't think this requires a whole lot of
> rethinking nor does it require any complex bandplanning.
>
> > > While not as verbose about it, I agree that this "proposal" was
> > > poorly thought out and does not meet any "obvious" need within Amateur
> > > Radio. It's a W5YI-ian like effort to create something new for the
> > > sake of sales/membership.
> >
> > I disagree! I think it has some good ideas and some bad ideas.
>
> There's good stuff here, Jim, but I'm going to cut to the chase.
>
> > On top of all this, the Tech written (Element 2) is full of arcane
> > stuff like RF exposure calculations, which displaces more basic stuff
> > that would serve a newcomer better.
>
> I don't think that much of what is "written" is pertinent even if
> it were "written" in the next 2 hours. As long as the question pools
> are open and the "newcomer" can pick up a verbatim "Q&A study guide",
> the tests are relatively irrelevant.

Passing the General written in 1958 was not difficult
at all for anyone with a memory and who spent limited time studying
the AMECO study guide or ARRL study guide which only had
some 5/6 pages of study material for General.

> Yes, some "learning" will occur just from reading the question
> over and over, but to what legitimate application can THAT kind of
> learning be applied?

The Q&As aren't going away. Better to focus effort on expanding the
Q&A pool for things like formiula calculations such that memorizing

the formula...not the answer is the better way to learn.

> > > My "answer" is a letter to the ARRL suggesting that this was NOT
> > > a wise idea and COULD have been made less of a surprise to the Amateur
> > > Community by discussing it first. I'll "cc" that letter to my SM.
> >
> > What about your Director and Vice Director - or better yet, the entire
> > BoD? And let 'em know exactly what's good and bad, and why.
>
> Perhaps, Jim, but my take is that the FCC has expressed more than
> it's fair share of frustration with the numerous licening strategies
> that have been offered, all suggesting that "this one" will be the one
> to open the flood gates of new licensees.

I don't think the FCC cares if there is or isn't a floodgate of
new hams. The FCC wants stability over the next decade or
longer. The ARRL proposal would do exactly that...once and for a
long time forward.

> Each has produced a momentary road bump followed by a rapid
> return to a steady-if-unimpressive growth rate.
>
> > If/when the proposal becomes an RM, it'll be comment time......
>
> Ditto.

Me too.

> Hope you're keeping warm Jim! It's embarrassing here...I spent
> most of the evening with the back door open to let a cool drizzling
> breeze pass through the house.

Six more inches of snow last night....ugh.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1850. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 19:24:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40180C7E.2010706@psu.edu>
Source record: 86576

N2EY wrote:
> In article <Xns947917F3AA9BDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>
>>>>It has worse S/N performance than SSB
>>>
>>>That depends entirely on the type of encoding and modulation used,
>>>doesn't it?
>>>Can you categorically say that digital voice can *never* outperform
>>>SSB?
>>
>>No. One day it might. But not yet.
>
>
> Even if the data rate is slowed down?
>
> If there's anything that deserves spectrum space for experimentation,
> it's digital modes, not analog voice modes.

DId you read the review in QST about the digital box you attach to your HF rig?

It sounded like a pretty good thing, until they pointed out it's fatal deficiency near the end. I shouldn't b that harsh - if it is a fixed frequency application, then it won't be too bad.

You just have to be listening at the right frequency at the beginning of a transmission, or it's no hearee! My guess is that anything that will allow you to pick up a transmission in the middle of a transmission will boost the bandwidth requirements up quite a bit.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1851. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 19:46:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86577

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040128133124.01692.00000276@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <rMQQb.23548$q4.4637@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >> In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
> >> <pschleck@novia.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >writes:
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>,
"Dee
> >D.
> >> >>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means
> >that
> >> >>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC
has
> >> >never
> >> >>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that
they
> >> >>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another
idea
> >for
> >> >>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if
> >they
> >> >>>decide to do anything at all.
> >> >>>
> >> >>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
> >> >
> >> >>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the
> >issue
> >> >came
> >> >>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
> >Pluses
> >> >to
> >> >>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has
had

> >no
> >> >>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
> >database.
> >> >
> >> >>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
> >> >>everybody's time.
> >> >
> >> >>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
> >> >
> >> >>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
> >> >
> >> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
> >> >thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes
(take
> >> >at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC
R&O
> >> >for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
> >>
> >> Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
> >
> >Here's your options:
> >
> >We currently have essentially a 6 license system in place (even though
> >several licenses are no longer issued). To go from that system
> >to the one proposed by ARRL leaves three options as I see it:
> >
> >1. The one-time free upgrade process as put forth by ARRL which takes
> >nothing away from anyone
>
> Hold on a sec.
>
> Right now there are about 105,000 Extras. And we have a few slices of
> choice kHz on 4 HF bands. In my experience, QRM in these subbands is
usually
> less than elsewhere in the same band because relatively few US hams have
access
> to them.
>
> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have access
to
> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So giving
them
> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.

Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start

operating in the Extra only segments.

> Same situation for Generals.
> elsewhere in the same band
>
> >and immediately gets everyone into the
> >new 3 license system,
>
> But nobody says why that is such a big priority, when it wasn't 4 years
ago.

I suspect the FCC four years ago (5 years ago now) expected change
over time. You are free to voice your own thoughts on need or not.

> >or
> >
> >2. Go to the new system but "grandfather" those on current but no
> >longer to be issued license classes which takes nothing from anyone but
> >presents a dual system of licenses, rules and regulations which would
> >likly exist for decades until those with licenses no longer being issued
> >as new ended up SK or otherwise dropped from our ranks
>
> or upgraded! Have you forgotten that any of the closed off classes can
> upgrade with the required tests? The fact that so few Advanceds have
> upgraded in almost 4 years is quite interesting, don't you think? Number
> of Advanceds is down by only about 16%, and that includes both upgrades
> and expirations.

Repeat my comment above about the unlikly QRM from former
advanced being in Extra segments...if freely upgraded.

> > or,
> >
> >3. Implement the ARRL 3 licnense system and downgrade some
> >folks to new Novice (i.e. the Techs) or General (i.e the Advanced).
> >This last scenario takes away privileges and we all know how well
> >that went down in the late 60's Incentive Licensing implementation.
>
> Or
>
> 4. Do something else.

I identified the ONLY three options on a general basis. You propose
something else but do not specify what that is. Either there is
nothing else as an option and you know it or, there is another
option but you don't wish for anyone to know what it is.
The ball is in your court. Only three options exist unless you can provide
a real 4th option.

> > To me the answer is clear...and, I suspect so is it also to ARRL which
> >is why the proposal includes free upgrades.
>

> Why should FCC allow free upgrades today, when they said no in 1999? What
has
> changed?

I don't care. In the end the FCC will decide. There's no need for me
to explain or even understand why the FCC might allow it.

> >> >Rather, it is just one of
> >> >the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until
better
> >> >consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
> >> >Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
> >> >band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC
official's
> >> >desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC
official,
> >> >but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not
longer,
> >> >is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
> >>
> >> I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good
or
> >> bad
> >> idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from
initial
> >> release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
> >>
> >> More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really
such
> >> a
> >> burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass
Element
> >> 3,
> >> in order to get the next higher grade of license?
> >
> >See options 2 and 3 above.
> >
> The rules for the 6 license classes are already in place. So what's the
> problem?

Which requires enforcement authorities to keep tabs on 6
different sets of spectrum authority. You can disagree that it isn't
significant, but I'd bet it IS an issue in the FCC and other
government mindsets. YMMV.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1852. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 19:49:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40181251.4090107@psu.edu>
Source record: 86578

N2EY wrote:
> In article <p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>|
>>| - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
>>is not
>>| taken is not necessary for the privileges.
>>|
>>
>>Here we go again!
>
>
> Where, Hans?

We are "going" to irritate Hans again! 8^)

>
>>it Jim, that is patently false and you know that
>>it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact.
>
>
> What is false?
>
> Here's the quote:
>
> "Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> is not taken is not necessary for the privileges."
>
> How is that patently false?
>
> Perhaps it would be clearler stated thusly:
>
> "If a free upgrade is allowed, some will say that
> such an upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> is not taken is not necessary for the privileges."

Jim, it is the truth as plain as can be.

"Wanna be a general class ham?"

"Sure."

"You have three choices:"

"1. Study and become a General class ham now

2. Study to become a Technician now, and wait a few months, then you'll be a General.

3. Wait until after those few months, and take a General test and then be a General class Ham."

"Is the technician class test more difficult than the General?

"Nope, it's easier."

"Wait a second! Is the Technician a higher class than the General?"

"Nope, General is one grade higher than Technician."

"So by taking an easier test now, I can get more privileges, and all I have to do is wait a few months?"

"Yup!"

"But if I wait, I'll have to take a harder test for the same thing?"

"Yup."

"Hold on a second! If I can take an easier test now, and get the same privileges as a harder test later, WHY should the later test be harder? Why should those who come later have to take a more difficult test when the test I take now is sufficient? Isn't the Technician test we take now qualification enough?

"I don't really know!"

>
>>Allowing a free upgrade
>>isn't "proof" of anything except that a free-pass was given, sort of
>>like a day of amnesty when all overdue library books can be returned
>>without fees.
>
>
> Not the same thing at all! Fee-amnesty is a forgiveness of a violation.
> Free upgrade isn't.
>
> Consider this scenario:
>
> FCC says new rules will go into effect on R-day (R for Restructuring)
>
> Our Hero gets Tech on R-day minus 1
>
> Our Hero gets free upgrade to General on R-day.
>
> General written test not needed by Our Hero.
>
> QED

>
>
>>Yes, it's a really bad idea, but it doesn't disprove the
>>need for proper qualification examinations.
>
>
> *IF* the free upgrades are actually done, don't you think some
> will say there's no reason for the General test?
>
> It's called logic, Hans. Try it sometime.

If they are done this way, those who want lesser testing will have a
powerful tool. "Look at all the people who are now Generals and only
took a Technician test. Give logical and compelling reasons that this
should not be a permanent thing."

How on earth are we going to argue against THAT?

>
>>Go join Carl Stevenson and
>>Ed Hare in the NTI sign-up queue. (I'd mention them by call sign, but I
>>wouldn't want to risk compromising your "standards".)
>
>
> You mean WK3C and W1RFI?

I always thought your opinion differed quite a bit from those two Jim! 8^)

>
> Why are you so afraid of dissenting opinions, Hans?
> What are you so afraid of?

Just cabin fever, Jim.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1853. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 19:55:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128145500.23171.00003737@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 86579

In article <InTRb.492$GO6.284@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040128115558.12501.00005864@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>, Roger Halstead
>> <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> writes:
>>
>> >When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal
>> >minority complaining.
>>
>> Were they complaining that it was needed or were they against it?
>> This isn't a trivial question. Some folks claim the majority were for it,
>> while others claim the majority were against it. Some say it was a good
>> idea, some say it trashed amateur radio.
>>
>> What say you?
>>
>> >When they came out with the No code tech license
>> >there was a vocal minority complaining.
>>
>> Which way?
>>
>> The FCC tried to get a nocodetest license as early as 1975, and again in
>1983,
>> but clear majorities of hams were against it. They funally pushed it
>through in
>> 1990. Some folks claim the majority were for it, while others claim the
>> majority were against it. Some say it was a good idea, some say it trashed
>> amateur radio.
>>
>> What say you?
>>
>> >Now they are doing away with
>> >most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.
>>
>> Which way? And how do you know they're a minority?
>>
>> Survey after survey shows that there is still majority support for at
>least
>> some code testing. Indeed, the comments to FCC back in 1999 show that not
>only
>> was there majority support for code testing, but a majority of commenters
>> wanted at least two code test speeds. The folks wanting only 5 wpm or no

>code
>> test were the minority. But that minority got its way.
>
>Water over the dam or under the bridge.
>
>Fact is, there has NOT been any
>credible survey done of late which would take into account
>the realities of change going on and the change that has gone on.

Yes, there has.

Simply look at the comments to the various petitions to the FCC re:
restructuring.

>Additionally, for the umpteenth time, the rules and
>regulations of amateur radio are NOT the sole province of
>already licensed amateurs. The mere fact that a majority of amateurs
>does or doesn't want code testing is NOT sufficient cause for
>the FCC to make the rules according to only those already
>licensed.

That's why the comments to the FCC are so revealing. Anyone can comment,
licensed or not. So all it takes is a simple review of the comments to get an
indication of what the amateur community, licensed or not, thinks.

And since FCC requires commenters to give their real identity, "box-stuffing"
and such is avoided, and if one person writes a dozen comments, they still only
count as one person's opinion.

NCI did a count of the comments to 98-143, and the majority wanted at least two
code test speeds. FCC said no. That's their right, but it's important to note
what the majority of commenters wanted.

>> >WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did
>> >away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges.
>>
>> Late 1952. Went into effect Feb, 1953.
>>
>> >Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs
>> >on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away
>> >with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international
>> >agreements.
>> >
>> >"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech
>> >heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the
>> >character of those coming into the service.
>> >
>> >Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming
>> >this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of
>> >Amateur Radio.
>>
>> That's one way to look at it. Here's another: Some look at the trend since

>> about 1975 and see a gradual reduction in the qualifications for a
>license, and
>> a gradual reduction in the "quality" of the ARS. YMMV. No one event or
>change
>> sticks out - just a slow, gradual change that is barely noticeable unless
>you
>> step back and compare over a long period of time.
>
>Fact is that a General in 1957 had all privileges and the test was
>probably easier then than now

I disagree! But without the actual tests for comparison, nobody can really say.

>..other than the code test.
>
>> >Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should
>> >run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such
>> >there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.
>> >
>> >I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my
>> >license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future
>> >applicants.
>>
>> I do.
>
>20wpm? Yet neither you nor anyone else was able to
>convince the FCC that even 13wpm was justifiable
>for any license class. And that was 5 years ago.

Doesn't mean it's what's best for the ARS.
>
>> >It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a
>> >mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other
>> >operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied
>> >no mater what is done.
>>
>> So it makes sense to please the majority, doesn;t it?
>
>Read my lips...this isn't a vote as to what is best!

Would you say that if you had a clear and obvious majority?

Suppose comments to the 98-143 had been 70% "dump the code test" - we'd never
hear the end of it.

>In the end it is the FCC that decides based on individual and
>group input from ALL that wish to do so....amateurs and non-amateurs
>alike. There is NO decision based on a majority of anything.

The claim was made in this thread that "a vocal minority complained". Majority
and minority opinion *do* have an effect - just ask John Kerry.
>

>> >The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
>> >treaty and world policy.
>> >
>> Some of it does.
>
>What part of it doesn't?
>
Free upgrades, for one.

>> But do you support free upgrades of all Techs and Tech Pluses to General,
>> and all Advanceds to Extra?
>
>It doesn't bother me at all.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1854. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 20:14:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <eKURb.494$jH6.225@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86580

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040128145500.23171.00003737@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <InTRb.492$GO6.284@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040128115558.12501.00005864@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> In article <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>, Roger Halstead
> >> <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal
> >> >minority complaining.
> >>
> >> Were they complaining that it was needed or were they against it?
> >> This isn't a trivial question. Some folks claim the majority were for
it,
> >> while others claim the majority were against it. Some say it was a good
> >> idea, some say it trashed amateur radio.
> >>
> >> What say you?
> >>
> >> >When they came out with the No code tech license
> >> >there was a vocal minority complaining.
> >>
> >> Which way?
> >>
> >> The FCC tried to get a nocodetest license as early as 1975, and again
in
> >1983,
> >> but clear majorities of hams were against it. They funally pushed it
> >through in
> >> 1990. Some folks claim the majority were for it, while others claim
the
> >> majority were against it. Some say it was a good idea, some say it
trashed
> >> amateur radio.
> >>
> >> What say you?
> >>
> >> >Now they are doing away with
> >> >most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.
> >>
> >> Which way? And how do you know they're a minority?

> >>
> >> Survey after survey shows that there is still majority support for at
> >least
> >> some code testing. Indeed, the comments to FCC back in 1999 show that
not
> >only
> >> was there majority support for code testing, but a majority of
commenters
> >> wanted at least two code test speeds. The folks wanting only 5 wpm or
no
> >code
> >> test were the minority. But that minority got its way.
> >
> >Water over the dam or under the bridge.
> >
> >Fact is, there has NOT been any
> >credible survey done of late which would take into account
> >the realities of change going on and the change that has gone on.
>
> Yes, there has.
>
> Simply look at the comments to the various petitions to the FCC re:
> restructuring.

Two points:

1. That was 5 years ago and
2. That was NO survey and you know it. Yes, one can
derive statistics of those that DID comment, but the
stats are in no way automatically revealing of what the amateur
community as a whole may think. Anyone that ever
took a statistics class can tell you that.

> >Additionally, for the umpteenth time, the rules and
> >regulations of amateur radio are NOT the sole province of
> >already licensed amateurs. The mere fact that a majority of amateurs
> >does or doesn't want code testing is NOT sufficient cause for
> >the FCC to make the rules according to only those already
> >licensed.
>
> That's why the comments to the FCC are so revealing. Anyone can comment,
> licensed or not. So all it takes is a simple review of the comments to get
an
> indication of what the amateur community, licensed or not, thinks.

WRONG for the same reasons I just stated above.

> And since FCC requires commenters to give their real identity,
"box-stuffing"
> and such is avoided, and if one person writes a dozen comments, they still
only
> count as one person's opinion.

Again...this isn't done by a vote.

> NCI did a count of the comments to 98-143, and the majority wanted at
least two
> code test speeds. FCC said no. That's their right, but it's important to
note
> what the majority of commenters wanted.

NOTE SPECIFICALLY: NCI never stated anything other than
the results of those that commented. Anything beyond that
would be speculation only.

> >> >WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did
> >> >away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges.
> >>
> >> Late 1952. Went into effect Feb, 1953.
> >>
> >> >Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs
> >> >on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away
> >> >with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international
> >> >agreements.
> >> >
> >> >"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech
> >> >heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the
> >> >character of those coming into the service.
> >> >
> >> >Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming
> >> >this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of
> >> >Amateur Radio.
> >>
> >> That's one way to look at it. Here's another: Some look at the trend
since
> >> about 1975 and see a gradual reduction in the qualifications for a
> >license, and
> >> a gradual reduction in the "quality" of the ARS. YMMV. No one event or
> >change
> >> sticks out - just a slow, gradual change that is barely noticeable
unless
> >you
> >> step back and compare over a long period of time.
> >
> >Fact is that a General in 1957 had all privileges and the test was
> >probably easier then than now
>
> I disagree! But without the actual tests for comparison, nobody can really
say.

I took the general in 1957/8 timeframe and it was
no big deal for me as a teenager of 16.

> >..other than the code test.
> >
> >> >Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should

> >> >run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such
> >> >there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.
> >> >
> >> >I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my
> >> >license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future
> >> >applicants.
> >>
> >> I do.
> >
> >20wpm? Yet neither you nor anyone else was able to
> >convince the FCC that even 13wpm was justifiable
> >for any license class. And that was 5 years ago.
>
> Doesn't mean it's what's best for the ARS.

ROTFLMAO... You left out the "IMHO" on that.
As we have often decided...we'll likly forever be at odds
on that one :-) :-)

> >> >It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a
> >> >mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other
> >> >operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied
> >> >no mater what is done.
> >>
> >> So it makes sense to please the majority, doesn;t it?
> >
> >Read my lips...this isn't a vote as to what is best!
>
> Would you say that if you had a clear and obvious majority?
>
> Suppose comments to the 98-143 had been
> 70% "dump the code test" - we'd never
> hear the end of it.

Welcome to the world of political persuasion.

> >In the end it is the FCC that decides based on individual and
> >group input from ALL that wish to do so....amateurs and non-amateurs
> >alike. There is NO decision based on a majority of anything.
>
> The claim was made in this thread that "a vocal minority complained".
Majority
> and minority opinion *do* have an effect - just ask John Kerry.

In the end it will come down to the FCC only...regardless
of any vocal minority or majority.

> >> >The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
> >> >treaty and world policy.
> >> >
> >> Some of it does.
> >

> >What part of it doesn't?
> >
> Free upgrades, for one.

Free upgrades do NOT specifically go against anything in
the treaty or otherwise in the more broad based "world policy" .
If you think otherwise, please point out the conflicting
treaty text.

> >> But do you support free upgrades of all Techs and Tech Pluses to
General,
> >> and all Advanceds to Extra?
> >
> >It doesn't bother me at all.

Jim, how'd you let my comment about it not bothering me
pass without a comment from you :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1855. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 20:22:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401281222.793c8788@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86581

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040128095524.22081.00003703@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401270542.3ec8668b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...

> > I don't think that much of what is "written" is pertinent even if
> >it were "written" in the next 2 hours. As long as the question pools
> >are open and the "newcomer" can pick up a verbatim "Q&A study guide",
> >the tests are relatively irrelevant.
>
> And that's not going to change. Been that way for 20 years, and FCC isn't
> going to take back the work that it now gets done for free by unpaid
> volunteers.

I don't see where the FCC would have to "take back work". They'd
just have to say "The test pools are closed, adn publishing the
verbatim responses is illegal as it compromises the validity of the
test."

Any "work" would be that of the VE's to not allow the tests to be
compromised.

> > Repeat after me: "Lopressor is a beta blocker administerd SIVP
> >for the control of hypertension and AFIB with IVR."
> >
> "Lopressor is a beta blocker administered SIVP for the control of hypertension
> and AFIB with IVR."
>
> Got it - sort of.

My point exactly.

> > Got that? Now, WHAT is a beta blocker?
>
> Some kind of drug. Has to do with the mechanisms that cause high blood pressure
> and /or hear attacks. Administered intravenously.

MAY be administered intraveneously. Also available in PO (oral)
form, occassionally administered sublingually.

> >What was the underlying
> >etiology of the hypertension or the atrial fibrillation that produced
> >the irregular ventricular response?
>
> Something to do with too much beta. Whatever beta is in this context.

Nope. You did pretty good to here. THAT question was what OTHER
problems CAUSED the A-fib. The Lopressor will correct (temporarily)
the A-fib...

> I figured out all that from context and a hazy layman's exposure to cardiac
> medicine. Do I really understand it? Of course not!

Again, my point exactly. Now, change that to any one of the
dozens of test questions for the Amateur exams and we have the same
thing...

> > Perhaps, Jim, but my take is that the FCC has expressed more than
> >it's fair share of frustration with the numerous licening strategies
> >that have been offered, all suggesting that "this one" will be the one
> >to open the flood gates of new licensees.
>
> I don't see that. What I do see is the FCC taking its time and letting everyone
> propose all sorts of stuff, and comment on same. NPRM? Maybe some months down
> the road. Actual rules changes? Don't hold your breath or you'll need more than
> beta blockers ;-)

Tell me about it.

I already credit the USMC for keeping me physically fit enough to
avoid most of the pitfalls I see in many of my patients "my age".
Scares the be-jeebers out of me "coding" guys younger than me!

> > Each has produced a momentary road bump followed by a rapid
> >return to a steady-if-unimpressive growth rate.
> >
> That's because none of them address, or can address, the underlying problems
> that limit growth in amateur radio.

I only see ONE underlying problem, Jim, and it's hardly a
"problem"...It's just human nature...Amateur Radio is a technical
hobby. Even in Amateur Radio's "Golden Ages" there were only certain
folks who got interested in it, and an even smaller number that got
interested and stayed!

It's no different than stamp collecting, hang gliding, or
motorcycle racing. Some people will be attracted to it, a great many
others won't. It's no big deal that we don't have ten million
licensees!
>
> >> If/when the proposal becomes an RM, it'll be comment time......
> >
> > Ditto.
> >

> > Hope you're keeping warm Jim! It's embarrassing here...I spent
> >most of the evening with the back door open to let a cool drizzling
> >breeze pass through the house.
>
> We've had 3 winter storms in the past 4 days. Last night was an ice storm
> followed by several inches of new snow. Also lots of flu in this house despite
> flu shots. Not pretty. See what you're missing?
>
> Time to dig out.

Don't consider it "digging out", Jim...Consider it cardiovascular
exercise!

I'll be driving to work tonight in a windbreaker! (nyuknyuknyuk)

73

Steve, K4YZ

1856. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 20:24:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401281224.774235fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86582

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040127162615.01692.00000262@mb-m18.aol.com>...

> Must be a sixth definition in 97.1, following something about "unique
> ability to enhance good will..." :-)

Last I checked, Your Sliminess, this was USENET, not Amateur
Radio...It may be a forum ABOUT Amateur Radio, but Part 97 does not
apply here.

And even if it did, nothing in it says "Bend over and let
spineless geeks slap you around".

Back under your rock, Putzy One.

Steve, K4YZ

1857. New Ham Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 21:10:58 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0401281310.3d5717a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86583

I can't figure out why the ARRL didn't just go for 1 class and give them all of the bands. Throw out the rule book. Tell the FCC to look the other way. Then everyone will be happy. No rules, no problem. That is what the US amateurs want give it to them. No more skill than a 4 year old sitting on the pot picking his nose. To the ARRl it's still about money. Less skill involved means more hams means more membership means more money. Next they will want PHD's for anyone passing basic algebra and 1st year gym.

Ham radio------a thing of the past!

1858. Re: Penny Cunningham gets in trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 21:26:13 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lo2dnbYyWd6PtlXdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Penny C wrote:
> http://www.themoradioshow.net/cb_files/index17.html [bla bla bla]

Finally someone posts something that is useful to r.r.a.m and r.r.a.p

Thanks!

--
This file is PureMail protected. To reply to the sender,
you MUST include this in the subject line:

RNWENK29CD 04/01/2004

(without that string in the subject, your
message will be deleted, unread)

1859. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 23:17:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nqXRb.34705$P%1.27433549@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86585

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:SvHRb.30606$zj7.25153@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
> |
> | Dolly Parton is the real thing -- beautiful, talented, and successful.
> Stop
> | comparing yourself to her until you write a song like "Jolene" and
> several
> | dozen others that are just as good.
> |
>
> I'm an agnostic, but I'm a sucker for anything seen through the eyes of
> a child, and despite it's Christian overtones the best piece ever
> written and performed by DP is "My Coat of Many Colors". Second place
> goes to "Apple Jack".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

"My Coat of Many Colors" goes to the deeper truth of family and love regardless of one's religious preferences. We relate to the love of a parent doing their best in tough times for their children. I think it is a great piece myself.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1860. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 23:22:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401281522.2a2d3be6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86586

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40181251.4090107@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <p0lRb.28184$1e.19835@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >>|
> >>| - Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> is not
> >>| taken is not necessary for the privileges.
> >>|
> >>
> >>Here we go again!
> >
> >
> > Where, Hans?
>
> We are "going" to irritate Hans again! 8^)

> >>it Jim, that is patently false and you know that
> >>it is, yet you keep dragging it out as a fact.
> >
> > What is false?
> >
> > Here's the quote:
> >
> > "Allowing a free upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> > is not taken is not necessary for the privileges."
> >
> > How is that patently false?
> >
> > Perhaps it would be clearler stated thusly:
> >
> > "If a free upgrade is allowed, some will say that
> > such an upgrade is proof that the material in the test which
> > is not taken is not necessary for the privileges."
>
> Jim, it is the truth as plain as can be.
>
> "Wanna be a general class ham?"
>
> "Sure."
>
> "You have three choices:"

>
>
> "1. Study and become a General class ham now
>
> 2. Study to become a Technician now, and wait a few months, then you'll
> be a General.
>
> 3. Wait until after those few months, and take a General test and then
> be a General class Ham."
>
> "Is the technician class test more difficult than the General?
>
> "Nope, it's easier."
>
> "Wait a second! Is the Technician a higher class than the General?"
>
> "Nope, General is one grade higher than Technician."
>
> "So by taking an easier test now, I can get more privileges, and all I
> have to do is wait a few months?"
>
> "Yup!"
>
> "But if I wait, I'll have to take a harder test for the same thing?"
>
> "Yup."
>
> "Hold on a second! If I can take an easier test now, and get the same
> privileges as a harder test later, WHY should the later test be harder?
> Why should those who come later have to take a more difficult test when
> the test I take now is sufficient? Isn't the Technician test we take now
> qualification enough?
>
> "I don't really know!"

That really says it all.

> >>Allowing a free upgrade
> >>isn't "proof" of anything except that a free-pass was given, sort of
> >>like a day of amnesty when all overdue library books can be returned
> >>without fees.

> > Not the same thing at all! Fee-amnesty is a forgiveness of a violation.
> > Free upgrade isn't.
> >
> > Consider this scenario:
> >
> > FCC says new rules will go into effect on R-day (R for Restructuring)
> >
> > Our Hero gets Tech on R-day minus 1
> >

> > Our Hero gets free upgrade to General on R-day.
> >
> > General written test not needed by Our Hero.
> >
> > QED
> >
> >
> >>Yes, it's a really bad idea, but it doesn't disprove the
> >>need for proper qualification examinations.
> >
> >
> > *IF* the free upgrades are actually done, don't you think some
> > will say there's no reason for the General test?
> >
> > It's called logic, Hans. Try it sometime.
>
> If they are done this way, those who want lesser testing will have a
> powerful tool. "Look at all the people who are now Generals and only
> took a Technician test. Give logical and compelling reasons that this
> should not be a permanent thing."
>
> How on earth are we going to argue against THAT?

Simple: We're not! We can say all we want that it was a one-time
thing,
that it was needed in order to close the books on licenses no longer
issued, that time-in-grade is worth something, yada yada yada. But in
the end, they'll be able to pick out a few dozen/hundred/thousand who
got their licenses X days before the freebie, and say, "why can't I
get the same deal?"

This sort of thing is probably why FCC didn't just grandfather all
existing Generals and above to Extra in 1968. And it also explains the
Great Giveaway of December 1952.

The newbies would have a legitimate-sounding gripe.

> >>Go join Carl Stevenson and
> >>Ed Hare in the NTI sign-up queue. (I'd mention them by call sign, but I
> >>wouldn't want to risk compromising your "standards".)
> >
> > You mean WK3C and W1RFI?
>
> I always thought your opinion differed quite a bit from those two Jim! 8^)
>
On some things, yes. But on other things (like BPL), the three of us
are in complete and perfect agreement.

> > Why are you so afraid of dissenting opinions, Hans?
> > What are you so afraid of?
>
> Just cabin fever, Jim.

>
Maybe. Or maybe, like some other rrap denizens, he resorts to anger
when lacking a logical counterargument.

wait till the RM comments....

Which brings up an interesting point....

Back in the ancient time, FCC essentially said they weren't going to
do
anything until the amateur community came to a consensus on changes.
That
all changed with the NPRM for 98-143.

It appears that folks in the ARRL BoD and Hq, as well as a few others,
knew that something was brewing at FCC, and put out proposals just
before
the NPRM hit the streets. But most of us did not know what was brewing
until proposals and the NPRM started to fly.

Then came all the comments, etc, and finally the Report and Order in
December
1999.

This time, it's quite a bit different. S25.5 is essentially gone, and
FCC does...nothing. 14 petitions from various groups, some of them
almost exactly identical (NCI and NCVEC), hit FCC, and they assign RM
numbers in batches of 7, and take comments.

Now comes the ARRL proposal. And maybe more, like Hans. Been over six
months since folks came home from Geneva and.....no rules changes.

See the difference?

The first ARRL website/QST story said the process would take 2 years.
I scoffed - now I'm wondering if they might be right!

Wanna do a proposal, Mike? Everybody else is!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1861. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-28 23:29:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128182917.21741.00001170@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86587

>The first ARRL website/QST story said the process would take 2 years.
>I scoffed - now I'm wondering if they might be right!
>
>Wanna do a proposal, Mike? Everybody else is!
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Not a Bad Idea Jim, maybe if everyone just keeps dumping hundreds of Proposals on the FCC, they might just drag it out forever.

1862. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 00:08:18 UTC
From: Murray <vk4aok@kellymed.com>
Message-ID: <40184EF2.EF40CC45@kellymed.com>
Source record: 86588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Sounds just like the system we have here in Australia!
Good luck getting it in the US
Murray vk4aok

Morbeius wrote:
>
> Code? Schmode! (what a load?)
>
> You "hams" want to keep the pride and technical prowess
> within Amateur Radio into the new Century? Then do this:
>
> 1) Eliminate ALL code testing for ALL License classes.
>
> 2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
> exam questions.
>
> (and now for the rub)
>
> 3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !
>
> If someone wants an Amateur License, then they should have a
> working technical and theoretical knowledge of RF Theorems and
> all related aspects of electrical and electronic practice.
>
Murray Kelly vk4aok

1863. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 00:36:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401281636.23ca4938@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86589

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<9wTRb.499$GO6.325@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> The Q&As aren't going away. Better to focus effort on expanding the
> Q&A pool for things like formiula calculations such that memorizing
> the formula...not the answer is the better way to learn.

I think most of us agree that it would be best if FCC took back the testing process and no longer made the Q&A pool public information. But it's clear that's not going to happen in any foreseeable future, for a long list of reasons. (Most of which come down to "money", as in "FCC isn't going to spend it on tests for hams").

There's also the issue that after 20 years of VECs, FCC would have to be convinced that the system is failing, *and* that the only way to fix it was to give the process back to FCC. Ain't gonna happen.

And there's nothing to stop Son Of Bash from doing what the original did 30 years ago.

On top of all this, suppose that by some miracle FCC *did* take back testing and test generation. Or maybe farm it out to a commercial testing firm. What do you think a test would cost? I recall that back in the '60s, when FCC imposed test fees on hams, the fee was $9. Which doesn't sound like much until you adjust for inflation. So it would probably be in the $50-100 range (or more) today. Not the kind of thing to help our growth - particularly among young people!

Yet no matter how often these facts are brought up, there are calls to end VE testing. Ain't likely to happen, folks, and even if it did you might not be real happy with the result.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1864. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 00:41:44 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <cFYRb.134969$sv6.717841@attbi_s52>
Source record: 86590

> Code? Schmode! (what a load?

Yep coming from a no-name ....will consider whom or what the load is ......

> You "hams" want to keep the pride and technical prowess
> within Amateur Radio into the new Century? Then do this:

> 1) Eliminate ALL code testing for ALL License classes.

Translation .....I am too lazy to learn 5 WPM. and partake of the 2nd most utilized communication mode.

> 2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
> exam questions.

Huh ???? revamped ... oh boy I don't even want to get in on this ..... Maybe we could add questions about gear bevels and ratios for the standard transmission-CW comparisons out there ...or wait maybe some biology of whales for buggy whip manufacture .....

> (and now for the rub)
>
> 3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !

Good point ....try to get it done ......

> If someone wants an Amateur License, then they should have a
> working technical and theoretical knowledge of RF Theorems and
> all related aspects of electrical and electronic practice.
>
> It used to be that if you were an Amateur Operator you had to demonstrate
> a degree of professionality and knowledge
>
> Having an Extra Class licence should be *almost equal* to someone
> who has a BSEE.

Here is where the bullshit valve gets turned on ...we all have to almost have EEs to get on the radio ... Look at the name of this service-hobby-endeavor whatever ...amateur. I am a "ham" as you call it because of the "love" of radio. If I wanted to make a buck at this then I should have changed my major 40 years ago. This is the egotistical attitude held by some of those who have radio or an EE field as their life's work ....frankly I would find it quite droll to have a hobby with a work matching arrangement. The license is just the first step into an enjoyable lifetime of learning ....I nor others need know "nearly" it all before I can pound brass on 40 or yak on 20.

Both should be able to answer questions on varied
> topics of Electrical Engineering with a reasonable degree of competence.

Here we go again ... at this rate you and a few hundred other guys would have all the bands to yourselves ....sounds like a lot of fun to me. I think I'll work on my matchbook collection or better yet get into crossstich with my wife ...at least I would have someting to hang on the wall.

> Until something along these lines is attempted, Amateur Radio will
> be nothing more than glorified CB radio.

I have heard that before ....ya know it really doesn't ruffle my feathers in the least ... ya know why ??? ...because I am having fun now and over the past 40 years and guess what .. hopefully for a few more years to come. It is a shame that you are either a grumpy old gieser or a grumpy young gieser.

I've been to enough club
> meetings and hamfests where I've seen holders of Extra Class tickets
> who couldn't comprehend even the most basic of electronics theory.

Yepper there Morbitus .... I would have to agree as a lot of guys out there, CW or not, bought their tickets ..a net result of : 1. The FCC desire to rid themselves of the millstone of testing and 2. The fact that most hams are so cheap they still have their 12th birthday money so to ask them to cough up a few bucks a year proper enforcement .....good luck.

> It didn't used to be this way!

OOGAA OOGAA Bullshit alarm on ....of course it was .. how about all those "conditional" fellows out there who knew squat ... how about the people the FCC caught taking tests for others ... I know a fellow who put a lot of guys on the air with his antics ...until he got caught. There were always ways around the system.

God Bless ..... 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa. nr Pittsburgh
... enjoying ham radio for what it is not what others would like it to be
......

1865. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 01:02:47 UTC
From: N8IE <dot.com@dot.com>
Message-ID: <XYYRb.50267$DE.13596@fe2.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 86591

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0401262136.4f60d263@posting.google.com...
> "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<bOgRb.66553$f97.8011@fe3.columbus.rr.com>...
>
> > Well you people have...(SNIP)
>
> Another anonymous sniper with more antagonistic, slanderous swill
> to yet slop the trough with.
>
> Be gone, Scumbag. We already have Lennie...We DON'T need you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Not anon at all.
My point is very valid, NCI and their like have killed a once great hobby.
The ARRL has abandoned the traditional Ham Radio (this is a matter of
survival on their part, they know the turn Ham Radio has taken and will
travel that path to save their jobs) and soon the radio manufacturers will
press for a more open market in which to sell their wares by wanting the
elimination of testing all together.

There is no "What now", it's too late, Ham Radio is dead.
Joke all you want about CB'ers taking over, but don't too shocked when it
happens. Thanks to Fred, Steve, and the likes.

As for the rest of your post, I won't stoop to your level to reply, sorry.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.572 / Virus Database: 362 - Release Date: 1/27/2004

1866. We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 01:31:30 UTC
From: expeditionradio@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128203130.13622.00000616@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 86592

==WE NEED A BANDWIDTH-BASED FREQUENCY PLAN==
FOR THE FUTURE OF AMATEUR RADIO

Bravo! for the new ARRL proposal in the works for code-free
license restructuring. It is long overdue, and it is a
great step forward!
ARRL: Thank you for all your work...

Please consider that, due to recent radio technology and
the proposed changes to licensing structure, we desperately
need a better frequency plan than the olde "Novice Refarming
Proposal" from the 1990s that was pulled off a dusty shelf.
Instead, we need a "Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan" for the
next decade or more.

DIGITAL MODULATION IS THE FUTURE
Digital modulation and processing is changing the way we
communicate and coexist in the HF frequency spectrum.
With the multitude of new digital and analog modulation
schemes, including "digital voice", there are compelling
reasons to integrate voice, CW, data, image, and
keyboarding "modes".
Hams want to be able to use existing technology to
simultaneously keyboard, exchange multimedia files,
and talk by voice with each other on the same frequency...
something our present rules prevent on HF.

MODE IS NO LONGER A VALID DEFINITION
Due to technology changes, the old definitions of what
a "mode" is are now blurred beyond recognition.
Existing band/mode rules are stifling creativity.

ARE WE NOT COMMUNICATORS?
One example of how our present plan stifles communication
is by keeping USA amateurs segregated and actually
preventing us from communicating with the rest of
the world on the 40 and 80/75 meter bands.
Hams want to be able to communicate via voice
internationally on the 40m and 80m ham bands.

HF FREQUENCY PLAN BY EMISSION BANDWIDTH - NOT MODE
If we are to continue to advance amateur radio into
the future, we need MODE FLEXIBILITY.
Otherwise, we will be faced with the need to be
constantly generating new proposals to the FCC to
accomodate new technology. The simplest and best

way to solve this problem is to divide the HF bands
according to "emission bandwidth" for better
distribution of spectrum activity.
This will not only encourage new research and
development in modulation techniques, but it will
help amateurs to communicate with each other by
breaking down the frequency/mode/band barriers
which have confounded us on some bands for the
past 40 years.

Here is a better HF Frequency Plan for Amateur Radio in USA.

MODE-BASED HF FREQUENCY PLAN USA

kHz
1800 to 2000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
3500 to 4000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth
7000 to 7300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
10100 to 10150 any mode <500kHz bandwidth
10115 to 10150 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
14000 to 14300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
14075 to 14350 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
18068 to 18168 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
18080 to 18168 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
21000 to 21450 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
21100 to 21450 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
28000 to 29700 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
28100 to 29700 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
28600 to 29700 any mode <10kHz bandwidth

NEW AMATEUR EXTRA - ALL FREQUENCIES - ALL BANDS.

"NEW GENERAL" and "NEW NOVICE" BANDS
ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING FREQUENCY PLAN:

kHz
1800 to 2000 GENERAL
3510 to 3600 GENERAL AND NOVICE
3650 to 4000 GENERAL
3700 to 4000 NOVICE
5MHz channels GENERAL
7010 to 7075 GENERAL
7025 to 7075 NOVICE
7100 to 7300 GENERAL
7150 to 7300 NOVICE
10100 to 10150 GENERAL

14010 to 14075 GENERAL
14025 to 14075 NOVICE
14150 to 14350 GENERAL
14250 to 14350 NOVICE
18068 to 18168 GENERAL, NOVICE
21010 to 21100 GENERAL, NOVICE
21100 to 21450 GENERAL
21250 to 21450 NOVICE
24890 to 24990 GENERAL, NOVICE
28000 to 29700 GENERAL, NOVICE

BY YEAR 2010, 30% OF ALL HAMS WILL BE NOVICE OPERATORS
Under the new ARRL proposed license restructuring plan,
the number of amateur radio operators on HF will
increase dramatically. This is good.
We need this to preserve our frequency allocations.
We will see a vast increase in the number of "New Novices".
The new Novice operators will be valuable emergency
communicators, so we need to make room in our bands
for them to communicate.

73---Bonnie KQ6XA
ARRL Member

.

1867. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 01:55:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040128205505.01019.00000218@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 86593

In article <5c01b95b.0401281222.793c8788@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040128095524.22081.00003703@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401270542.3ec8668b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0401260717.134eced9@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0401260209.7a6355c6@posting.google.com>...
>
>> > I don't think that much of what is "written" is pertinent even if
>> >it were "written" in the next 2 hours. As long as the question pools
>> >are open and the "newcomer" can pick up a verbatim "Q&A study guide",
>> >the tests are relatively irrelevant.
>>
>> And that's not going to change. Been that way for 20 years, and FCC isn't
>> going to take back the work that it now gets done for free by unpaid
>> volunteers.
>
> I don't see where the FCC would have to "take back work". They'd
>just have to say "The test pools are closed, adn publishing the
>verbatim responses is illegal as it compromises the validity of the
>test."

First off, they'd have to replace the entire question pool (all three tests) because there are many copies of it already out there. And then they'd need a study guide that wasn't exactly like the questions so we'd know what was on the tests. Who is going to do all that work, and who is going to foot the bill?

Second, the work of VEs would be complicated by the need to keep the pools and tests secret.

Third (and probably worst), there'd be nothing to stop Son Of Bash from doing his thing all over again. In fact, it would be even easier - just let *one* VE decide to break the rules, and the entire new pool would be on somebody's website. And untraceable. Sure. 99.999% of VEs aren't going to do that - but as Bash proved, it doesn't take many.
>
> Any "work" would be that of the VE's to not allow the tests to be
>compromised.

See above.
>
>> > Repeat after me: "Lopressor is a beta blocker administerd SIVP
>> >for the control of hypertension and AFIB with IVR."
>> >
>> "Lopressor is a beta blocker administered SIVP for the control of
>> hypertension and AFIB with IVR."
>>
Lopressor is a brand name, not a generic drug name, right?

>> Got it - sort of.
>
> My point exactly.
>
>> > Got that? Now, WHAT is a beta blocker?
>>
>> Some kind of drug. Has to do with the mechanisms that cause high blood
>> pressure and /or hear attacks. Administered intravenously.
>
> MAY be administered intraveneously. Also available in PO (oral)
>form, occassionally administered sublingually.
>
Under the tongue. Like you're supposed to take zinc.

>> >What was the underlying
>> >etiology of the hypertension or the atrial fibrillation that produced
>> >the irregular ventricular response?
>>
>> Something to do with too much beta. Whatever beta is in this context.
>
> Nope. You did pretty good to here. THAT question was what OTHER
>problems CAUSED the A-fib. The Lopressor will correct (temporarily)
>the A-fib...

By blocking the excess beta - whatever beta is - but the real problem is
whatever is causing all that beta in the first place. I think.
>
>> I figured out all that from context and a hazy layman's exposure to cardiac
>> medicine. Do I really understand it? Of course not!
>
> Again, my point exactly. Now, change that to any one of the
>dozens of test questions for the Amateur exams and we have the same
>thing...

Sure. Except that in the case of Lopressor, a mistake can easily kill a
patient. In the case of most ham radio questions, that's not going to happen.

Do you get Newsweek? Good letter/article from an ER nurse on page 12.
>
>> > Perhaps, Jim, but my take is that the FCC has expressed more than
>> >it's fair share of frustration with the numerous licening strategies
>> >that have been offered, all suggesting that "this one" will be the one
>> >to open the flood gates of new licensees.

>>
>> I don't see that. What I do see is the FCC taking its time and letting
>> everyone propose all sorts of stuff, and comment on same. NPRM?
>> Maybe some months down
>> the road. Actual rules changes? Don't hold your breath or you'll need more
>> than beta blockers ;-)
>
> Tell me about it.

'zactly.
>
> I already credit the USMC for keeping me physically fit enough to
>avoid most of the pitfalls I see in many of my patients "my age".

HOO-RAH!

I was told once that "there is no such thing as an 'ex-Marine', just ones that
are not on active duty at the moment....

>Scares the be-jeebers out of me "coding" guys younger than me!

I know a tiny bit about what you mean, having gone to the funerals of
coworkers at [name of former employer deleted] who were younger
than I am now, and who died of MIs and such after repeated warnings
from health care professionals.

For me, it's running that keeps things in shape. This morning I was too sick -
first time that's been true in months. Tomorrow it's back on the road.

>> > Each has produced a momentary road bump followed by a rapid
>> >return to a steady-if-unimpressive growth rate.
>> >
>> That's because none of them address, or can address, the underlying
>> problems that limit growth in amateur radio.
>
> I only see ONE underlying problem, Jim, and it's hardly a
>"problem"...It's just human nature...Amateur Radio is a technical
>hobby. Even in Amateur Radio's "Golden Ages" there were only certain
>folks who got interested in it, and an even smaller number that got
>interested and stayed!

That's one problem. Here are some more:

- Lack of publicity
- High cost of getting started*
- Competition for time and resources
- Antenna restrictions
- Certain elements of ham radio's appeal have disappeared**

* Yes, it's true that one can get on the air for very little money. But most
newcomers don't know this, and there aren't many who are going to build
an HT from an old TV set. It's true that a computer can cost as much as a
ham rig, but a computer is almost a necessity these days, and its cost can

often be rationalized by all the different things it can do. A ham rig has only its one purpose, or maybe two if you count SWLing.

** There was an excellent article some time back about why people become hams. The author cited three types of radio amateur: the experimenter/tinkerer, the operator, and the communicator.

The experimenter/tinkerer likes the techno end of it, and in extreme cases is almost never on the air because s/he's working on something new.

The operator likes the thrill of actually communicating by radio, with his/her own station and skill. DXers and contesters are prime examples. For them, the media is the message.

The communicator just wants to converse. The technology doesn't matter, it's getting the message through.

Once upon a time, amateur radio attracted all three because there were few other options open to the average person of average means. Go back just 20-25 years - the average person didn't have a cell phone, (let alone a picture-cellpbone or text messaging) or a computer, (let alone email), or a fax, or cheap long distance telephone service, etc. etc..Today those things are so common they are taken for granted. The communicators have lots of options besides amateur radio, most of them cheaper and faster.

And as for experimenter/tinkerers - when the self-proclaimed "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO" use manufactured radios, how can we poor ignorant amateurs be expected to build anything? Those of us who do build often find ourselves being taunted and insulted by those self same professional appliance owners....

So what's left are (mostly) the operators.

> It's no different than stamp collecting, hang gliding, or
>motorcycle racing. Some people will be attracted to it, a great many
>others won't. It's no big deal that we don't have ten million
>licensees!

Agreed - but try to sell that!

Here's another point: The more hams we have, the more newbies we need to replace those who drop out. With 683,000 US hams, if only 3% drop out each year, we need 20,490 newcomers per year just to break even. To have 1% growth, we need 30,735 newcomers per year.
>>
>> >> If/when the proposal becomes an RM, it'll be comment time......
>> >
>> > Ditto.
>> >
>> > Hope you're keeping warm Jim! It's embarrassing here...I spent
>> >most of the evening with the back door open to let a cool drizzling
>> >breeze pass through the house.
>>
>> We've had 3 winter storms in the past 4 days. Last night was an ice storm

>> followed by several inches of new snow. Also lots of flu in this house
>> despite flu shots. Not pretty.

It was blessedly short-lived but a nasty GI flu. If it was that bad with a flu shot I don't want to be without one. I also got the anti-pneumonia vaccine some years back - prolly time to re-up.

>> See what you're missing?
>>
>> Time to dig out.
>
> Don't consider it "digging out", Jim...Consider it cardiovascular
>exercise!

It all counts. Neighbor and I dug out our shared driveway. Tomorrow I put the shoes back on...
>
> I'll be driving to work tonight in a windbreaker! (nyuknyuknyuk)
>
Wait till July...I got yer windbreaker right here!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1868. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 03:38:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Fe%Rb.1021$GO6.443@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86594

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0401281636.23ca4938@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<9wTRb.499$GO6.325@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > The Q&As aren't going away. Better to focus effort on expanding the
> > Q&A pool for things like formiula calculations such that memorizing
> > the formula...not the answer is the better way to learn.
>
> I think most of us agree that it would be best if FCC took back the
> testing process and no longer made the Q&A pool public information.

First, even if the FCC took back the process, the questions would
end up in the public domain via internet sharing, etc.

> But it's clear that's not going to happen in any foreseeable future,
> for a long list of reasons. (Most of which come down to "money", as
> in "FCC isn't going to spend it on tests for hams").

That's second. It just isn't going to happen because there hasn't
been any case made as to why it should. You and others
complain, but there just isn't any examples of gross abuse
or widespread problems. Are there occasional abuses, yes, but
clearly insufficient numbers to warrant even a concern on the
FCC's part.

> There's also the issue that after 20 years of VECs, FCC would have
> to be convinced that the system is failing, *and* that the only way
> to fix it was to give the process back to FCC. Ain't gonna happen.

Agree 100%

> And there's nothing to stop Son Of Bash from doing what the original
> did 30 years ago.

As I said above...even easier today with the internet.

> On top of all this, suppose that by some miracle FCC *did* take back
> testing and test generation. Or maybe farm it out to a commercial
> testing firm. What do you think a test would cost? I recall that
> back in the '60s, when FCC imposed test fees on hams, the fee was
> $9. Which doesn't sound like much until you adjust for inflation. So
> it would probably be in the $50-100 range (or more) today. Not the kind
> of thing to help our growth - particularly among young people!

Agree again.

> Yet no matter how often these facts are brought up, there are calls
> to end VE testing. Ain't likely to happen, folks, and even if it did you
> might not be real happy with the result.

Agree yet again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1869. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 03:44:13 UTC
From: Morbeius <error7nullassign@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <32c5e40188292d1cc5ae2$3965@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike in San Antonio" <big@mikeantons.org> wrote in message
news:bv8lu0$2lu$0@pita.alt.net...
> "Nitespark" <nitespark@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:ZvQRb.1003$gl2.693@lakeread05...
> >
> > It used to be that way. Remember the "Dick Bash" books. These came
out
> > when the FCC was still administering Amateur tests. The FCC didn't
> > release the question pool or the answers. Ham applicants would send
the
> > questions in the remembered from the tests and Bash would publish them.
> >
> > Andy
> > WD4KDN
> >
>
> Dick Bash was and still is one of the finest ham radio operators to
> ever key a microphone. A true gentlman & a scholar. A pillar
> of the ham radio community.
>
> Mike in San Antonio

Surely you jest.

Dick Bash was solely responsible for more unqualified
individuals entering Amateur
Radio than any other person(s), apart from corrupt VEC's
who accept cash in advance for the promise of a passing
grade on an exam.

Perhaps a few good apples, but the bulk of the "Bash
graduates" I've met are the most misplaced non-conforming
people I've run into on the air. True CB'ers.

The brain drain of Amateur Radio was started
by Dick Bash, and unfortunatly, I'm afraid it
might just be too late to correct the problem.

1870. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 11:27:46 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <e76Sb.10122$tP1.2546@fed1read07>
Source record: 86596

Bonnie, KQ6XA, posted:

> ==WE NEED A BANDWIDTH-BASED FREQUENCY PLAN==

> <deletia>

> 1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
.
.
.
> 21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth

When AM is outlawed, only outlaws will run AM?

Too much boatanchor enthusiasm for this to work
well. Perhaps there needs to be "AM-Window"
allocations on 160, 80 and 40?

Jim, K7JEB
Glendale, AZ

1871. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 12:00:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vB6Sb.1749$GO6.1039@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86597

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > You're absolutely right, Dee. I do
> > live in an environment where tits,
> > breasts, and other words to describe
> > the human body are not outright, and
> > immediately, derogatory or vulgar -
> > only a certain context makes them so.
>
> Let's try a little experiment that would
> serve to prove what you just said.
> Sometime within the course of going
> about your daily duties, locate and
> approach an attractive woman with a
> particularly voluptious bustline. Say
> something like, "Hey, lady, I think you
> have a really nice set of tits there!"
> (snip)

I don't think so. I don't know about you, but I don't go around approaching strangers so I can comment about their breasts. However, during the course of many conversations with female friends and associates over the years, some of them have used the word "tits" and so have I in response. Clearly, since the women led off with the use of that word, they obviously were not offended by my use of it in response. Clearly, at lot of this depends on the situation. With a stranger, if the subject even came up, only the most polite words would be used. With a friend, more casual conversation is acceptable. In my opinion, the woman always decides when that point is reached.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1872. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 16:30:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4019351A.6000606@psu.edu>
Source record: 86599

N2EY wrote:
> In article <rTGRb.11849$ac4.4518@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>, " Stephen Cowell"
> <scowell@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
>
>>If you ever had to struggle through the period
>>of no-voice novice, you might never wish that
>>particular chore on anyone.
>
>
> I had a no-voice, nonrenewable, nonretakeable Novice back in 1967.
>
> Had a great time with it.
>
>
>>I got my first Novice
>>in '75, and let it lapse due primarily to the lack
>>of voice priviliges (and no manuals for the
>>boatanchors I'd been given). CB was just a lot
>>more fun.
>
>
> I've never been on cb. Ham radio seemed like way more fun.
>
>
>>I got my second novice in '89, man, what a
>>difference! Sunspots were coming on, 10M
>>was hopping, and I worked for a commercial
>>radio shop. That's what Ham Radio is all about,
>>for me.... not hazing, but graduated challenges.
>
>
> Hazing?

There is no qualification that someone, somewhere, somehow thinks is Hazing.

If the proposed plan to upgrade Technicians to General happens, will
not those who test afterward be able to claim that their (presumably)
more difficult test is "hazing"?

I would. If I were a prospective new ham, I wouldn't be thinking about
one-time "adjustments", the history of Ham radio, or anything like that.
I'd hear about the new tests, and be annoyed at the seeming
discrimination or "hazing".

I'd probably call the whole thing an attempt by old time hams to keep new people out of the avocation. That is what it would look like.

This about time for Bill to chime in with one of those "life is a bitch, and then you die" comments. After which point I as a prospective ham, would then apply the arguments he uses against him.

>>The greatest concern, and one which I don't think
>>has been addressed in this thread yet, is the fact
>>that our spectrum is in danger.

>
> It's always been in danger. Other services have always looked
> at our allocations and asked why they couldn't have some.

>>We need more
>>occupants to help occupy it... and HF voice
>>priviliges are the only carrot left to put on the stick.
>
>
> We have 683,000 US hams today. That's about 2-1/2 times
> what there were back when I got started in 1967. If the
> bands aren't crowded, it's because existing hams aren't
> on the air, not because there aren't enough hams.

ahhh, get more people on HF argument. Sorry, that argument doesn't work, because there is a way to get even *more* people on HF by simply giving licenses away. Maybe we should look into registration for ham licenses when we get our drivers license?

And I don't know about others, but when I tune through the bands, there is plenty to listen to. Now that the cycle is winding down, 75/80 gets downright crowded in the evenings.

Ludicrous mode on:

Maybe the new influx of Hams can do something about making poor propagation on 10 meters go away. And what's the deal with 20 meters? It goes away in the evenings just when I sit down to do some serious hammin! First thing they have to do is petition the F.C.C. to make it illegal to have bad propagation..... ;^)

Ludicrous mode off...

- Mike KB3EIA -

1873. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 16:34:15 UTC
From: Hap <hap@thecrewonmeters.net>
Message-ID: <bvbcm0$h4g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Yes, Dick was and is a fine getleman, a truly dynamic individual.
Any negative comments I've heard about him always come from
people who are envious of his many successes, both in and out
of ham radio. Successful people will always be victim of the
envious sick people who can't stand others to be successful.

Hap

"Mike in San Antonio" <big@mikeantons.org> wrote in message
news:bv8lu0$2lu$0@pita.alt.net...
> "Nitespark" <nitespark@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:ZvQRb.1003$gl2.693@lakeread05...
> >
> > It used to be that way. Remember the "Dick Bash" books. These came out
> > when the FCC was still administering Amateur tests. The FCC didn't
> > release the question pool or the answers. Ham applicants would send the
> > questions in the remembered from the tests and Bash would publish them.
> >
> > Andy
> > WD4KDN
> >
>
> Dick Bash was and still is one of the finest ham radio operators to
> ever key a microphone. A true gentlman & a scholar. A pillar
> of the ham radio community.
>
> Mike in San Antonio
>
>
>

1874. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:25:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401941F9.9CD652DD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86600

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> | > 3) free upgrades for Techs and Tech Pluses to General?
> |
> | I was initially against this idea, thinking that taking the additional
> | written element should be a requirement. However, I've read
> | Ed Hare's excellent *personal, not ARRL policy* comments
> | on this from eham, and find that they make sense to me - a
> | compelling case for a "one-shot adjustment" to
> | make things clean in a way that nobody loses anything.
>
> I haven't seen Ed Hare's argument, so I can't comment on it. If the
> "adjustment" were some minor clean-up to sweep up the remnants of a long
> abandoned legacy class and the number of licenses involved was trivial
> (under 10,000), then I'd have no problem with it.
>
> But we aren't dealing with some trival number, we are dealing with
> almost 2/3rds of existing licensees.
>
> The message ARRL sends with this proposal is "our General (and Extra)
> qualifications" are more strenuous than need be. Such a free-pass would
> establish that all these hundreds of thousands of licensees have been
> qualified for General (or Extra) all along. At that moment it is
> established, ipso facto, that the current Technician examination is
> sufficient for the 'new General' and that the last Advanced examination
> is sufficient for the 'new Extra'.
>
> Up until now I have never raised the cry of "dumbing down", but such a
> mass give-away would set a new lower bar for all future qualification
> levels in the Amateur Radio service, and your position allegedly in
> support of strenuous technical qualification standards rings hollow
> indeed.

The latest offering from the League ranks right up there with the idea
of creating the "Diamond Club", the "Animal Farm" of memberships.

Dave K8MN

1875. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:29:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401290929.9c9e89f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86651

expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio) wrote in message
news:<20040128203130.13622.00000616@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> ==WE NEED A BANDWIDTH-BASED FREQUENCY PLAN==
> FOR THE FUTURE OF AMATEUR RADIO
>
> Bravo! for the new ARRL proposal in the works for code-free
> license restructuring. It is long overdue, and it is a
> great step forward!

The ARRL proposal has some good points ("NewNovice") but
it also has some bad ones (free upgrades for almost 60%
of existing hams).

> ARRL: Thank you for all your work...

What work?
>
> Please consider that, due to recent radio technology and
> the proposed changes to licensing structure, we desperately
> need a better frequency plan than the olde "Novice Refarming
> Proposal" from the 1990s that was pulled off a dusty shelf.

That was also an ARRL proposal. I commented against it to FCC.

Did you?

> Instead, we need a "Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan" for the
> next decade or more.

Agreed. But not just for a decade, but indefinitely.

Bandwidth is a better demarcation than the current rules
that limit digial/data modes.

> DIGITAL MODULATION IS THE FUTURE
> Digital modulation and processing is changing the way we
> communicate and coexist in the HF frequency spectrum.
> With the multitude of new digital and analog modulation
> schemes, including "digital voice", there are compelling
> reasons to integrate voice, CW, data, image, and
> keyboarding "modes".

WHOA!

What exactly do you mean by "integrate"?

> Hams want to be able to use existing technology to
> simultaneously keyboard, exchange multimedia files,

> and talk by voice with each other on the same frequency...
> something our present rules prevent on HF.

They also want to be able to use various modes without
undue interference.
>
> MODE IS NO LONGER A VALID DEFINITION
> Due to technology changes, the old definitions of what
> a "mode" is are now blurred beyond recognition.

No, they're not. The old rules simply need to be
changed to fit new modes.

> Existing band/mode rules are stifling creativity.
>
> ARE WE NOT COMMUNICATORS?

We're amateur radio operators.

> One example of how our present plan stifles communication
> is by keeping USA amateurs segregated and actually
> preventing us from communicating with the rest of
> the world on the 40 and 80/75 meter bands.

How? I've worked quite a bit of DX on those bands.

> Hams want to be able to communicate via voice
> internationally on the 40m and 80m ham bands.

They can! It's done all the time. Look at the results
of the DX contests and DXpeditions on those bands.
>
> HF FREQUENCY PLAN BY EMISSION BANDWIDTH - NOT MODE
> If we are to continue to advance amateur radio into
> the future, we need MODE FLEXIBILITY.
> Otherwise, we will be faced with the need to be
> constantly generating new proposals to the FCC to
> accomodate new technology. The simplest and best
> way to solve this problem is to divide the HF bands
> according to "emission bandwidth" for better
> distribution of spectrum activity.

Agreed!

> This will not only encourage new research and
> development in modulation techniques, but it will
> help amateurs to communicate with each other by
> breaking down the frequency/mode/band barriers
> which have confounded us on some bands for the
> past 40 years.

? What happened in 1964?
>
> Here is a better HF Frequency Plan for Amateur Radio in USA.

Let's take a look
>
> MODE-BASED HF FREQUENCY PLAN USA
>
> kHz
> 1800 to 2000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

Why 500 Hz? That leaves out a number of
digital modes already in use.

> 1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

So you would outlaw AM and NFM? Why?

> 3500 to 4000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

You want to widen the 80/75 meter 'phone band
by 150 kHz? Not a good idea!

> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth

Won't work. NTIA will object. It's USB only for now.

> 7000 to 7300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 10100 to 10150 any mode <500kHz bandwidth
> 10115 to 10150 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 14000 to 14300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 14075 to 14350 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 18068 to 18168 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 18080 to 18168 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 21000 to 21450 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 21100 to 21450 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 28000 to 29700 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 28100 to 29700 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 28600 to 29700 any mode <10kHz bandwidth

I see a pattern here - you want to drastically
widen the 'phone bands and eliminate AM and NFM
below 28.6 MHz. Why?

If the 'phone bands are widened as you propose, many of the
foreign 'phones will go still lower in the band to get away
from American hams calling them. They're already way down in
bands like 40 - and your proposal would push them even further
down, on top of CW and digital QSOs. No thanks.

>
> NEW AMATEUR EXTRA - ALL FREQUENCIES - ALL BANDS.

Nothing new about that - been that way since 1951.
>

> "NEW GENERAL" and "NEW NOVICE" BANDS
> ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING FREQUENCY PLAN:
>
> kHz
> 1800 to 2000 GENERAL
> 3510 to 3600 GENERAL AND NOVICE
> 3650 to 4000 GENERAL
> 3700 to 4000 NOVICE
> 5MHz channels GENERAL
> 7010 to 7075 GENERAL
> 7025 to 7075 NOVICE
> 7100 to 7300 GENERAL
> 7150 to 7300 NOVICE
> 10100 to 10150 GENERAL
> 14010 to 14075 GENERAL
> 14025 to 14075 NOVICE
> 14150 to 14350 GENERAL
> 14250 to 14350 NOVICE
> 18068 to 18168 GENERAL, NOVICE
> 21010 to 21100 GENERAL, NOVICE
> 21100 to 21450 GENERAL
> 21250 to 21450 NOVICE
> 24890 to 24990 GENERAL, NOVICE
> 28000 to 29700 GENERAL, NOVICE

I see another pattern here. You're proposing to
drastically cut down the amount of spectrum
gained by getting an Extra. Why? If anything,
the spectrum gained by upgrading should be greater,
not less.

You're proposing reducing the Extra CW/narrow data spectrum
from 100 kHz to 40 kHz and giving Novices more voice than
Extras have now. No thanks!

> BY YEAR 2010, 30% OF ALL HAMS WILL BE NOVICE OPERATORS

How do you know?

Right now there are less than 35,000 Novices out of about
683,000 US hams. That's about 5%. To reach 30%, we'd need
to reach 205,000 Novices in less than 6 years from now.

How is that going to happen?

> Under the new ARRL proposed license restructuring plan,
> the number of amateur radio operators on HF will
> increase dramatically.

How do you know? Where will the 205,000 Novices come from?

> This is good.
> We need this to preserve our frequency allocations.

Agreed.

> We will see a vast increase in the number of "New Novices".

Again - how do you know? And why do you think they'll stay Novices?

> The new Novice operators will be valuable emergency
> communicators, so we need to make room in our bands
> for them to communicate.

So do existing hams and existing modes. And there also need to be
incentives to upgrade.

Dividing the bands by bandwidth rather than content is a good idea.
But your implementation of it will have many bad effects.

A much better plan is to divide the bands into three segments: CW
only, digital, analog voice/image. CW allowed everywhere but
encouraged to stay in
its subband. Division to be about 15-20% CW only, 20-25% digital,
50-60% voice/image. The limitation on digital bandwidth would be about
1 kHz - any mode that fits in a ~1 kHz bandwidth could operate there.
Modes from 850 shift FSK RTTY to some forms of digital voice could be
used in the digital subband, but not any analog voice modes.

Drastically widening the voice subbands will not encourage development
of
digital modes. Indeed, it will do exactly the opposite. Your plan
rewards
the use of spectrum-inefficent modes at the expense of
spectrum-efficent modes.

And while I hope we do get lots of new hams, your predictions of 30%
Novices
are wildly optimistic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

ARRL member since 1968

1876. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:29:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401942F5.28FBCB0A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86652

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote
>
> | Because ARRL is a representative democracy, ARRL Directors listened to
> members
> | in their respective divisions while considering these issues.
> Directors heard
> | from many amateurs in their divisions, and some directors conducted
> their own
> | surveys. The final proposal represents the Board's best effort at
> changes to
> | the Amateur Radio licensing structure needed to carry us through the
> next 10 to
> | 15 years."
>
> I, for one, suggest that popularity polls and beauty contests are not a
> particularly good method for influencing and guiding the evolution of
> the Amateur Radio service.
>
> This is particularly true for the National Association for Amateur
> Radio, which in my not-so-humble-opinion is abdicating its
> responsibility to show leadership and vision, but has cobbled together
> an unimaginative proposal lacking both, and copping out by passing it
> off as "listened to members"

Ah, but directors do listen to members. Roanoke Division Director
Bodson read my e-mail concerning the removal of "Section News" and
contest line scores from QST. He listened at Jackson's Mill during the
state ARRL convention as I outlined my views and the reasons for them.
Then he himself introduced the motion to bring the changes about.
"Listening to" is not the same as "acting on the views held by"
members.

Dave K8MN

1877. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:33:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401290933.6811b77d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86653

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Fe%Rb.1021$GO6.443@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0401281636.23ca4938@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<9wTRb.499$GO6.325@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > The Q&As aren't going away. Better to focus effort on expanding the
> > > Q&A pool for things like formiula calculations such that memorizing
> > > the formula...not the answer is the better way to learn.
> > >
> > I think most of us agree that it would be best if FCC took back the
> > testing process and no longer made the Q&A pool public information.
> >
> First, even if the FCC took back the process, the questions would
> end up in the public domain via internet sharing, etc.

I'm agreeing with ya, Bill!
>
> > But it's clear that's not going to happen in any foreseeable future,
> > for a long list of reasons. (Most of which come down to "money", as
> > in "FCC isn't going to spend it on tests for hams").
> >
> That's second.

I say it's first. Which should FCC spend $$ on - Riley or examiners? I say
Riley.

> It just isn't going to happen because there hasn't
> been any case made as to why it should.

Sure there has. It's self-evident that "secret" tests are
"better", all else being equal. Are they better enough to
get FCC to change? Of course not!

> You and others
> complain, but there just isn't any examples of gross abuse
> or widespread problems. Are there occasional abuses, yes, but
> clearly insufficient numbers to warrant even a concern on the
> FCC's part.

Not talking about abuse at all. I'm talking about the effectiveness
of different test methods.

> > There's also the issue that after 20 years of VECs, FCC would have
> > to be convinced that the system is failing, *and* that the only way

> > to fix it was to give the process back to FCC. Ain't gonna happen.
>
> Agree 100%

That's not a complaint.
>
> > And there's nothing to stop Son Of Bash from doing what the original
> > did 30 years ago.
>
> As I said above...even easier today with the internet.

Yup. Probably be a whole bunch of little Bashes doing it in far less time.
>
> > On top of all this, suppose that by some miracle FCC *did* take back
> > testing and test generation. Or maybe farm it out to a commercial
> > testing firm. What do you think a test would cost? I recall that
> > back in the '60s, when FCC imposed test fees on hams, the fee was
> > $9. Which doesn't sound like much until you adjust for inflation. So
> > it would probably be in the $50-100 range (or more) today. Not the kind
> > of thing to help our growth - particularly among young people!
>
> Agree again.

> > Yet no matter how often these facts are brought up, there are calls
> > to end VE testing. Ain't likely to happen, folks, and even if it did you
> > might not be real happy with the result.
>
> Agree yet again.
>
"Be careful what you ask for - you might just get it".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1878. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:35:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40194451.61A33959@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86654

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ac6dnXOknbhYhIjdRVn-vA@adelphia.com...

> I think it's just that, Mike. A power thing. I mean, after all, why the
> chagrin over a callsign; and all the angst; and all the broohaha were it not
> for wanting to be miserable about something.
> Call it stupid of me but...

Okay.

>I really don't see the huge issue with it and never have.

Precisely.

> I enjoy the deliberate ignorance of the reason I got the call...which at its
> root was purely on a dare from some local hams.

A dare based upon what, Kim? You've already provided us your
motivation.

Dave K8MN

1879. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:42:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401945EF.22BCEA67@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86655

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
> >sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
> >orientated types.
>
> "Technically oriented," not 'orientated.'

"Sycophant", not "syncophant" (used thrice over several days).
"Belligerent", not "beligerant".
"Atilla", not "Atila".

The rest of Doctor Anderson's lecture has been omitted since there is an ARRL (once a local Hartford, Connecticut club but no longer) and there is an amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

1880. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:50:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401947F4.E6C6C4A2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86656

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The biggest moneymaker at the ARRL is their Publishing. They break
> even with QST but the gold is in the numerous books they have for
> sale (shipping charges extra if ordered from Newington but same
> prices, no shipping charges if bought over the counter at HRO).

Why is with your shipping charges fetish? There should be some
incentive for folks to buy League publications from dealers, saving
shipping costs (that's if the consumers forget that they are going to
pay sales tax when they buy from dealers). MFJ does the same thing.
Buy direct from MFJ and pay full list price. Almost all MFJ dealers
discount substantially.

> Publishing pays nearly all the bills at ARRL, including all the so-called
> membership services that are supposed to be so wonderful and
> "cost nothing" to members...renting of banquet rooms for the BoD
> get-togethers (and probably travel expenses, too?)...maintenance of
> W1AW and the museum...and the legal and lobbying fees in DC.

Tell us how that differs from how things work at AARP, NRA, VFW or
American Legion, Len.

> Membership fees don't go for much directly. That pays for the
> "fulfillment services" (mailing lists, printing, distribution of QST) with
> the rest of it spread throughout Hq; membership magazine QST
> gets its income from advertising charges...just like the other
> independent magazines of interest to amateurs.
>
> The 2002 Federal Tax Returns for ARRL showed an operating
> budget of around $12 million. Given only 170 thousand or so
> memberships, that multiplied by annual dues isn't going to hit any
> $12 million.
>
> ARRL stays alive by BEING a business. Their self-promotion is a
> necessary thing. Unfortunately, many members don't see that,
> preferring the delusion of some altruistic, noble, kind, and good
> organization "solely for members." <shrug>

What is the deal with you and the ARRL? You aren't a League member and
you aren't a radio amateur. What is any of this to you?

Dave K8MN

1881. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 17:58:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401949D4.D24B5BF0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86657

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <bv0t97$jq4@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Huh? Well, I don't make an issue of my breasts, either. And, in addition,
> >I've heard many interviews and giggles wherein Dolly was either alluding to
> >or answering direct questions pertaining to her breasts.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> You don't make an issue of your breasts? Then what is your call sign
> all about? I clearly recall that you stated that since you consider yourself
> to be particularly "well endowed," you took up some sort of challenge to
> request that particular Vanity Call Sign for the purpose of creating interest
> directed toward your breasts. Of course, I can understand your need to
> create confusion over this issue, but an out-and-out lie like you made
> above only serves to weaken your already thin credibility.

Don't forget that Kim wants it both ways. She describes her
more-than-ample superstucture and requests a callsign because of it but
she notes with disdain the looks she gets from women on the street (as
if she has a way of knowing what other women are thinking). She want to
draw attention to herself but claims that she didn't ask to be born
with.... Well, you know the drill.

Kim empathizes with strippers, lets us in on what she'd like to tell
other women at cocktail parties, tells us which foul words she'd yell at
a football game and clue us in to what prompted her to choose her tacky
call based upon a dare.

Dave K8MN

1882. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:01:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40194A8D.1CC9B2CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86658

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0401271502.2c8f16f5@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> 73, Leo
> > >
> > >Len, another extra credit trivia question: where does the term "wing nut"
> > >come from?
> >
> > Ahem...that's LEO, Brian... :-)
> >
> > But, you have to admit that the A.I. message program is a darn
> > good one! :-)
> >
> > The term "wing nut" probably came from within the USAF before
> > Larrah signed off the Form 1 on his desk. [that's what he was
> > called when trying to "wing it" with rationalizations of how and why
> > he did what he did]

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

I thought this might refresh your memory while you're preparing for more
civil debate on the elimination of morse testing, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

1883. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:06:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <9o6dnQHNQvEn1oTdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86659

Dave Heil wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>> The biggest moneymaker at the ARRL is their Publishing. They break
>> even with QST but the gold is in the numerous books they have for
>> sale (shipping charges extra if ordered from Newington but same
>> prices, no shipping charges if bought over the counter at HRO).
>
>
> Why is with your shipping charges fetish? There should be some
> incentive for folks to buy League publications from dealers, saving
> shipping costs (that's if the consumers forget that they are going to
> pay sales tax when they buy from dealers). MFJ does the same thing.
> Buy direct from MFJ and pay full list price. Almost all MFJ dealers
> discount substantially.
>
>
>> Publishing pays nearly all the bills at ARRL, including all the so-called
>> membership services that are supposed to be so wonderful and
>> "cost nothing" to members...renting of banquet rooms for the BoD
>> get-togethers (and probably travel expenses, too?)...maintenance of
>> W1AW and the museum...and the legal and lobbying fees in DC.
>
>
> Tell us how that differs from how things work at AARP, NRA, VFW or
> American Legion, Len.
>
>
>> Membership fees don't go for much directly. That pays for the
>> "fulfillment services" (mailing lists, printing, distribution of QST) with
>> the rest of it spread throughout Hq; membership magazine QST
>> gets its income from advertising charges...just like the other
>> independent magazines of interest to amateurs.
>>
>> The 2002 Federal Tax Returns for ARRL showed an operating
>> budget of around $12 million. Given only 170 thousand or so
>> memberships, that multiplied by annual dues isn't going to hit any
>> $12 million.
>>
>> ARRL stays alive by BEING a business. Their self-promotion is a
>> necessary thing. Unfortunately, many members don't see that,
>> preferring the delusion of some altruistic, noble, kind, and good
>> organization "solely for members." <shrug>

>
>
> What is the deal with you and the ARRL? You aren't a League member and
> you aren't a radio amateur. What is any of this to you?

And what is the deal with the publications in general? I enjoy them and buy them. They gather information that is of interest to Hams, and we buy them and they make money. They are happy with the arrangement and so am I and plenty of other people. Sounds like the American way to me!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1884. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:39:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4019534B.651F3870@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86660

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Since ARRL controls QST, they can get FREE advertising for
> whatever else ARRL is publishing. They do. It's an all-around
> money-winner since they don't pay much for submitted work by
> others.

Controls QST? Leonard, the League owns QST. It is the ARRL's membership magazine. Imagine getting free ARRL adversts in the ARRL magazine. You may have blown the cover off this thing.

> Since ARRL arranges to OWN first rights to all articles in
> QST, they can reprint that material in Handbooks or anything else
> as much and as many times as they wish without giving a cent
> more in compensation to authors. Fabulous setup for making a
> bit of money for the League. They've got it sewn up tight. :-)

I'd think a fellow who frequently touts his talents as a "PROFESSIONAL WRITER" would be up on what "first rights" are all about.

www.writing-world.com says:

" 'First' rights give a publication the right to be first to publish your material in either a particular medium or a particular location. FNASR, for example, generally applies to print publication, within North America. First British rights means the right to publish a piece first within Britain -- even if it has already been published somewhere else. First electronic rights means the right to be first to provide the material in electronic format. Note that one can sell many different variations on 'first' rights, as long as these variations don't overlap."

So either QST isn't buying only "first rights" or you have made yet another error. Let's give your statement the last rites.

> Note: Retail outlets for League publications make a small profit
> on publishing sales, yet the price for each one is the same whether
> one buys it in HRO or orders from Newington. The difference is
> that anyone ordering from Newington has to ALSO pay shipping
> charges! Double profits...no cost to them for shipping and they
> make the retailer's discount difference for themselves! Lovely.

There's one interpretation. The dealer can sell the books without shipping charges, thus saving a buyer the shipping charges. I don't have an amateur radio dealer closer than two hours away. If I order the ARRL Handbook from R&L Electronics or Universal Amateur Radio, I'm going to pay the same price as if I'd bought from ARRL--and I'm going to pay

shipping.

> "Endowment funds?" I doubt there are many millionaires out
> there bequeathing large sums to the League. Nowhere close to
> Kroc endowments. It is a kind of crock, though.

You'd be surprised. Then again, you aren't a radio amateur nor are you
an ARRL member.

> [now watch all the ARRL syncophants come out, panting with rage
> and vitriol for Telling It Like It Really Is...:-)]

Leonard, the word is "sycophants". Master it. Make it your own.

Dave K8MN

1885. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.How

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:40:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4019538A.9050008@psu.edu>
Source record: 86661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Morbeius wrote:
> Code? Schmode! (what a load?)
>
> You "hams" want to keep the pride and technical prowess
> within Amateur Radio into the new Century? Then do this:
>
> 1) Eliminate ALL code testing for ALL License classes.
>
> 2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
> exam questions.
>
> (and now for the rub)
>
> 3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !

Even better would be to ask questions that were not covered in ANY
book. That'd make sure only good smart people got in.

Seriously, there is not much these days that doesn't have a supply of Q
and A's somewhere.

I was up at Barnes and Noble a few days ago, and saw they have pools for
many professional trades. Electrician, HVAC pro's, etc. You will have a
looong haul to get the pool eliminated for Ham radio tests.

The answers in the pool are shuffled around for at least the Extra test.

There are 806 questions to choose from, up from 665 in the previous pool.

What is the difference between a pool of questions and a book in which
the answers are in there in text form - or do you suggest that there be
no actual study guide for the tests? If there is a study guide without
the needed material in it, it isn't a study guide.

> If someone wants an Amateur License, then they should have a
> working technical and theoretical knowledge of RF Theorems and
> all related aspects of electrical and electronic practice.

> It used to be that if you were an Amateur Operator you had to demonstrate
> a degree of professionality and knowledge

How was professionality demonstrated on the test process?

> Having an Extra Class licence should be *almost equal* to someone
> who has a BSEE. Both should be able to answer questions on varied
> topics of Electrical Engineering with a reasonable degree of competence.

Good heavens! A person has to take "almost" 4 years of college to qualify for Extra? If ya wanna tie it to education, how about BS for Technician, MS for General and PHD for Extra. Then all those hams would be real smart!

> Until something along these lines is attempted, Amateur Radio will
> be nothing more than glorified CB radio. I've been to enough club
> meetings and hamfests where I've seen holders of Extra Class tickets
> who couldn't comprehend even the most basic of electronics theory.
> It didn't used to be this way!

DLTDHYAOTWO!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1886. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:42:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4019542E.BF2CD66E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86662

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Yes, we all KNOW how you bragged about those wonderful
> grades and class standings while becoming a Human
> Resources (personnel) professional, could get your pick of
> jobs, etc., etc., etc., ...and then became a bus driver. :-)
>
> All that while telling us of your distinguished, vital, important
> USAF career where you always knew more than your officers,
> were more smarts, noble, self-sacrificing to learn how to do
> 20 WPM morse...just like hams did in the 1930s before you
> were born.
>
> Sunnavagun!

A perfect time for the profile of your likely actions, Leonard.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Please continue your civil debate on the elimination of morse testing in
the Amateur Radio Service in which you are not involved.

Dave K8MN

1887. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:46:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40195502.78B8E7E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86663

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Dolly is a great entertainer, to be sure. Not so sure about the singing,
> though...she's "ok" to me. I'm also great at what I do, and am beautiful
> and successful.

I just love your Al Franken "Saturday Night Live" routine. You're
pleasant, fun to be around and, by golly, people LIKE you. Don't let
your "beauty" or "success" go to your head.

So, you're correct...there's no comparing needed!

...or even possible.

Dave K8MN

1888. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:51:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86664

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <rTGRb.11849$ac4.4518@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>, " Stephen Cowell"
> > <scowell@sbcglobal.net> writes:

> >>I got my second novice in '89, man, what a
> >>difference! Sunspots were coming on, 10M
> >>was hopping, and I worked for a commercial
> >>radio shop. That's what Ham Radio is all about,
> >>for me.... not hazing, but graduated challenges.
> >

Graduated challenges = obtaining a Novice license for the second time.

> > Hazing?
>
> There is no qualification that someone, somewhere, somehow thinks is Hazing.

As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.

Dave K8MN

1889. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:53:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <401956B1.3000001@psu.edu>
Source record: 86666

garigue wrote:
>>Code? Schmode! (what a load?
>
>
> Yep coming from a no-name ....will consider whom or what the load is ......
>
>
>>You "hams" want to keep the pride and technical prowess
>>within Amateur Radio into the new Century? Then do this:
>
>
>>1) Eliminate ALL code testing for ALL License classes.
>
>
> Translation .....I am too lazy to learn 5 WPM. and partake of the 2nd most
> utilized communication mode.
>
>
>
>>2) Enact a complete re-vamping of the pool of the written
>> exam questions.
>
>
> Huh ???? revamped ... oh boy I don't even want to get in on this ..... Maybe
> we could add questions about gear bevels and ratios for the standard
> transmission-CW comparisons out there ...or wait maybe some biology of
> whales for buggy whip manufacture .....
>
>
>>(and now for the rub)
>>
>>3) DO NOT PUBLISH the question pools - PERIOD !
>
>
> Good point ....try to get it done ......
>
>
>>If someone wants an Amateur License, then they should have a
>>working technical and theoretical knowledge of RF Theorems and
>>all related aspects of electrical and electronic practice.
>>
>>It used to be that if you were an Amateur Operator you had to demonstrate
>>a degree of professionality and knowledge
>>

>>Having an Extra Class licence should be *almost equal* to someone
>>who has a BSEE.
>
>
> Here is where the bullshit valve gets turned on ...we all have to almost
> have EEs to get on the radio ... Look at the name of this
> service-hobby-endeavor whatever ...amateur. I am a "ham" as you call it
> because of the "love" of radio. If I wanted to make a buck at this then I
> should have changed my major 40 years ago. This is the egotistical attitude
> held by some of those who have radio or an EE field as their life's work
> ....frankly I would find it quite droll to have a hobby with a work matching
> arrangement. The license is just the first step into an enjoyable lifetime
> of learning ....I nor others need know "nearly" it all before I can pound
> brass on 40 or yak on 20.
>
Lessee, I have a kid in college now, and with Educational discount and
him living at home, it's costing $10K per year. Assuming no discount,
we'd be looking at $40K per annum. Living on campus would add even more.
So the prospective ham would be expected to spend "almost" 4 years,
and "almost" 40K to get their Extra?

>
>
> Both should be able to answer questions on varied
>
>>topics of Electrical Engineering with a reasonable degree of competence.
>
>
> Here we go again ... at this rate you and a few hundred other guys would
> have all the bands to yourselves ....sounds like a lot of fun to me. I
> think I'll work on my matchbook collection or better yet get into crossstich
> with my wife ...at least I would have someting to hang on the wall.
>

But just think of the QUALITY of those few Hams, Tom!! I just get all
aquiver at the thought. The Extra walks into the room, and all rise to
show respect. After accepting the respect, they are allowed to go back
to their tasks.

>
>
>>Until something along these lines is attempted, Amateur Radio will
>>be nothing more than glorified CB radio.
>
>
> I have heard that before ....ya know it really doesn't ruffle my feathers in
> the least ... ya know why ??? ...because I am having fun now and over the
> past 40 years and guess what .. hopefully for a few more years to come. It
> is a shame that you are either a grumpy old gieser or a grumpy young gieser.
>
>

>
> I've been to enough club
>
>>meetings and hamfests where I've seen holders of Extra Class tickets
>>who couldn't comprehend even the most basic of electronics theory.
>
>
> Yepper there Morbitus .... I would have to agree as a lot of guys out
> there, CW or not, bought their tickets ..a net result of : 1. The FCC
> desire to rid themselves of the millstone of testing and 2. The fact that
> most hams are so cheap they still have their 12th birthday money so to ask
> them to cough up a few bucks a year proper enforcement .....good luck.

Getting back to the college analogy, Students today and in my day are
expert at the art of cramming. Study like a madman/woman before the
tests, stay up all night cramming. Take the test and do okay, unless you
have a brain cramp during it.

Ask them a question from the test the next day, and they draw a blank.
All that did was to put that knowledge into short term memory, and most
of what they learned is gone after the test.

So not having a question pool isn't going to guarantee much.

>
>>It didn't used to be this way!
>
>
> OOGAA OOGAA Bullshit alarm on ....of course it was .. how about all those
> "conditional" fellows out there who knew squat ... how about the people the
> FCC caught taking tests for others ... I know a fellow who put a lot of guys
> on the air with his antics ...until he got caught. There were always ways
> around the system.

Things never were like they used to be, Eh Tom?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1890. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:53:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401956B8.D6AA9492@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hap wrote:
>
> Yes, Dick was and is a fine getleman, a truly dynamic individual.
> Any negative comments I've heard about him always come from
> people who are envious of his many successes, both in and out
> of ham radio. Successful people will always be victim of the
> envious sick people who can't stand others to be successful.
>
> Hap

I almost tripped over the Hap-hazard there. Yep, that's why many of us resent Ken Lay, Martha Stewart, Michael Jackson and their ilk. We're simply envious of successful people.

Dave K8MN

1891. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 18:56:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40195758.9090005@psu.edu>
Source record: 86667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Morbeius wrote:
> "Mike in San Antonio" <big@mikeantons.org> wrote in message
> news:bv8lu0$2lu$0@pita.alt.net...
>
>>"Nitespark" <nitespark@cox.net> wrote in message
>>news:ZvQRb.1003$gl2.693@lakeread05...
>>
>>>It used to be that way. Remember the "Dick Bash" books. These came
>>
> out
>
>>>when the FCC was still administering Amateur tests. The FCC didn't
>>>release the question pool or the answers. Ham applicants would send
>>
> the
>
>>>questions in the remembered from the tests and Bash would publish them.
>>>
>>>Andy
>>>WD4KDN
>>>
>>
>>Dick Bash was and still is one of the finest ham radio operators to
>>ever key a microphone. A true gentlman & a scholar. A pillar
>>of the ham radio community.
>>
>>Mike in San Antonio
>
>
> Surely you jest.
>
> Dick Bash was solely responsible for more unqualified
> individuals entering Amateur
> Radio than any other person(s), apart from corrupt VEC's
> who accept cash in advance for the promise of a passing
> grade on an exam.
>
> Perhaps a few good apples, but the bulk of the "Bash
> graduates" I've met are the most misplaced non-conforming
> people I've run into on the air. True CB'ers.

Did you get that in depth when you QSO'd with these "Bash graduates"?

> The brain drain of Amateur Radio was started
> by Dick Bash, and unfortunatly, I'm afraid it
> might just be too late to correct the problem.

Quick! Get out while you still can!!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1892. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 19:04:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40195924.8060108@psu.edu>
Source record: 86668

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40181251.4090107@psu.edu>...

<some snippage>

>>
>> Just cabin fever, Jim.
>>
>
> Maybe. Or maybe, like some other rrap denizens, he resorts to anger
> when lacking a logical counterargument.

I'd hope not. But it is possible. There is an interesting debate style for sure. I've only been called stupid by two people here. Lenover21 and Hans..... Umm, yes, your point!

> wait till the RM comments....
>
> Which brings up an interesting point....
>
> Back in the ancient time, FCC essentially said they weren't going to
> do
> anything until the amateur community came to a consensus on changes.
> That
> all changed with the NPRM for 98-143.
>
> It appears that folks in the ARRL BoD and Hq, as well as a few others,
> knew that something was brewing at FCC, and put out proposals just
> before
> the NPRM hit the streets. But most of us did not know what was brewing
> until proposals and the NPRM started to fly.
>
> Then came all the comments, etc, and finally the Report and Order in
> December
> 1999.
>
> This time, it's quite a bit different. S25.5 is essentially gone, and
> FCC does...nothing. 14 petitions from various groups, some of them
> almost exactly identical (NCI and NCVEC), hit FCC, and they assign RM
> numbers in batches of 7, and take comments.
>
> Now comes the ARRL proposal. And maybe more, like Hans. Been over six
> months since folks came home from Geneva and.....no rules changes.
>
> See the difference?

>
> The first ARRL website/QST story said the process would take 2 years.
> I scoffed - now I'm wondering if they might be right!
>
> Wanna do a proposal, Mike? Everybody else is!

My proposal would not be anywhere near as radical as the others going around. And yes, I do think that ARRL's proposal is radical. Hans' proposal, with all its quirks, is much more consistent and rewarding of knowledge than the league's idea. If it were a choice between the two, I'd choose Hans' proposal in a second.

Maybe I'll write something up, and bounce it off you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1893. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 19:27:22 UTC
From: Radio45 <r45@radiostawater.net>
Message-ID: <bvbmqi$73h$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:401956B8.D6AA9492@earthlink.net...
>
> I almost tripped over the Hap-hazard there. Yep, that's why many of us
> resent Ken Lay, Martha Stewart, Michael Jackson and their ilk. We're
> simply envious of successful people.
>
> Dave K8MN

Quick! The sky is falling! The sky is falling! Cancel your
ARRL membership now! Hope you don't earn a living
writing about celebrities. ROTFLMAO!

R45

1894. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 21:42:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40197E59.8FE448CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86670
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Radio45 wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:401956B8.D6AA9492@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I almost tripped over the Hap-hazard there. Yep, that's why many of us
> > resent Ken Lay, Martha Stewart, Michael Jackson and their ilk. We're
> > simply envious of successful people.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Quick! The sky is falling! The sky is falling! Cancel your
> ARRL membership now! Hope you don't earn a living
> writing about celebrities. ROTFLMAO!
>
> R45

That sound you just heard was sarcasm whooshing over your head.

Dave K8MN

1895. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 22:48:04 UTC
From: Radio45 <r45@radiostawater.net>
Message-ID: <bvc2is$sg5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40197E59.8FE448CC@earthlink.net...
>
>
> Radio45 wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:401956B8.D6AA9492@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > I almost tripped over the Hap-hazard there. Yep, that's why many of
us
> > > resent Ken Lay, Martha Stewart, Michael Jackson and their ilk. We're
> > > simply envious of successful people.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Quick! The sky is falling! The sky is falling! Cancel your
> > ARRL membership now! Hope you don't earn a living
> > writing about celebrities. ROTFLMAO!
> >
> > R45
>
> That sound you just heard was sarcasm whooshing over your head.
>
> Dave K8MN

1896. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-29 22:58:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401291458.3592f0b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86672

expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio) wrote in message
news:<20040128203130.13622.00000616@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> MODE IS NO LONGER A VALID DEFINITION
> Due to technology changes, the old definitions of what
> a "mode" is are now blurred beyond recognition.

You've got to be kidding me...

> Existing band/mode rules are stifling creativity.

Bonnie, are you ON the bands at all?

> ARE WE NOT COMMUNICATORS?
> One example of how our present plan stifles communication
> is by keeping USA amateurs segregated and actually
> preventing us from communicating with the rest of
> the world on the 40 and 80/75 meter bands.
> Hams want to be able to communicate via voice
> internationally on the 40m and 80m ham bands.

Yeah...That wall full of QSL cards attests to how I've been
unable to "communicat(e) with the rest of the world"...

I have 52 DXCC entities on 75m phone and 87on CW. I have 85 DXCC
entities on 40m phone. I am two shy of DXCC on 40m CW. Not bad for
low power and wire antennas close to the ground.

> HF FREQUENCY PLAN BY EMISSION BANDWIDTH - NOT MODE
> If we are to continue to advance amateur radio into
> the future, we need MODE FLEXIBILITY.

After one reads through this post they will see that ALL you
suggest, in the end, is dropping specific modes by name. The result,
however, is just an expansion of the U.S. phone bands.

Don't get me wrong, I completely agree that we can afford to
expand our phone allocations. However YOUR premise is that we enact
your ideas to deter "stifling" of experimentation.

In the long run, you're wedging more efficient narrowband modes
into smaller and smaller subbands to the preference of the less
efficient wideband modes...Specifically, SSB voice.

> Otherwise, we will be faced with the need to be
> constantly generating new proposals to the FCC to
> accomodate new technology. The simplest and best
> way to solve this problem is to divide the HF bands

> according to "emission bandwidth" for better
> distribution of spectrum activity.
> This will not only encourage new research and
> development in modulation techniques, but it will
> help amateurs to communicate with each other by
> breaking down the frequency/mode/band barriers
> which have confounded us on some bands for the
> past 40 years.

All you've done is change the language. The application will be
unchanged.

And the FCC has been absolutely wonderful about accomodating new
technologies.

> Here is a better HF Frequency Plan for Amateur Radio in USA.

It's nothing of the sort. All you did was change some language
in order to justify expanding the phone bands.

> MODE-BASED HF FREQUENCY PLAN USA
>
> kHz
> 1800 to 2000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> 3500 to 4000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
> 3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

All this did was eliminate the opportunity for AM'ers to operate,
and also for others who wish to experiment with whatever new WIDEBAND
modes that might manifest.

> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth

No change here. This is exactly what we have right now.

> 7000 to 7300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

No change here. "<500hz bandwidth"...?!?! Narrowband data
modes...CW, RTTY, etc.

> 7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

You moved the phone bands down to 7075...other than that, no
difference here. Also, you suggest we can't communicate
"internationally", yet the "phone band" goes down to 7030 or
7050...Why, if your intent is to increase interoperability with
Europeans, did you lop it off there?

> 10100 to 10150 any mode <500kHz bandwidth
> 10115 to 10150 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

The band here is only 50kHz wide to start with, yet you suggest
we allow phone operations to take up 80% of the band which means fewer
stations on the band at the same time. How is that an improvement?

> 14000 to 14300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

No change.

> 14075 to 14350 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

Again, you moved the phone band down under the guise of deleting
terms of SPECIFIC modes, yet the only mode that's going to move here
will be SSB phone.

> 18068 to 18168 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

No change here. CW and data, regardless of what you want to call
it.

> 18080 to 18168 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

Just moved the phone band down again...Do we see a pattern here?

> 21000 to 21450 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

Yawn.....

> 21100 to 21450 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

Again...more phone band.

> 21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth

Why? If you were going to have a 10kHz passband, the lowbands
were the place to do it since that's where most of it exists. This
could only promote FM use here.

Again, why?

> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

Why no protection for narrowband modes? PSK, AMTOR, RTTY, and
yes...CW.

Might as well just channelize it and wait for Ranger to come out
with a "multimode" radio for it...

Oooops! Pretty much already done!

> 28000 to 29700 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

Still no change, Bonnie.

> 28100 to 29700 any mode <3kHz bandwidth

Just moved that phone band down again, Bonnie. Except during
contests, there's ample room all across 10 meters for just about
anything you could want to do already.

> 28600 to 29700 any mode <10kHz bandwidth

Here you just DELETED wideband capability where it already
exists. This would force existing repeaters to go QRT. Why?

> NEW AMATEUR EXTRA - ALL FREQUENCIES - ALL BANDS.

Snip.

> "NEW GENERAL" and "NEW NOVICE" BANDS
> ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING FREQUENCY PLAN:

Snip.

> BY YEAR 2010, 30% OF ALL HAMS WILL BE NOVICE OPERATORS
> Under the new ARRL proposed license restructuring plan,
> the number of amateur radio operators on HF will
> increase dramatically. This is good.
> We need this to preserve our frequency allocations.
> We will see a vast increase in the number of "New Novices".
> The new Novice operators will be valuable emergency
> communicators, so we need to make room in our bands
> for them to communicate.

The Novice Class license should be just for that...Novices. When one has gained experience and confidence in what they are doing, it's time to move up. Then they will have more than adequate spectrum in which to "communicate".

Your bandplan only addresses HF. Ninety-nine percent of "emergency communications" takes place above 50mHz.

Nice try, Bonnie. You're thinking, and that's good, but the ultimate result was all you did was expand the phone bands on HF where very little "experimentation" is going on anyway.

73

Steve Robeson, K4YZ

Steve, K4YZ

1897. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 00:04:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86673

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...

> As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
>
> Dave K8MN

I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.

bb

1898. Re: Do yourself a favor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 00:12:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401291612.4104afec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86674

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<401942F5.28FBCB0A@earthlink.net>...

> Ah, but directors do listen to members. Roanoke Division Director
> Bodson read my e-mail concerning the removal of "Section News" and
> contest line scores from QST. He listened at Jackson's Mill during the
> state ARRL convention as I outlined my views and the reasons for them.
> Then he himself introduced the motion to bring the changes about.
> "Listening to" is not the same as "acting on the views held by"
> members.
>
> Dave K8MN

So you have a history of having your views ignored.

bb

1899. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 01:56:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040129205618.11022.00003831@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86675

In article <eKURb.494$jH6.225@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040128145500.23171.00003737@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <InTRb.492$GO6.284@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20040128115558.12501.00005864@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> >> In article <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>, Roger Halstead
>> >> <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >When they came out with incentive licensing, there was a vocal
>> >> >minority complaining.
>> >>
>> >> Were they complaining that it was needed or were they against it?
>> >> This isn't a trivial question. Some folks claim the majority were for
>it,
>> >> while others claim the majority were against it. Some say it was a good
>> >> idea, some say it trashed amateur radio.
>> >>
>> >> What say you?
>> >>
>> >> >When they came out with the No code tech license
>> >> >there was a vocal minority complaining.
>> >>
>> >> Which way?
>> >>
>> >> The FCC tried to get a nocodetest license as early as 1975, and again
>in
>> >1983,
>> >> but clear majorities of hams were against it. They funally pushed it
>> >through in
>> >> 1990. Some folks claim the majority were for it, while others claim
>the
>> >> majority were against it. Some say it was a good idea, some say it
>trashed
>> >> amateur radio.
>> >>
>> >> What say you?
>> >>
>> >> >Now they are doing away with

>> >> >most of the CW requirement and there is a vocal minority complaining.
>> >>
>> >> Which way? And how do you know they're a minority?
>> >>
>> >> Survey after survey shows that there is still majority support for at
>> >least
>> >> some code testing. Indeed, the comments to FCC back in 1999 show that
>not
>> >only
>> >> was there majority support for code testing, but a majority of
>commenters
>> >> wanted at least two code test speeds. The folks wanting only 5 wpm or
>no
>> >code
>> >> test were the minority. But that minority got its way.
>> >
>> >Water over the dam or under the bridge.
>> >
>> >Fact is, there has NOT been any
>> >credible survey done of late which would take into account
>> >the realities of change going on and the change that has gone on.
>>
>> Yes, there has.
>>
>> Simply look at the comments to the various petitions to the FCC re:
>> restructuring.
>
>Two points:
>
>1. That was 5 years ago and

So?

Check the comments to the various RMs filed since then.

>2. That was NO survey and you know it. Yes, one can
>derive statistics of those that DID comment, but the
>stats are in no way automatically revealing of what the amateur
>community as a whole may think. Anyone that ever
>took a statistics class can tell you that.

Not the point! Looking at the comments tells us what those who
cared enough to comment think. Just as an election tells us what those
who cared enough to vote think. The FCC makes it incredibly easy to
file comments by email or paper, so it's not like the old massive copying
mess of the old days.
>
>> >Additionally, for the umpteenth time, the rules and
>> >regulations of amateur radio are NOT the sole province of
>> >already licensed amateurs. The mere fact that a majority of amateurs
>> >does or doesn't want code testing is NOT sufficient cause for

>> >the FCC to make the rules according to only those already
>> >licensed.
>>
>> That's why the comments to the FCC are so revealing. Anyone can comment,
>> licensed or not. So all it takes is a simple review of the comments to get
>> an indication of what the amateur community, licensed or not, thinks.
>
>WRONG for the same reasons I just stated above.

Why is that wrong? If someone cares about the issue, let 'em put their fingers
to work and write or email.

>> And since FCC requires commenters to give their real identity,
>>"box-stuffing"
>> and such is avoided, and if one person writes a dozen comments, they still
>> only count as one person's opinion.
>
>Again...this isn't done by a vote.

It should be.
>
>> NCI did a count of the comments to 98-143, and the majority wanted at
>> least two
>> code test speeds. FCC said no. That's their right, but it's important to
>> note what the majority of commenters wanted.
>
>NOTE SPECIFICALLY: NCI never stated anything other than
>the results of those that commented. Anything beyond that
>would be speculation only.

And those results were that a MINORITY supported the NCI view of 5 wpm only.
A MAJORITY wanted either two test speeds or three test speeds. That's clear
from the results.

>> >> >WAyyyy back there used to be the class separation and then they did
>> >> >away with it to the point where the General class had full privileges.
>> >>
>> >> Late 1952. Went into effect Feb, 1953.
>> >>
>> >> >Then incentive licensing, then the new structure with code free techs
>> >> >on VHF, then they lowered the CW speed and now they are doing away
>> >> >with most of the CW requirements which are there due to international
>> >> >agreements.
>> >> >
>> >> >"To me" it matters little whether they make the requirements tech
>> >> >heavy, procedure heavy, or require CW. It has little to do with the
>> >> >character of those coming into the service.
>> >> >
>> >> >Each change has brought out the "gloom and doom" element proclaiming
>> >> >this will be the straw that broke the camel's back and the end of
>> >> >Amateur Radio.
>> >>

>> >> That's one way to look at it. Here's another: Some look at the trend
>since
>> >> about 1975 and see a gradual reduction in the qualifications for a
>> >license, and
>> >> a gradual reduction in the "quality" of the ARS. YMMV. No one event or
>> >change
>> >> sticks out - just a slow, gradual change that is barely noticeable
>unless
>> >you
>> >> step back and compare over a long period of time.
>> >
>> >Fact is that a General in 1957 had all privileges and the test was
>> >probably easier then than now
>>
>> I disagree! But without the actual tests for comparison, nobody can really
>say.
>
>I took the general in 1957/8 timeframe and it was
>no big deal for me as a teenager of 16.

Heck, I passed the General and Advanced at 14 in 1968 and the Extra at 16
(1970).
No big deal either. So what's all the fuss?
>
>> >..other than the code test.
>> >
>> >> >Maybe in addition to the technology and procedure testing we should
>> >> >run a test on character traits? <:-)) If we had been doing such
>> >> >there would be a number of current hams who would have failed.
>> >> >
>> >> >I have gone the whole route and yes, I passed 20 wpm to get my
>> >> >license, but I don't see that need be a requirement for future
>> >> >applicants.
>> >>
>> >> I do.
>> >
>> >20wpm? Yet neither you nor anyone else was able to
>> >convince the FCC that even 13wpm was justifiable
>> >for any license class. And that was 5 years ago.
>>
>> Doesn't mean it's what's best for the ARS.
>
>ROTFLMAO... You left out the "IMHO" on that.

It's not just my opinion...

>As we have often decided...we'll likly forever be at odds
>on that one :-) :-)
>
>> >> >It really doesn't matter how we test, there is always going to be a
>> >> >mix of character traits and groups who oppose the way each other

>> >> >operate. There will also be a small percent who will not be satisfied
>> >> >no mater what is done.
>> >>
>> >> So it makes sense to please the majority, doesn;t it?
>> >
>> >Read my lips...this isn't a vote as to what is best!
>>
>> Would you say that if you had a clear and obvious majority?
>>
>> Suppose comments to the 98-143 had been
>> 70% "dump the code test" - we'd never
>> hear the end of it.
>
>Welcome to the world of political persuasion.

Exactly.
>
>> >In the end it is the FCC that decides based on individual and
>> >group input from ALL that wish to do so....amateurs and non-amateurs
>> >alike. There is NO decision based on a majority of anything.
>>
>> The claim was made in this thread that "a vocal minority complained".
>> Majority and minority opinion *do* have an effect - just ask John Kerry.
>
>In the end it will come down to the FCC only...regardless
>of any vocal minority or majority.

"We'll put it to a vote...You all get one vote - FCC gets one billion votes"
>
>> >> >The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
>> >> >treaty and world policy.
>> >> >
>> >> Some of it does.
>> >
>> >What part of it doesn't?
>> >
>> Free upgrades, for one.
>
>Free upgrades do NOT specifically go against anything in
>the treaty or otherwise in the more broad based "world policy" .
>If you think otherwise, please point out the conflicting
>treaty text.

The part about meeting the suggested syllabus, for one....
>
>> >> But do you support free upgrades of all Techs and Tech Pluses to
>> >> General,
>> >> and all Advanceds to Extra?
>> >
>> >It doesn't bother me at all.
>

>Jim, how'd you let my comment about it not bothering me
>pass without a comment from you :-) :-)
>
You comment didn't bother me....

73 es stay warm de Jim, N2EY

1900. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 01:56:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040129205621.11022.00003832@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86676

In article <5c01b95b.0401291458.3592f0b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio) wrote in message
>news:<20040128203130.13622.00000616@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
>> MODE IS NO LONGER A VALID DEFINITION
>> Due to technology changes, the old definitions of what
>> a "mode" is are now blurred beyond recognition.
>
> You've got to be kidding me...
>
>> Existing band/mode rules are stifling creativity.
>
> Bonnie, are you ON the bands at all?

Steve,

There *is* a valid concern here. Part 97 definitions
do limit the kinds of modes we can use on HF, even
if they are narrow.

For example, we're not allowed
to run datamodes in the 'phone subbands. Not even
narrow-as-heck PSK-31. OTOH, if you can figure
out a way to send voice in a 400 Hz channel, you
have to do it in the phone subbands, even though it's
half the width of an 850 shift FSK signal, which can
be run in the CW/digital subbands.

Want to try out a form of PSK-31 that is, say, <1 kHz
wide but over 1200 baud? Sorry, not legal
on amateur HF/MF below 25 MHz without an STA.
(Might not be legal on 10 - check the rules).

Imagine a mode that is a combination of PSK-31 and
SSB voice, with the PSK carrier where the SSB carrier
would be. Send data and voice at the same time. Interesting?
Yes! Possible? Of course! Legal? No.
>
>> ARE WE NOT COMMUNICATORS?
>> One example of how our present plan stifles communication
>> is by keeping USA amateurs segregated and actually
>> preventing us from communicating with the rest of
>> the world on the 40 and 80/75 meter bands.
>> Hams want to be able to communicate via voice

>> internationally on the 40m and 80m ham bands.
>
> Yeah...That wall full of QSL cards attests to how I've been
>unable to "communicat(e) with the rest of the world"...
>
> I have 52 DXCC entities on 75m phone and 87on CW. I have 85 DXCC
>entities on 40m phone. I am two shy of DXCC on 40m CW. Not bad for
>low power and wire antennas close to the ground.

dayum!
>
>> HF FREQUENCY PLAN BY EMISSION BANDWIDTH - NOT MODE
>> If we are to continue to advance amateur radio into
>> the future, we need MODE FLEXIBILITY.
>
> After one reads through this post they will see that ALL you
>suggest, in the end, is dropping specific modes by name. The result,
>however, is just an expansion of the U.S. phone bands.

It gets worse...
>
> Don't get me wrong, I completely agree that we can afford to
>expand our phone allocations. However YOUR premise is that we enact
>your ideas to deter "stifling" of experimentation.
>
I say widening the 'phone bands as much as is suggested is not a good thing
at all.

> In the long run, you're wedging more efficient narrowband modes
>into smaller and smaller subbands to the preference of the less
>efficient wideband modes...Specifically, SSB voice.

Bingo.
>
>> Otherwise, we will be faced with the need to be
>> constantly generating new proposals to the FCC to
>> accomodate new technology. The simplest and best
>> way to solve this problem is to divide the HF bands
>> according to "emission bandwidth" for better
>> distribution of spectrum activity.
>> This will not only encourage new research and
>> development in modulation techniques, but it will
>> help amateurs to communicate with each other by
>> breaking down the frequency/mode/band barriers
>> which have confounded us on some bands for the
>> past 40 years.
>
> All you've done is change the language. The application will be
>unchanged.

Sort of.
>

> And the FCC has been absolutely wonderful about accomodating new
>technologies.
>
>> Here is a better HF Frequency Plan for Amateur Radio in USA.
>
> It's nothing of the sort. All you did was change some language
>in order to justify expanding the phone bands.

And cutting down the incentive to get an Extra. Note how little
additional spectrum the big E gets under this proposal.
>
>> MODE-BASED HF FREQUENCY PLAN USA
>>
>> kHz
>> 1800 to 2000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 1830 to 2000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> 3500 to 4000 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>> 3600 to 4000 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> All this did was eliminate the opportunity for AM'ers to operate,
>and also for others who wish to experiment with whatever new WIDEBAND
>modes that might manifest.
>
>> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth
>
> No change here. This is exactly what we have right now.

No it isn't! We're allowed USB voice *only* - nothing else - because
NTIA says so.

>> 7000 to 7300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>
> No change here. "<500hz bandwidth"...?!?! Narrowband data
>modes...CW, RTTY, etc.
>
>> 7075 to 7300 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> You moved the phone bands down to 7075...other than that, no
>difference here. Also, you suggest we can't communicate
>"internationally", yet the "phone band" goes down to 7030 or
>7050...Why, if your intent is to increase interoperability with
>Europeans, did you lop it off there?
>
>> 10100 to 10150 any mode <500kHz bandwidth
>> 10115 to 10150 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> The band here is only 50kHz wide to start with, yet you suggest
>we allow phone operations to take up 80% of the band which means fewer
>stations on the band at the same time. How is that an improvement?

It isn't.
>
>> 14000 to 14300 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>
> No change.
>
>> 14075 to 14350 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> Again, you moved the phone band down under the guise of deleting
>terms of SPECIFIC modes, yet the only mode that's going to move here
>will be SSB phone.
>
>> 18068 to 18168 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>
> No change here. CW and data, regardless of what you want to call
>it.
>
>> 18080 to 18168 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> Just moved the phone band down again...Do we see a pattern here?
>
>> 21000 to 21450 any mode <500Hz bandwidth
>
> Yawn.....
>
>> 21100 to 21450 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> Again...more phone band.
>
>> 21350 to 21450 any mode <10kHz bandwidth

I must have missed this before.
>
> Why? If you were going to have a 10kHz passband, the lowbands
>were the place to do it since that's where most of it exists. This
>could only promote FM use here.
>
> Again, why?
>
>> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> Why no protection for narrowband modes? PSK, AMTOR, RTTY, and
>yes...CW.

One guess why CW isn't mentioned...
>
> Might as well just channelize it and wait for Ranger to come out
>with a "multimode" radio for it...
>
> Oooops! Pretty much already done!
>
>> 28000 to 29700 any mode <500Hz bandwidth

>
> Still no change, Bonnie.
>
>> 28100 to 29700 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>
> Just moved that phone band down again, Bonnie. Except during
>contests, there's ample room all across 10 meters for just about
>anything you could want to do already.
>
>> 28600 to 29700 any mode <10kHz bandwidth
>
> Here you just DELETED wideband capability where it already
>exists. This would force existing repeaters to go QRT. Why?

No AM on 160, 75, 40, 20....
>
>> NEW AMATEUR EXTRA - ALL FREQUENCIES - ALL BANDS.
>
Nothing new about that..

> Snip.
>
>> "NEW GENERAL" and "NEW NOVICE" BANDS
>> ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING FREQUENCY PLAN:
>
> Snip.
>
>> BY YEAR 2010, 30% OF ALL HAMS WILL BE NOVICE OPERATORS

How? To reach that level, we'd need about 30,000 new hams per year for
the next six years *and* no upgrades of any of them. If half of them go
for General of Extra, we need 60,000 per year...

no wait, if we get that many, the 30% number gets bigger, so we need
even more newcomers...

>> Under the new ARRL proposed license restructuring plan,
>> the number of amateur radio operators on HF will
>> increase dramatically. This is good.
>> We need this to preserve our frequency allocations.
>> We will see a vast increase in the number of "New Novices".

That's what they said would happen when the Tech lost its code
test. We saw a surge for a while, then back to almost the same
level of newcomers as before.

Check the growth of the entire ARS from 1991 to 2000, and compare
it to the growth from 1982 to 1991.

>> The new Novice operators will be valuable emergency
>> communicators, so we need to make room in our bands
>> for them to communicate.
>

> The Novice Class license should be just for that...Novices. When
>one has gained experience and confidence in what they are doing, it's
>time to move up. Then they will have more than adequate spectrum in
>which to "communicate".

Bingo.
>
> Your bandplan only addresses HF. Ninety-nine percent of
>"emergency communications" takes place above 50mHz.
>
> Nice try, Bonnie. You're thinking, and that's good, but the
>ultimate result was all you did was expand the phone bands on HF where
>very little "experimentation" is going on anyway.
>
There's more to it than that, Steve, but the proposed solution creates
more problems than it solves.

I really do hope we get lots of newcomers, but 30% Novices in 6 years
is kinda optimistic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1901. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 03:23:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040129222343.22081.00003739@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86677

In article <lb6dnZEnQdo-z4rdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>
>> If Kim had any class at all,
>> that is precisely what she would do with her present call.
>
>If kim had any class at all she would never have chosen such a call.
>

Amen!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1902. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 03:23:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040129222344.22081.00003740@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86678

In article <bv8223$4sg@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> There you go again, begging for this thread to be dropped! Whassamatta?
>> Getting tired of defending the indefensible? Running out of arguments?
>> Feeling like you're at the end of your rope? I thought so. Well, as it
>> happens, you know how to make this thread go away. Start acting like
>> an intelligent, mature, and decent human being, and get rid of that
>> obnoxious call sign!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>OMYGAWD!!! "Begging for this thread to be dropped!"?????????? Larry,
>puhleeze. You're not that stupid.
>
>A) I do not defend my callsign: I like my callsign

Kim:

You'd better like it, because plenty of other hams don't!

>B) No "arguments" needed for my callsign. It's mine. Period.

Nobody is disputing that, for obvious reasons!

>C) End of my rope?? Over a phucking callsign?

Now, now, Kim, no need to be crude, just because you know how!
Ooops, just remembered your call sign, so I guess that being crude
comes naturally.

>Now, I *DARE* you to keep this callsign going beyond your usual
>"time-of-year" spin with it.

I believe you mean this thread, and it will continue as long as there
are posts being made to it, by you, by me, and by other participants.
Isn't that how all threads work?

>But, just to let you know up front, the I have
>*no* intention of changing my callsign and I don't think I could get any
>more decent a human than I am.

Get that sentence to the cleaners by noon tomorrow, and they'll have
it ready for you by Friday!

>As to learning, I do that every day--thank
>goodness. As to being intelligent, I think I speak too lofty for you now as
>it is!

You "speak too lofty" for me? Right. Very intelligent. But only if you're stacking up examples of ungrammatical sentences. Toss this one in the laundry bag with the one above it.

>Gads, you're getting hilarious.

I've been "hilarious" all of my life -- I have a great sense of humor!

>Only thing is: we're packing to move so
>this is the last I'll be on for a while!.

I see. Well, at least you won't need someone to help you sit on the suitcase to get it closed!

>I'll be back on sometime around
>the first of March. Gonna have this thread still going, there, big fella?

Possibly.

>If not, tell ya what, I'll drag it up again! ROFLMAO!!!

That's mighty nice of you! I'll hold you to that! Be careful during the move.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1903. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 03:53:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ZykSb.2758$GO6.2171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86679

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040129205618.11022.00003831@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <eKURb.494$jH6.225@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040128145500.23171.00003737@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >> In article <InTRb.492$GO6.284@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20040128115558.12501.00005864@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <5mce101djt1aq5tbeladeu6crgrmsfj811@4ax.com>, Roger
Halstead
> >> >> <mynews@rogerhalstead.com> writes:
> >> >> >The move proposed by the League is consistent with international
> >> >> >treaty and world policy.
> >> >> >
> >> >> Some of it does.
> >> >
> >> >What part of it doesn't?
> >> >
> >> Free upgrades, for one.
> >
> >Free upgrades do NOT specifically go against anything in
> >the treaty or otherwise in the more broad based "world policy" .
> >If you think otherwise, please point out the conflicting
> >treaty text.
>
> The part about meeting the suggested syllabus, for one....

Not at all since there is NO specific licensing breakdown in
the treaty by subject/syllabus.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1904. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 04:09:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040129230923.22081.00003742@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86681

In article <bv8241$2in@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> That sounds like wishful thinking. However, you asked for it, and as long
>> as you've got it, you're gonna get it! This thread has a life of it's
>own, and
>> as long as I am a participant in this newsgroup, it will always pop up
>> whenever you least expect it.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I think you're beyond "popping up," Larry...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Now just exactly what do you mean by that? Remember, that as someone
who has accused others of having "dirty minds" when it comes to your
call sign, you'd better be pretty careful how you answer!

Oh, now I get it. Well, when you are around, I can understand how such
things would be unlikely to "pop."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1905. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 04:09:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040129230924.22081.00003743@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86680

In article <bv82n6$14l@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> That sounds like wishful thinking. However, you asked for it, and as long
>> as you've got it, you're gonna get it! This thread has a life of it's
>own, and
>> as long as I am a participant in this newsgroup, it will always pop up
>> whenever you least expect it.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>By the way, Larry, *this* is the original thread, so be sure it's this one
>you keep going!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but it's *not* the original thread, just a thread with the
same subject line as the original thread!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1906. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 04:09:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86682

In article <vB6Sb.1749$GO6.1039@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>
> I don't think so. I don't know about you, but I don't go around
>approaching strangers so I can comment about their breasts. However, during
>the course of many conversations with female friends and associates over the
>years, some of them have used the word "tits" and so have I in response.
>Clearly, since the women led off with the use of that word, they obviously
>were not offended by my use of it in response. Clearly, at lot of this
>depends on the situation. With a stranger, if the subject even came up, only
>the most polite words would be used. With a friend, more casual conversation
>is acceptable. In my opinion, the woman always decides when that point is
>reached.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Dwight:

I have many female friends and acquaintences, and I almost never hear the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally, but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others who are, or may be, involved in the ARS. As a woman who presumes to be taken seriously as an intelligent, competent woman of the modern era, she is, in actuality, setting herself and all other women back to the time when they were mere objects of prurient interest. Or could it be that she really wants to be seen that way? Unfortunately, the image is objectionable in any context, and it's effect on the ARS has the potential to be exactly as Mr. Hollingsworth predicted.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1907. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 04:09:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040129230925.22081.00003745@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86683

In article <401949D4.D24B5BF0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>Don't forget that Kim wants it both ways. She describes her
>more-than-ample superstucture and requests a callsign because of it but
>she notes with disdain the looks she gets from women on the street (as
>if she has a way of knowing what other women are thinking). She want to
>draw attention to herself but claims that she didn't ask to be born
>with.... Well, you know the drill.
>
>Kim empathizes with strippers, lets us in on what she'd like to tell
>other women at cocktail parties, tells us which foul words she'd yell at
>a football game and clue us in to what prompted her to choose her tacky
>call based upon a dare.
>
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

All of which is why our Kim is such a constant source of amusement.
However, I doubt that any other YL's who happened to be regular
participants in this NG would find her very entertaining.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1908. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 04:23:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <u%kSb.12301$OB.3693@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 86684

Ouch!

1st quarter math in an associates program (engineering science) was calculus. You betcha it wouldn't be pretty if the requirements were at a BSEE level! You start throwing around a bunch of inductors, resistors, and capacitors in a network with some ac source and ask the amplitude, direction, and phase of something .... and that is still at the associate's level. It would be real ugly, for sure LOL.

Glad to see the newsgroup still functioning at about the same level it has been for the past few years.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.574 / Virus Database: 364 - Release Date: 1/29/04

1909. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.How

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 04:28:38 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <W3lSb.12302$rM.9413@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 86685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike,

If BS were to be the qualifying factor for a Tech, everyone in the
newsgroups would likely qualify :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.574 / Virus Database: 364 - Release Date: 1/29/04

1910. OT- How to be a Net Tough Guy (a must read)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 05:18:55 UTC
From: Viceroy Fraterus Vehiocipede <dw2dw2d1@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <2b9ec$4019e94c$d1cc7aaa$13945@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86686
Cross-posted to: alt.fan.art-bell,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hilarious article.

"I Wanna Be an Internet Tough Guy"
- by 'lowtax'

here: http://www.somethingawful.com/articles.php?a=1936

This is a MUST READ for all r.r.s, a.f.a-b
and r.r.a.p. "frequent flyer mile holders"...

(.....you'll understand.......trust me!)

1911. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 08:31:25 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a837502b8d2265a9896a6@news.individual.net>
Source record: 86687

[This followup was posted to rec.radio.amateur.policy and a copy was
sent to the cited author.]

In article <k5gIb.19640$P%1.18292052@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>,
deehays@qix.net says...
> Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely to
> rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the
> technical elements for the license classes. One should not be able to get
> on the air if they miss a significant percentage of the rules.

That's a reasonable proposal. Unfortunately, that means it will
probably never be given serious consideration.... ;-)

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net

PS: I'm not a cynic, but I play one on TV....

1912. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1380 – January 23, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 09:55:50 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040130045550.13115.00000637@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86688

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1380 – January 23, 2004

CLOSED CIRCUIT ADVISORY

This is Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Newsline Support Fund Administrator. We haven't asked for quite some time, but we need contributions TODAY. If you value this service, please help.

We're here to serve you for as long as you want us. Your response over the next several weeks will provide that answer.

The address for the Amateur Radio Newsline is Post Office Box 660937, Arcadia California, 91066.

Looking forward to hearing from you REALLY soon, I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1380 with a release date of Friday, January 23, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The ARRL says that it will petition the FCC for a code free entry level license with high frequency phone privileges and Amateur Radio Neewsline announces the Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project. These stories and more coming your way on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1380 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO POLITICS: A NEW DIRECTION

Topping the news this week -- honoring one of our own. Enlisting an army of volunteers to make us all a little bit better -- and doing it in the name of the late Roy Neal, K6DUE. But first -- the biggest organization of Amateur Radio operators in the world finally takes a position on the code versus no-code issue. The ARRL is asking the FCC in a petition for rulemaking to create a no code entry level H-F license for anyone who can successfully pass a written exam of a mere 25 questions. If the FCC accepts the ARRL idea, it would keep the more stringent requirements for the Amateur Extra Class license, including their ability to send and receive Morse code. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, takes a look at the details of what the ARRL is asking the FCC to do:

--
Code free access to ham radio's high frequency bands ... it's part of what could change amateur radio's complexion forever. And it could become reality.

The ARRL says it will ask the FCC to make sweeping changes to the United States amateur radio service. Perhaps the biggest change of all: Creating a new entry level ham radio license that grants access to high frequencies without requiring any Morse code proficiency.

But that's not all. The League also proposes consolidating all amateur radio licenses into three classes: Novice, as it's being called for now, General and the highest level, Extra. And only the Extra class license would require Morse code proficiency--of 5 words per minute. The new Novice license would require a 25-question written test and would offer limited HF, Morse code, data and phone and image privileges on 80, 40, 15 and 10 meters. Novices would also have VHF and UHF privileges, including access to 6 meters and 2 meters. Their power levels would be restricted to 100 watts on 80, 40 and 15 meters, and to 50 watts on 10 meters and higher.

The middle amateur radio license would continue to be the General, but it would include all current Technician, Tech Plus and present General license holders. This license would not require a Morse code test. Under this proposal, if you are a current Technician or Technician Plus, you would automatically obtain General class privileges with no additional testing. The current General examination would remain unchanged for new applicants.

The third license class, the Extra, would involve the fewest changes. Under the League proposal, hams with Advanced class licenses would essentially automatically become Extra class because of similarities in the technical proficiency required for both levels. New applicants for the Extra class license would have to pass a 5 word-per-minute code test--the written test would stay as is. If you're currently a Novice, Tech Plus or General license holder, you would receive a lifetime 5 word-per-minute credit.

The proposed changes got the blessing of ARRL's Board of Directors January 16th. The proposals are the creation of a League Executive Committee acting at the Board's direction. The new structure suggestions come as a result to changes in international radio regulations that are part of the World Radiocommunication Conference 2003. At the same time, the FCC has been wanting to streamline the amateur radio licensing structure which it began more than five years ago.

How do radio amateurs feel about the changes? Reaction is mixed:

--
Janice Rock AF4LT - Audio Only Report: Please listen to audio version of newscast.
--

Janice Rock, AF4LT, sees benefits and drawbacks:

--
Janice Rock AF4LT - Audio Only Report: Please listen to audio version of newscast.
--

Supporters say the new structure offers a true entry level license with HF privileges that should boost growth in the amateur radio service. While some hams may claim that taking away code for HF access damages amateur radio, other hams dispute that. Bill Levey, WA4FAT:

--
Bill Levey, WA4FAT - Audio Only Report: Please listen to audio version of newscast.
--

Supporters say the changes will help amateur radio by allowing new Novices to participate in emergency nets on HF sideband. The impact of this proposal on amateur radio's long term future has Janice Rock concerned for another reason:

--
Janice Rock AF4LT - Audio Only Report: Please listen to audio version of newscast.
--

League Executive Vice President David Sumner K1ZZ says the Novice class license could wind up getting a new name, more appropriate for the times -- this, as amateur radio faces what could be one of the biggest changes in its history.

From Birmingham, Alabama, I’m David Black, KB4KCH for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

More is in cyberspace at the League’s website. You will find it at www.arrl.org (ARRL, ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESCUE RADIO: NYC ARES ACTIVATES FOR COLD WEATHER

The New York City District Amateur Radio Emergency Service was called into action last Wednesday evening, January 14 th. This, after the American Red Cross of Greater New York contacted Mike Lisenco N2YBB. Lisenco is the District Emergency Coordinator for ARES and the message was clear: Call together the members of ARES to provide emergency communications between the warming centers being established in the five boroughs and Red Cross headquarters in Manhattan.

--

Lisenco: “Once I received the phone call from the coordinator of disaster volunteers at the Red Cross of greater New York, the first thing that I did was to call the five EC’s we have here in New York City. Each borough which constitutes a county has its own EC. In turn they called their people looking staff the shelters.”

--

By the next morning, New York City District ARES Emergency Coordinators had more than a dozen Amateur Radio operators on standby awaiting the activation. Friday evening they went into action after Mayor Bloomberg announced the

shelter openings. The ARES radio operators manned their posts throughout the operation, which lasted the better part of a day during some of the most frigid weather ever recorded in the Big Apple. The hams finally stood down on Saturday afternoon.

This is not the first time that New York City District ARES has provided critical communications for emergencies. They were active with the oil barge explosion at Port Mobile on Staten Island, the Northeast Blackout in August 2003 and did heroic work following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. (ARNewsline(tm), NYC ARES)

**

Break 1

Stay tuned for the details on one of amateur radios most ambitious mentoring projects. It’s coming up later in the newscast, but first From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Peace River Repeater Associations systems serving Punta Gorda Florida.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ANNOUNCING THE ROY NEAL, K6DUE, AMATEUR RADIO MENTORING PROJECT

Amateur Radio Newsline is paying tribute its late vice president, Roy Neal, K6DUE, by naming an ongoing mentoring program in his honor. Roy became a silent key last August after surgery. He was 82.

The Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is designed to pair new hams -- often called “newbies” -- with veteran amateurs. This, in the hope that some of the established hams’ operator skills can be passed down to new generations.

--

Pasternak: “ere is a long tradition of mentoring, often called “elmering,” in Amateur Radio. No one knows the origin of the term, but the first teacher might well have been named “Elmer.” My mentor was a guy named Charlie Zussman. Back in the 1950’s he was WA2AKX. Today he’s WE2R. And his helping me become a ham has lead to a friendship that has lasted a lifetime. What he taught me was that tradition is an important part of the hobby.

--

That’s Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, who has produced these newscasts since 1977. He and the Newsline Board of Directors came up with the idea for this project. Bill says that ham radio has become a tremendously complex arena and new hams often don’t know where to turn for help:

--

Pasternak: “We have licensed hams who are truly experts in numerous fields ranging from bouncing radio signals off the moon, to writing complicated software which enables new forms of two-way communication. We want to take advantage of that knowledge base to help newcommers.”

--

While Amateur Radio includes world-class experts in a number of specialties, there are literally thousands of hams who have operating skills also worthy of passing on. For example, contesting is very popular, yet it is a tough nut to crack for a beginner.

--

Pasternak: “Contesting is intimidating. I know. I’m just getting started. Good contest operators often are able to contact four stations per minute for hours at a time. The great ones do even better than that. How they are able to do that is a skill that should be passed on to newcommers.”

--

Two large pools of Amateurs are needed to make this mentoring project work. First, there must be a group of volunteers who have a skill and are willing to share their time. The second group is made up of the large number of beginners who want to learn.

One of the nations top mentors, kit building expert Joe Eisenberg, K0NEB, has agreed to help set up databases and to begin the process of matching mentors with beginners. All we need to know is if you need assistance or if you are able to mentor others. We also need your name, call letters, address with zipcode, phone number, e-mail and when its best call.

The special e-mail address to register is mentor@arnewsline.org.

Mentors might be matched by zipcode – and be in the same town, or they might be half-way around the world from each other and communicate by e-mail. Either way I think we can make it work.

--

Pasternak: “The project’s namesake, Roy Neal, K6DUE, was himself a mentor and not only in ham radio. I know this first hand because he is the one who taught me to become a better writer and producer.

More important: Those of us who knew Roy, also know that helping others was a very important part of his life. As such. we feel that the least that we here at Amateur Radio Newsline can do is keep his memory alive with this project.”

--

Again, that e-mail address to register for the Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is mentor@arnewsline.org More information is on our website at www.arnewsline.org

And Roy, old buddy, this one is for you! (ARNewsline(tm), W6RCL)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: NORTH CAROLINA HAMS MEET WITH POWER PROVIDERS

Slow but steady progress in dealing with the imminent release of Broadband over Poweerlines in North Carolina. Gary Pearce, KN4AQ, is here with more:

--

Progress Energy fulfilled their promise to North Carolina Amateur Radio operators and invited several Raleigh area hams to observe their new Phase II BPL trial in a rural subdivision south of the city on January 15th.

BPL – Broadband over Power Lines – is a system for delivering high speed Internet through neighborhoods and into homes and businesses via the power lines. The technology places radio frequency signals on the power lines in parts of the spectrum between 2 and 80 MHz. Those signals radiate to some extent, and can cause interference to a receiver in the vicinity of the power lines. Naturally this has become cause for great concern among hams worldwide.

In Raleigh, three ham radio operators met with engineers for both Progress Energy and Amperion, the equipment manufacturer. Two of the Progress Energy engineers were also hams.

The BPL trial consisted of a half-mile of overhead feeder along a highway, and a few dozen homes passed by buried power lines. A “repeater” amplified the signal about every other block.

We were particularly interested in the spectrum used. We learned that each run of BPL, from repeater to repeater, uses two blocks of spectrum, 2.5 and 3.5 MHz wide. At each repeater, a different block of spectrum is required.

The overhead feeder segment in this trial used spectrum blocks around 25 and 29 MHz. We listened with mobile equipment driving on the road adjacent to the power line, and received S-9 signals in the immediate vicinity of the line that sounded like this when tuning across the 10 meter band:

--
[audio clip of BPL signal]
--

The signal fell off quickly when driving away from the line, but a ham at a home station almost a mile away heard the 10-meter BPL signal about S-6 using an 80-meter dipole antenna.

Amperion says a Network Operation Center can move any repeater to another block of spectrum, or notch part of a block by remote control, to eliminate interference, but they were unable to demonstrate that for our test.

Even with that flexibility, fitting 3.5 MHz wide blocks of energy in between ham bands would be a delicate jigsaw puzzle. That much “empty” spectrum exists only between the 30, 20 and 17-meter bands, and it’s empty only from the perspective of Amateur Radio.

Skip could completely upset the equation. BPL signals, which are similar to very low power QRP Amateur signals, could reflect off the ionosphere and appear

hundreds or thousands of miles away. The energy of one isolated trial area might not have much impact, but a mature nationwide system with hundreds or even thousands of installations using the same spectrum blocks could be a very different story.

Yet to come in BPL is a comprehensive report from the NTIA; an FCC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for changes in Part 15, based on last year's Notice of Inquiry; and a decision by your local utility about getting involved in BPL.

Reporting for Newsline, this is Gary Pearce KN4AQ in Raleigh, North Carolina

--

The hams at the test included Wake County ARES E-C Tom Brown, N4TAB, Technical Specialist Frank Lynch, W4FAL, and reporter Gary Pearce, KN4AQ. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: K1IGD NAMED NEW QCWA GENERAL MANAGER

Chuck Walbridge, K1IGD is the new General Manager of the Quarter Century Wireless Association. Walbridge is already at work and has set up a new postal address. You now write to QCWA at PO Box 3247, Framingham, Massachusettes, 01705. He can be reached by e-mail to qcwagm@rcn.com (E-Mail)

**

RADIO LAW: CA COMMERCIAL SITE OWNER LOSES A ROUND IN BATTLE OVER ANTENNA FARM

Commercial mobile radio service provider James A. Kay has been dealt a setback by a California state appellate panel. The court has upheld a superior court finding that the antenna farm Kay maintains at his Rancho Palos Verdes home is not exempt from city permit requirements.

Late word is that Kay is continuing his fight with the city. This, even though he obtained permits for two of his 20 antennas with the condition that he remove the others. More is on-line at http://www.dailybreeze.com/content/news/nmpntenna7.html (CGC)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: GAINSVILLE FL. IN APRIL

Looking ahead in the social calendar we find the Gainesville Hamfest slated for April 24th and 25th at the Leach County Fair Grounds near GAINSVILLE Florida. The event will feature fun, food, prizes, tailgate selling , camping, ham radio testing and lots more. For more information write to GARS, PO Box 140383, Gainesville, Florida 32614, or visit www.gars.net/hamfest on the world wide web. (E-Mail)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: THE AES SUPERFEST IN APRIL

Molly Schreiber of Amateur Electronic Supply says that now is the time to schedule your organization for a display at the 2004 AES Superfest.

Molly says that the new web pages are up and running. Just go to www.aesham.com, select MENU from the right-hand side bar and click SUPERFEST in the menu listing on the page that appears.

After that all; you need do is click on RADIO CLUB REGISTRATION. After registering your organization, you will receive a conformation E-mail with the confirmation and itinerary.

Molly adds that the deadline for signing up is March 1st. Superfest 2004 is slated for April 2nd and 3rd at the A-E-S location at 5710 W. Good Hope Road in Milwaukee Wisconsin. (AES)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**
HAMVENTION 2004: THE HAMVENTION "SHOPPING CART"

Hamvention 2004 says that it is now accepting VISA, MasterCard, American Express and Discover Cards for tickets, booth spaces and flea market spaces. This, using its brand new on-line "Shopping Cart."

Planners say that this is a simple and secure way to set up your personal Hamvention experience and assures that you can get what you want. And you can do it all without having to ever leave your home.

The Hamvention "Shopping Cart" is located in cyberspace at www.w8bi.org/hamvention/shop.html. When the page loads, click on the green box with the words: "Enter The Shopping Cart" and take a look at what's being offered over the world-wide-web.

This years Hamvention dates are May 14th, 15th and 16th. The venue is the HARA Arena in the Dayton suburb of Trotwood Ohio. (Hamvention)

**

SYMPOSIUMS: CSVHFS IN JULY IN CANADA

The 38th annual Central States VHF Society Conference will be held July 22nd to the 25th and planners are already seeking presenters of technical talks that will also be published in the conference proceedings.

The deadline for submitting final papers will be May 1st. This years gathering will be held at the Delta Meadowvale Resort and Conference Centre in Mississauga Ontario, Canada not far from Toronto. More information on the

event and the need for speakers is available from Bob Morton, VE3BFM. His e-mail is VE3BFM@csvhfs.org (CSVHFS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ECHO TEAM REPORTS PROGRESS

AMSAT North America reports that work on the Echo satellite is progressing smoothly. According to the ham radio space agency, an integration and testing team lead by Jim White, WD0E, and Mike Kingery, KE4AZN, was 2003 at SpaceQuest in December. SpaceQuest is in Virginia and during the initial satellite integration session, about 90% of Echo's hardware was successfully tested. Also, most of the telemetry calibration was accomplished. Especially encourage is word that the new experimental L-band receiver and S-band transmitter functioned well during their first tests.

For more information on the progress of this new bird take your web browsder over top see www.amsat.org and take the "Echo Project Info" link. (AMSAT--NA)

**

INTERNATIONAL - CANADA: NEW ONTARIO SM

Radio Amateurs of Canada reports that Robert McKenzie, VE3SJQ, has stepped down as Ontario Section Manager. His replacement is Rose Scholtyssek, VE3RIS. Scholtyssek’s E-mail is rose@igs.net (RAC)

**

DX

In D-X, word that F6FXS will be active as FG/F6FXS from Guadeloupe through the 13th of February. He will operate on 40, 30, 20, 15 and 10 metres on CW only. Look for him between 13.00 and 14.00 and again from 22.00 to 24.00 UTC. Q-S-L as directed on the air.

And GB4BLC, standing for 'Bedworth Lions Club', is being operated by Brian, G8GMU, until the 29th of January to raise awareness of the work of Lions International. (Varios DX sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE LIFE AND TIMES OF K2ORS

And finally this week, a new book is in the works about a broadcast legend who also happened to be a ham radio operator. Take a listen:

--
Shep: “Well there I am playing that character deep in the jungle. We have $400,000 of camera equipment that’s being eaten by mosquitoes. They eat Betamax cameras. You don’t know about the tropics. Leaches are coming up the tripods, when a runner comes down the beach. He’s a Chumaro Indian.

He’s running. He’s sweating. He arrives in the clearing. This is exactly what happened.

The Director is standing there. He's sweating and saying: '...damn, we got to get this.' We kept trying to clean the lens off. It was a tough shoot.

And this Chumaro runner comes up and he's saying; 'Message. Message." He has a message. The Director looks at it and he hands it to me and the message said -- and I quote: '...The Dayton Hamvention called. They want you to speak this spring.'

I said: 'For cripes sake, how did they know I was in the jungle' (laughter)"

--

That was the late Gene Shepherd, K2ORS, speaking at the Dayton Hamvention several years ago. Shep as he liked to be called, passed away in 1999. Now, author Eugene Bergmann has set to work writing the definitive book about the ham who invented talk radio. In a recent interview with Amateur Radio Newsline, he told us why:

--

Bergmann: "Well I first started listening to Jean Shepherd way back in '56 when I was in college and I think what he had to say and the way he said it affected my thinking for the rest of my life. Soon after he died I realized how important he was to my way of thinking. That he was like an old friend. I got more and more involved in learning more about him and I finally decided that I had to write a book about his art."

--

In writing his book, Eugene Bergmann wants to make certain that every aspect of Shep's life and career is accounted for, including his love of ham radio. And a love it was as in this very rare recording where he accurately predicted the explosive growth in F-M and repeaters in general and one New York City machine in particular:

--

Shep: "I don't think you guys who sit around every night like you do recognize the already legandary status of this repeater outside of this area. I just came back from a trip from the Canadian border and all the way down through New England and way up in the Northern part of Maine I worked guys and the one thing that they all talked about was SUR (WA2SUR). And they really was a quality of 'wow' in their voice. I think that in another ten years there's no telling how immense this repeater will be and what a structure it will be. I am very serious when I say this. I think we are in the beginning of a thing here and I think that ultimately 25 years from now people will look back on the early two meter guys like us -- we're considered early guys now -- with a legendary awe. You know, with a quality of awe, like 'my god -- they started it all."

--

That was recorded way back the evening of June 21st 1972 over the then WA2SUR repeater in New York City. K2ORS was right on in his F-M and repeater growth

forecast. Bergmann says that’s the kind of he plans to include:

--

Bergmann: “In May of 1968 in one of his broadcasts he said: ‘...I became at the age of ten, totally, maniacally and for life I might point out -- completely skulled out by Amateur Radio.’ So he was quite an enthusiast up to his death in ‘99”

--

Sound intriguing? Well you can find out a lot more about Eugnene Bergann’s book and how you can help to writer it on this weeks RAIN Report. Just go to www.rainreport.com or dial into area code 847-827-7246, sit back and enjoy a quarter hour with Eugene Bergmann and his new book on the legendary Jean Shepherd, K2ORS. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), PO Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the e-mail address to register to take part in the Eroy Neal, K6DUE Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is mentor@arnewsline.org

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

1913. AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE™ ANNOUNCES CREATION OF THE ROY NEAL, K6DUE, AMATEUR RADIO MENTORING PROJECT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 10:00:51 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040130050051.13115.00000647@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86689

THE AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE
(A Federal 501(c)(3) Non Profit Corporation)
Editorial Office - 28197 Robin Avenue
Santa Clarita California
Tel: (661) 296-7180
E-Mail: newsline@arnewsline.org
on the web at: www.arnewsline.org

Press Release

For more information please contact Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
(wa6itf@arnewsline.org)

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE™ ANNOUNCES CREATION OF THE ROY NEAL, K6DUE, AMATEUR RADIO MENTORING PROJECT

January 15, 2004 (Los Angeles California) The Amateur Radio Newsline Inc., a Federally chartered 501(c)(3) not-for-profit corporation has today announced the creation of the “Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project.” This is a program designed to take newly licensed radio amateurs and place them one-on-one with veteran hams so that they may learn the traditions and operating skills that no classroom or home-study environment can teach.

Roy Neal, K6DUE, was a driving force within the structure of Amateur Radio Newsline. He passed away on Friday, August 15, 2003 from complications arising from heart valve replacement surgery a few days earlier.

In addition to serving as Amateur Radio Newsline's Vice President, he was also our teacher, advisor and friend. Those of us who had the honor of knowing Roy were keenly aware of his willingness to help anyone better themselves. He was always willing to share his lifetime of knowledge in many areas including science, space exploration and Amateur Radio. With this in mind the Amateur Radio Newsline Board of Directors at its annual meeting on December 13, 2003 voted unanimously to honor Roy’s memory by creating a program to carry on his vision.

What we have named “The Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project” is loosely based on a similar program created by Broadway performer Ann Reinking. Reinking was a student of and performer with the legendary choreographer/director Bob Fosse. She is now carrying on the “mentoring” tradition in the art of dance through her own educational foundation, the Broadway Theater Project. This is a Florida based training program connecting students with seasoned theater professionals. If we may quote Ms. Reinking:

“Its sort of an un-written law or rule in the world of dance that you pass on what you know. This particular craft is at its best when its passed from one person's hands to the next.”

Now, if you think about it, what Ann Reinking says about "dance" applies equally to our world of Amateur Radio. Maybe more so, because, for decades the knowledge and tradition of our hobby/service was passed down from seasoned operators to newcomers, one to one. Unfortunately, in the ham radio of today, this art of mentoring that we call "Elmering" seems to be disappearing. It is being replaced by "weekend cram class training" and/or the more tedious world of “home study.” Both provide lots of technologically trained hams, but they do not turn out skilled operators or hams who really appreciate the art of amateur radio. Only one-on-one “mentoring” or “Elmering” can do that.

“The Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project” is to be a similarly structured program that fosters those one-on-one relationships that go well beyond the knowledge necessary to pass a ham radio exam. It will put an emphasis on our traditional ham radio values by placing new hams into contact with skilled operators who are willing to teach them such radio art-forms as how to work DX, or run a contest, build and operate a repeater, talk by bouncing signals off the moon, kit construction and anything else that makes a ham a ham. In essence, to pass along the living traditions that make ham radio what it is to all of us old timers.

To make this work, two groups of hams are needed. First we need skilled operators who are willing to donate time to assist those in need of training. We also need new hams to come forward and say: “I want to learn more.” We will do our part by matching the mentors to those in need of Elmering.

To get the project underway we have asked Joe Eisenberg, K0NEB, to create the necessary databases and begin the process of matching volunteer mentors to those wishing instruction. We are also asking both groups to send us an e-mail at mentor@arnewsline.org. In your note please state if you are offering to be a mentor or are in need of training. Please include your name, call, address, e-mail address with zipcode, phone number, best time of day to call and any other pertinent information.

It is our hope that the nation's Amateur Radio community will join with us to make "The Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project" a part of the traditions of the hobby, and that it will become a lasting memorial to the radio amateur who gave so much of his life to making Amateur Radio the best hobby and service in the universe.

.

-30-

1914. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 14:41:35 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc1kriv.33t.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 86690

In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally,
> but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
> requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others

gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.

Alex / AB2RC

1915. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.How

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 14:49:45 UTC
From: Michael Coslo <mjc5@enoughalready.psu.edu>
Message-ID: <bvdqujrdq1@f04n12.cac.psu.edu>
Source record: 86691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Mike,
>
> If BS were to be the qualifying factor for a Tech, everyone in the
> newsgroups would likely qualify :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Haven't heard from you for a while, Jim!

1916. Another Life Ruined by the Evil Bush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 16:47:09 UTC
From: anon <anon@noanonone.net>
Message-ID: <bve1q5cfp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> *** Bush cost me my job, my kids and my houses ***
>
> Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak my mind. I lost my
> job this past year. When Clinton was president I was secure and
> prosperous, but in the last year, we had to close our operations. We
> simply could not compete with foreign labor. This foreign labor worked
> for low pay under very bad conditions.
>
> They worked very long shifts, and many even died on the job.
>
> This competition could hardly be called "fair." I was forced out of
> the place where I had worked for 34 years.
>
> Not a single government program was there to help me.
>
> How can Bush call himself "compassionate?" Far worse, I lost two of my
> sons in Bush's evil war in Iraq. They gave their lives for their
> country, and for what? So that Bush's oil buddies can get rich. My
> pain of losing my sons is indescribable.
>
> While it is trivial next to the loss of my sons, I regret to say that
> I also lost my home. I simply have nothing left. How can Bush call
> himself a Christian when he neglects people like me? I am a senior
> citizen with various medical problems. I'm not in a position where I
> can begin a new career. I was reduced to the point where I had to live
> in a hole in a ground, all because of President Bush.
>
> And when the authorities found me there, did they have any compassion
> for my misfortune and ailments? No, I was arrested. Mr. Bush, I dare
> you to look me in the face and tell me you are a compassionate man! I
> dare you to look me in the face and tell me you are a Christian. If I
> had any money left, I would donate it to the Democrat Party.
>
> If Al Gore had been elected in 2000 I would still have a job, a home,
> and most importantly, my dear sons!
>
> Regards,
> Saddam Hussein
>
>
>
> .

1917. Re: Another Life Ruined by the Evil Bush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 17:15:47 UTC
From: Harold Burton <hwburton@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <101l48acip0t73c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"anon" <anon@noanonone.net> wrote in message
news:bve1q5cfp0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > *** Bush cost me my job, my kids and my houses ***
> > If Al Gore had been elected in 2000 I would still have a job, a home,
> > and most importantly, my dear sons!
> >
> > Regards,
> > Saddam Hussein

Turned out a whole lot funnier than I would have thought just reading the
beginning of the lament.

Harold
KD5SAK

1918. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 17:19:23 UTC
From: Harold Burton <hwburton@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <101l4f8c47n09d8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86694

"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
news:slrnc1kriv.33t.alex@homer.linux1.lan...
> In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT
wrote:
> > the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes,
occasionally,
> > but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
> > requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others
>
> gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
> simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
>
> Alex / AB2RC

I'd hate to think what kind of sex oriented twist some folks might
place on my callsign and it's the original assigned to me by the FCC.

Harold
KD5SAK

1919. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 17:41:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <n9idnRzb3-nWBYfdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86695

Alex Flinsch wrote:
> In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>>the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally,
>>but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
>>requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others
>
>
> gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
> simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
>
> Alex / AB2RC

Are you kidding? I doubt she can even send Morse.

1920. New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 18:02:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86696

Tech at 5 years old
General at 6
Extra at 7

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

1921. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1381 – January 30, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 19:50:18 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040130145018.21736.00000742@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 86697

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1381 – January 30, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1381 with a release date of Friday, January 30, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Hams across the nation react to the ARRL restructuring proposal and the first B-P-L law suit involving ham radio is threatened in Austria. These stories and an interview with ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, highlight this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1381 coming your way right now!

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: HAMS REACT TO THE ARRL NO-CODE PROPOSAL

Hams are starting to react to the recent ARRL proposal to restructure the United States Amateur Radio service, and not surprising the comments are as diverse as the community itself. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, is at our South-East Bureau with this part of the story:

--

If you listen to the ham bands and check out the comments on the qrz.com website, it appears that most amateur radio operators have a somewhat sedate response to the ARRL's restructuring proposal. While some activists make their opposition quite vocal, the majority of comments so far seem to accept the League's initiative, 'though some do express reservations.

"I can live with this" is how some comments go. Others more strongly support the League by saying, "right on, A-double-R-L." The biggest concern most express centers around the ability to monitor the airwaves for rules compliance if explosive growth results. As one operator on 15 meters says, "If we get a million new hams, will the FCC give us 500 more Riley Hollingsworth's to keep them in line?" Hollingsworth handles amateur radio enforcement matters for the Commission.

Some operators say the League's proposal will wind up dumbing down amateur radio. Some even claim to have resigned their ARRL membership, 'though so far, no proof of that has surfaced. Vehement opponents of restructuring may in fact terminate their League memberships, but the number is not expected to be significant.

Restructuring is not a done deal. Announcement of the League's proposal is only the start. The League will formally request that the FCC make a rules change. Once the Commission receives that request, it will be up to the FCC to decide

whether or not it will consider the League proposal put it out for public comment. Chances are that it will. Once the proposal is assigned a rule making designation, you will have a chance to make your opinion known.

Comments are likely to come from the general public, the business community and any special interest groups as well as those who hold an FCC assigned call sign.

Stay tuned -- the story's just beginning.

From the South-East Bureau in Birmingham Alabama, I'm David Black, KB4KCH, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Unless the FCC decides to place the ARRL request on a separate fast-track, you can expect the agency’s first action to be putting it out for initial comment sometime in the next several weeks. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESTRUCTURING: THE ARRL ON THE ARRL RESTRUCTURING PROPOSAL

The ARRL is now explaining why it has decided to ask the FCC to restructure the United States Amateur Radio Service, and the words are coming straight from the top. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, caught up with ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, by phone and got some insight into why the ARRL Board acted as it did :

--
With the American Radio Relay League's imminent filing with the FCC of its proposal for a new, no-code HF entry level license, the debate is certain to heat up.

ARRL President Jim Haynie W5JBP acknowledges the league's proposal will generate some controversy. But he says months of research, surveys and lots of internal debate went into crafting the revival of a Novice-class license.

Yes, Haynie confides, the ARRL's directors and Haynie himself were pressing the flesh - so to speak - for months gathering input from the amateur community. Directors also were conducting informal surveys among ARRL members. And, he says, a professional research company was hired by the league to survey hams about the state of the hobby.

Haynie says the research company's findings were pretty sobering and bolstered the ARRL board's drive for license reform.

"For example, 53 percent, if my memory serves me correct, today of all amateurs now are 55 years or older," Haynie says. "And this is growing at an exponential rate, it's not linear. And this is a very disturbing thought."

He says the results also revealed something the ARRL suspected for some time.

"There's people getting licenses and they're getting involved in what we call, or what I call '2-meter ghettos' and they have no place else to go so they lose

interest after about a year or six months or whatever," Haynie explains. "So you've got 200,000 or 300,000 Technician licenses out there who say 'I've tried' and they did and they didn't like it."

Haynie says it became clear one way to recapture the magic of the hobby lay in the experiences many long-time hams had when they first entered amateur radio.

"We went back and thought about, okay, how did it used to work and what was successful about it? And the old Novice class license was extremely successful, I think. And, we said, 'Well, okay then we have to go back to some form of that.' "

Last year's World Radiocommuncations Conference laid the ground work for countries to decide for themselves what to do about CW and licensing. But Haynie says the WRC '03 decision played a small role in the ARRL's deliberations.

"Morse Code is certainly tradition, I don't deny that," Haynie says. "And I think it's a neat ability. It's a skill. It has nothing to do with intelligence."

Haynie says he and other directors have heard some argue: 'Hey, I had to pass a code test, why shouldn't everyone else.' Haynie says that's like saying I'd like to play golf like Tiger Woods and coming to the realization that's probably not going to happen because you simply don't possess the skills - even with lots of practice. The same logic, he says, applies to CW. For many hams, he says, it's simply not their bag.

Haynie says the ARRL's proposal preserves CW for one license class, yet opens the doors to the world of HF for those who couldn't learn and master Morse Code to pass even a 5-words-per-minute test.

"People, they realize, they've come to grips: We are getting older. And we're not getting the people into Amateur Radio," Haynie says.

"And the amateur community realizes that we've gotta do something. And, I don't say that the league's proposal is perfect. Neither does any of the directors or officers of the league say that. But it was the best that we could come up with that still preserved the Morse Code tradition for the Extra class exam, and yet, gave you the taste of the old Novice that I used to have 30-something years ago."

Haynie says he's confident, based on his experience with the FCC, that the agency will look favorably on the ARRL license proposal.

"I have a gut feeling that they will take a majority of it, at least I think they will. They'll probably fine tune it, they'll tweak it some because that's typical of the federal government," Haynie says.

"But on the other hand, I know, I know that they want to simplify the Amateur Radio Service. They want three classes of licenses. They want to reduce their workload and continue to do what they like to do and amateur radio take care of itself."

And how long does Haynie think it will take the FCC to act and make any changes to the Amateur Radio license structure? He says don't expect a decision anytime soon.

"I don't see anything happening on any of the petitions, including the league's, probably 'til late 2005," Haynie concludes.

Haynie says his e-mail and phone have been busy since the board's vote two weeks ago. He says he's comfortable with the license proposal and is prepared to support and defend it.

Haynie says he had the chance to do so earlier this week before his hometown radio club in Garland, Texas. He says after explaining the league's rationale to the group, those willing to listen asked lots of questions. Haynie says he felt by the time it was over, many appreciated the league's work on behalf of the hobby.

Haynie's next stop: The 44th Tropical Hamboree in Miami on February 7 where he's expecting to get lots of feedback.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz NT3V in Philadelphia.

--

If all went as expected, the ARRL was to transmit its proposal to the FCC on Wednesday, January 28th. And less we forget, a word of congratulations to Jim Haynie on his election to a third term leading the United States only recognized Amateur Radio society. The ARRL Letter Board of Directors expressed its confidence in W5JBP’s leadership on January 16 with a unanimous vote for his him to continue as President. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Catalina repeater Association system serving the City of Angeles from picturesque Catalina Island off the California coastline.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: AUSTRIAN BPL PROVIDER SUING HAMS OVER NEWS STORY

In what looks to be a case of “he said -- no -- he said,” a row is brewing over the introduction of Broadband over Powerline telecommunications in the city of Linz, Austria. One that has a service provider taking that nations Amateur Radio society to court over statements quoted in the media world-wide.

As reported a few weeks ago, stories were circulating that PLT, or Power Line Telecommunications as the Europeans call their BPL system, had been halted in Linz. This, due to interference caused by the system. Also that the Austrian government had enjoined the service provider and the system would never be permitted.

Not true says the BPL provider and the power company and its now headed to court to try to stop the hams from complaining to them and to the press. From across the Atlantic, Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has more:

--

The Austrian national amateur radio society, OeVSV, has objected to the use of PLT in Linz, stating that it causes interference to amateur stations, and issuing a press release which was picked up by the Austrian mass media. It appears that the OeVSV was misquoted as saying that the Austrian ministry had taken out an injunction against the PLT providers and that the service had been closed down for good in Linz.

The management of Speed-Web Consulting and Linz AG, who are responsible for the PLT transmissions, are disclaiming what they say are "press attacks by Austrian radio amateurs". They say that there has not been any injunction against them and the roll-out of PLT continues.

Speed-Web and Linz AG say that Austrian radio amateurs are doing their best to stop PLT "by filing undue interference complaints". They go on to say that "if there should be any actual, harmful and officially proven interference case caused by Powerline Communications, mitigation measures will solve this very case at that specific location in the concerned frequency".

On the 14th of January, Linz AG stated that it would be suing the OeVSV, as well as its president personally, over this matter.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

The decision of Linz A G to sue the ham radio operators over the story of BPL says that in this one, big business is willing to go the whole nine yards. (GB2RS)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: FCC'S ABERNATHY ACKNOWLEDGES AMATEUR RADIO BPL CONCERNS

Here at home, FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy is apparently shifting away from her definition of BPL as a "Broadband Nirvana.” Last week Abernathy specifically cited Amateur Radio concerns about the interference potential of Broadband Over Power Line in remarks she delivered to the Catholic University of America's Columbus School of Law.

According to the ARRL Letter, Abernathy said BPL should not be widely deployed before dealing with ham radio's interference fears. She admitted that she now recognizes that Amateur Radio licensees have raised concerns about the potential for harmful interference. Abernathy described this as something that will have to be addressed before any mass market deployment can occur.

Commissioner Abernathy made her remarks on January 22 at the school's Washington, DC campus. Abernathy said that if engineers can find a way to prevent harmful interference to other radio services, BPL would represent a tremendous advance for consumers, because it could bring broadband to any home

that has electric power delivery. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: CONGRESS MAY RAISE INDECENCY AND OBSCENITY FINES

Using obscene and indecent language on the airwaves may soon get very expensive. This as congress considers raising the stakes for those who insist on talking dirty on the radio. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has the details:

--
United States Representative Fred Upton of Michigan introduced congressional legislation to upthe maximum fine for an indecent broadcast from $27,500 to $275,000. Under the Upton sponsored measure the maximum fine for a continuing violation would be raised from $300,000 to $3 million.

Upton had also scheduled hearings to review the FCC's indecency enforcement policies for January 28th. Ken Johnson, a spokesman for Representative Billy Tauzin of Louisiana is quoted as saying that law makers intend to move the legislation quickly in hopes of sending a signal to broadcasters that enough is enough.

This action comes following recent complaints by FCC Chairman Michael Powell. He says that the existing penalty cap on indecency fines was too low to discourage off-color broadcasts.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

--

Commissioner Powell believes that once broadcasters start to feel the pinch where in their wallets they will start to think twice about transmitting indecency on the airwaves. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UPS TO THE FCC: YOU HAVE OUR FULL COOPERATION

The FCC has received a letter from United Parcel Service offering the company’s full cooperation in removing any unlicensed radio equipment from its nationwide fleet. This follows a January 7th letter to the Middlesburg Ohio office of U-P-S detailing unlicensed 10 meter operations coming from delivery vehicles in that area.

The FCC also has contacted another trucking company, R and L Transfer of Norwalk Ohio regarding the same type of problem. Unlicensed operators coming to the 10 meter band has been a growing problem around the world in recent years. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THAT RADAR IS A NO-NO

The FCC has also written to a pair of hams in the Winfield and Haysville Kansas area. This, regarding a reported piece of marine radar equipment mounted in a land based vehicle. According to the FCC the radar unit was being used for storm spotting without being licensed for this use. The identities of those using the radar system were not revealed. (FCC)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: OKLAHOMA IN MARCH

Turning to the social scene, the Green Country Hamfest and ARRL Oklahoma Section Convention is slated for Friday and Saturday, March 19th and 20th at the Claremore Exposition Center in Claremore Oklahome. Claremore is not far from Tulsa, and the event will feature free parking, loads of vendors, on-site ham radio exams, numerous forum sessions along with some truly nifty prizes. More information is on the web at www.greencountryhamfest.com (KC5FM)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: FIRE CANT STOP THE DIXIFEST IN MEMPHIS

Despite a fire that destroyed its normal venue, Dixiefest 2004 in Memphis Tennessee will happen the weekend of February 14 and 15. Planners were able to find a new home at the Mid-South Fairgrounds' Pipkin Building. This is only a proverbial stones-throw from the Shelby County Building which was destroyed in the December 2003 blaze. More information about this premiere event can be found on-line. Just take your web browser to www.dixifest.org and take a peek. (Via e-mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

OUR GOLDEN PAST: CARL & JERRY "LIVE" AGAIN

Its time for a trip back to the 1950's. To a kinder and gentler Amateur Radio. Our tour guide for this journey is Bruce Tennant, K6PZW:

--]

Remember the names Carl and Jerry? Well if you were playing with ham radio in the 1950's and 1960's you are well aware that these are the first names of the two fictitious teenage electronic whizze's. Characters created by the late John T. Frye, W9EGV, for his long-running magazine series of the same name.

The Carl and Jerry stories appeared in Popular Electronics from October 1954 through December 1964. They told of the adventures of two perennial teenage boys who shared a special bond because of their shared love of music, electronics and radio. Now, many of these stories are again available to read to enjoy thanks to a new spot on the world-wide-web. Better yet, they are the kind of stuff you may want to read to your grandkids, especially if they have the same wonderment as you when you were their age.

Where are they and how do you these Pop Com classics? Thats easy. Just follow to link you will find in this weeks print edition of this Amateur Radio Newsline report. And good news for our sight impaired listeners. Word is that the print works well with most devices to help the blind to read as well.

Traveling back in time for the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, enjoying the past.

--

So far there are only 21 of the stories in the seriers on the web, but enough to keep you glued to your computer screen for several hours. They are there to read at http://home.gwi.net/~jdebell/pe/cj/cnjindex.htm (ARNewsline(tm))
**

INTERNATIONAL - IARU: NEW IARU REGION 2 ARDF WEBSITE

Back to the present and word that Region II of the International Amateur Radio Union now has web site to serve as the voice of its Amateur Radio Direction Finding Working Group. The site provide links to official rules and regional results along with contact information for A-R-D-F groups and individuals throughout the Region.

Plans call for the site to be in four languages that include English, Spanish, French, and Portuguese. If you have any comments or wish to volunteer with the translations, please contact Dale Hunt, WB6BYU or Ken Harker ,WM5R. Their respective e-mails are wb6byu@arrl.net and wm5r@arrl.net. The website can be found at www.ardf-r2.org (Press release)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UNITED KINGDOM: OFCOM NEW TELECOM REGULATOR

From the international wire, word that Ofcom is name of the new regulator of Amateur Radio in the United Kingdom. The agency also holds responsibility for control other services that include broadcast television, radio, and numerous wireless communications services. More about Ofcom is on-line www.ofcom.org.uk (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - VK: AN AUSTRALIAN LICENSE IS REQUIRED

A note to those of you who intend to operate from Australia on an extended visit. It appears that many amateurs, including those operating maritime mobile from within Australia's territorial waters, are using their own callsign with the 'stroke VK' suffix. Under Australian telecommunications law, this is

not permitted for any lengthy stay. Once past the grace period, all radio amateurs operating from Australia, and more importantly, from Australia's territorial waters must obtain an Australian license and individual VK callsign from the Australian Communications Authority. If you don't you will be told to go off the air. (Q-News, RSGB)

**

INTRUDER WATCH: HARMONICS BOTHER 20 METERS

An unidentified broadcaster on 14.280 MHz, has been identified as a harmonic of a Radio Liberty. The transmitter in question operates on 4.760 MHz and it's the 3rd harmonic that been heard in V-K-Land.

Meantime, another intruder on 14.320 MHz has been found to be Radio Uzbeckistan. This time it's the 2nd harmonic of a transmitter on 7.160 that's responsible for what's being heard. (Q-News)

**

WITH THE ARRL: MAJOR CHANGE IN DXCC POLICY ANNOUNCED

A major change in the criteria for determining what is a new DXCC entity. An ARRL news release says that the organizations Board of Directors has removed the guideline that provides for an entity to be added to the DXCC list if it has a separate International Amateur Radio Union member society. The ARRL says that this provision had the unintended consequence of bringing in applications for IARU membership that do not further the objectives of the organization. In fact, all it has done is to create what ARRL terms as an unfortunate and unnecessary administrative burden for the IARU. (ARRL)

**

DX

In DX, Dwayne Barbee KE4RVT is the latest ham on the air from war-torn Iraq. Q-R-Zed dot com reports that Barbee received his Amateur radio license from the Ministry of Communication on January 25th. He has been assigned YI9RVT and will be operating SSB and CW on all bands for the next 12 to 18 months from the city of Al Kut. (qrz.com)

And word that SM5DIC was scheduled to return to the Democratic Republic of Congo on the 20th of January. He will be there for two months and will operate the club call 9QZ0AR in his spare time. (GB2RS)

Also, AA1M and W1USN will be active as J3 stroke their home calls from Grenada to the 6th of February. They will operate CW, SSB and some PSK on the High Frequency bands. For all of these operations, QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: RADIO FROM SPACE - THE SETI INSTITUTE IS MONITORING

Lastly this week, scientists searching the stars for aliens are convinced an E.T. is out there -- it's just that they haven't had the know-how to detect such a being. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the rest of the story:

--
Science Online says that technological advances have opened the way for scientists to check millions of previously unknown star systems, dramatically increasing the chances of finding intelligent life in outer space in the next 25 years.

The article quotes Seth Shostak. Shostak is the senior astronomer at California's non-profit Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Institute says that it is like looking for needles in the haystack that is our galaxy, but there could be thousands of needles out there. But on a recent visit to Australia to attend a conference on extraterrestrial research, Shostak said detecting alien life is only the start.

Since it was founded in 1984, the SETI Institute has monitored radio signals, hoping to pick up a transmission from outer space. Its Project Phoenix conducts two annual three-week sessions on a radio telescope at Arecibo, Puerto Rico. Project Phoenix, is the privately funded successor to an original NASA program that searched the heavens for signals from extra-terrestrial beings. That program was canceled in 1993 amid much skepticism in the Congress regarding the possibility of life in outer space.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline. I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP

--

But Science Online says that the search has been slow. About 500 of 1,000 targeted stars have been examined and no extraterrestrial transmissions have been heard. (ScienceOnLine)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the newly created Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is up and operating. We already have signed up close to a dozen hams who are willing to assist others. If you can help, or if you need assistance please drop a note with your name, address, hone number and area of expertise to mentor@arnewsline.org

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved. Now please stand by for a special

mesaage regarding Amateur Radio Newsline's current financial situation from Andy Jarema, N6TCQ. It following this 5 second pause.

--
5 sec pause
--

This is Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Chief Financial Officer of the not-for-profit organization you know as the Amateur Radio Newsline. And once again, I am using the single word -- HELP! If you value this service, please help. We try to keep these kind of thing as subtle as we can.

You responded so wonderfully to our plea last April, and we haven't really asked for anything
since. But, unfortunately, your response dwindled in the waning months. The expenses of bringing you the up-to-date news on Amateur Radio did not.

We'd really like to hear from you. And we'd really like to hear from the repeater clubs out
there. These are the wonderful folks who re-transmit our broadcasts, bringing your nets increased value, and giving your members the latest in Amateur Radio news and information to enhance their hobby.

But Amateur Radio Newsline cannot continue without the funding needed to pay the monthly bills. And right now, we can't.

In the quarter century that it has existed, no one at the Amateur Radio Newsline has ever taken a salary. We all volunteer our time and talents. But what we ARE faced with are monthly expenses for gathering and delivering the news to YOU! We are talking telephone, Internet access and the like. This has not changed.

The bottom line is this: I'm asking that you try to find it within your organization or yourself as an amateur to continue this service. As we've said before, whether Amateur Radio Newsline continues to provide this service or if it disappears is totally your decision. We're here to serve
you for as long as you want us. Your response over the next several weeks will provide the answer.

The address for the Amateur Radio Newsline is Post Office Box 660937, Arcadia California, 91066.

Looking forward to hearing from you REALLY soon, I'm Andy Jarema, N-6-Tiny California Quake.

--End--

1922. Re: Code-Schmode! Try this proposal instead.How

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 20:18:19 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0401301218.2971bbed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86698
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Michael Coslo <mjc5@enoughalready.psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<bvdqujrdq1@f04n12.cac.psu.edu>...
> Jim Hampton wrote:
> > Mike,
> >
> > If BS were to be the qualifying factor for a Tech, everyone in the
> > newsgroups would likely qualify :)
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> Haven't heard from you for a while, Jim!

I don't see the point of code being a requirement these days, but I don't see the "no code" licensing the only reason for all the wackos being on the HAM band. Good HAM's totally outnumber bad HAM's, the majority of HAM's I've listened too are good users of the bands. There has been always wackos and crackpots on the radio, and then you have your old-school HAM's who passed all those code tests back in the day and still act like kooks. I've certainily heard them on there.

It's the responsibility factor, not much of this exists these days, especially when times change, your going to have more increasing numbers of kooks no matter if the code is eliminated or not.

1923. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 21:02:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401301302.1d41b20e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86699

Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
news:<slrnc1kriv.33t.alex@homer.linux1.lan>...
> In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally,
> > but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
> > requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others
>
> gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
> simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
>
> Alex / AB2RC

Great for contests and DX!

1924. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 21:04:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401301304.2d985942@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86700

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4019534B.651F3870@earthlink.net>...

> Leonard, the word is "sycophants". Master it. Make it your own.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you appear to have it mastered. Run with it.

1925. My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 22:27:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86601

For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:

(1) Amateur Basic.

Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz, 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz. Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands. Morse Code endorsement required for operation in lower 100kHz of any band. Limit 100 watts output on any band.

(2) Amateur Advanced.

Additional written examination. All presently HF-licensed Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license. Privileges same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those previously code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees (not grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.

(3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life

(OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur Extra) Comprehensive closed-pool written test. REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific classifications) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.

Why?

Why not...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1926. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 22:52:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401301452.64bd296b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86602

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040129205621.11022.00003832@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401291458.3592f0b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Imagine a mode that is a combination of PSK-31 and
> SSB voice, with the PSK carrier where the SSB carrier
> would be. Send data and voice at the same time. Interesting?
> Yes! Possible? Of course! Legal? No.

After reassessing the idea in these terms, I stand corrected.

I have changed my mind. This DOES make more sense.

> > I have 52 DXCC entities on 75m phone and 87 on CW. I have 85 DXCC
> >entities on 40m phone. I am two shy of DXCC on 40m CW. Not bad for
> >low power and wire antennas close to the ground.
>
> dayum!

Tain't nuttin...My best friend (K4YJ) has numerous single-band
DXCC, WAZ, 5BWAZ, etc, with nothing mroe than the driven element of an
old butterfly beam in the attic of his townhouse in suburban Atlanta.
I thought I was doing pretty good till the shoeboxes full of QSL's at
his shack fell on me! =)

> >> HF FREQUENCY PLAN BY EMISSION BANDWIDTH - NOT MODE
> >> If we are to continue to advance amateur radio into
> >> the future, we need MODE FLEXIBILITY.
> >
> > After one reads through this post they will see that ALL you
> >suggest, in the end, is dropping specific modes by name. The result,
> >however, is just an expansion of the U.S. phone bands.
>
> It gets worse...
> >
> > Don't get me wrong, I completely agree that we can afford to
> >expand our phone allocations. However YOUR premise is that we enact
> >your ideas to deter "stifling" of experimentation.
> >
> I say widening the 'phone bands as much as is suggested is not a good thing
> at all.
>
> > In the long run, you're wedging more efficient narrowband modes
> >into smaller and smaller subbands to the preference of the less
> >efficient wideband modes...Specifically, SSB voice.

>
> Bingo.
> >
> >> Otherwise, we will be faced with the need to be
> >> constantly generating new proposals to the FCC to
> >> accomodate new technology. The simplest and best
> >> way to solve this problem is to divide the HF bands
> >> according to "emission bandwidth" for better
> >> distribution of spectrum activity.
> >> This will not only encourage new research and
> >> development in modulation techniques, but it will
> >> help amateurs to communicate with each other by
> >> breaking down the frequency/mode/band barriers
> >> which have confounded us on some bands for the
> >> past 40 years.
> >
> > All you've done is change the language. The application will be
> >unchanged.
>
> Sort of.

As I said, I've changed my mind. This is a good idea.

> >> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth
> >
> > No change here. This is exactly what we have right now.
>
> No it isn't! We're allowed USB voice *only* - nothing else - because
> NTIA says so.

And that's all they're likely to say, unless there is a proposal
put forth that makes it more efficient to do so.

My idea for 60 meters?

Limit ALL Amateur access to this band to persons participating in
ARES, RACES or other RECOGNIZED emergency service organization or
agency. This would include drills and nets of both Amateur and
non-Amateur organizations for practice purposes.

Takes steps to enact NTIA regulation changes to make this the
defacto liasion band between disaster relief agencies, both civil and
military.

> > The band here is only 50kHz wide to start with, yet you suggest
> >we allow phone operations to take up 80% of the band which means fewer
> >stations on the band at the same time. How is that an improvement?
>
> It isn't.

And I thought it was just me! =)

> >> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
> >
> > Why no protection for narrowband modes? PSK, AMTOR, RTTY, and
> >yes...CW.
>
> One guess why CW isn't mentioned...

=) Do I get THREE guesses...?!?!

> There's more to it than that, Steve, but the proposed solution creates
> more problems than it solves.
>
> I really do hope we get lots of newcomers, but 30% Novices in 6 years
> is kinda optimistic.

Waaaaaaaaaaay optimistic, I'd say...Hopeful, but optimistic.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1927. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 23:05:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401301505.7969340b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86603

"N8IE" <dot.com@dot.com> wrote in message
news:<XYYRb.50267$DE.13596@fe2.columbus.rr.com>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0401262136.4f60d263@posting.google.com...
> > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> news:<bOgRb.66553$f97.8011@fe3.columbus.rr.com>...

> Not anon at all.
> My point is very valid, NCI and their like have killed a once great hobby.

They have?

Hmmmm...I turned the radio on just as soon as I read this and
heard TONS of signals on HF and the local repeaters.

Local guys chatting about new license class just completed...

HF rocking with DX CW and SSB signals.

> The ARRL has abandoned the traditional Ham Radio (this is a matter of
> survival on their part, they know the turn Ham Radio has taken and will
> travel that path to save their jobs) and soon the radio manufacturers will
> press for a more open market in which to sell their wares by wanting the
> elimination of testing all together.

And if they ONLY catered to "traditional" Ham Radio, what then?
They'd be catering to an ever-dwindling fraction of the Amateur Radio
community and THAT would be the death of their jobs!

> There is no "What now", it's too late, Ham Radio is dead.
> Joke all you want about CB'ers taking over, but don't too shocked when it
> happens. Thanks to Fred, Steve, and the likes.
>
> As for the rest of your post, I won't stoop to your level to reply, sorry.

You have already stooped LOWER than you think...by making
assertions that are easily disproven and are, at the very worst,
supermarket tabloid headlines.

Try again.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1928. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 23:06:55 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0401301506.4db43d57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86604

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
> Tech at 5 years old
> General at 6
> Extra at 7
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Very VERY kewl! Thanks for sharing it.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1929. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 23:50:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401301550.2a10397f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86605

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
> Tech at 5 years old
> General at 6
> Extra at 7
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I think you've finally found Larry's equal.

1930. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-30 23:51:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401301551.43dbd7d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86606

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<n9idnRzb3-nWBYfdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>...
> Alex Flinsch wrote:
> > In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> >>the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally,
> >>but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
> >>requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others
> >
> >
> > gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
> > simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
> >
> > Alex / AB2RC
>
> Are you kidding? I doubt she can even send Morse.

You don't have to send - just copy.

1931. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 01:19:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401B029A.30A8ABB0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86607

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4019534B.651F3870@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Leonard, the word is "sycophants". Master it. Make it your own.

> Dave, you appear to have it mastered. Run with it.

Well, well. Begin writing of sycophants and one pops out of the
woodwork.
Give my regards to Doctor Evil.

Dave K8MN

1932. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 03:35:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040130223533.07155.00000388@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86608

In article <40180C7E.2010706@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> Even if the data rate is slowed down?
>>
>> If there's anything that deserves spectrum space for experimentation,
>> it's digital modes, not analog voice modes.
>
>
> DId you read the review in QST about the digital box you attach to your

>HF rig?
>
> It sounded like a pretty good thing, until they pointed out it's fatal
>deficiency near the end. I shouldn't b that harsh - if it is a fixed
>frequency application, then it won't be too bad.
>
>You just have to be listening at the right frequency at the beginning of
>a transmission, or it's no hearee! My guess is that anything that will
>allow you to pick up a transmission in the middle of a transmission will
>boost the bandwidth requirements up quite a bit.

It's just one try at it. There are other ways.

For example, listen to people talk sometime and notice how many pauses most people insert in their speech. Some folks' speech is full of umms and ahhs because they are mentally trying to "hold the VOX". (I'm not making this up - listen to *how* people speak, rather than what they are saying, and note how the odd patterns!)

Suppose that before modulation the digitized signal compressed the pauses and on the receive end they were expanded. Or maybe left out if they were over a certain length. The digital signal could be sent at a slower pace and yet catch up during the pauses.

Maybe simply trade bandwidth for speech rate. You stop talking and the rig takes a few seconds to finish sending - no problem!

Point is, a lot of experimentation in this area is hampered or discouraged by the current rules. That's why folks like Hans and I commented *against* ARRL's "novice refarming" proposal some time back, saying the kHz would be better reused as a digital sandbox rather than simply more SSB space.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1933. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 04:45:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <EKGdnZYdCspQqYbdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86609

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<n9idnRzb3-nWBYfdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Alex Flinsch wrote:
>>
>>>In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally,
>>>>but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
>>>>requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others
>>>
>>>
>>>gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
>>>simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
>>>
>>>Alex / AB2RC
>>
>>Are you kidding? I doubt she can even send Morse.
>
>
> You don't have to send - just copy.

So how are you going to converse with another Morse station, assuming
you are in the CW portion of the band, if you don't send? Reread the
post, it was talking about sending.

1934. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 06:10:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <AFHSb.3568$jH6.158@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86610

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) Unfortunately, the image is
> objectionable in any context, and it's
> effect on the ARS has the potential
> to be exactly as Mr. Hollingsworth
> predicted.

If you say so, Larry. I, on the other hand, don't have the time right now
to continue this.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1935. Re: OT- How to be a Net Tough Guy (a must read)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 07:40:59 UTC
From: "Vanilla Gorilla (Monkey Boy)" <vgorilla@pobox.alaska.net>
Message-ID: <qvmm105de1vmhgut9bsgdgotqok3pjei8r@4ax.com>
Source record: 86611
Cross-posted to: alt.fan.art-bell,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 30 Jan 2004 00:18:55 -0500, "Viceroy Fraterus Vehiocipede"
<dw2dw2d1@yahoo.com> wrote in alt.fan.art-bell:

>Hilarious article.
>
>"I Wanna Be an Internet Tough Guy"
> - by 'lowtax'
>
>here: http://www.somethingawful.com/articles.php?a=1936
>
>This is a MUST READ for all r.r.s, a.f.a-b
>and r.r.a.p. "frequent flyer mile holders"...
>
>(.....you'll understand.......trust me!)

That's an awesome fucking website, man.
--
V.G.

"People are more violently opposed to fur than leather, because it is easier to harrass
rich women than it is motorcycle gangs." - Bumper Sticker
(This sig file contains not less than 80% recycled SPAM)

Sarcasm is my sword, Apathy is my shield.

1936. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 12:55:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040131075523.02537.00002764@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 86612

In article <dCTQb.27124$zj7.21663@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote
>
>| Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
>| don't see it starting up today.
>
>You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
>sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
>orientated types.

Also traffic handlers, ragchewers, DX and emergency types.
Skilled operators, IOW.

The early hams had to be technically oriented, because the equipment of the time demanded it. A ham who knew what s/he was doing could work the world with arelatively simple station, while a ham who didn't couldn't hear a station in the next town.

Of course, much of the development of electronics since those times has been aimed at reducing and eliminating the need for "users" to have technical knowledge and/or operator skill. Amateur radio is one of the few places where such things are considered important. Indeed, the whole concept of "radio operator" has largely disappeared outside amateur radio.

>That our service continues to exist today is a
>miracle, attributable mainly to the efforts of RAC, ARRL, DARC, JARL,
>IARU, RAE, RSGB, and all the other national societies who so far have
>convinced the regulators to allow us to continue.

And the hams who make up those organizations.
>
>The notion of a "start up" amateur radio service or any personal radio
>service with such broad gifts of spectrum and freedom to experiment as
>we enjoy wouldn't gain any traction at all in todays technological
>environment.
>
Exactly. What might be created would resemble MURS or FRS, with lots of restrictions and requirements, and very little of the freedom we take for granted.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1937. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 14:36:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86613

N2EY wrote:
> In article <dCTQb.27124$zj7.21663@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote
>>
>>| Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
>>| don't see it starting up today.
>>
>>You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
>>sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
>>orientated types.
>
>
> Also traffic handlers, ragchewers, DX and emergency types.
> Skilled operators, IOW.
>
> The early hams had to be technically oriented, because the
> equipment of the time demanded it. A ham who knew what s/he
> was doing could work the world with arelatively simple station,
> while a ham who didn't couldn't hear a station in the next
> town.
>
> Of course, much of the development of electronics since those
> times has been aimed at reducing and eliminating the need for
> "users" to have technical knowledge and/or operator skill.
> Amateur radio is one of the few places where such things are
> considered important. Indeed, the whole concept of "radio
> operator" has largely disappeared outside amateur radio.

Careful Jim!! One of the arguments against Morse testing is that
outside groups do not use Morse code any more, so it isn't needed. Since
outside groups don't use "trained radio operators" any more, this is one
more reason not to test for anything.

Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1938. Re: Do yourself a favor. Cancel your League membership now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 14:52:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401310652.6e04d8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86614

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<401B029A.30A8ABB0@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4019534B.651F3870@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Leonard, the word is "sycophants". Master it. Make it your own.
>
> > Dave, you appear to have it mastered. Run with it.
>
> Well, well. Begin writing of sycophants and one pops out of the
> woodwork.
> Give my regards to Doctor Evil.
>
> Dave K8MN

Doctor Evil? Are you reliving a 60's James Bond movie, in between
working out of band Frenchmen?

1939. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 14:56:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401310656.7ccf05e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86615

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401301505.7969340b@posting.google.com>...
> "N8IE" <dot.com@dot.com> wrote in message
news:<XYYRb.50267$DE.13596@fe2.columbus.rr.com>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:5c01b95b.0401262136.4f60d263@posting.google.com...
> > > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> > news:<bOgRb.66553$f97.8011@fe3.columbus.rr.com>...
>
> > Not anon at all.
> > My point is very valid, NCI and their like have killed a once great hobby.
>
> They have?
>
> Hmmmm...I turned the radio on just as soon as I read this and
> heard TONS of signals on HF and the local repeaters.
>
> Local guys chatting about new license class just completed...
>
> HF rocking with DX CW and SSB signals.

Steve, now that you're an NCI supporter, would you like to join?

bb

1940. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 15:03:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401310703.16c59bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86616

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>...
> For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>
> (1) Amateur Basic.
>
> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz. Same phone allocations as other
> licensees on HF bands. Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> tion in lower 100kHz of any band. Limit 100 watts output on any band.

Needs rf hazard study on 28Mhz with 100 watts.

>
> (2) Amateur Advanced.
>
> Additional written examination. All presently HF-licensed
> Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license. Privileges
> same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
> for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those previously
> code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees (not
> grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>
> (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life

Tell it like it is! Love it!!!

> (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur Extra)
> Comprehensive closed-pool written test. REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
> test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone
> allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific classifi-
> cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
>
> Why?
>
> Why not...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, other than one license class too many, and no term limit on
"basic," sounds reasonable.

1941. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 15:49:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 86617

In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:

For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at all.
>
> (1) Amateur Basic.
>
> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.

Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
use of the band?

> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.

You mean same as Extras have now?

> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.

Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
incentive to use voice only!

>Limit 100 watts output on any band.

Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?
>
> (2) Amateur Advanced.
>
> Additional written examination.

OK

> All presently HF-licensed
> Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.

Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!

> Privileges
> same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
> for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
>previously
> code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
>(not
> grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.

See above about code test.
>
> (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
>
> (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
>Extra)

I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.

> Comprehensive closed-pool written test.

How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you make a
case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the others?

> REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
>
> test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone
> allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
>classifi-
> cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
>
> Why?

Three levels - good.
Incremental power and privs - good
>
> Why not...?!?!
>
See above.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1942. great new page for hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 15:52:32 UTC
From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20040131105232.13174.00000684@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86618

http://hometown.aol.com/niw2004/myhomepage/

1943. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 18:18:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401311018.74b62a8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86619

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401310703.16c59bd@posting.google.com>...

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>...

> > For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> >
> > (1) Amateur Basic.
> >
> > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz. Same phone allocations as other
> > licensees on HF bands. Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > tion in lower 100kHz of any band. Limit 100 watts output on any band.
>
> Needs rf hazard study on 28Mhz with 100 watts.

Snip to...

> Steve, other than one license class too many, and no term limit on
> "basic," sounds reasonable.

Thanks, but what's the problem with an "rf hazard study"...?!?!
Everyone acts as though this is going to require a Master's degree to
accomplish. I don't see why any reasoable nudge towards anything
having to do with safety is an imposition...Other than it might
REQUIRE some acutal exercising of the grey matter, I think ALL classes
should have to do it at some point in time.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1944. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 18:39:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401311039.6961b3ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86620

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>
> For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at all.

Agreed, but then there are folks who are still insisting on a
second shooter on the Grassy Knoll. You can't please everyone!

> > (1) Amateur Basic.
> >
> > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
>
> Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
> use of the band?

80: Perhaps 80.

30: Let's leave this for folks who WANT to beep and for those
elusive
data modes.

20: This is where everyone wants to go and play...Let them get
their feet
wet on 17 and 15 meters...then they can come play with the
Big Boys.

12: If you're going to draw limitations on bands you have to
draw the
line somewhere.

1.25: I think this band is fodder, Jim. I realize that the metro
areas
(ie: NYC, LA, ATL, etc...) make better use of it, but we've
done
everything except beg the Pope to support the band. We can
give it
a shot, but the history of this band is that it won't
"sell".

> > Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
>
> You mean same as Extras have now?

>
> > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>
> Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> incentive to use voice only!

OK...Bottom 50kHz...?!?!

> >Limit 100 watts output on any band.
>
> Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?

It rrequires an eval >>IF<< you're using that much power.

As I asked "Billy Beeper", why is everyone running away from
trying to make sure we are as safe as we can be? Isn't this a part of
the "learning curve"...?!?!

> > (2) Amateur Advanced.
> >
> > Additional written examination.
>
> OK
>
> > All presently HF-licensed
> > Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.
>
> Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!

It's one-time and it's over.

If current expiration of Novices and Techs are any indicator,
most of those folks won't be taking advantage of it anyway.

> > Privileges
> > same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
> > for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
> >previously
> > code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
> >(not
> > grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>
> See above about code test.

Ditto my last. There's no "data" being used in the bottom 50 of
most bands...

> > (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
> >
> > (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
> >Extra)
>

> I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.

It's like swinging at a pinata...One guy makes a fool out of
himself while everyone else gets to laugh at the process!

> > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
>
> How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you make a
> case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the others?

Because this would be the "final exam". If someone is truly
worthy of having "the whole enchilada", then they should be able to
prove it.

And as for the "Bash" syndrome, I suggest a new line in Part 97:
"Test Confidentiality: Except for those test items released by the
VEC as approved by the Commission, it shall be a violation of this
Part to reveal content of any examination prepared for any Amateur
Radio operator examination."

> > REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
> >
> > test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone
> > allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
> >classifi-
> > cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
> >
> > Why?
>
> Three levels - good.
> Incremental power and privs - good
> >
> > Why not...?!?!
> >
> See above.

Ya still snowed in, Jim? Blue skies here, and I washed the car in
a scrub shirt this morning!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1945. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 18:44:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401311044.3c9be0ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86621

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message news:<1e4e3692.0401310656.7ccf05e2@posting.google.com>...

> Steve, now that you're an NCI supporter, would you like to join?

I am not an NCI supporter...I am resigned to the fact that we've tossed a major skill down the drain, and I'd just like to minimize the damage.

I served in the Armed Forces to protect the "majority rules" concept, and this is one of those times that I came out on the short end of the stick. Oh well...Got to make the best of it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1946. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 18:52:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0401311052.41519cba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86622

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040127124316.05957.00000174@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> There is absolutely NOTHING "wrong" with getting a block of
> frequencies just for recreation. R/C did it and modelers have NEVER
> claimed anything close to aiding homeland security or being of some
> vital and important aid in times of emergency.

Because, your Scumminess, that's NOT what they are trying to
accomplish, nor are they required by regulation to be able to assist
with.

> Amateur radio, if it came to be, would have a decidedly different
> scope of activities in this alternate universe. It would BEGIN to
> evolve, probably to something else, since there was no "tradition"
> to "preserve" nor any set of 1930s Standards and Practices to
> uphold 7 decades later. Radio amateurism would begin ANEW.

And it would STILL not include a lying putz like you...even if
you said "pretty please".

Steve, K4YZ

1947. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 19:46:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <401C0620.6030303@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86623

William wrote:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
>
>
>>Tech at 5 years old
>>General at 6
>>Extra at 7
>>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>I think you've finally found Larry's equal.
>
>
No way! Larry did 20! ;-)

1948. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 19:55:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040131145522.25517.00004000@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 86624

In article <5c01b95b.0401301452.64bd296b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040129205621.11022.00003832@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401291458.3592f0b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> Imagine a mode that is a combination of PSK-31 and
>> SSB voice, with the PSK carrier where the SSB carrier
>> would be. Send data and voice at the same time. Interesting?
>> Yes! Possible? Of course! Legal? No.
>
> After reassessing the idea in these terms, I stand corrected.
>
> I have changed my mind. This DOES make more sense.

Only if it's done right!
>
>> > I have 52 DXCC entities on 75m phone and 87 on CW. I have 85 DXCC
>> >entities on 40m phone. I am two shy of DXCC on 40m CW. Not bad for
>> >low power and wire antennas close to the ground.
>>
>> dayum!
>
> Tain't nuttin...My best friend (K4YJ) has numerous single-band
>DXCC, WAZ, 5BWAZ, etc, with nothing mroe than the driven element of an
>old butterfly beam in the attic of his townhouse in suburban Atlanta.
>I thought I was doing pretty good till the shoeboxes full of QSL's at
>his shack fell on me! =)

Gotta get me one o' them K4Yx calls...
>
>> >> HF FREQUENCY PLAN BY EMISSION BANDWIDTH - NOT MODE
>> >> If we are to continue to advance amateur radio into
>> >> the future, we need MODE FLEXIBILITY.
>> >
>> > After one reads through this post they will see that ALL you
>> >suggest, in the end, is dropping specific modes by name. The result,
>> >however, is just an expansion of the U.S. phone bands.
>>
>> It gets worse...
>> >
>> > Don't get me wrong, I completely agree that we can afford to
>> >expand our phone allocations. However YOUR premise is that we enact

>> >your ideas to deter "stifling" of experimentation.
>> >
>> I say widening the 'phone bands as much as is suggested is not a good thing
>> at all.
>>
>> > In the long run, you're wedging more efficient narrowband modes
>> >into smaller and smaller subbands to the preference of the less
>> >efficient wideband modes...Specifically, SSB voice.
>>
>> Bingo.
>> >
>> >> Otherwise, we will be faced with the need to be
>> >> constantly generating new proposals to the FCC to
>> >> accomodate new technology. The simplest and best
>> >> way to solve this problem is to divide the HF bands
>> >> according to "emission bandwidth" for better
>> >> distribution of spectrum activity.
>> >> This will not only encourage new research and
>> >> development in modulation techniques, but it will
>> >> help amateurs to communicate with each other by
>> >> breaking down the frequency/mode/band barriers
>> >> which have confounded us on some bands for the
>> >> past 40 years.
>> >
>> > All you've done is change the language. The application will be
>> >unchanged.
>>
>> Sort of.
>
> As I said, I've changed my mind. This is a good idea.

Only if it's done so as to not simply crush the CW/digital folks under a wave
of SSB. The basic concept proposed is OK, the implementation is awful.
>
>> >> 5MHz channels - mode <2.8kHz bandwidth
>> >
>> > No change here. This is exactly what we have right now.
>>
>> No it isn't! We're allowed USB voice *only* - nothing else - because
>> NTIA says so.
>
> And that's all they're likely to say, unless there is a proposal
>put forth that makes it more efficient to do so.

Too soon to do that. We've had 60 m for how long? How many hams use 60?
>
> My idea for 60 meters?
>
> Limit ALL Amateur access to this band to persons participating in
>ARES, RACES or other RECOGNIZED emergency service organization or
>agency. This would include drills and nets of both Amateur and

>non-Amateur organizations for practice purposes.

That's a step backwards. Would generate less interest in the band.
>
> Takes steps to enact NTIA regulation changes to make this the
>defacto liasion band between disaster relief agencies, both civil and
>military.

Possible. In any event, we'd have to match their modes!

>> > The band here is only 50kHz wide to start with, yet you suggest
>> >we allow phone operations to take up 80% of the band which means fewer
>> >stations on the band at the same time. How is that an improvement?
>>
>> It isn't.
>
> And I thought it was just me! =)

It isn't.
>
>> >> 24890 to 24990 any mode <3kHz bandwidth
>> >
>> > Why no protection for narrowband modes? PSK, AMTOR, RTTY, and
>> >yes...CW.
>>
>> One guess why CW isn't mentioned...
>
> =) Do I get THREE guesses...?!?!

Do you need more than one? ;-)
>
>> There's more to it than that, Steve, but the proposed solution creates
>> more problems than it solves.
>>
>> I really do hope we get lots of newcomers, but 30% Novices in 6 years
>> is kinda optimistic.
>
> Waaaaaaaaaaay optimistic, I'd say...Hopeful, but optimistic.
>
Let's be wildly optimistic and say the proposal results in 40,000 newcomers per year. Let's also say that each year 30,000 (about 4%) of those licensed today drop out.

Then in six years we'll have 60,000 more hams than today - about 744,000. Of these, 240,000 will have joined in the intervening 6 years. That's about 30% - but *only* if none of the newcomers comes in as anything but a Novice, and *only* if not one of them upgrades!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1949. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 20:00:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BqednaH4DOfFIlHdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86625

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>
>>>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>>
>>For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at all.
>
>
> Agreed, but then there are folks who are still insisting on a
> second shooter on the Grassy Knoll. You can't please everyone!
>
>
>>> (1) Amateur Basic.
>>>
>>> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
>>> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
>>
>>Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
>>use of the band?
>
>
> 80: Perhaps 80.
>
> 30: Let's leave this for folks who WANT to beep and for those
> elusive
> data modes.
>
> 20: This is where everyone wants to go and play...Let them get
> their feet
> wet on 17 and 15 meters...then they can come play with the
> Big Boys.
>
> 12: If you're going to draw limitations on bands you have to
> draw the
> line somewhere.
>
> 1.25: I think this band is fodder, Jim. I realize that the metro
> areas
> (ie: NYC, LA, ATL, etc...) make better use of it, but we've

> done
> everything except beg the Pope to support the band. We can
> give it
> a shot, but the history of this band is that it won't
> "sell".
>
>
>>>Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
>>
>>You mean same as Extras have now?
>>
>>
>>> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
>>> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>>
>>Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
>>incentive to use voice only!
>
>
> OK...Bottom 50kHz...?!?!
>
>
>>>Limit 100 watts output on any band.
>>
>>Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?
>
>
> It rrequires an eval >>IF<< you're using that much power.
>
> As I asked "Billy Beeper", why is everyone running away from
> trying to make sure we are as safe as we can be? Isn't this a part of
> the "learning curve"...?!?!

Very good point, Steve! If we have to learn about RF safety, we might
as well use it. I would want ANY amateur at ANY license level to be
capable of doing an RF safety evaluation. To not have such a thing is to
me criminal negligence!

>
>>> (2) Amateur Advanced.
>>>
>>> Additional written examination.
>>
>>OK
>>
>>
>>> All presently HF-licensed
>>> Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.
>>
>>Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!
>

>
> It's one-time and it's over.
>
> If current expiration of Novices and Techs are any indicator,
> most of those folks won't be taking advantage of it anyway.
>
>
>>> Privileges
>>> same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
>>> for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
>>>previously
>>> code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
>>>(not
>>> grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>>
>>See above about code test.
>
>
> Ditto my last. There's no "data" being used in the bottom 50 of
> most bands...
>
>
>>> (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
>>>
>>> (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
>>>Extra)
>>
>>I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.
>
>
> It's like swinging at a pinata...One guy makes a fool out of
> himself while everyone else gets to laugh at the process!

HOWL!!!!!! Best comeback all week, Steve! I owe ya for the good laugh. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1950. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 21:54:24 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 86629

Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >

> > > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
> >
> > How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you make a
> > case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the others?

> Because this would be the "final exam". If someone is truly
> worthy of having "the whole enchilada", then they should be able to
> prove it.

> And as for the "Bash" syndrome, I suggest a new line in Part 97:
> "Test Confidentiality: Except for those test items released by the
> VEC as approved by the Commission, it shall be a violation of this
> Part to reveal content of any examination prepared for any Amateur
> Radio operator examination."

Never going to happen; this would require a FCC exemption from the Freedom
of Information Act.

The FAA has such an exemption and still publishes all the questions and
answers for FAA tests.

Of course there are those that seem to think an amateur extra license is
of greater importance than an airline transport pilot certificate and an
instrument rating.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

1951. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 21:54:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040131165456.07984.00000358@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86627

In article <b7d1465c.0401301506.4db43d57@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
(Bert Craig) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
>> Tech at 5 years old
>> General at 6
>> Extra at 7
>>
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Very VERY kewl! Thanks for sharing it.
>
Interesting story and obviously a very bright kid! Homeschooled, too.
The story documents other young hams, including the Philly area's W3OVV,
who earned her Class B at the Philly FCC office soon after her 10th birthday -
in 1948. This was back in the days when *all* US ham licenses required 13 wpm
code, sending and receiving, and when the writtens were not only "secret" but
also consisted in large part of essay and draw-a-diagram questions.

One interesting side note is that these young hams are almost all girls!

73 de Jim, N2EY

"Age requirements? We doan' need no steenkeen age requirements!"

1952. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 21:54:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040131165457.07984.00000359@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86626

In article <5c01b95b.0401311044.3c9be0ad@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> I am not an NCI supporter...

That's good!

>I am resigned to the fact that we've
>tossed a major skill down the drain,

"we've tossed"??!! I'm *NOT* part of that "we", and I don't think you are either, Steve!

Some would like to toss that skill down the drain, but not all.

> and I'd just like to minimize the damage.

That's good! One way to do that is to encourage rather than discourage the development and use of that major skill by hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1953. BARF Stumpjumper Searching

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 22:30:49 UTC
From: possum grits <pg@gravypossum.org>
Message-ID: <bvhaab$31g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

hoe yo howDy ank i have bin looKing fo sevreal fomo
BARF stumpjumpEr guy who sole me radeedo tHat
done werk none mo. i wants me $ bak cuz da radeedo
donot werk. dey Sells me da dang radeedo ank sez
it gOnk werk ok fer a Hole bunch loNg time, weller ,
it dont ank it wonner. Soooo, ifn yuse done no
Where i kin fine the liKes o sum fermer BARF den lets
me Know write now!!!!

possum grits
Phd
ozarks kollege of arts

1954. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 23:06:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401311506.526e368e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86630

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401311018.74b62a8f@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401310703.16c59bd@posting.google.com>...
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> > >
> > > (1) Amateur Basic.
> > >
> > > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> > > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz. Same phone allocations as other
> > > licensees on HF bands. Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band. Limit 100 watts output on any band.
> >
> > Needs rf hazard study on 28Mhz with 100 watts.
>
> Snip to...
>
> > Steve, other than one license class too many, and no term limit on
> > "basic," sounds reasonable.
>
> Thanks, but what's the problem with an "rf hazard study"...?!?!
> Everyone acts as though this is going to require a Master's degree to
> accomplish. I don't see why any reasoable nudge towards anything
> having to do with safety is an imposition...Other than it might
> REQUIRE some acutal exercising of the grey matter, I think ALL classes
> should have to do it at some point in time.

Then why have classes?

1955. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 23:14:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86631

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>
> For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at all.
> >
> > (1) Amateur Basic.
> >
> > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
>
> Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
> use of the band?
>
> > Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
>
> You mean same as Extras have now?

I believe he does. Is that a problem?

> > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>
> Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> incentive to use voice only!

Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known as Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
or greater disincentive since 1912.

Why is it NOW a problem?

> >Limit 100 watts output on any band.
>
> Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?
> >
> > (2) Amateur Advanced.
> >
> > Additional written examination.
>
> OK
>
> > All presently HF-licensed
> > Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.

>
> Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!
>
> > Privileges
> > same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
> > for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
> >previously
> > code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
> >(not
> > grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>
> See above about code test.
> >
> > (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
> >
> > (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
> >Extra)
>
> I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.

It gets Steve out of bed in the morning.

> > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
>
> How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you make a
> case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the others?
>
> > REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
> >
> > test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone
> > allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
> >classifi-
> > cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
> >
> > Why?
>
> Three levels - good.
> Incremental power and privs - good

You once told me when we had 7 license class distinctions that we
needed more classes.

Why the change now?

bb

1956. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 23:16:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401311516.172ad17a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86632

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<401C0620.6030303@ix.netcom.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >
> >>Tech at 5 years old
> >>General at 6
> >>Extra at 7
> >>
> >>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >>
> >
> >I think you've finally found Larry's equal.
> >
> >
> No way! Larry did 20! ;-)

Qualudes?

1957. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 23:24:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0401311524.b4b3138@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86633

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401311044.3c9be0ad@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401310656.7ccf05e2@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Steve, now that you're an NCI supporter, would you like to join?
>
> I am not an NCI supporter...

Maybe not a supporter. "Defender" might have been a better word
choice. ;^))

I am resigned to the fact that we've
> tossed a major skill down the drain, and I'd just like to minimize the
> damage.

Nope. Just an exam. Want to replace it with a stand alone exam on
rules and regs? Amateur history?

And the mode still exists and can even be used on all amateur
allocations ('cept a little bit of 220).

> I served in the Armed Forces to protect the "majority rules"
> concept, and this is one of those times that I came out on the short
> end of the stick. Oh well...Got to make the best of it.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Keep your chin up and your head down.

bb

1958. New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 01:52:24 UTC
From: expeditionradio@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040131205224.20606.00000708@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86634

An updated version of the entire article "A Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan", is no available on the web at:

http://www.qsl.net/kq6xa/freqplan/

Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.

It equitably distributes the space within the allocated band so that approximately the same number of narrowband 500Hz signals vs wider bandwidth signals can share the precious spectrum resources. Keep in mind that the plan is mode-neutral. If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz, then you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my experience working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that it can happen in Amateur Radio.

In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant band segments. When the number of HF operators doubles overnight, we will no longer have the luxury to waste spectrum as we have in the past.

I would like to thank everyone who has contributed with suggestions and constructive criticism during the development of the plan.

The article and band chart is now on the web at:
http://www.qsl.net/kq6xa/freqplan/

73---Bonnie KQ6XA

1959. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 05:18:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <401C8C24.3060002@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86635

>
>
> from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
>
> Why?
>
> Why not...?!?!
>
>
>
We could do a class of license that is code only, crystal controlled 75 watt transmitter built from junked tube TV sets and modified AM radio receivers.

;-)

1960. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 11:53:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402010353.2dccd37a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86636

expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio) wrote in message
news:<20040131205224.20606.00000708@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> An updated version of the entire article "A Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan", is
> no available on the web at:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/kq6xa/freqplan/
>
> Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.

Did that. For one your "30M bandplan" would require both ITU and FCC
approval to implement. Good luck with that one Bonnie.

> It equitably distributes the space within the allocated band so that
> approximately the same number of narrowband 500Hz signals vs wider bandwidth
> signals can share the precious spectrum resources. Keep in mind that the plan
> is mode-neutral. If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz, then
> you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my experience
> working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that it can
> happen in Amateur Radio.
>
> In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant band
> segments. When the number of HF operators doubles overnight,

IF the FCC buys into anything like the recent ARRL proposal AND
drops anything vaguely resembling that proposal on Hamdom USA MAYBE
the number of individuals licensed to actually get on HF MIGHT double.
All of which is pure conjecture right there and is a real stretch at
best.

What is not conjecture is the fact that there is no statistical
evidence which indicates that simply having a license to operate HF
somehow equates to those with any new "giveaway" HF ticket actually
putting together HF stations and getting 'em on the air on a 1:1 new
license privs/band occupancy ratio.

Quite the opposite is being demonstrated in fact. We already have tons
of experience with, for example, the recent huge increase in the
number of Extra Class licensees which fell out of the reduction in the
code test speed for Extras.

I tune the Extra 75/40/20M phone setasides today and the recently
enfranchised don't seem to be there. In volume. If anything the
overall activity level in those setasides is noticeably down from what
it was long before the code test speed was dropped.

> we will no longer
> have the luxury to waste spectrum as we have in the past.

The problem with HF ham radio, if there really is a problem, has
nothing to do with whimsical "bandplans" like yours, "we need space .
. sombody might eventually do some 10Khz wide digital voice modes" or
any of the rest of it. The dead spectrum problem has far more to do
with getting the HF-enabled of all flavors off the Internet, off their
dead butts, geting the radios, actually putting the HF antennas up and
getting on the air than it does with any "bandwidth-based frequency
plan" sorts of things.

> I would like to thank everyone who has contributed with suggestions and
> constructive criticism during the development of the plan.

. . . no problem, you're welcome . .

>
> The article and band chart is now on the web at:
> http://www.qsl.net/kq6xa/freqplan/
>
> 73---Bonnie KQ6XA

Brian w3rv

1961. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 13:06:13 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9482525F85AEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86637

Mikle@com.ru wrote in news:401cd78e.11387255@news.supernews.com:

> On 01 Feb 2004 01:52:24 GMT, expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio)
> wrote:
>
>>An updated version of the entire article "A Bandwidth-Based Frequency
>>Plan", is no available on the web at:
>
> Isn't there a sub-band for lesbians?
>

Plonk!

1962. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 14:16:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201091608.15923.00003511@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86638

In article <bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>, jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com writes:

>Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>> >
>
>> > > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
>> >
>> > How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you
>make a
>> > case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the
>others?
>
>> Because this would be the "final exam". If someone is truly
>> worthy of having "the whole enchilada", then they should be able to
>> prove it.

Sell that to FCC.
>
>> And as for the "Bash" syndrome, I suggest a new line in Part 97:
>> "Test Confidentiality: Except for those test items released by the
>> VEC as approved by the Commission, it shall be a violation of this
>> Part to reveal content of any examination prepared for any Amateur
>> Radio operator examination."
>
>Never going to happen; this would require a FCC exemption from the Freedom
>of Information Act.
>
And how could it ever be enforced? Someone slips a disk in the right 'puter and
swipes the secret Q&A pool, then retypes or OCRs and slightly edits it to hide
its origins. How you gonna *prove* what was done? And who's going to do it?

>The FAA has such an exemption and still publishes all the questions and
>answers for FAA tests.
>
>Of course there are those that seem to think an amateur extra license is
>of greater importance than an airline transport pilot certificate and an
>instrument rating.
>
HAW! That's a good one! And it makes the point perfectly.

On a completely different note, here's proof that even USAF levels of training, testing, evaluation, leadership and review can't stop all operator errors. Experienced pilot had a history of hotdog behavior, and may have tried to roll a BUFF:

http://s92270093.onlinehome.us/crmdevel/resources/paper/darkblue/darkblue.htm

http://www.alexisparkinn.com/photogallery/Videos/B-52%20Crash.mpg

73 de Jim, N2EY

1963. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 14:16:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201091610.15923.00003512@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86639

In article <d22b54c3.0402010353.2dccd37a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>expeditionradio@aol.com (Expeditionradio) wrote in message
>news:<20040131205224.20606.00000708@mb-m21.aol.com>...
>> An updated version of the entire article "A Bandwidth-Based Frequency
>Plan", is
>> no available on the web at:
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/kq6xa/freqplan/
>>
>> Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.
>
>Did that. For one your "30M bandplan" would require both ITU and FCC
>approval to implement. Good luck with that one Bonnie.

And that's just the beginning.
>
>> It equitably distributes the space within the allocated band so that
>> approximately the same number of narrowband 500Hz signals vs wider
>> bandwidth signals can share the precious spectrum resources.

IOW the 'phone bands are drastically widened and the CW/digital bands
drastically narrowed. Also, the incentives to upgrade are reduced, the
spectrum available for modes wider than SSB is reduced.

>Keep in mind that the plan is mode-neutral.

No, it isn't.

> If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz,
>>then
>> you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my experience
>> working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that it
>> can happen in Amateur Radio.

Of course it can. But will it? If the 'phone bands are as drastically widened
as
proposed, why should anyone bother with 500 Hz processed voice when they
have so much room for regular SSB?
>>
>> In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant
>> band segments.

On HF? Where are they?

>When the number of HF operators doubles overnight,
>
>*IF* the FCC buys into anything like the recent ARRL proposal AND
>drops anything vaguely resembling that proposal on Hamdom USA MAYBE
>the number of individuals licensed to actually get on HF MIGHT double.
>All of which is pure conjecture right there and is a real stretch at
>best.

More like wildly optimistic.

We currently have about 324,000 US hams with General, Advanced or Extra class licenses. Also at least 130,000 with Novice, TechPlus and "Tech-with-HF" licenses. If even a small percentage of them were on HF at any one time, the bands would be full to busting.

>What is not conjecture is the fact that there is no statistical
>evidence which indicates that simply having a license to operate HF
>somehow equates to those with any new "giveaway" HF ticket actually
>putting together HF stations and getting 'em on the air on a 1:1 new
>license privs/band occupancy ratio.

BINGO!

And that's not going to change much.
>
>Quite the opposite is being demonstrated in fact. We already have tons
>of experience with, for example, the recent huge increase in the
>number of Extra Class licensees which fell out of the reduction in the
>code test speed for Extras.

And the reduction in written testing for Extra.
>
>I tune the Extra 75/40/20M phone setasides today and the recently
>enfranchised don't seem to be there. In volume. If anything the
>overall activity level in those setasides is noticeably down from what
>it was long before the code test speed was dropped.

Don't forget sunspots.
>
>> we will no longer
>> have the luxury to waste spectrum as we have in the past.

When was spectrum ever "wasted"? Is that why AM is so restricted in this plan?
>
>The problem with HF ham radio, if there really is a problem, has
>nothing to do with whimsical "bandplans" like yours, "we need space .
>. sombody might eventually do some 10Khz wide digital voice modes" or
>any of the rest of it. The dead spectrum problem has far more to do
>with getting the HF-enabled of all flavors off the Internet, off their
>dead butts, geting the radios, actually putting the HF antennas up and
>getting on the air than it does with any "bandwidth-based frequency
>plan" sorts of things.

HEAR HEAR

And *THAT'S* where the problem really is! Fiddling with licenses is only going to have a minor effect on that, if any. License changes aren't going to fix anybody's CC&Rs, or suddenly improve the sunspot number, or empower vast numbers of existing hams to figure out how to end feed a wire and actually get on the air.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1964. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 15:00:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402010700.474ef506@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86640

jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>...

> Of course there are those that seem to think an amateur extra license is
> of greater importance than an airline transport pilot certificate and an
> instrument rating.

I am a Pilot, Jim, and don't think so...But we're discussing
AMATEUR RADIO in this forum, not FAA ratings and testing policies.

My position is that we are not going to completely (or even
remotely) get the degree of "training" the FCC sets before us with
open pools. We have far too many "Extra's" who can't calculate the
length of a dipole or know the difference between peak-envelope-power
and PeeWee Herman. That's a shame.

And if it were up to me, the FAA pools WOULD be closed. I can
tolerate the idea of a 71% correct Amateur Extra, but I'd rather not
think about a 71% correct ATP droning around with a load full of pax
and wx at minimums that made that 71% from a verbatim Q&A manual!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1965. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 16:55:12 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <401d2ee5$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86641

In <20040128115555.12501.00005862@mb-m04.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <4016b2c4$0$99194$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>In <20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>>
>>>>In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>>writes:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>>D.
>>>>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Basically I think the ARRL Board knows that the free upgrades means
>>that
>>>>>>>>their proposal probably will not be adopted in this form. The FCC has
>>>>> never
>>>>>>>>gone along with free upgrades before and there is no evidence that they
>>>>>>>>would do so now. However, I believe they tossed it in as another idea
>>>>for
>>>>>>>>the FCC to consider in developing whatever the FCC decides to do, if
>>they
>>>>>>>>decide to do anything at all.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>That's probably correct, Dee. And that's what bothers me!
>>>>>
>>>>>>>As you say, FCC has never done free upgrades, and the last time the
>>issue
>>>>> came
>>>>>>>up (98-143), the ARRL proposal was for existing Novices (!) and Tech
>>>>Pluses
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>get free upgrade to General. Of course, FCC said "no way", and has had

>>no
>>>>>>>problem whatever keeping the closed-to-new-issues classes in their
>>>>database.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>So why propose something FCC obviously isn't going to do? Just wastes
>>>>>>>everybody's time.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>More important, it diverts attention from the other issues.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>oh wait, I think I just answered my own question...;-)
>>>>>
>>>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>>>>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes (take
>>>>>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>>>>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>>>>
>>>>>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>>>>
>>>>It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
>>>>pros and cons:
>>>>
>>>>Cons:
>>>>
>>>>Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
>>>>it.
>>
>>>That's one. There are others:
>>
>>>- Allowing a free upgrade

>*can be taken as*

>>>proof that the material in the test which is not
>>>taken is not necessary for the privileges.
>>
>>To quote from the ARRL's FAQ on their proposal:
>>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/restructuring2/faq.html
>>
>>"The fact is that the examination bar has never been at a uniform height
>>over ham radio's nearly 100-year history."

>And I say: "So what? The question is whether there is any good reason to
>give almost 60% of existing hams a free upgrade to the next license class,
>even though the upgrade to that class requires only a written test from a
>published pool.
>
>>Were you also opposed to giving pre-1917 hams a waiver for the 20 WPM
>>code test?

>No such waiver ever existed. What *was* waived were the 20 wpm receiving and
>sending code tests, plus the Extra written test. The person who got the waiver
>had to hold at least a General license, too.

Now you're being pedantic. I was describing a subset of the waiver given, enough for the purpose of the argument. You described the entire waiver. Both are correct, and neither contradicts my arguments.

>That was long before my time, too. And it affected maybe 2% of the licensed
>hams at the time.

So you might accept grandfathering, if it occurred at some asymptotic point in the past, and only affected a small minority of hams? What percentage would be a threshold? You say that it is wrong to grandfather 60% of all hams, but you might be willing to accept grandfathering of 2% of all hams. What about a proposal that grandfathers some percentage of hams in-between? What would be your greater objection, grandfathering all of the Techs, or grandfathering all of the Advanced?

Remember that at some time in the future, we may be looking on this grandfathering as occurring at some asymptotic point in the past, as with the pre-1917 waiver above. You ask below what is the long-term plan. I say one aspect of the plan is to be able to look back on this grandfathering in the same way that we look upon the pre-1917 waiver.

>>>- Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than those
>>>who didn't. How do we justify that?
>>
>>It's called "grandfathering," which is done in more regulatory contexts
>>than can possibly be named here. Due to the need for certainty in the
>>law, it is nearly always based on hard cutoff dates. Technologies,
>>practices, and people change over the very long timeline that laws and
>>regulations are required to cover. It is not possible to predict the
>>future with certainty, so laws and regulations must change to reflect
>>current knowledge. It is also impractical for society to retest,
>>recertify, or revalidate every existing entity against current
>>requirements.

>None of which is proposed.

But when considering alternatives, one really has to identify all implicit alternatives, and argue for or against them (avoiding the logical pitfall of false dichotomies, trichotomies, etc.). The status quo, which you have advocated, and might be labeled alternative #4 based on your exchange with Bill Sohl, is one such implicit alternative. I would argue against that, for the reasons I have given previously (streamlining of license classes, streamlining of band plans, reduction of regulatory burden, reduction in confusion for amateurs and the FCC, harmonization with the deletion of S25.5 and with other countries' regulations, etc.).

If license classes are consolidated to a smaller number, one alternative is simply to grandfather existing hams, which the ARRL has advocated.

One other implicit alternative (say, #5), is to make every Novice, Advanced (and possibly non-Plus, or would that be non-Plussed, Tech) come back in to take written tests to upgrade to the next level, or otherwise lose privileges. I would argue against that also, for the reasons I have also given previously (it is impractical to retest everyone, and such existing hams are a large, stable user base such as that in the definition of grandfathering below).

>>
>>The web site for Malvern Instrumentation gives a good definition of
>>grandfathering in a technical context:
>>
>>"Grandfathering is the practice of claiming exemption of older systems
>>from validation regulations and requirements on the basis that these
>>systems have proved their reliability by adoption for a long period of
>>time by a large user base."
>>
>>Grandfathering in the context of ham radio recognizes that existing hams
>>have not only passed the tests in effect at the time, sometimes topics
>>not covered presently (Morse code, drawing circuit diagrams, etc.), but
>>have also gained experience beyond their initial exam topics. It is a
>>fair, and pragmatic, distinction between existing hams and entry-level
>>ones. Quoting again from the FAQ document:
>>
>>"Passing any amateur examination does not magically result in a good
>>operator. It's just the key to the kingdom, so to speak. Experience and
>>good mentoring create skillful and knowledgeable operators, not the
>>relative difficulty or ease of the test."

>I disagree with that assessment. YMMV.
>>
>>You might argue that not every existing ham has obtained the same degree
>>of experience, or even a minimum necessary level of experience to be
>>given a free upgrade. That would be true, but ultimately would be
>>self-limiting, as experience would correlate with participation. An
>>inactive ham using no privileges today would be using no more privileges
>>if the FCC gave him a free upgrade tomorrow. Free upgrades are not a
>>perfect solution, ideal in all cases, but are a good solution overall.

>I disagree. What's wrong with simply allowing Techs, Tech Pluses and Advanceds
>to upgrade in their own time?

>What is the sudden need to eliminate those license classes? The Novice and
>Advanced have been closed off to new issues for almost 4 years, and their
>numbers have declined. And from 1953 to 1967, no new Advanceds were issued. Did
>any of that cause problems?

>What's the rush?

>Are the written tests too hard?
>>
>>>- Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.

>>
>>No proposal is perfect. Weigh this one against the pros.
>>
>I have. The cons win.

>>>>Pros:
>>>>
>>>>Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
>>>>refarm the Advanced phone bands.
>>
>>>Why does that have to be done at all?
>>
>>So, are you advocating not refarming the Advanced phone bands even
>>*after* the last Advanced class license expires? Yeah, that's a
>>semantic nit-pick over what you wrote above, but then so is "You mean
>>the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?" that you wrote below.

>You're avoiding the question.

>Why do the Advanced class subbands have to be "refarmed" at all? Who or what
>would they be "refarmed" to? What's the longterm plan?
>>
>>If you do agree that the Advanced phone bands should be refarmed at some
>>point in the future, at what point would you have it done? Would you
>>leave it to Extras, give it to Generals, or would you otherwise split it
>>up in some way?

>Why does it need to be done at all? Is the Extra written that hard?

So you would argue that any refarming would be done at some asymptotic
point in the far future, indistinguishable at present between "decades"
and "never."

>>
>>>>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
>>>>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
>>>>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
>>>>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
>>>>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).
>>
>>>Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?
>>
>>In this day and age, regulatory agencies seem more eager to simplify
>>regulations. Removing regulations that are obsolete, or cover too small
>>an intended audience to be justified on a cost basis, is likely a top
>>priority for such agencies. Again, what is your timeline for change?
>>Decades in the future, or never?

>I don't see any reason to "refarm" them at all. Not at this time, anyway.

>Note that in 4 years, the number of Advanceds has dropped by only about 16%.
>Seems to be a pretty popular license even today.

>It sounds to me like you want all Advanceds to become Extras so that the
>Advanced subbands can become General bandspace. That's not part of the ARRL
>proposal, though.

No, I never said that. I would combine Advanced and Extra phone bands into just Extra phone bands, and leave the General bands as they are. That doesn't mean that I wouldn't support frequency shifting, such as that proposed to make 40 meters a primary amateur allocation, or part of Novice band refarming. Just that I would keep the proportional amounts roughly the same. I realize that the current ARRL proposal splits up the Advanced phone bands, giving proportionally more to the General than the Extra phone bands on 80 and 40 meters, and proportionally less on 15 meters (no changes on 20 meters). I do not strongly support that, but even that proposal isn't giving the entire Advanced phone bandwidth to the Generals.

>>>>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
>>>>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
>>>>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
>>>>documentation forever.
>>
>>>If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
>>>years, two months and 20 days or so.
>>
>>If by saying, "If the current rules are left alone..." you really meant
>>leaving alone everything *except* the 5 WPM Morse code requirement
>>(which would be eliminated for these General and below under the ARRL
>>proposal), then, and only then, Technician-class hams will assume the
>>HF privileges of Technician-Plus.

>Whatever. I don't see why the 5 wpm code test is such a big deal as a
>requirement.

Does your "Whatever" answer above mean that you support 5 WPM Morse code for all HF license classes, or just for Extra? If the former, then there is a very real distinction that will continue to exist in the license ladder whether or not it continues to be recorded in the database. If so, then the expiring of Tech-Plus license in 6 years is not a simplification, it is a complication.

>>That's still a long time in FCC
>>enforcement (and VEC administration) years.

>Why? It's been almost 4 years since the last restructuring took effect. Look at
>the enforcement letters - Techs without code masquerading as Tech Pluses isn't
>a
>big problem, from what I see.

You argue that it's not an enforcement problem because few or none have been caught. I would argue that it is an enforcement problem because it would be very hard to catch someone, especially if confirming who has what privileges requires documentation that is no longer in the FCC database, and might no longer be retained by hams or VEC's. The FCC's

limited staff time is probably being aimed at big fish, such as Advanced
and Extra-class scofflaws engaging in power and interference violations.

>>Even if you argue that FCC
>>action on further restructuring will take most of that six years anyway,
>>there are still all those Novice and Advanced class licenses that will
>>likely exist in the database for decades to come.

>It makes sense to grandfather existing Novices to the "NewNovice" (or whatever
>it is called). There are only about 32,000 Novices left now, down from just
>under 50,000 after restructuring.

>What *is* the problem with Advanceds just staying as they are? Have you not
>read from the Advanceds who say they *don't want* to become Extras?

Which is as much of an argument as "Have you not read from the hams who
say that they *don't want* to have ham radio examinations without Morse
code?"

>>
>>>Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the
>>>"NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database
>>>doesn't need to change at all.
>>
>>Did you notice that Novices actually lose privileges? See the FAQ
>>document above for more details. In particular, power limits are
>>lowered from 200 Watts PEP to 100 Watts PEP on HF bands except for 10
>>meters, and 50 Watts PEP on 10 meters.

>Is that really much of a problem? How many Novices are on the air today running
>more than those power levels?

>> From the FAQ:
>>
>>"The reason behind the change in Novice power limits is to avoid having
>>to examine entry-level applicants about how to evaluate amateur stations
>>for RF safety. "
>>
>>I'm sure that you would argue that Technicians should retain their power
>>limits (1500 Watts PEP) on 6 meters and up, and I would agree, but what
>>about HF? Should Technicians lose privileges on those bands, by having
>>their power limits lowered (from 200 Watts PEP), or should there be
>>separate power limits for Novice and Technician on HF? This is starting
>>to get more complicated than before.

>Not at all! Where an existing ham has greater privs, those privs would be
>retained. This has been done with Tech Pluses for almost 4 years now. FCC
>proposed it and enacted it, btw. Why can't it be done for existing Novices and
>Techs?

So, again, as part of your status-quo alternative, you want to keep in
place the regulations and bandplans for six classes of license, only
five of which will be tracked in the FCC database six years from now.

>The 1998 proposal from ARRL Hq was for Tech Pluses and Novices to get a freebie
>to General - and FCC said no. What has changed that suddenly makes free
>upgrades a good idea?

The ARRL argues that this is now the second round of restructuring. The
FCC prefers to revisit things every few years, and do things in
manageable chunks. What is driving this second round is the lifting of
the S25.5 requirement, the eventual need (in the ARRL's opinion, and
mine) to address the shrinking pools of Novice and Advanced class
licenses, as well as the fact that there will be no distinction in the
FCC database between two classes of licenses with different privileges
(Tech and Tech Plus) in the very near future.

>>>>>>Rather, it is just one of
>>>>>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until better
>>>>>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>>>>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>>>>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC official's
>>>>>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>>>>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>>>>>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>>>>>
>>>>>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>>>>>bad
>>>>>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>>>>>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>>>>
>>>>>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really such
>>a
>>>>>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass Element
>>>>>3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?
>>>>
>>>>I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
>>>>credit.
>>
>>>You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?
>>
>>Yes, I meant the governance of the ARRL when I used the shorthand "ARRL"
>>in the context of offering an opinion on a BoD decision. Only they can
>>establish ARRL official policy and petition the FCC in the name of the
>>ARRL. Who else did you think I meant?

>Those folks are elected and paid for by members like *me*. They supposedly
>make those proposals in *my* name and with *my* support.

>Well, I don't support everything in that proposal.

Welcome to the realities of representative democracy. Both of us pay
dues to the ARRL and elect Directors. They make proposals in both of
our names. I don't support everything in that proposal either, but it
is an ARRL proposal. You and I are perfectly free to submit comments to
the FCC as "ARRL Members," but the ARRL Board of Directors will submit
comments to the FCC as "*The* ARRL."

>>
>>>How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?
>>
>>You will need more than a rhetorical question to make an argument here.
>>Instead, why don't you just come right out and say, for the benefit of
>>the audience, which items in the ARRL proposal got enacted, and which
>>ones didn't? And, of those that didn't get enacted, which ones you
>>think have already been given a final "no" answer?

>All right.

>Fact is, almost nothing proposed by ARRL Hq in 1998 got enacted. 5 wpm for
>General, that's about it. On everything else, FCC either:

>- said no: free upgrades, better written tests, Techs on HF CW without a formal
>test

>- went far beyond what was requested: 5 wpm Extra, Advanced closed off, written
>testing reduced dramatically

>>>>They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
>>>>a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
>>>>Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
>>>>at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
>>>>past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
>>>>license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
>>>>gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
>>>>future."
>>
>>>Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.
>>
>>But does address the subject of why they may be politically desirable,
>>not only by leading to simplified FCC regulations, but also resulting
>>in a more harmonious and productive amateur radio in the future by
>>addressing most of the concerns of most factions.

>I don't see that at all. Are the written tests so difficult, and the VE test
>process so onerous, that free upgrades are the only answer?
>>
>>>I say they're not.
>>
>>So you've said. I'm sure that you will also say this to your
>>representatives within the ARRL and comment on any future FCC NPRM on
>>the subject.

>Already have. In detail. More to come, too.

>>I will, too. For the record, I'm not in complete
>>agreement with the ARRL proposal, either. I don't see the regulatory
>>justification for the retention of 5 WPM Morse code for Extra,

>I do. Morse code is a big part of amateur radio, and having no code test at all
>simply denies the reality of that.

I'm sure that you will argue in more detail than "Morse code is a big part of ham radio, and having no code test simply denies the reality of that." You may also have to find new arguments beyond those that the FCC rejected in Docket WT 98-143, including yours.

>>and I
>>remain skeptical that a Novice license (even a restructured one) is
>>viable today.

>What we have now is a system that tends to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF
>amateur radio, and manufactured equipment. And away from HF and homebrewing. A
>restructured Novice could change that.

Part of arguing for a new Novice license would involve identifying what has not worked with the present Novice license, and what changes would somehow "open the floodgates" with the proposed future one. You argue that most entry-level hams are being funneled to VHF/UHF. I might also argue that there are not very many entry-level hams at all, especially younger people, regardless of where they are being funneled. The youngest members in most clubs locally are well into their mid-30's. The presence of teenagers has all but evaporated.

What types of realistic homebrewing are you advocating for "NewNovice" hams beyond 3-transistor OOK transmitters and single-conversion receivers? Please be specific. What aspects of current communications technology, something that would be used and would not be a trophy or shop-project to be put on a shelf, can be realistically homebrewed via commercially-available (and presently-manufactured) parts by high-school age hams?

When you argue for "NewNovice" privileges, are you supporting it with 5 WPM code, or without? What if almost no one wants to sign up for 5 WPM code as an entry-level requirement?

>73 de Jim, N2EY

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

1966. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 16:56:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201115628.06226.00002647@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86642

In article <tS0Rb.25744$q4.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> The days when the nests were all
>> empty by the time Mom and Dad
>> hit 50 are long gone, Dwight. And
>> that's in "typical" America.
>
> That may be typical in your world.

It's typical in much of the USA.

>However, I haven't met a single 40 or
>50 year old recently with a young child.

Do *you* have reason to meet such people, Dwight? How many "parent's nights" have you spent recently at the local elementary school?

>In fact, I only remember meeting
>one in my entire life - a couple with an adopted child. Whatever the case, I
>haven't seen it to be commonplace.

But you've spent a good part of your adult life outside the USA, haven't you, Dwight?
>
>> Why does that matter? You may have
>> noticed that I don't talk about my
>> domestic situation here.
>
> It matters only in the context of the discussion - how many in our age
>group have young children.

Just among my family, friends and acquaintances, the number of families with at least one parent over 40 and at least one child under 10 exceeds 40%.
>
>> Suppose, just suppose, that I have 5
>> children ranging in age from toddlers to
>> teenagers. (I don't, but that's not the
>> point). Would you then say I was right
>> and Kim's call was inappropriate?
>
> Have those supposed children also talked to Kim on the radio, hearing her
>callsign and making something out of it?

You're avoiding the question.

>Lets not discuss hypothetical
>situations, Jim.

Why not?

>Anything can be justified or condemned using that.

Not true at all.
>
>> And your source is?
>
> Fifty years of life, meeting thousands in that period.

My 49+ years has resulted in meeting a lot of 40+ parents of small children.
>
>> Do you consider that to be "old"?
>> I don't. I consider it to be "middle
>> aged".
>
> Forty or fifty is certainly not young.

Not old either.
>
>> Both. I say neither is appropriate.
>
> Appropriate for what?

Appropriate for the amateur radio service, which should be G-rated.

>As I said earlier, it's not my job to decide what is
>appropriate for others in this world, or demand they conform to my ideas of
>what is appropriate.
>
Either a call such as Kim's is appropriate for the ARS or it isn't. If you have
no objection to it, you're saying it's appropriate, and therefore the rest of
us should accept it. Well, I don't. Period.
>
>> You and Kim keep using the term
>> "vukgar"

actually, "vulgar"

>> rather than addressing
>> whether it's "appropriate".
>
> I've addressed the issue of appropriateness several times.
>
And you think it is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1967. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 17:14:33 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <bvjc5p$m5o$1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 86703

Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
> jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>...

> > Of course there are those that seem to think an amateur extra license is
> > of greater importance than an airline transport pilot certificate and an
> > instrument rating.

> I am a Pilot, Jim, and don't think so...But we're discussing
> AMATEUR RADIO in this forum, not FAA ratings and testing policies.

The discussion was the the testing practices of an agency of the
US government.

Comparing the practices of another agency gives a reality check on
the possibility of closed question pools.

> My position is that we are not going to completely (or even
> remotely) get the degree of "training" the FCC sets before us with
> open pools. We have far too many "Extra's" who can't calculate the
> length of a dipole or know the difference between peak-envelope-power
> and PeeWee Herman. That's a shame.

I have mixed feelings on that.

I think the perception of the ignorance level is skewed for those that
spend a lot of time on USENET for the simple reason that those that do
know how to calculate the length of a dipole are not going to post
a message stating that.

Only the ignorant are going to post things like that and the posts
will stand out in your memory but you will never know how many read
that post and just thought to their self "how did that guy get a
license".

If such questions were answered simply and correctly, and perhaps some
references given as to where such things may be found (such as ARRL
publications) without the usual derisive comments, maybe a goodly
part of the training you hope for would take place.

I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
was a major part of the amateur training process.

The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
with diagrams.

A closed test pool is no panacea.

> And if it were up to me, the FAA pools WOULD be closed. I can
> tolerate the idea of a 71% correct Amateur Extra, but I'd rather not
> think about a 71% correct ATP droning around with a load full of pax
> and wx at minimums that made that 71% from a verbatim Q&A manual!

Those that memorize the tests tend to get scores closer to 100% than
to 70%.

For some insight on the testing process and question pool challenges
for the FAA, see http://www.avweb.com/news/columns/186574-1.html.

The discussion there is a mirror of this one.

> 73

> Steve, K4YZ

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

1968. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 17:14:39 UTC
From: uncle_mopo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e685ec50.0402010914.157a67@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040123151112.767$uw@newsreader.com>...
> Dummy Load <License@CBers.org> wrote:
> > "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in
> > news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net:
> >
> > > Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be
> > > nothing you can do to stop it. I am so happy.
> >
> > Ten-Four on that Good-Buddy!! :-)
> >
> "Can ya hear me now?..Good."

Steveo, dickhead, you are a loser.

1969. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 17:17:44 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040201121744.526$lv@newsreader.com>
Source record: 86644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
uncle_mopo@yahoo.com (bobo_brazil) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040123151112.767$uw@newsreader.com>...
> > Dummy Load <License@CBers.org> wrote:
> > > "Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in
> > > news:oNaPb.16634$D%.6580@bignews1.bellsouth.net:
> > >
> > > > Move over! People like me are coming to HF,. and there will be
> > > > nothing you can do to stop it. I am so happy.
> > >
> > > Ten-Four on that Good-Buddy!! :-)
> > >
> > "Can ya hear me now?..Good."
>
> Steveo, dickhead, you are a loser.
>
A loser that will mop the parking lot with your over-medicated dome.

--
Japanese Nascar?
http://tinyurl.com/3apbj
```

1970. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 18:07:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86645

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401291458.3592f0b@posting.google.com>...

> The Novice Class license should be just for that...Novices. When
> one has gained experience and confidence in what they are doing, it's
> time to move up. Then they will have more than adequate spectrum in
> which to "communicate".

And many of them will be perfectly content to remain Novices
"forever".

> Your bandplan only addresses HF. Ninety-nine percent of
> "emergency communications" takes place above 50mHz.

Amen. What little HF emergency-related ham comms actually do take
place are not emergency comms, they're post-disaster H&W comms.

> Nice try, Bonnie. You're thinking, and that's good, but the
> ultimate result was all you did was expand the phone bands on HF where
> very little "experimentation" is going on anyway.

There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in any
ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia" wideband
ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk, the walk
simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on the HF
bands??

The concept of reshuffling the whole deck to "promote experimentation"
has been around for eons, it's a cyclic refrain which pops up every
few years and here's the current iteration.

The problem with "new modes" has nothing to do with the regs,
allowable bandwidths or any of the rest of the usual micro-managed
"grand plans". It's a MARKETING problem, pure and simple.

> 73
>
> Steve Robeson, K4YZ

w3rv

1971. page updated

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 19:14:29 UTC
From: niw20042003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <ca7d6672.0402011114.5a39b339@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86646

http://hometown.aol.com/niw2004/myhomepage/

1972. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 19:43:42 UTC
From: medina_mopo <doctor_mopo@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <101qlnpjreaj6ca@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:

> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>
>>wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>>>>Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
>>>>butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"
>>>>
>>>
>>>You know thats a LIE, I never wanted the Extra. But I guess I need to
>>>explain to you again.
>>> A Bunch of No-Code Knuckle Draggers bet me $250.00 I couldnt pass the
>>>TEST. Well I not only passed with a score of 100%, with no study at
>>>all, I got to collect $250.00 From the Knuckle Draggers.
>>> As I remember you still are not able to pass it.
>>>
>>
>>You swallow. Nuff said.
>>
>
> Well whenever someone say's nuff said, it usually not e-nuff.
>
> Check out my sig file, you rotten bastard. hehe

Don't bother with his sig file. Just get a look at his kids. That
tells the whole story.

1973. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 21:38:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <guadnQ2Y4-JL7IDdRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:

Japanese Nascar?
http://tinyurl.com/3apbj

Ohh, how NASCAR is going to change under Nextel! Dunno if the present fans are gonna like it at all!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1974. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 21:58:20 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040201165820.950$mR@newsreader.com>
Source record: 86649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
>
> Japanese Nascar?
> http://tinyurl.com/3apbj
>
> Ohh, how NASCAR is going to change under Nextel! Dunno if the
> present fans are gonna like it at all!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
I know what you mean, I'm gonna have trouble remembering not to
call it Winston. I still don't completely understand
the playoff thing. I figure Nextel won't last as long as the
smokes did for a sponsor either.

--
Plymouth Motorcycle:
http://www.allpar.com/history/plymouth/motorcycle.html

1975. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 21:58:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <401D7693.2030505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86650

>
>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>We could do a class of license that is code only, crystal controlled 75 watt
>>transmitter built from junked tube TV sets and modified AM radio receivers.
>>
>>
>
>Why so much power?
>
>
>
>>;-)
>>
>>
Well, seeing how we will measure that power as that drawn from the
power supply and not at the antenna, ... :-)

1976. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 22:07:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <401D788A.4000002@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86701

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>...
>
>
>
>>Of course there are those that seem to think an amateur extra license is
>>of greater importance than an airline transport pilot certificate and an
>>instrument rating.
>>
>>
>
> I am a Pilot, Jim, and don't think so...But we're discussing
>AMATEUR RADIO in this forum, not FAA ratings and testing policies.
>
>
>
> And if it were up to me, the FAA pools WOULD be closed. I can
>tolerate the idea of a 71% correct Amateur Extra, but I'd rather not
>think about a 71% correct ATP droning around with a load full of pax
>and wx at minimums that made that 71% from a verbatim Q&A manual!
>
>
>
A pilot who screws up can do a lot more damage than a ham ever could.
I've been told
that small private planes)general aviation) are not permitted to fly
over Manhattan in NYC.
Because if your engine quits, there's no place to land it there. Not so
much over fear of
a 9/11 event. Some kid stole a Cesna and flew it into a skyscraper in
Atlanta IIRC.
Not much damage at all except taking out one office.

1977. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 22:55:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201175524.02537.00002786@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 86702

In article <5c01b95b.0401311039.6961b3ce@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>>
>> For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at
>> all.
>
> Agreed, but then there are folks who are still insisting on a
>second shooter on the Grassy Knoll. You can't please everyone!

Point is, don't hold yer breath until the code test issue is over.
>
>> > (1) Amateur Basic.
>> >
>> > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
>> > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
>>
>> Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
>> use of the band?
>
> 80: Perhaps 80.
>
> 30: Let's leave this for folks who WANT to beep and for those
>elusive data modes.

Better yet, include it as an incentive to try out those modes.
>
> 20: This is where everyone wants to go and play

Sez who? I prefer 40

>...Let them get their feet
> wet on 17 and 15 meters...then they can come play with the
>Big Boys.
>
> 12: If you're going to draw limitations on bands you have to
>draw the line somewhere.
>
Why draw limitations on which HF bands newbies get? Give 'em a taste of many, and let 'em figure out which ones they like.

Remember that one of the prime limitations of many hams are when they can get
on the air, and what antennas they can put up. (Some can't even figure out how
to end feed a simple wire, but that's *their* problem). A wide selection of
bands
insures that there will be some options for almost everyone.

> 1.25: I think this band is fodder, Jim. I realize that the metro
>areas (ie: NYC, LA, ATL, etc...) make better use of it, but we've
>done everything except beg the Pope to support the band.

Punch line to old joke about the pope:

"He's-a no play-a da game, he's-a no make-a da rules!"

>We can give it
> a shot, but the history of this band is that it won't
>"sell".

Maybe, but Novices already have it anyway.
>
>> > Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
>>
>> You mean same as Extras have now?
>>
>> > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
>> > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>>
>> Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
>> incentive to use voice only!
>
> OK...Bottom 50kHz...?!?!

No.

Either the code test is part of the license exam, or it isn't. If it is, no
endorsement
needed. If it isn't, the solution is that the lower 20% or so of each band
should
be made CW-only.
>
>> >Limit 100 watts output on any band.
>>
>> Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?
>
> It rrequires an eval >>IF<< you're using that much power.
>
> As I asked "Billy Beeper", why is everyone running away from
>trying to make sure we are as safe as we can be? Isn't this a part of
>the "learning curve"...?!?!

The point of an entry-level license is to offer an easy way to get started, and
an incentive to learn by doing. That's what the old Novice was all about, and
what a new "Basic" or whatever should be about. Making the test simple is part
of that.

>
>> > (2) Amateur Advanced.
>> >
>> > Additional written examination.
>>
>> OK
>>
>> > All presently HF-licensed
>> > Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.
>>
>> Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!
>
> It's one-time and it's over.

Has all the problems of other freebies and more.

Did you see the story about the 7 year old who just earned her Extra?
Tech at 5, General at 6, Extra at 7.

Now tell me why it's expecting too much for existing hams to pass the
current tests in order to upgrade.
>
> If current expiration of Novices and Techs are any indicator,
>most of those folks won't be taking advantage of it anyway.
>
Then why do it at all?

>> > Privileges
>> > same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement
>required
>> > for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
>> >previously
>> > code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
>> >(not
>> > grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>>
>> See above about code test.
>
> Ditto my last. There's no "data" being used in the bottom 50 of
>most bands...

Just wait...
>
>> > (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
>> >
>> > (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
>> >Extra)
>>
>> I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.
>
> It's like swinging at a pinata...One guy makes a fool out of
>himself while everyone else gets to laugh at the process!

The only reason for swinging at a pinatta is because you know
there's something inside.

There's no point in swinging at an empty pinata.
>
>> > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
>>
>> How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you make
>a
>> case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the
>others?
>
> Because this would be the "final exam". If someone is truly
>worthy of having "the whole enchilada", then they should be able to
>prove it.
>
> And as for the "Bash" syndrome, I suggest a new line in Part 97:
>"Test Confidentiality: Except for those test items released by the
>VEC as approved by the Commission, it shall be a violation of this
>Part to reveal content of any examination prepared for any Amateur
>Radio operator examination."

Already discussed. No way to enforce it. And convincing FCC
of the need is even less likely than convincing them of the need
for newcomers to pass a 30 wpm code test.
>
>> > REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
>> >
>> > test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional
>phone
>> > allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
>> >classifi-
>> > cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
>> >
>> > Why?
>>
>> Three levels - good.
>> Incremental power and privs - good
>> >
>> > Why not...?!?!
>> >
>> See above.
>
> Ya still snowed in, Jim?

Heck no, we dug out in a few hours.

> Blue skies here, and I washed the car in
>a scrub shirt this morning!
>
Washing the car is an invitation for more snow! It was 35 and sunny earlier
today. Went to BJ's and spent over $300, unloaded the car without a coat.

Spring is coming - tomorrow's Ground Hog Day.

Punxsutawney is in WPA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1978. Re: Finally! My ARRL membership pays off!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-01 22:58:54 UTC
From: medina_mopo <doctor_mopo@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <101r15ip0lr1t4e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Stupid Steve wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20040201173348.091
> $Ci@newsreader.com:
>
>
>
>>>It is not a playoff, and they are sure to say that it is not a playoff.
>>>
>>
>>Go and believe them if you so choose, it IS a playoff.
>>
>
>
> Ohhh really dickface since when then does every team participate in the
> playoffs?

Yes indeed Steveo Moparholic is a big dickface who knows nothing and
understands even less!

1979. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 01:54:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201205438.13960.00000409@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 86705

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 1, 2004:

Novice - 32,611 (decrease of 16,718)
Technician - 260,018 (increase of 54,624)
Technician Plus - 62,284 (decrease of 66,576)
General - 141,207 (increase of 28,530)
Advanced - 81,699 (decrease of 18,083)
Extra - 104,923 (increase of 26,173)
Total - 682,742 (increase of 7,950)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1980. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 02:15:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86706

In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <dCTQb.27124$zj7.21663@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote
>>>
>>>| Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
>>>| don't see it starting up today.
>>>
>>>You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
>>>sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
>>>orientated types.
>>
>>
>> Also traffic handlers, ragchewers, DX and emergency types.
>> Skilled operators, IOW.
>>
>> The early hams had to be technically oriented, because the
>> equipment of the time demanded it. A ham who knew what s/he
>> was doing could work the world with arelatively simple station,
>> while a ham who didn't couldn't hear a station in the next
>> town.
>>
>> Of course, much of the development of electronics since those
>> times has been aimed at reducing and eliminating the need for
>> "users" to have technical knowledge and/or operator skill.
>> Amateur radio is one of the few places where such things are
>> considered important. Indeed, the whole concept of "radio
>> operator" has largely disappeared outside amateur radio.
>
> Careful Jim!! One of the arguments against Morse testing is that
>outside groups do not use Morse code any more, so it isn't needed. Since
>outside groups don't use "trained radio operators" any more, this is one
>more reason not to test for anything.

We've been going in that direction for almost 30 years, Mike.

The issue isn't Morse Code testing or question pools or VEs vs. FCC examiners.
It's much bigger than that.

Remember the old original Rod Serling "Twilight Zone" TV show? One of the most memorable episodes was called "The Obsolete Man". Starred Burgess Meredith and Dennis Weaver in a future totalitarian state where most books were banned. Meredith's character was a librarian - and was declared "obsolete" by The State,
because without most books there was no need for libraries or librarians.

From the beginnings of radio, the concept of "radio operator" has been part of our thinking. To us, that concept means "a person trained and skilled in the operation and adjustment of radio equipment". An honorable profession going back to at least Jack Binns if not before.

Remember when ham rigs required skill and knowledge to use? A piece of gear that the average person couldn't get a peep out of becomes a worldwide communications system in the right hands. Some folks don't like that.

And it's exactly the concept of "radio operator" that some want to eliminate, I think.

In the case of maritime radio, it was for economic reasons - the beancounters said it was cheaper to buy satellite equipment than to pay ROs. Coast Guard could replace their coast stations and ops with automated stuff. The military and airlines did it years ago for similar reasons. Broadcasters hopped on the wagon several years ago too. In fact it goes all the way back to Western Union and the RRs getting rid of the wire telegraph.

The idea they're selling is simply that radio isn't supposed to require radio operators, just as the telephone network and the internet don't require them. That's why they avoid the word "radio" and instead say "cellphone" or "wireless network" or "broadband" or "satellite" - *anything* but "radio". The "modern" equipment is supposed to be so automatic that there's no need for operators, or their skills.

Of course they can't just come out and say that, nor eliminate the licenses. I don't see how arguing the point with FCC can accomplish anything but get them mad at us, which we don't need.

I think the some folks are trying to slowly but surely declare radio operators "obsolete" - along with their licenses.

All that's left is us hams to keep the concept alive.
>
> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
>
Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here. Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as "electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a modem" "better modes and modulations"....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1981. Re: Another Life Ruined by the Evil Bush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:16:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040201221620.07155.00000431@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86708

In article <101l48acip0t73c@corp.supernews.com>, "Harold Burton"
<hwburton@cableone.net> writes:

>
>"anon" <anon@noanonone.net> wrote in message
>news:bve1q5cfp0@pita.alt.net...
>> >
>> > *** Bush cost me my job, my kids and my houses ***
>> > If Al Gore had been elected in 2000 I would still have a job, a home,
>> > and most importantly, my dear sons!
>> >
>> > Regards,
>> > Saddam Hussein
>
>Turned out a whole lot funnier than I would have thought just reading the
>beginning of the lament.
>
>Harold
>KD5SAK

Poor old Saddam. He'd probably complain if we hanged him with a
brand-new rope!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1982. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:16:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040201221621.07155.00000432@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86711

In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>
> (1) Amateur Basic.
>
> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz. Same phone allocations as other
> licensees on HF bands. Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> tion in lower 100kHz of any band. Limit 100 watts output on any
>band.
>
> (2) Amateur Advanced.
>
> Additional written examination. All presently HF-licensed
> Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license. Privileges
> same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
> for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
>previously
> code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
>(not
> grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>
> (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
>
> (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
>Extra)
> Comprehensive closed-pool written test. REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
>
> test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone
> allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
>classifi-
> cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
>
> Why?
>
> Why not...?!?!
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Steve:

Why not? Because it would make the perennial do-nothing whiners, like your friend Lennie, scream bloody murder ad infinitum. Not that I much care about that, mind you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1983. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:16:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040201221622.07155.00000434@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86709

In article <slrnc1kriv.33t.alex@homer.linux1.lan>, Alex Flinsch
<alex@localhost.localdomain> writes:

>gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
>simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
>
>Alex / AB2RC

You know, Alex, if Kim had used that as her justification, and had never
mentioned her "well-endowed" figure and the dare she took from friends
to request that call sign, I might have accepted that reason. However,
I would have suggested that "TET" would have been even better. Her
only problem then may have been an adverse reaction by Vietnam-Era
Veterans. It was Kim who raised the issues of her physical characteristics
in regard to her call sign, for the sole purpose of calling attention to them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1984. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:16:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040201221622.07155.00000433@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86710

In article <1e4e3692.0401301550.2a10397f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>
>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
>> Tech at 5 years old
>> General at 6
>> Extra at 7
>>
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I think you've finally found Larry's equal.

Billy:

Not hardly. Young Miss Clauson bears the unfortunate burden of being a
New Age, Dumbed-Down "Nickle" Extra. I got my Extra in 1983, and was
code tested at 20 WPM at the FCC Field Office in Baltimore. Moreover,
I learned my electrical theory from years of self-study as an avid electronics
hobbyist, built dozens of homebrew and kit projects, and spent years as
an avid shortwave listener. I did all of this without the benefit of parents
who were amateur radio operators, and almost no exposure to other hams
as a result. Young Mattie has an Extra-class ticket, and the same privileges
as I do, but that's where our "equality" ends. She has to melt quite a few
pounds of 60/40 rosin-core, and make several thousand CW and digital
QSO's, to get close to me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1985. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:16:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040201221623.07155.00000435@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 86707

In article <101l4f8c47n09d8@corp.supernews.com>, "Harold Burton"
<hwburton@cableone.net> writes:

>
>I'd hate to think what kind of sex oriented twist some folks might
>place on my callsign and it's the original assigned to me by the FCC.
>
>Harold
>KD5SAK

Harold:

Sorry to disappoint you, but I'd have to say, none at all.

You just Keep Drinking 5 Scotches And Kool-Aids.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1986. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:38:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040201223819.01019.00000251@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 86712

In article <bvjc5p$m5o$1@mail.specsol.com>, jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com writes:

>Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
>> jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message
>news:<bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>...

>The discussion was the the testing practices of an agency of the
>US government.
>
>Comparing the practices of another agency gives a reality check on
>the possibility of closed question pools.

Yep - and there's ain't much chance!
>
>> My position is that we are not going to completely (or even
>> remotely) get the degree of "training" the FCC sets before us with
>> open pools. We have far too many "Extra's" who can't calculate the
>> length of a dipole or know the difference between peak-envelope-power
>> and PeeWee Herman. That's a shame.
>
>I have mixed feelings on that.
>
>I think the perception of the ignorance level is skewed for those that
>spend a lot of time on USENET for the simple reason that those that do
>know how to calculate the length of a dipole are not going to post
>a message stating that.
>
>Only the ignorant are going to post things like that and the posts
>will stand out in your memory but you will never know how many read
>that post and just thought to their self "how did that guy get a
>license".
>
>If such questions were answered simply and correctly, and perhaps some
>references given as to where such things may be found (such as ARRL
>publications) without the usual derisive comments, maybe a goodly
>part of the training you hope for would take place.

>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>was a major part of the amateur training process.

Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with the
question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>
>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that

>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>with diagrams.
>
>A closed test pool is no panacea.

There's more:

I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971. The study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power supply, filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license calsses and older versions.

The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual only, for the Advanced class.

In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that they are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid interference, and regulations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1987. Re: Another Life Ruined by the Evil Bush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:55:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OSjTb.35811$P%1.28300412@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86713

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040201221620.07155.00000431@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <101l48acip0t73c@corp.supernews.com>, "Harold Burton"
> <hwburton@cableone.net> writes:
>
> >
> >"anon" <anon@noanonone.net> wrote in message
> >news:bve1q5cfp0@pita.alt.net...
> >> >
> >> > *** Bush cost me my job, my kids and my houses ***
> >> > If Al Gore had been elected in 2000 I would still have a job, a home,
> >> > and most importantly, my dear sons!
> >> >
> >> > Regards,
> >> > Saddam Hussein
> >
> >Turned out a whole lot funnier than I would have thought just reading the
> >beginning of the lament.
> >
> >Harold
> >KD5SAK
>
> Poor old Saddam. He'd probably complain if we hanged him with a
> brand-new rope!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I doubt that he would rate a new rope.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1988. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 03:57:59 UTC
From: Harold Burton <hwburton@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <101rik9j2b89h6e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86715

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040201221623.07155.00000435@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <101l4f8c47n09d8@corp.supernews.com>, "Harold Burton"
> <hwburton@cableone.net> writes:
>
> >
> >I'd hate to think what kind of sex oriented twist some folks might
> >place on my callsign and it's the original assigned to me by the FCC.
> >
> >Harold
> >KD5SAK
>
> Harold:
>
> Sorry to disappoint you, but I'd have to say, none at all.

>
No problem or disappointment, my own obsessions don't run that way either.
but there are probably other minds out there that might react with a titter
(no pun intended) to a simple alpha-numeric identifier.

Harold
KD5SAK

1989. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 04:30:18 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <bvkjoqhrd1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 86714

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with the
> question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.

For that I definitely blame the Internet.

In days gone by when one had to go to the library for information, two
things were different:

1) The world in general wasn't made aware of your ignorance.

2) By having to go through a book you usually picked up some other pieces
of information.

In today's age, the Internet is touted as the grand source of all
information with instant response.

Hence the huge number of really ignorant questions on USENET and mailing
lists that show the questioner has obviously never bothered to read a book
or manual because anything you want to know can be found through the
Internet just by asking.

What's even worse is these people don't bother to do a search of archives or
FAQs to see if the question has already been asked, which it generally has.

This mode of operation is by no means limited to amateur radio; it appears
to an epidemic of major proportions.

Unfortunately, I can think of no solution to the problem in general, nor
one specific to amateur radio other than to just accept the situation for
what it is and get on with life. Bitching about it is just a waste of time.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

1990. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 10:01:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <CdpTb.7130$GO6.3744@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86716

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > However, I haven't met a single 40 or
> > 50 year old recently with a young child.
>
> Do *you* have reason to meet such
> people, Dwight? How many "parent's
> nights" have you spent recently at the
> local elementary school?

My wife has a degree in elementary education and has taught off and on for twenty-five years. She is now back in school getting another degree in secondary education. She graduates in a few months and will then start her masters degree classes this coming summer.

> But you've spent a good part of your adult
> life outside the USA, haven't you, Dwight?

Yes, around thousands of active duty military personnel and civilian employees of the military.

And now I have to cut this short, Jim. I'm starting a new business and it's really eating up my time at the moment. Things should settle down in a few days. Until then, this newsgroup will have to take a back seat. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1991. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 11:12:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402020312.542262a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86717

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<EKGdnZYdCspQqYbdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<n9idnRzb3-nWBYfdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>Alex Flinsch wrote:
> >>
> >>>In article <20040129230924.22081.00003744@mb-m17.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>the word "tits" used to describe their breasts. "Boobs," yes, occasionally,
> >>>>but not the "t" word. I digress; this is about Kim, the reason why she
> >>>>requested her call sign, and the unfavorable image it projects on others
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>gee, and all this time I thought she took that callsign because TIT was
> >>>simple to send and had a nice rhythm in morse.
> >>>
> >>>Alex / AB2RC
> >>
> >>Are you kidding? I doubt she can even send Morse.
> >>
> >>
> > You don't have to send - just copy.
>
> So how are you going to converse with another Morse station, assuming
> you are in the CW portion of the band, if you don't send?

All of the portions of the band are CW portions.

Reread the
> post, it was talking about sending.

This purpose of this group is Morse Code testing. The exam is receive only.

1992. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 11:26:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402020326.822226@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86718

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040201221622.07155.00000433@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0401301550.2a10397f@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
> >> Tech at 5 years old
> >> General at 6
> >> Extra at 7
> >>
> >> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I think you've finally found Larry's equal.
>
> Billy:
>
> Not hardly. Young Miss Clauson bears the unfortunate burden of being a
> New Age, Dumbed-Down "Nickle" Extra.

Larry, you're so quick to tear down the achievements of a child.

1993. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 11:54:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040202065445.29660.00002719@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86719

In article <bvkjoqhrd1@mail.specsol.com>, jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com writes:

>N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>the
>> question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>
>For that I definitely blame the Internet.
>
>In days gone by when one had to go to the library for information, two
>things were different:
>
>1) The world in general wasn't made aware of your ignorance.
>
>2) By having to go through a book you usually picked up some other pieces
>of information.

Agree on both counts!
>
>In today's age, the Internet is touted as the grand source of all
>information with instant response.
>
>Hence the huge number of really ignorant questions on USENET and mailing
>lists that show the questioner has obviously never bothered to read a book
>or manual because anything you want to know can be found through the
>Internet just by asking.

And here I thought it was just me getting ornery!
>
>What's even worse is these people don't bother to do a search of archives or
>FAQs to see if the question has already been asked, which it generally has.

EXACTLY!

I first noticed this on rec.radio.amateur.antenna. Despite lots of websites
dealing with the G5RV and T2FD antennas, it seemed that about every other
thread was about either one or the other of those two. Worse, the *same*
questions would be asked over and over.
>
>This mode of operation is by no means limited to amateur radio; it appears
>to an epidemic of major proportions.

Agreed.
>
>Unfortunately, I can think of no solution to the problem in general, nor

>one specific to amateur radio other than to just accept the situation for
>what it is and get on with life.

On the one hand, folks like me *want* to Elmer the newcomers, but on the other, we don't want to spend all our time answering the same questions over and over and simultaneously reinforcing the behavior of "learned helplessness" where the person doesn't even *try* to figure out or research the answer.

One thing I've done is to respond more to questions where it's obvious that the

person has at least tried to find the answer themselves, and is now stumped on a particular point. Another approach is to answer in URLs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1994. TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 11:58:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86720

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> >
> > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > incentive to use voice only!
>
> Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> or greater disincentive since 1912.
>
> Why is it NOW a problem?

Why?

1995. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 14:30:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402020630.49ed38bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86721

jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<bvjc5p$m5o$1@mail.specsol.com>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
> > jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>...
>
> > > Of course there are those that seem to think an amateur extra license is
> > > of greater importance than an airline transport pilot certificate and an
> > > instrument rating.
>
> > I am a Pilot, Jim, and don't think so...But we're discussing
> > AMATEUR RADIO in this forum, not FAA ratings and testing policies.
>
> The discussion was the the testing practices of an agency of the
> US government.

Yes...The Federal Communications Commission...NOT the FAA, DOT,
DHS, DoD, etc etc etc...

> Comparing the practices of another agency gives a reality check on
> the possibility of closed question pools.

No more than finding diarrhea in the commode next to you means
YOU have a problem.

> > My position is that we are not going to completely (or even
> > remotely) get the degree of "training" the FCC sets before us with
> > open pools. We have far too many "Extra's" who can't calculate the
> > length of a dipole or know the difference between peak-envelope-power
> > and PeeWee Herman. That's a shame.
>
> I have mixed feelings on that.
>
> I think the perception of the ignorance level is skewed for those that
> spend a lot of time on USENET for the simple reason that those that do
> know how to calculate the length of a dipole are not going to post
> a message stating that.

Unfortunately you are wrong. There are any number of folks who
happen along here asking questions from time-to-time that are easily
answered in any number of texts. And many of those folks "ID" with an
Amateur callsign of a class that SHOULD know.

> Only the ignorant are going to post things like that and the posts
> will stand out in your memory but you will never know how many read
> that post and just thought to their self "how did that guy get a
> license".

I know the answer to THAT question...

"They" used a verbatim "Q&A" guide that allowed them to memorize
enough to pass the test.

> > If such questions were answered simply and correctly, and perhaps some
> references given as to where such things may be found (such as ARRL
> publications) without the usual derisive comments, maybe a goodly
> part of the training you hope for would take place.

And when those folks show up here I DO answer them, as precisely
and as cordially as I can. However, had they been required to actually
KNOW the material they "tested" on, they'd already know the
answer...or at least know where to find it without embarrassing
themselves.

> A closed test pool is no panacea.

A closed pool would require those who took the tests tom actually
KNOW the material

> > And if it were up to me, the FAA pools WOULD be closed. I can
> > tolerate the idea of a 71% correct Amateur Extra, but I'd rather not
> > think about a 71% correct ATP droning around with a load full of pax
> > and wx at minimums that made that 71% from a verbatim Q&A manual!
>
> Those that memorize the tests tend to get scores closer to 100% than
> to 70%.

But WHAT do they know?

They "know" if they see "this" question, the answer will be
"c"...and nothing more.
>
> For some insight on the testing process and question pool challenges
> for the FAA, see http://www.avweb.com/news/columns/186574-1.html.

Interesting. Still doesn't fix the problem, though.

Steve, K4YZ

1996. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 14:47:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402020647.2127c236@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86722

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<CdpTb.7130$GO6.3744@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > >
> > > However, I haven't met a single 40 or
> > > 50 year old recently with a young child.
> >
> > Do *you* have reason to meet such
> > people, Dwight? How many "parent's
> > nights" have you spent recently at the
> > local elementary school?
>
>
> My wife has a degree in elementary education and has taught off and on for
> twenty-five years. She is now back in school getting another degree in
> secondary education. She graduates in a few months and will then start her
> masters degree classes this coming summer.

Doesn't answer the question, Dwight!
>
>
> > But you've spent a good part of your adult
> > life outside the USA, haven't you, Dwight?
>
>
> Yes, around thousands of active duty military personnel and civilian
> employees of the military.

The vast majority of whom were under 40, let alone 50, right? How much
of
the US military (other than senior officers) is over 40?
>
> And now I have to cut this short, Jim. I'm starting a new business and
> it's really eating up my time at the moment. Things should settle down in a
> few days. Until then, this newsgroup will have to take a back seat. Take
> care.

Good luck in the new venture! I dare say that if it has anything to do
with young (10 and under) children, you may be surprised at how many
of them have at least one parent in the 40-50 y.o. range.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1997. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 15:40:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402020740.55fc6688@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86723

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311524.b4b3138@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401311044.3c9be0ad@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401310656.7ccf05e2@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Steve, now that you're an NCI supporter, would you like to join?
> >
> > I am not an NCI supporter...
>
> Maybe not a supporter. "Defender" might have been a better word
> choice.

Nor do I "defend" NCI or any of it's "policies". I realize there
are some well-meaning, well-intentioned folks in NCI who think they
are doing (did) the right thing. I respect them for standing up for
thier beliefs and using the democratic system the way it was meant to
be used, but therein ends any "mutual" understanding.

> I am resigned to the fact that we've
> > tossed a major skill down the drain, and I'd just like to minimize the
> > damage.
>
> Nope. Just an exam. Want to replace it with a stand alone exam on
> rules and regs? Amateur history?

If "Amateur history" was able to allow folks with dissimilar
languages to communicate via 2-way radio, even in this most
rudimentary manner, then yes, I'd support it.

However it doesn't. Morse Code however, does.

> And the mode still exists and can even be used on all amateur
> allocations ('cept a little bit of 220).
>
> > I served in the Armed Forces to protect the "majority rules"
> > concept, and this is one of those times that I came out on the short
> > end of the stick. Oh well...Got to make the best of it.

> Keep your chin up and your head down.

I wonder if the chips had fallen the other way if the NCI folks
would have been as accepting...?!?! I doubt it...liberals never do.
73

Steve, K4YZ

1998. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 15:42:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86724

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
>
> > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.

Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
of that station's operation?

That's what you're suggesting.

Steve, K4YZ

1999. wa3moj causing trouble again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 16:53:22 UTC
From: "Burke N.Hare" <postmaster@bogg.dynu.com>
Message-ID: <EGY787JE38019.4911574074@bogg.dynu.com>
Source record: 86725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

This individual is problematic and causes trouble on usenet and on the radio. He is responsible for the problems in rec.radio.cb and is responsible for many of the problems here. He has aol account and a comcast account. Beware this cb acolyte.

2000. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 17:41:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <HvGdnXPCn6KsEIPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86726

William wrote:

>
> All of the portions of the band are CW portions.

True, one can operate CW in any portion of the band, but if you are in the phone band, you can answer a CW station on phone, you don't have to answer in CW as opposed to if you are in the portion of the band where one can not use phone, ie., must use CW, thus the "CW" portion of the band, you must answer in CW.
>
> Reread the
>
>>post, it was talking about sending.
>
>
> This purpose of this group is Morse Code testing.

It is? Since when? That topic is often discussed but just where does it state the purpose of the group is Morse testing?

The exam is receive only.

So what good is being able to receive Morse if you can't send it? You must be one of the cbplussers ULX speaks frequently of. And I still stand behind my statement that kim probably can't send CW, or bet she can't copy it either.

2001. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 18:32:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402021032.6649605b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86727

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040201091610.15923.00003512@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402010353.2dccd37a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> >> Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.
> >
> >Did that. For one your "30M bandplan" would require both ITU and FCC
> >approval to implement. Good luck with that one Bonnie.
>
> And that's just the beginning.

Right: I haven't rummaged thru it in real depth and I don't intend to
but I'll just betcha there are more similar instances of conflicts
with the ITU regs.

> > If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz,
> >>then
> >> you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my experience
> >> working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that it
> >> can happen in Amateur Radio.

I poked around, she's apparently big on "pack radio", using digital
military HF "tactical" gear is one piece of it. She doesn't seem to
understand the collections of "differences" . . ?

> Of course it can. But will it? If the 'phone bands are as
drastically widened
> as
> proposed, why should anyone bother with 500 Hz processed voice
> when they
> have so much room for regular SSB?

Is it even possible to compress digitized voice down to 500Hz?
Violation of Shannon's Law?

> >> In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant
> >> band segments.
>
> On HF? Where are they?

There really are a bunch of underutilized spaces in the 160, 80, 15 &
10M bands James. "Spectrum banks for future expansions . . "

> >What is not conjecture is the fact that there is no statistical
> >evidence which indicates that simply having a license to operate HF

> >somehow equates to those with any new "giveaway" HF ticket actually
> >putting together HF stations and getting 'em on the air on a 1:1 new
> >license privs/band occupancy ratio.
>
> BINGO!
>
> And that's not going to change much.

If anything the ratio will get worse. I've seen too many examples of new-wave 5wpm ex-Tech Extras who have yet to make the first move toward putting an HF station on the air to believe otherwise. I'm not at all convinced that expanded HF privs is all that much of an incentive to upgrade these days vs. earlier days. Prolly has more to do today with the incentive to acquire bragging rights vs. anything to do with actually operating.

> >Quite the opposite is being demonstrated in fact. We already have tons
> >of experience with, for example, the recent huge increase in the
> >number of Extra Class licensees which fell out of the reduction in the
> >code test speed for Extras.
>
> And the reduction in written testing for Extra.

It's all one disgusting big dumbed-down bag of worms.

> >I tune the Extra 75/40/20M phone setasides today and the recently
> >enfranchised don't seem to be there. In volume. If anything the
> >overall activity level in those setasides is noticeably down from what
> >it was long before the code test speed was dropped.
>
> Don't forget sunspots.

I'm talking about the much longer term thru the highs and the lows. In years gone by there was always chatter in the Extra phone setasides, not with just sunspot-affected dx, but with."locals". After the last FD I decided to dredge up a ragchew in the 20 phone setaside before I tore down. Usta be no sweat. I had to tune around for ten minutes until w3bv came on the air and we yakked for 45 minutes via ground path.. Mid day, the spots were middling and the dx was there. The only w's in the space were a small group of 8s & 9s and Alan (keeper of the k3jh pole) and I. All of us were old 1 x 2s. Message there.

> > . . The dead spectrum problem has far more to do
> >with getting the HF-enabled of all flavors off the Internet, off their
> >dead butts, geting the radios, actually putting the HF antennas up and
> >getting on the air than it does with any "bandwidth-based frequency
> >plan" sorts of things.
>
> HEAR HEAR
>
> And *THAT'S* where the problem really is! Fiddling with licenses is
> only going to have a minor effect on that, if any. License changes

> aren't going to fix anybody's CC&Rs, or suddenly improve the
> sunspot number, or empower vast numbers of existing hams to
> figure out how to end feed a wire and actually get on the air.

Perfect example of the results of dumbing-down.

Bonnie also dumped her Master Plan into QRZ.com. Bad move. Those guys make us RRAPers look like wilted lilly nice guys in comparison. Check it out.

I notice that she hasn't gone back at anybody with a single rebuttal. Whatta weenie SHE is.

"Glory hound shoots self in foot."

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2002. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 18:32:58 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402021032.3083f33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86728

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040201091610.15923.00003512@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402010353.2dccd37a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> >> Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.
> >
> >Did that. For one your "30M bandplan" would require both ITU and FCC
> >approval to implement. Good luck with that one Bonnie.
>
> And that's just the beginning.

Right: I haven't rummaged thru it in real depth and I don't intend to
but I'll just betcha there are more similar instances of conflicts
with the ITU regs.

> > If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz,
> >>then
> >> you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my experience
> >> working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that it
> >> can happen in Amateur Radio.

I poked around, she's apparently big on "pack radio", using digital
military HF "tactical" gear is one piece of it. She doesn't seem to
understand the collections of "differences" . . ?

> Of course it can. But will it? If the 'phone bands are as
drastically widened
> as
> proposed, why should anyone bother with 500 Hz processed voice
> when they
> have so much room for regular SSB?

Is it even possible to compress digitized voice down to 500Hz?
Violation of Shannon's Law?

> >> In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant
> >> band segments.
>
> On HF? Where are they?

There really are a bunch of underutilized spaces in the 160, 80, 15 &
10M bands James. "Spectrum banks for future expansions . . "

> >What is not conjecture is the fact that there is no statistical
> >evidence which indicates that simply having a license to operate HF

> >somehow equates to those with any new "giveaway" HF ticket actually
> >putting together HF stations and getting 'em on the air on a 1:1 new
> >license privs/band occupancy ratio.
>
> BINGO!
>
> And that's not going to change much.

If anything the ratio will get worse. I've seen too many examples of new-wave 5wpm ex-Tech Extras who have yet to make the first move toward putting an HF station on the air to believe otherwise. I'm not at all convinced that expanded HF privs is all that much of an incentive to upgrade these days vs. earlier days. Prolly has more to do today with the incentive to acquire bragging rights vs. anything to do with actually operating.

> >Quite the opposite is being demonstrated in fact. We already have tons
> >of experience with, for example, the recent huge increase in the
> >number of Extra Class licensees which fell out of the reduction in the
> >code test speed for Extras.
>
> And the reduction in written testing for Extra.

It's all one disgusting big dumbed-down bag of worms.

> >I tune the Extra 75/40/20M phone setasides today and the recently
> >enfranchised don't seem to be there. In volume. If anything the
> >overall activity level in those setasides is noticeably down from what
> >it was long before the code test speed was dropped.
>
> Don't forget sunspots.

I'm talking about the much longer term thru the highs and the lows. In years gone by there was always chatter in the Extra phone setasides, not with just sunspot-affected dx, but with."locals". After the last FD I decided to dredge up a ragchew in the 20 phone setaside before I tore down. Usta be no sweat. I had to tune around for ten minutes until w3bv came on the air and we yakked for 45 minutes via ground path.. Mid day, the spots were middling and the dx was there. The only w's in the space were a small group of 8s & 9s and Alan (keeper of the k3jh pole) and I. All of us were old 1 x 2s. Message there.

> > . . The dead spectrum problem has far more to do
> >with getting the HF-enabled of all flavors off the Internet, off their
> >dead butts, geting the radios, actually putting the HF antennas up and
> >getting on the air than it does with any "bandwidth-based frequency
> >plan" sorts of things.
>
> HEAR HEAR
>
> And *THAT'S* where the problem really is! Fiddling with licenses is
> only going to have a minor effect on that, if any. License changes

> aren't going to fix anybody's CC&Rs, or suddenly improve the
> sunspot number, or empower vast numbers of existing hams to
> figure out how to end feed a wire and actually get on the air.

Perfect example of the results of dumbing-down.

Bonnie also dumped her Master Plan into QRZ.com. Bad move. Those guys make us RRAPers look like wilted lilly nice guys in comparison. Check it out.

I notice that she hasn't gone back at anybody with a single rebuttal. Whatta weenie SHE is.

"Glory hound shoots self in foot."

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2003. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 18:51:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402021051.2e6bfcd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86729

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402020740.55fc6688@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311524.b4b3138@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0401311044.3c9be0ad@posting.google.com>...

> > > I served in the Armed Forces to protect the "majority rules"
> > > concept, and this is one of those times that I came out on the short
> > > end of the stick. Oh well...Got to make the best of it.
>
> > Keep your chin up and your head down.
>
> I wonder if the chips had fallen the other way if the NCI folks
> would have been as accepting...?!?! I doubt it...liberals never do.
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, the NPRM came out in 1998 with the writing on the wall. You've
had a long time to get used to the idea, and a long time to accept it.
You've suprised me recenty with a mature attitude toward the whole
ordeal - thanks.

Had the chips gone the other way we simply would have kept trying.

73, Brian

2004. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 18:56:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402021056.70cc3d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86730

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> > > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.
>
> Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
> that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
> quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
> of that station's operation?
>
> That's what you're suggesting.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

No, Steve, I'm not suggesting that at all. Notice that I referenced
one country, and that was France. See above. A French amateur
replied to Dave what the French 6 Meter allocations were, and another
ham on here verified the allocations via a French telecom website.
Its really not as hard as you think it is.

So if you know that Frenchmen are on 6 Meters out of band, do you keep
working them? What if it's a downtown Dar el Salam hazing ritual?

2005. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 20:50:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <401EB80F.2060406@psu.edu>
Source record: 86731

N2EY wrote:
> In article <bvjc5p$m5o$1@mail.specsol.com>, jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com writes:
>
>
>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>>>jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message
>>
>>news:<bvh86g$3ac$1@mail.specsol.com>...
>
>
>>The discussion was the the testing practices of an agency of the
>>US government.
>>
>>Comparing the practices of another agency gives a reality check on
>>the possibility of closed question pools.
>
>
> Yep - and there's ain't much chance!
>
>>> My position is that we are not going to completely (or even
>>>remotely) get the degree of "training" the FCC sets before us with
>>>open pools. We have far too many "Extra's" who can't calculate the
>>>length of a dipole or know the difference between peak-envelope-power
>>>and PeeWee Herman. That's a shame.
>>
>>I have mixed feelings on that.
>>
>>I think the perception of the ignorance level is skewed for those that
>>spend a lot of time on USENET for the simple reason that those that do
>>know how to calculate the length of a dipole are not going to post
>>a message stating that.
>>
>>Only the ignorant are going to post things like that and the posts
>>will stand out in your memory but you will never know how many read
>>that post and just thought to their self "how did that guy get a
>>license".
>>
>>If such questions were answered simply and correctly, and perhaps some
>>references given as to where such things may be found (such as ARRL
>>publications) without the usual derisive comments, maybe a goodly
>>part of the training you hope for would take place.
>
>

>>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>>was a major part of the amateur training process.
>
>
> Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with the
> question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.

I came to RF from the audio and computer end of things. I probably will
ask questions that may elicit a few snickers from time to time. anyone
that thinks I'm an idiot is free to not answer the question! ;^) Self
training is a great thing. In fact I'll use a book and study before I
ask another ham.

>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>with diagrams.
>>
>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>
>
> There's more:
>
> I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971. The
> study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power supply,
> filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
> magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
> questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license calsses
> and older versions.

I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?

> The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual only,
> for the Advanced class.
>
> In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that they
> are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid interference,
> and regulations.

Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days. What is your
opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
likely easier, harder, or not much difference?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2006. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 21:23:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <401EBFD0.6060903@psu.edu>
Source record: 86732

N2EY wrote:
> In article <bvkjoqhrd1@mail.specsol.com>, jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com writes:
>
>
>>N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>>
>>the
>>
>>>question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>>
>>For that I definitely blame the Internet.
>>
>>In days gone by when one had to go to the library for information, two
>>things were different:
>>
>>1) The world in general wasn't made aware of your ignorance.
>>
>>2) By having to go through a book you usually picked up some other pieces
>>of information.
>
>
> Agree on both counts!
>
>>In today's age, the Internet is touted as the grand source of all
>>information with instant response.
>>
>>Hence the huge number of really ignorant questions on USENET and mailing
>>lists that show the questioner has obviously never bothered to read a book
>>or manual because anything you want to know can be found through the
>>Internet just by asking.
>
>
> And here I thought it was just me getting ornery!
>
>>What's even worse is these people don't bother to do a search of archives or
>>FAQs to see if the question has already been asked, which it generally has.
>
>
> EXACTLY!
>
> I first noticed this on rec.radio.amateur.antenna. Despite lots of websites

> dealing with the G5RV and T2FD antennas, it seemed that about every other
> thread was about either one or the other of those two. Worse, the *same*
> questions would be asked over and over.
>
>>This mode of operation is by no means limited to amateur radio; it appears
>>to an epidemic of major proportions.
>
>
> Agreed.

ahh r.r.a.a! Now there is a interesting place! There are some
interesting characters there. Anyone that posts a "simple" question
there does so at their own risk. Threads undergo an instant
transformation from a question to unintelligible arguments between the
hoi-polloi on some minute point in the post. The experts that are
bothered by us dummies can rest secure though, because we usually go
away completely befuddled. They almost had me talked out of the idea of
ever getting on the air. Not enough antenna height, not enough space,
not a good enough ground, not a good enough tuner.... And that was just
the stuff I could understand! There really should be two separate
newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.antenna, and
rec.radio.amateur.I.just.want.to.put.up.something.that.will.get.a.signal.out.

>>Unfortunately, I can think of no solution to the problem in general, nor
>>one specific to amateur radio other than to just accept the situation for
>>what it is and get on with life.
>
>
> On the one hand, folks like me *want* to Elmer the newcomers, but on the other,
> we don't want to spend all our time answering the same questions over and over
> and simultaneously reinforcing the behavior of "learned helplessness" where the
> person doesn't even *try* to figure out or research the answer.

I dunno, Jim. I suspect that teachers DO spend a lot of time answering
the same questions, and I suspect it was that way long before the
internet or liberals or whatever our favorite blame target is.

In the end, you can find out if the person wants spoon fed by seeing
what their second question is, no the first. And very importantly, how
they respond to the reference lists you send them.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2007. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 23:04:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402021504.6e171d7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86733

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402021056.70cc3d7@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> > > > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.
> >
> > Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
> > that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
> > quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
> > of that station's operation?

Silly Willy will never have the problem Steve, he doan know how to put
up antennas so the dx isn't gonna call him.

> > That's what you're suggesting.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> No, Steve, I'm not suggesting that at all. Notice that I referenced
> one country, and that was France. See above. A French amateur
> replied to Dave what the French 6 Meter allocations were, and another
> ham on here verified the allocations via a French telecom website.
> Its really not as hard as you think it is.
>
> So if you know that Frenchmen are on 6 Meters out of band, do you keep
> working them? What if it's a downtown Dar el Salam hazing ritual?

2008. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-02 23:19:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402021519.da853b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86734

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<HvGdnXPCn6KsEIPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >
> > All of the portions of the band are CW portions.
>
> True, one can operate CW in any portion of the band, but if you are in
> the phone band, you can answer a CW station on phone, you don't have to
> answer in CW as opposed to if you are in the portion of the band where
> one can not use phone, ie., must use CW, thus the "CW" portion of the
> band, you must answer in CW.

Unless you are an amateur in a foreign country where freedoms abound.

> > Reread the
> >
> >>post, it was talking about sending.
> >
> >
> > This purpose of this group is Morse Code testing.
>
> It is? Since when? That topic is often discussed but just where does it
> state the purpose of the group is Morse testing?
>
> The exam is receive only.
>
> So what good is being able to receive Morse if you can't send it?

Dunno. That always puzzled me. Just one of the many oddities of the
inventive licensing system.

You
> must be one of the cbplussers ULX speaks frequently of.

If you're listening to ULX, you've got bigger problems than CB radio.
You probably really hated passing that $250 over to him.

And I still
> stand behind my statement that kim probably can't send CW, or bet she
> can't copy it either.

You can stand behind your modified statement all day long.

2009. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 01:05:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040202200502.07984.00000419@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86735

In article <401EB80F.2060406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>>>was a major part of the amateur training process.
>>
>>
>> Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>> the question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>
>I came to RF from the audio and computer end of things. I probably will
>ask questions that may elicit a few snickers from time to time. anyone
>that thinks I'm an idiot is free to not answer the question! ;^) Self
>training is a great thing. In fact I'll use a book and study before I
>ask another ham.

That's all we're asking. It's one thing when someone says "Explain X to me" and
quite a different thing when someone says "I read books A, B and C on X,
but I still don't quite understand why you need to ....."..
>
>>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>>with diagrams.
>>>
>>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>>
>>
>> There's more:
>>
>> I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971.
>> The
>> study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power
>> supply,
>> filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
>> magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
>> questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license
>> calsses and older versions.
>
> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?
>
Depends entirely on the person. For some people, such nonverbal stuff is
easy, while for others it's really tough. Similar to the way some people have
no
problem reading maps or blueprints, while others are completely befuddled by

such things.

>> The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual
>> only, for the Advanced class.
>>
>> In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that
>> they
>> are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid
>> interference, and regulations.
>
> Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days.

It seems to me that a *lot* of the old exams was based on problems they
had experienced with hams. Hum modulation on ham signals? Ask a lot
of questions on rectifiers and filters. Some hams wander outside the band
edges? Lots of questions on band edges, frequency meters and computing the
tolerance of crystals an measuring systems.

>What is your
>opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
>likely easier, harder, or not much difference?

It's impossible to say for sure without the actual tests.

However, having read all of the guides, and having taken the tests that way,
I'd say that the old exams required a prospective ham to have a better
understanding of radio than the modern ones. While the modern tests cover more
subjects, they do so at a much lower level.

But what's most important is that the old guides only gave a general idea of
the
subject areas. For example, you knew there would be some fancy Ohm's Law
questions on the test (because the study guide had 'em) but you didn't know
exactly what they'd look like, or what the numbers would be. So you learned
Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and upside down just in case. And that was just
one subject.

Also, the old exams used multiple choice exams with 5 choise, not 4.

But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier for
99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
word-associate their way to a passing grade.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2010. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 03:36:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040202223625.11022.00003899@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 86736

In article <1e4e3692.0402020326.822226@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Billy:
>>
>> Not hardly. Young Miss Clauson bears the unfortunate burden of being a
>> New Age, Dumbed-Down "Nickle" Extra.
>
>Larry, you're so quick to tear down the achievements of a child.

Billy:

Point taken, and I offer all appropriate apologies to Miss Clauson.
However, her achievement, while a fairly notable one ***for a child,***
is no longer noteworthy for anyone over the age of, say, 10 years,
and certainly a meaningless one for an adult. I'd go farther to say
that the the amateur radio licensing requirements of the time when
I was licensed (early '80's) were nothing that could not be easily
achieved by the typical high-school student, even though there were,
in fact, some kids in the single-digit ages who were getting Extra with
the support of their ham parents.

Mattie Clauson's achievement only points accusingly to the fact that
present amateur radio licensing requirements are "dumbed-down" to
such an unreasonably low level that even a 7-year old can attain an
Amateur Extra-class license. And while the novelty of a 7-year old
Extra is certainly "news" in the Amateur Radio community, it does
not point to a secure future for our hobby/service. One must keep in
mind that she had the support of a mother who is also an Extra-class
licensee, and young Mattie was undoubtedly "pushed" along the
licensing process, whether Mrs. Clauson will admit to that or not.
Any of Mattie's young peers, without the support of a licensed parent,
and the material support of a functional station in their home, would
not likely achieve the same results. About the best we can hope for
is that other ham parents will take similar steps to induce their
children to become licensed, but that's about as far as it can go
until they become adults, with their own financial resources and the
adult prerogatives that go with it.

About the best face I can put on this is that young Mattie now has
the rest of her life to "grow" into the hobby. Hopefully, over the
years, she will acquire technical knowledge and operating skills which
will become equivalent to her Amateur Extra status. As of now,
however, she is more of a stunt than the real thing. I have no
doubt that when asked to engage in even a fairly low-level discussion
of technical and operating subjects, she will not be able to give

any reasonable accounting of herself, beyond perhaps the simple recitation of answers to the exam questions. The news articles make no mention of her on-the-air involvement in CW or digital modes, just the fact that she likes HF/SSB phone. Big deal -- a 7-year old who can push a button and talk! I'm sure she can use a telephone as well! But can she solder a PL-259 onto a piece of LMR 400 Coax? Can she build a dipole for 40-meters? Can she set up a Field Day station on her own? Can she build an interface so she can use PSK-31 and other digital modes on her parents' computer? Does she even know which end of the soldering iron gets hot? I have my doubts about all of the above, and I would think that these should be the minimum skill requirements for ANY amateur radio license.

Again, none of Mattie's inadequacies are her fault, she is just the product of her parent's dreams. But I do not consider her to be my "equal" as an Amateur Extra in any but the most rudimentary aspects -- those being that she has the ticket and the privileges. I had fourteen years of experience as an electronics hobbyist, project builder, and SWL before I ever got my Novice. As a result, I progressed to Extra at what was, at the time a notably rapid pace. Anyway, I look forward to working Mattie someday in CW or one of the digital modes. I just hope I get the chance, since I will not likely work her on HF phone.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2011. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 04:10:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402022010.11246a6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86737

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402021056.70cc3d7@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> > > > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.
> >
> > Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
> > that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
> > quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
> > of that station's operation?
> >
> > That's what you're suggesting.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> No, Steve, I'm not suggesting that at all. Notice that I referenced
> one country, and that was France. See above. A French amateur
> replied to Dave what the French 6 Meter allocations were, and another
> ham on here verified the allocations via a French telecom website.
> Its really not as hard as you think it is.

Sure it is...If we do it for "the French", then why not the
Russians, Poles, Czechs, South Africans, etc etc etc...?!?!

> So if you know that Frenchmen are on 6 Meters out of band, do you keep
> working them? What if it's a downtown Dar el Salam hazing ritual?

How am I to know from one day to the next what a Frrenchman's
allocations are? Thier government is just as likely as ours is to
change the rules, so without keeping a database of some sort on
EVERYONE'S allocations, how is a prudent American Amateur to know if
the guy/gal he's working is "legit" or not?

Steve, K4YZ

2012. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 04:13:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401F1FF6.FB8D774E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86738

Mike Coslo wrote:

> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?

Now you've opened another can of worms, Mike. I'm sure that you'll hear from those who find it difficult to draw if only to tell you that they regard drawing as a hazing ritual or as jumping through a hoop. Indeed little William Weeper will no doubt chime in that he isn't sure what a hoop is but that he'll know one when he sees it.

Dave K8MN

2013. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 04:21:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402022021.42e8ceab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86739

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<401EBFD0.6060903@psu.edu>...

> ahh r.r.a.a! Now there is a interesting place! There are some
> interesting characters there. Anyone that posts a "simple" question
> there does so at their own risk. Threads undergo an instant
> transformation from a question to unintelligible arguments between the
> hoi-polloi on some minute point in the post. The experts that are
> bothered by us dummies can rest secure though, because we usually go
> away completely befuddled. They almost had me talked out of the idea of
> ever getting on the air. Not enough antenna height, not enough space,
> not a good enough ground, not a good enough tuner.... And that was just
> the stuff I could understand! There really should be two separate
> newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.antenna, and
> rec.radio.amateur.I.just.want.to.put.up.something.that.will.get.a.signal.out.

Yet one more example of how it >>IS<< possible to have "TOO MUCH"
education.

I deal with similar types in Nursing...Those "special" few who
have BS or Masters in Nursing who have spent no more time at the
bedside than was required to get through thier clinical time in
school, yet now THEY are the ones who "specify" what constitutes good
Nursing practice.

And I think I know that other newsgroup!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2014. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 04:23:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402022023.7f40d27d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86740

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message

> Steve, the NPRM came out in 1998 with the writing on the wall. You've
> had a long time to get used to the idea, and a long time to accept it.
> You've suprised me recenty with a mature attitude toward the whole
> ordeal - thanks.

It's been my "attitude" all along.

> Had the chips gone the other way we simply would have kept trying.

I doubt it...The whining and the cries of "FOUL" would have been
reverberating for decades.

> 73, Brian

I shudda known.

Steve, K4YZ

2015. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 04:32:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86741

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...

> There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in any
> ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia" wideband
> ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk, the walk
> simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on the HF
> bands??

Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.

Go figure!

> The problem with "new modes" has nothing to do with the regs,
> allowable bandwidths or any of the rest of the usual micro-managed
> "grand plans". It's a MARKETING problem, pure and simple.

You go dude!

So...where ya been...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2016. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 04:34:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <401F24B8.756372C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86742

William wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> > > > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.

> > > I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.
> > >
> > Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
> > that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
> > quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
> > of that station's operation?
> > >
> > That's what you're suggesting.
> > >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> No, Steve, I'm not suggesting that at all. Notice that I referenced
> one country, and that was France. See above. A French amateur
> replied to Dave what the French 6 Meter allocations were, and another
> ham on here verified the allocations via a French telecom website.
> Its really not as hard as you think it is.

I'll try clearing it up for you again, Willie. I am responsible for
operating my station in spectrum assigned to me. I am in no way
responsible for ensuring that other radio amateurs operate where they
are licensed to be. French amateurs, regardless of amateur band, are
responsible for operating where their licenses permit them to be, using
modes permitted them and using power which their licenses permit.

It has been suggested on numerous occasions that you should take the
matter up with the RAEF or the French PTT. I'll now suggest it once
again. March with your banner held high. Write petitions. Lobby the
French government. Make certain that scofflaw French amateurs are taken
to task by their government.

> So if you know that Frenchmen are on 6 Meters out of band, do you keep
> working them?

You sit there with your charts and graphs in hopes of a 6m opening to anywhere, ready to maintain order on the band. I'll operate under the terms of my license and let authorities elsewhere control their amateur radio licensees.

> What if it's a downtown Dar el Salam hazing ritual?

I've seen downtown Dar es Salaam hazing rituals. You couldn't handle one.

Dave K8MN

2017. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 13:12:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86743

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > >
> > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > incentive to use voice only!
> >
> > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> >
> > Why is it NOW a problem?
>
> Why?

Why, Jim?

2018. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 13:51:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86744

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040202223625.11022.00003899@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> I'd go farther to say
> that the the amateur radio licensing requirements of the time when
> I was licensed (early '80's) were nothing that could not be easily
> achieved by the typical high-school student, even though there were,
> in fact, some kids in the single-digit ages who were getting Extra with
> the support of their ham parents.

The former record holder was an 8 year old in 3rd grade when she
got her Extra.

Back in the days of secret pools, essay and draw-a-diagram exams and
before the Novice or Tech existed, a local ham earned her Class B
license at the FCC office in Philly - a few days after her 10th
birthday.
>
> Mattie Clauson's

Why not use her callsign, Larry?

> achievement only points accusingly to the fact that
> present amateur radio licensing requirements are "dumbed-down" to
> such an unreasonably low level that even a 7-year old can attain an
> Amateur Extra-class license.

That's one way to look at it. The way I prefer to look at it is that a
bright and motivated young child set herself a goal and achieved it.

> And while the novelty of a 7-year old
> Extra is certainly "news" in the Amateur Radio community, it does
> not point to a secure future for our hobby/service.

Why not? I don't see anything wrong with young people, or females,
getting
licenses. In fact, I think that sort of thing is just what ham radio
needs *more* of!

> One must keep in
> mind that she had the support of a mother who is also an Extra-class
> licensee,

And a father, and a grandmother, and a great-grandfather who were/are
hams. Why single out her mother?

> and young Mattie was undoubtedly "pushed" along the
> licensing process, whether Mrs. Clauson will admit to that or not.

Do you know the family? Or is this just a rationalization?

> Any of Mattie's young peers, without the support of a licensed parent,
> and the material support of a functional station in their home, would
> not likely achieve the same results.

So what? Part of what healthy families *DO* is support each other's
needs
and interests. In that family, it's clear that ham radio is a family
thing,
not something one family member does in seclusion from the rest.
That's a
good thing. It brings families together, crosses generational
barriers, helps
build a level of education, maturity and understanding that are
greatly needed.

And there is no better way to help a child learn than to get them
interested in the subject. Geography? Time zones? Math, science,
technology? An interest in ham radio helps with all of those.

> (About the best we can hope for
> is that other ham parents will take similar steps to induce their
> children to become licensed, but that's about as far as it can go
> until they become adults, with their own financial resources and the
> adult prerogatives that go with it.
>
It's simply a matter of *SUPPORTING* a child's interests. I know
families that are very musically-oriented, and if a child expresses
any interest in music, an instrument and lessons are provided. Not
pushed - supported. Would you expect a
7 year old to buy her own piano and pay for her own lessons?

I never got any help in the ham radio area from my folks. So I was
delayed a few years in getting started. That doesn't mean other young
hams shouldn't have family support.

> About the best face I can put on this is that young Mattie now has
> the rest of her life to "grow" into the hobby. Hopefully, over the
> years, she will acquire technical knowledge and operating skills which
> will become equivalent to her Amateur Extra status.

She got 4 wrong on Element 4. How many did you get wrong on yours?

> As of now,
> however, she is more of a stunt than the real thing.

How do you know?

> I have no
> doubt that when asked to engage in even a fairly low-level discussion
> of technical and operating subjects, she will not be able to give
> any reasonable accounting of herself, beyond perhaps the simple
> recitation of answers to the exam questions.

You might be surprised.

And even if true, so what? The license test is the beginning, not the end, of learning.

> The news articles
> make no mention of her on-the-air involvement in CW or digital
> modes, just the fact that she likes HF/SSB phone.

So? I thought I saw a mention of packet, btw.

> Big deal -- a
> 7-year old who can push a button and talk! I'm sure she can use
> a telephone as well!

What would be adequate proof of competency, Larry?

> But can she solder a PL-259 onto a piece of
> LMR 400 Coax? Can she build a dipole for 40-meters?

Maybe. Neither of those things are on the test.

Tell ya what, Larry, I'll fill a box with parts and you can come over and build afunctioning ham rig out of them. No instructions, no elmers, just parts and a book or two. I did it when I was 13. I doubt you could do it, Larry.

> Can she
> set up a Field Day station on her own? Can she build an interface
> so she can use PSK-31 and other digital modes on her parents'
> computer? Does she even know which end of the soldering iron gets
> hot? I have my doubts about all of the above, and I would think
> that these should be the minimum skill requirements for ANY
> amateur radio license.

Why? None of that has ever been required before.
>
> Again, none of Mattie's inadequacies are her fault, she is just
> the product of her parent's dreams.

Nonsense, Larry. She's an individual. Kids are not robots.

> But I do not consider her
> to be my "equal" as an Amateur Extra

Y'know, the irony is that by making such a statement, you prove that *you* are not up to being *her* equal.

> in any but the most
> rudimentary aspects -- those being that she has the ticket and the
> privileges.

What if there are things she can do better than you?

> I had fourteen years of experience as an electronics
> hobbyist, project builder, and SWL before I ever got my Novice.

Well, ya got me beat, 'cause I wasn't even alive 14 years before I got mine.

> As a result, I progressed to Extra at what was, at the time a
> notably rapid pace.

There are folks who walk into a test session with no ham license and walk out with an Extra. That was going on before the VE system, too. The barely-10-year-old I mentioned above had to do 13 wpm sending and receiving plus the old Class B/General written.

> Anyway, I look forward to working Mattie
> someday in CW or one of the digital modes. I just hope I get
> the chance, since I will not likely work her on HF phone.

Larry, somehow I think that if she saw your posts she might not want to talk to you......

I don't know whether a particular ham is my "equal" or not. In some ways I'm probably better, and in other ways the other ham may be better. Unless we're in a mutually-agreed upon competition, I really don't care.

I say congratulations to a new Extra and her family. We need more of that sort of thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2019. What is this military transceiver ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 16:46:25 UTC
From: not@top-post
Message-ID: <i9idnV8Jo7P8TYLdRVn-hw@is.co.za>
Source record: 86745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.ham-radio.dxing,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hi,

I decided to open up this military transceiver which a tenant
left about a decade ago -- during the non-pc days of s. africa.

It looks as if it was for a tank or armoured car. Made by Barlows.
2 units SO/53 and VS/57 which strap into a base unit: the
power distributor B57.

It's 30 - 40 Hz steppable.

Q1. Is this one of the military frequencies ?

The SO/53 unit has 7 internal cans: Tx, VCO, TLT, Audio, IF, I.C.,Front End.

Q2. what are TLT and I.C. ?

After carefully tracing/testing the power (24 VDC), I obviously want to
monitor the audio out, which I'm guessing is to earphones; but I can't
find any obvious connector.

There are 2 connectors: 8-pin on the SO/53 unit and a similar one on
the base-power-distrubutor unit. They have 'dust covers'.

Q3. Is this possibly the earphone/mic I/O ?
Why would there be 2 on the SO/53 unit and one the base-unit ?
Perhaps to allow 2 or 3 persons to listen ?

Q4. Is there a standard military configuration, or must I just measure
between the 8 pins to find out which is the audio-out ?

The SO/53 unit has a coax/bnc to the VS/57 unit marked 'anten'
and next to it [and confirmewd from inside going to the same RF LC
group] what-looks-like a female thread for a whip-antenea, which
is 5.7 ohm to chassis. Since the thread is horizontal, someone suggested
that the unit could be unclipped and worn vertically on the belt;
except how the power-source-springs would be replaced is not clear.

Q5. How else could a whip operate when the female thread is
horizontal ? OK perhaps the 'dials face upwards' !?

The lower VS/57 unit seems to be the RF power unit, with some 1 watt
resistors and 'flat rf transistors': TWR pt9783 & vmp4 7848
and some TTL which together with 2 leds which change from green to
red, indicate various diagnostic states.

Q6. How could I proceed to test this thing ?
I've got 1970 - 1980 telecoms experience but not really RF.

Thanks for any advice possibly email also to:

easlab AT absamail . co . za

== Chris Glur.

2020. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 17:56:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AICdnQxpB8lRfYLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86746

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?
>
>
> Now you've opened another can of worms, Mike. I'm sure that you'll hear
> from those who find it difficult to draw if only to tell you that they
> regard drawing as a hazing ritual or as jumping through a hoop.

Just like the difficulties I had with learning Morse, a person that has trouble with drawing should just work hard at it!

I dunno where the idea of working hard if you need to went to, but it seems to have gone somewhere.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2021. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 18:27:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ttednfZXZ5e4dYLdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86747

N2EY wrote:

> In article <401EB80F.2060406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>>>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>>>>was a major part of the amateur training process.
>>>
>>>
>>>Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>>>the question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>>
>>I came to RF from the audio and computer end of things. I probably will
>>ask questions that may elicit a few snickers from time to time. anyone
>>that thinks I'm an idiot is free to not answer the question! ;^) Self
>>training is a great thing. In fact I'll use a book and study before I
>>ask another ham.
>
>
> That's all we're asking. It's one thing when someone says "Explain X to me" and
> quite a different thing when someone says "I read books A, B and C on X,
> but I still don't quite understand why you need to ....."..

That's all SOME of us are asking might be more accurate. Others take
umbrage at the asking.

>>>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>>>with diagrams.
>>>>
>>>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>>>
>>>
>>>There's more:
>>>
>>>I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971.
>>>The
>>>study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power
>>>supply,
>>>filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
>>>magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
>>>questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license
>>>calsses and older versions.

>>
>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?
>>
>
> Depends entirely on the person. For some people, such nonverbal stuff is
> easy, while for others it's really tough. Similar to the way some people have
> no problem reading maps or blueprints, while others are completely befuddled by
> such things.

Or me with Morse! 8^) It is amazing to me that in the past year, I have
learned DVD production authoring,learned a new 3-D rendering program,
taught myself visual basic programming, and am learning (of all things)
pottery making); and am now getting proficient in each. Yet I have spent
more time on learning Morse code than all the others combined, and still
am pretty rank at it. Not complaining, mind ya, (well maybe a little) it
just serves to make your point.

But ya duz what you have to do!

>>>The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual
>>>only, for the Advanced class.
>>>
>>>In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that
>>>they
>>>are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid
>>>interference, and regulations.
>>
>> Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days.
>
>
> It seems to me that a *lot* of the old exams was based on problems they
> had experienced with hams. Hum modulation on ham signals? Ask a lot
> of questions on rectifiers and filters. Some hams wander outside the band
> edges? Lots of questions on band edges, frequency meters and computing the
> tolerance of crystals an measuring systems.
>
>
>>What is your
>>opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
>>likely easier, harder, or not much difference?
>
>
> It's impossible to say for sure without the actual tests.
>
> However, having read all of the guides, and having taken the tests that way,
> I'd say that the old exams required a prospective ham to have a better
> understanding of radio than the modern ones. While the modern tests cover more
> subjects, they do so at a much lower level.
>
> But what's most important is that the old guides only gave a general idea of
> the

> subject areas. For example, you knew there would be some fancy Ohm's Law
> questions on the test (because the study guide had 'em) but you didn't know
> exactly what they'd look like, or what the numbers would be. So you learned
> Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and upside down just in case. And that was just
> *one* subject.
>
> Also, the old exams used multiple choice exams with 5 choise, not 4.
>
> But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
> solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier for
> 99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
> word-associate their way to a passing grade.

The present pool has IIRC around 800some questions. That is getting to
the level you speak of. When I studied for mine, I went over all them,
although there is another incentive to learn the material, because
several of the questions are similar, and the answers are shifted
around. Question 32's answer might be "A" in the pool, but "C" on the
real test.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2022. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 19:48:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86748

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...
>
> > There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in any
> > ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia" wideband
> > ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk, the walk
> > simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on the HF
> > bands??
>
> Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
> has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
> technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
> no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.

> Go figure!

It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
anything but talk either.

Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.

> > The problem with "new modes" has nothing to do with the regs,
> > allowable bandwidths or any of the rest of the usual micro-managed
> > "grand plans". It's a MARKETING problem, pure and simple.
>
> You go dude!

I ain't buying no dayum Yugo!

> So...where ya been...?!?!

Keeping a lower profile. I've run a bit short of patience with this
funny farm.

> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Brian w3rv

2023. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150348.21232.00004011@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86801

In article <5c01b95b.0402022021.42e8ceab@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> I deal with similar types in Nursing...Those "special" few who
>have BS or Masters in Nursing who have spent no more time at the
>bedside than was required to get through thier clinical time in
>school, yet now THEY are the ones who "specify" what constitutes good
>Nursing practice.

Hello? This newsgroup is about RADIO, specifically amateur radio.

It isn't about nursing or flying or the USMC school of helicopter maintenance.

You and Larrah ought to get together in a Superiors Club to show everyone how it is done based on how good you both are... :-)

LHA / WMD

2024. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150349.21232.00004012@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86803

In article <20040202200502.07984.00000419@mb-m22.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <401EB80F.2060406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>>>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>>>>was a major part of the amateur training process.
>>>
>>>
>>> Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>>> the question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>>
>>I came to RF from the audio and computer end of things. I probably will
>>ask questions that may elicit a few snickers from time to time. anyone
>>that thinks I'm an idiot is free to not answer the question! ;^) Self
>>training is a great thing. In fact I'll use a book and study before I
>>ask another ham.
>
>That's all we're asking. It's one thing when someone says "Explain X to me"
>and
>quite a different thing when someone says "I read books A, B and C on X,
>but I still don't quite understand why you need to ....."..
>>
>>>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>>>with diagrams.
>>>>
>>>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>>>
>>>
>>> There's more:
>>>
>>> I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971.
>>> The
>>> study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power
>>> supply,
>>> filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
>>> magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
>>> questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license
>>> calsses and older versions.
>>
>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?

>>
>Depends entirely on the person. For some people, such nonverbal stuff is
>easy, while for others it's really tough. Similar to the way some people have
>no
>problem reading maps or blueprints, while others are completely befuddled by
>such things.
>
>>> The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual
>>> only, for the Advanced class.
>>>
>>> In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that
>>> they
>>> are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid
>>> interference, and regulations.
>>
>> Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days.
>
>It seems to me that a *lot* of the old exams was based on problems they
>had experienced with hams. Hum modulation on ham signals? Ask a lot
>of questions on rectifiers and filters. Some hams wander outside the band
>edges? Lots of questions on band edges, frequency meters and computing the
>tolerance of crystals an measuring systems.
>
>>What is your
>>opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
>>likely easier, harder, or not much difference?
>
>It's impossible to say for sure without the actual tests.
>
>However, having read all of the guides, and having taken the tests that way,
>I'd say that the old exams required a prospective ham to have a better
>understanding of radio than the modern ones. While the modern tests cover
>more
>subjects, they do so at a much lower level.
>
>But what's most important is that the old guides only gave a general idea of
>the
>subject areas. For example, you knew there would be some fancy Ohm's Law
>questions on the test (because the study guide had 'em) but you didn't know
>exactly what they'd look like, or what the numbers would be. So you learned
>Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and upside down just in case. And that was just
>
>*one* subject.
>
>Also, the old exams used multiple choice exams with 5 choise, not 4.
>
>But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
>solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier for
>99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
>word-associate their way to a passing grade.

USA amateur radio regulations require only a MINIMUM of 10 for every written test element question. There is NO maximum.

Anyone who wants a "tougher" test that all but the eidetic could not memorize ought to bug the VEC Question Pool Committee. They decide on how big the question pool is, not the FCC.

I've been repeating the above for quite a while...but it seems that "new ideas" have a difficult time catching on... :-)

LHA / WMD

2025. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150351.21232.00004014@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86802

In article <20040201221622.07155.00000433@mb-m06.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <1e4e3692.0401301550.2a10397f@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>
>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<c2356669.0401301002.77a3bf07@posting.google.com>...
>>> Tech at 5 years old
>>> General at 6
>>> Extra at 7
>>>
>>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/29/1/?nc=1
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>I think you've finally found Larry's equal.
>
>Billy:
>
>Not hardly. Young Miss Clauson bears the unfortunate burden of being a
>New Age, Dumbed-Down "Nickle" Extra. I got my Extra in 1983, and was
>code tested at 20 WPM at the FCC Field Office in Baltimore. Moreover,
>I learned my electrical theory from years of self-study as an avid
>electronics
>hobbyist, built dozens of homebrew and kit projects, and spent years as
>an avid shortwave listener. I did all of this without the benefit of parents.

A wonderful, self-taught radio orphan...

>who were amateur radio operators, and almost no exposure to other hams
>as a result. Young Mattie has an Extra-class ticket, and the same privileges
>as I do, but that's where our "equality" ends. She has to melt quite a few
>pounds of 60/40 rosin-core, and make several thousand CW and digital
>QSO's, to get close to me!

Larrah, NOBODY is as good as you...by your own definition.

Are you electronically connected here and formerly on FIDONET
BECAUSE no one could "come close to you?"

Try regular bathing. It might help.

LHA / WMD

2026. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150351.21232.00004013@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86804

In article <bvkjoqhrd1@mail.specsol.com>, jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com writes:

>N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
the
>> question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>
>For that I definitely blame the Internet.
>
>In days gone by when one had to go to the library for information, two
>things were different:
>
>1) The world in general wasn't made aware of your ignorance.
>
>2) By having to go through a book you usually picked up some other pieces
>of information.
>
>In today's age, the Internet is touted as the grand source of all
>information with instant response.

It IS a grand source of information...but takes a few seconds or
minutes to respond. :-)

The Internet is a SUPERB source of information, everything from
simple through complex in technology, from primers in electronics
to vast archives of application notes from leading electronics
manufacturers. I use it regularly.

The home office room my wife and I share has 39 lineal feet of
bookshelving, books packed in literally cover to cover. Good
reference material collected over half a century of time, mostly
mine. Given the cost of textbooks today, collecting all of that
would be prohibitive now.

>Hence the huge number of really ignorant questions on USENET and mailing
>lists that show the questioner has obviously never bothered to read a book
>or manual because anything you want to know can be found through the
>Internet just by asking.

Classrooms have always been full of the ignorant. That's why
classrooms exist. :-)

In the days of the old ARPANET (the "grandfather" of the Internet
and "father" of USENET) there were a number of ignorant users.
[been there, done that, got the T-shirts and TTY printouts]

>What's even worse is these people don't bother to do a search of archives or
>FAQs to see if the question has already been asked, which it generally has.

In olde-tyme days of classrooms, many students never used a
library. So, what else is new?

>This mode of operation is by no means limited to amateur radio; it appears
>to an epidemic of major proportions.

Shall we call the Center for Disease Control about this "epidemic?"

>Unfortunately, I can think of no solution to the problem in general, nor
>one specific to amateur radio other than to just accept the situation for
>what it is and get on with life. Bitching about it is just a waste of time.

You can always take Corrective Action.

One way is to recognize human beans and not carry on a bitch
session such as the above.

LHA / WMD

2027. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150355.21232.00004016@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86750

In article <HvGdnXPCn6KsEIPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>William wrote:
>
>> All of the portions of the band are CW portions.
>
>True, one can operate CW in any portion of the band, but if you are in
>the phone band, you can answer a CW station on phone, you don't have to
>answer in CW as opposed to if you are in the portion of the band where
>one can not use phone, ie., must use CW, thus the "CW" portion of the
>band, you must answer in CW.
>>
>> Reread the
>>
>>>post, it was talking about sending.
>>
>> This purpose of this group is Morse Code testing.
>
>It is? Since when? That topic is often discussed but just where does it
>state the purpose of the group is Morse testing?

This newsgroup was CREATED for the sole purpose of removing
the morse code testing issue from rec.radio.amateur.miscellaneous.

Morse code TESTING is a prime topic of GETTING INTO amateur
radio below 30 MHz. Ergo, the morse code test issue is most
prime for a discussion of amateur radio POLICY.

>The exam is receive only.

The omission of the morse code sending test is an OPTION of the
Volunteer Examiner team doing the testing. That is in the
regulations. VEs may invoke a sending test if they so wish.

>So what good is being able to receive Morse if you can't send it? You
>must be one of the cbplussers ULX speaks frequently of. And I still
>stand behind my statement that kim probably can't send CW, or bet she
>can't copy it either.

So what good is being tested for morse code...other than it being
the law for amateur radio license examinations in the USA having
below 30 MHz privileges?

The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.

There is nothing in the USA amateur regulations that mandates or compels any amateur radio licensee to use morse code over and above any other mode or modulation.

All allocated modes are optional to use in USA amateur radio. Optional. Option is not a failure.

LHA / WMD

2028. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150355.21232.00004015@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86805

In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>> In article <dCTQb.27124$zj7.21663@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Michael Black" <blackm00@cam.org> wrote
>>>>
>>>>| Take out that history from amateur radio, and I really
>>>>| don't see it starting up today.
>>>>
>>>>You absolutely NAILED it Michael. Amateur radio was started and
>>>>sustained until post-WWII by tinkerers, experimenters, and technically
>>>>orientated types.
>>>
>>>
>>> Also traffic handlers, ragchewers, DX and emergency types.
>>> Skilled operators, IOW.
>>>
>>> The early hams had to be technically oriented, because the
>>> equipment of the time demanded it. A ham who knew what s/he
>>> was doing could work the world with arelatively simple station,
>>> while a ham who didn't couldn't hear a station in the next
>>> town.
>>>
>>> Of course, much of the development of electronics since those
>>> times has been aimed at reducing and eliminating the need for
>>> "users" to have technical knowledge and/or operator skill.
>>> Amateur radio is one of the few places where such things are
>>> considered important. Indeed, the whole concept of "radio
>>> operator" has largely disappeared outside amateur radio.
>>
>> Careful Jim!! One of the arguments against Morse testing is that
>>outside groups do not use Morse code any more, so it isn't needed. Since
>>outside groups don't use "trained radio operators" any more, this is one
>>more reason not to test for anything.
>
>We've been going in that direction for almost 30 years, Mike.

You two are defining "trained radio operators" solely in terms of
RADIOTELEGRAPHY.

In the entire vast, much-bigger-than-amateurism world of radio
communications there is NO NEED of radio telegraphers. That has
been true for many years.

The FCC does not mandate, compel, or imply that morse code
must be used over and above any other allocated mode.

Yet, some radio amateurs insist that the essence, the prime
existance of amateur radio is all for radiotelegraphy skills. Why?

Rhetorical answer to the above should be obvious. :-)

>The issue isn't Morse Code testing or question pools or VEs vs. FCC
>examiners.
>It's much bigger than that.

"Much bigger than that?"

Not in this newsgroup. :-)

>Remember the old original Rod Serling "Twilight Zone" TV show? One of the
>most
>memorable episodes was called "The Obsolete Man". Starred Burgess Meredith
>and
>Dennis Weaver in a future totalitarian state where most books were banned.
>Meredith's character was a librarian - and was declared "obsolete" by The
>State,
>because without most books there was no need for libraries or librarians.

This newsgroup is NOT a forum for critiquing fictitious television
shows, FAA policy, or nursing.

FACT: Radiotelegraphy IS becoming obsolete, even in amateur radio.

FACT: Radiotelegraphy is NOT used for prime radio communications
outside of amateur radio except in isolated uses in maritime radio.

>From the beginnings of radio, the concept of "radio operator" has been part of
>our thinking. To us, that concept means "a person trained and skilled in the
>operation and adjustment of radio equipment".

To US who were in the big-time radio communications on HF of a half
century ago, that did not involve morse code. There were and still are
a lot of "US" involved in that.

As usual, there is considerable misconstruance on equating "skilled
radio operator" with radio telegrapher.

>An honorable profession
>going back to at least Jack Binns if not before.

Amateur radio is NOT a profession. By definition of law.

>Remember when ham rigs required skill and knowledge to use? A piece of gear
>that the average person couldn't get a peep out of becomes a worldwide
>communications system in the right hands. Some folks don't like that.

I was IN worldwide communications on HF over a half century ago.
At the time I liked it fine...even felt honored to be able to serve my
country doing just that.

None of that involved morse code.

>And it's exactly the concept of "radio operator" that some want to
>eliminate, I think.

You think mistakenly, but your freedom exists to state that you
think as you do and "much better" than others. :-)

Tens of thousands of skilled radio operators worldwide have used
worldwide communications effectively for decades without ever
once having to use or know morse code. They have done so for
over a half century.

The year is 2004. It is not the 1920s or the 1930s when radio was
a rarity that only a few knew or understood.

You cannot maintain a status quo in a technological field solely on
the grounds of having "mastered" a particular skill that was once a
necessity, especially one whose necessity was before your life
existance.

>In the case of maritime radio, it was for economic reasons - the beancounters
>said it was cheaper to buy satellite equipment than to pay ROs. Coast Guard
>could replace their coast stations and ops with automated stuff. The military
>and airlines did it years ago for similar reasons. Broadcasters hopped on the
>wagon several years ago too. In fact it goes all the way back to Western
>Union and the RRs getting rid of the wire telegraph.

Too narrow a focus.

The essence of radio operation is to effect COMMUNICATIONS. It is
not about USING a radio.

>The idea they're selling is simply that radio isn't supposed to require radio
>operators, just as the telephone network and the internet don't require them.

The only ones "selling" the concept of "skilled radio telegrapher" seems
to be the ARRL and its faithful Believer membership.

The U.S. military did not require any morsemanship to use the very
first handheld transceivers (on HF) for communications in 1940. That's
64 years ago. Neither did they require any morsemanship to use the
first backpack radio (on VHF) in 1943. That's 61 years ago.

Did broadcasters EVER use radiotelegraphy? I don't think so. The
broadcasters and the government of the USA tossed amateurs off of
MF a very long time ago. Broadcasters have continued to operate
on fixed frequencies for long, long operating times due to good design

of equipment, never really had any need to "operate" the radio transmitters in the amateur (apparent) definition. [been there, done that, got the signed backs licenses] Broadcasters concentrate on program production, not the continual operation of their transmitters.

The hundreds of thousands of PLMRS transceivers are not "operated" every day in the apparent amateur sense. The essence of such radios is to communicate and get information, not to "work other stations" to get QSL cards or to engage in "radiosport."

>That's why they avoid the word "radio" and instead say "cellphone" or "wireless
>network" or "broadband" or "satellite" - *anything* but "radio".

You haven't been in the wider world of radio communications if you think thusly. :-)

The key word in the rest of the radio world has always been COMMUNICATIONS, not the operation of radios.

A wireless network is called "wireless" since it does not use wires as in a wired local area network linking computes. Neither network requires "trained radio operators" to use and never did. :-)

"Satellite" as spoken of in the communications field refers to the communications satellite, usually (but not always) in a geo-synchronous orbit. There are other types of satellites and all of them use radio in various forms for control, guidance, telemetry as well as communications. There are no manned satellites yet. Only the International Space Station is manned.

"Broadband" is a generic term for any data, video, or other communications that requires a broad bandwidth in its propagation path. That applies to both wired, fibered, or radioed communications paths and the "broadness" depends on the rate of communications.

The telephone was conceived as a simple-to-use communications device, primarily for individual users. A cellular telephone is an extension of the telephone using a small two-way radio to complete the wireless extension. A "cellphone" is releatively easy to use, so much so that the number of USA cellphone subscribers is one in every three citizens.

>The "modern"
>equipment is supposed to be so automatic that there's no need for operators,
>or their skills.

That worked out very nicely, thanks be to the engineers and designers who made it all possible. :-)

>Of course they can't just come out and say that, nor eliminate the licenses.
>I don't see how arguing the point with FCC can accomplish anything but get
>them mad at us, which we don't need.

So...the old thoughts about keeping a living museum of ancient radio skills in amateurism is out? :-)

>I think the some folks are trying to slowly but surely declare radio operators
>"obsolete" - along with their licenses.

Radiotelegraphers ARE obsolete. They just refuse to admit it. :-)

>All that's left is us hams to keep the concept alive.

Ah! The concept of a living museum of ancient radio skills is still alive!

>> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
>>
>Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here.
>Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as
>"electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a
>modem" "better modes and modulations"....

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still feeling pain of old, old newsgroup gropes? :-)

Olde-tyme radio amateurs who are firm Believers of the standards and practices of the 1930s should TRY to approach the new millennium with some up-to-date concepts.

Radiotelegraphy IS obsolete...everywhere but in amateur radio.

Radiotelegraphy is on the road to Defunctville.

Radiotelegraphy is as modern as horses and buggies on interstate highways...restricted to a cult status like the Amish who froze all their technology past an ancient time.

Keep polishing the handle on the door of the Living Museum of Archaic Radio. Who knows what visitors will show up?

LHA / WMD

2029. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 20:03:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203150356.21232.00004017@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 86749

In article <5c01b95b.0402022023.7f40d27d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>
>> Steve, the NPRM came out in 1998 with the writing on the wall. You've
>> had a long time to get used to the idea, and a long time to accept it.
>> You've suprised me recenty with a mature attitude toward the whole
>> ordeal - thanks.
>
> It's been my "attitude" all along.

...which seems to have started only a week or so ago...after months and months of "putz" and "scumminess" statements. :-)

>> Had the chips gone the other way we simply would have kept trying.
>
> I doubt it...The whining and the cries of "FOUL" would have been
>reverberating for decades.

"Vigilance in the defense of liberty is no vice." - B.G.

>> 73, Brian
>
> I shudda known.

Took you that long to discover the obvious?

LHA / WMD

2030. Well, BPL is coming to Rochester, NY :(

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 22:30:47 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <riVTb.13981$1Z4.4406@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 86806

Hi gang!

Well, I've not been very active in the newsgroup since so much seems to be the old flames, but in case anyone is interested, I received an email at work. One of the hams passed along a note (names, of course, have been removed) and it appears that BPL will be coming to Rochester, NY. Sigh. My feeling is that the concept was fine, but everyone ignored the results of raising standards. In any case, here is the snip from the email.

**** begin quote****
I don't know if you've seen the ARRL video of RFI due to BPL systems
but it is a very dramatic demo. My brother, who works at RGE, says it is
coming here. Pass this along to any other hams that might be interested.
The ARRL BPL video is at:
http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-web.mpg
**** end quote****

Rochester Gas & Electric is, of course, the local gas and electric distribution for my area.

I've had some fun on 440 and 10 meters too, but have not been active on the lower HF bands since 1969. There are some folks that think this is an amateur radio only problem; many of us know otherwise. I'm guessing I'll have to put up a 10 meter beacon at the least for now, but would love to have some serious input for suggestions. Obviously, I can make measurements (and I'm hoping I might be able to talk *real* nice to those guys at the cal lab I worked at some 8 years ago to make some measurements on calibrated equipment - Open Air Test Site) and try whatever.

Meanwhile, if we could avoid the flames, some serious suggestions would be most welcome from anyone (licensed or not).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.577 / Virus Database: 366 - Release Date: 2/3/04

2031. Re: Well, BPL is coming to Rochester, NY :(

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 22:46:53 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <W4idnV9Hsvh7ub3d4p2dnA@crocker.com>
Source record: 86807

i would contact w1rfi at arrl hq and ask for a procedure to make some before and after measurements. that way if you do get interference you are prepared to document the damage and help not only yourself but many others out. don't just write down a few s meter readings, you will want to document the antennas used, all radio settings, frequencies, time of day, other normal noise, etc. it may be best to make measurements on certain frequencies at certain times of the day... say 75m at mid day, 10m at night, etc when other band noise is minimal.

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:riVTb.13981$1Z4.4406@news01.roc.ny...
> Hi gang!
>
> Well, I've not been very active in the newsgroup since so much seems to be
> the old flames, but in case anyone is interested, I received an email at
> work. One of the hams passed along a note (names, of course, have been
> removed) and it appears that BPL will be coming to Rochester, NY. Sigh.
My
> feeling is that the concept was fine, but everyone ignored the results of
> raising standards. In any case, here is the snip from the email.
>
> **** begin quote****
> I don't know if you've seen the ARRL video of RFI due to BPL systems
> but it is a very dramatic demo. My brother, who works at RGE, says it is
> coming here. Pass this along to any other hams that might be interested.
> The ARRL BPL video is at:
> http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-web.mpg
> **** end quote****
>
> Rochester Gas & Electric is, of course, the local gas and electric
> distribution for my area.
>
> I've had some fun on 440 and 10 meters too, but have not been active on
the
> lower HF bands since 1969. There are some folks that think this is an
> amateur radio only problem; many of us know otherwise. I'm guessing I'll
> have to put up a 10 meter beacon at the least for now, but would love to
> have some serious input for suggestions. Obviously, I can make
measurements
> (and I'm hoping I might be able to talk *real* nice to those guys at the c
al
> lab I worked at some 8 years ago to make some measurements on calibrated
> equipment - Open Air Test Site) and try whatever.
>

> Meanwhile, if we could avoid the flames, some serious suggestions would be
> most welcome from anyone (licensed or not).
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.577 / Virus Database: 366 - Release Date: 2/3/04
>
>

2032. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 23:43:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402031543.3ab87b59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86808

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402022010.11246a6e@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402021056.70cc3d7@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be considered
> > > > > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.
> > >
> > > Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
> > > that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
> > > quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
> > > of that station's operation?
> > >
> > > That's what you're suggesting.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > No, Steve, I'm not suggesting that at all. Notice that I referenced
> > one country, and that was France. See above. A French amateur
> > replied to Dave what the French 6 Meter allocations were, and another
> > ham on here verified the allocations via a French telecom website.
> > Its really not as hard as you think it is.
>
> Sure it is...If we do it for "the French", then why not the
> Russians, Poles, Czechs, South Africans, etc etc etc...?!?!

I didn't say that. I said "if you knew that they were operating out
of band, would you work them anyway?"

No one other than Dave, and now you, has ever proposed having to know
all amateur allocations at all times.

The question was, "if you knew..."

Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?

> > So if you know that Frenchmen are on 6 Meters out of band, do you keep
> > working them? What if it's a downtown Dar el Salam hazing ritual?
>
> How am I to know from one day to the next what a Frrenchman's
> allocations are?

You're not being asked to.

I asked "if you knew that they were operating out of band, would you
work them anyway?"

No one other than Dave, and now you, has ever proposed having to know
all amateur allocations at all times.

The question was, "if you knew..."

Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?

> Thier government is just as likely as ours is to
> change the rules, so without keeping a database of some sort on
> EVERYONE'S allocations, how is a prudent American Amateur to know if
> the guy/gal he's working is "legit" or not?

That wasn't the question, and you know it. Just another diversion.
But I'll bet they're the same as when Dave was working out-of-banders
in downtown Dar es Salaam.

So many Dave apologists, so little time.

2033. Re: OK...So What Are YOU Going To DO About It...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-03 23:44:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402031544.6f79ed3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86809

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402022023.7f40d27d@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>
> > Steve, the NPRM came out in 1998 with the writing on the wall. You've
> > had a long time to get used to the idea, and a long time to accept it.
> > You've suprised me recenty with a mature attitude toward the whole
> > ordeal - thanks.
>
> It's been my "attitude" all along.

Hardly.

> > Had the chips gone the other way we simply would have kept trying.
>
> I doubt it...The whining and the cries of "FOUL" would have been
> reverberating for decades.

Hardly.

2034. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 00:52:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203195238.15923.00003572@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86813

In article <ttednfZXZ5e4dYLdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <401EB80F.2060406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>>>>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>>>>>was a major part of the amateur training process.
>>>>
>>>>Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>>>>the question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>>>
>>>I came to RF from the audio and computer end of things. I probably will
>>>ask questions that may elicit a few snickers from time to time. anyone
>>>that thinks I'm an idiot is free to not answer the question! ;^) Self
>>>training is a great thing. In fact I'll use a book and study before I
>>>ask another ham.
>>
>> That's all we're asking. It's one thing when someone says "Explain X to me"
and
>> quite a different thing when someone says "I read books A, B and C on X,
>> but I still don't quite understand why you need to ....."..
>
> That's all SOME of us are asking might be more accurate. Others take
>umbrage at the asking.

Don't you have any good umbrages there?

I hear they are real good at keeping off rain...

>>>>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>>>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>>>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>>>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>>>>with diagrams.
>>>>>
>>>>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>>>>
>>>>There's more:
>>>>
>>>>I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971.
>>>>The
>>>>study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power
>>>>supply,

>>>>filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
>>>>magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
>>>>questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license
>>>>calsses and older versions.
>>>
>>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?
>>
>> Depends entirely on the person. For some people, such nonverbal stuff is
>> easy, while for others it's really tough. Similar to the way some people
have
>> no problem reading maps or blueprints, while others are completely befuddled
by
>> such things.
>
>Or me with Morse! 8^) It is amazing to me that in the past year, I have
>learned DVD production authoring,learned a new 3-D rendering program,
>taught myself visual basic programming, and am learning (of all things)
>pottery making); and am now getting proficient in each. Yet I have spent
>more time on learning Morse code than all the others combined, and still
>am pretty rank at it. Not complaining, mind ya, (well maybe a little) it
>just serves to make your point.
>
> But ya duz what you have to do!

Sounds like you went to the same school that Larrah Roll went to.

Keep up the good work.

Remember, seven year olds can be Amateur Extras.

I'm sure that child put in many HOURS of WORK to achieve that
most responsible achievement of being able to access any
amateur band, even worldwide, all by her little self. [there's
absolutely nothing in the Part 97 regulations requiring any
"parental supervision" while operating transmitters...]

>>>>The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual
>>>>only, for the Advanced class.
>>>>
>>>>In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that
they
>>>>are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid
>>>>interference, and regulations.
>>>
>>> Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days.
>>
>> It seems to me that a *lot* of the old exams was based on problems they
>> had experienced with hams. Hum modulation on ham signals? Ask a lot
>> of questions on rectifiers and filters. Some hams wander outside the band
>> edges? Lots of questions on band edges, frequency meters and computing the
>> tolerance of crystals an measuring systems.
>>

>>>What is your
>>>opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
>>>likely easier, harder, or not much difference?
>>
>> It's impossible to say for sure without the actual tests.
>>
>> However, having read all of the guides, and having taken the tests that way,
>> I'd say that the old exams required a prospective ham to have a better
>> understanding of radio than the modern ones. While the modern tests cover
more
>> subjects, they do so at a much lower level.
>>
>> But what's most important is that the old guides only gave a general idea of
the
>> subject areas. For example, you knew there would be some fancy Ohm's Law
>> questions on the test (because the study guide had 'em) but you didn't know
>> exactly what they'd look like, or what the numbers would be. So you learned
>> Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and upside down just in case. And that was
just
>> *one* subject.
>>
>> Also, the old exams used multiple choice exams with 5 choise, not 4.
>>
>> But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
>> solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier
for
>> 99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
>> word-associate their way to a passing grade.
>
> The present pool has IIRC around 800some questions. That is getting to
>the level you speak of. When I studied for mine, I went over all them,
>although there is another incentive to learn the material, because
>several of the questions are similar, and the answers are shifted
>around. Question 32's answer might be "A" in the pool, but "C" on the
>real test.

The OLD ways are the "best" ways?

You have a complaint on the question pool? Go direct to the VEC QPC.
Do not pass Go, do not collect $200.

There is NO MAXIMUM on the number of pool questions. Those can be
20 times, 50 times, 100+ times the number of required questions per
test element. By LAW there must be 10 times the number but there has
never been any maximum. The maximum is optional.

Option is not a failure.

LHA / WMD

2035. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 00:52:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203195239.15923.00003573@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86810

In article <AICdnQxpB8lRfYLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?
>>
>> Now you've opened another can of worms, Mike. I'm sure that you'll hear
>> from those who find it difficult to draw if only to tell you that they
>> regard drawing as a hazing ritual or as jumping through a hoop.
>
> Just like the difficulties I had with learning Morse, a person that has

>trouble with drawing should just work hard at it!

Do you have trouble drawing a salary?

Can you draw a draft of beer?

Can you draw flies?

I have NO trouble drawing legible schematics. Did that in 1956 in
Chicago at an FCC field office. Did that for years and years
in the southern California electronics-aerospace industry. Am still
doing it.

I just deposited a hefty check in the Bank this afternoon, all for
doing real work in electronics. From General Electric.

> I dunno where the idea of working hard if you need to went to, but it
>seems to have gone somewhere.

Well then, you need to get down to basics...like knowing how to
skillfully shoe a horse in order to get a driver's license...like being
skillful at blowing glass so you can make your own vacuum tubes
(even if vacuum sucks). All basics taking a LOT of "work."

I'm sure that making all those analogies is a lot of work, but I don't
need them any more than I needed to use any morse code to work
in HF radio communications a half century ago.

"When I was young we whittled our own ICs out of wood!" - anon.

LHA / WMD

2036. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 00:52:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86811

In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in any
>> > ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia" wideband
>> > ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk, the walk
>> > simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on the HF
>> > bands??
>>
>> Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
>> has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
>> technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
>> no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.
>
>> Go figure!
>
>It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
>nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>anything but talk either.

Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)

Maybe you don't recognize Peter Martinez, G3PLX?

He was experimenting with polyphase shifting networks for SSB
back in 1973.

>Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.

Smoking isn't good for you. You ought to quit.

>> > The problem with "new modes" has nothing to do with the regs,
>> > allowable bandwidths or any of the rest of the usual micro-managed
>> > "grand plans". It's a MARKETING problem, pure and simple.
>>
>> You go dude!
>
>I ain't buying no dayum Yugo!

Yugos have built-in ham transceivers?

The automotive forums are way over to the right on the first floor.
Go there. You can't miss it.

> > So...where ya been...?!?!
>
>Keeping a lower profile. I've run a bit short of patience with this
>funny farm.

Awwww. You mean there's no more Tales of the South Pacific
and your shooting bears from a carrier?

No steam left in your catapult? We are all desolate...

LHA / WMD

2037. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 00:52:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203195242.15923.00003575@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86812

In article <1e4e3692.0402031543.3ab87b59@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0402022010.11246a6e@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0402021056.70cc3d7@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0402020742.17cbe1ff@posting.google.com>...
>> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0401291604.cb897cc@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40195625.2F129B2A@earthlink.net>...
>> > > >
>> > > > > As used in regard to amateur radio licensing, hazing may be
>considered
>> > > > > to be anything that one thinks he can't do or simply refuses to do.
>
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave K8MN
>> > > >
>> > > > I simply refuse to work French amateurs out of band.
>> > >
>> > > Do you have a reference of all international band allocations so
>> > > that when an Amateur of ANY nationality answers your call, you can
>> > > quickly look up that nations's regulations and determine the alidity
>> > > of that station's operation?
>> > >
>> > > That's what you're suggesting.
>> > >
>> > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> > No, Steve, I'm not suggesting that at all. Notice that I referenced
>> > one country, and that was France. See above. A French amateur
>> > replied to Dave what the French 6 Meter allocations were, and another
>> > ham on here verified the allocations via a French telecom website.
>> > Its really not as hard as you think it is.
>>
>> Sure it is...If we do it for "the French", then why not the
>> Russians, Poles, Czechs, South Africans, etc etc etc...?!?!
>
>I didn't say that. I said "if you knew that they were operating out
>of band, would you work them anyway?"
>

>No one other than Dave, and now you, has ever proposed having to know
>all amateur allocations at all times.
>
>The question was, "if you knew..."
>
>Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?
>
>> > So if you know that Frenchmen are on 6 Meters out of band, do you keep
>> > working them? What if it's a downtown Dar el Salam hazing ritual?
>>
>> How am I to know from one day to the next what a Frrenchman's
>> allocations are?
>
>You're not being asked to.
>
>I asked "if you knew that they were operating out of band, would you
>work them anyway?"
>
>No one other than Dave, and now you, has ever proposed having to know
>all amateur allocations at all times.
>
>The question was, "if you knew..."
>
>Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?

He might. To paraphrase, "lonely are the brave." :-)

>> Thier government is just as likely as ours is to
>> change the rules, so without keeping a database of some sort on
>> EVERYONE'S allocations, how is a prudent American Amateur to know if
>> the guy/gal he's working is "legit" or not?
>
>That wasn't the question, and you know it. Just another diversion.
>But I'll bet they're the same as when Dave was working out-of-banders
>in downtown Dar es Salaam.
>
>So many Dave apologists, so little time.

Go easy on Dave. He is busy revolutionizing the Internet by using
it as a transporter to download hardware.

Important work. Actual pioneering.

After that, who knows? He might invent transparent aluminum
and tell Scotty all about it.

He'll go where no ham has gone before...

LHA / WMD

2038. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 01:07:27 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9484CCA26AF2Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 86814

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com:

> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>...
>>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>> news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...
>>>
>>> > There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in
>>> > any ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia"
>>> > wideband ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk,
>>> > the walk simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on
>>> > the HF bands??
>>>
>>> Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
>>> has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
>>> technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
>>> no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.
>>
>>> Go figure!
>>
>>It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
>>nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
>>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>>experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>>"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>>anything but talk either.
>
> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
>
> Maybe you don't recognize Peter Martinez, G3PLX?
>
> He was experimenting with polyphase shifting networks for SSB
> back in 1973.
>

The original research paper on that particular topic was actually published
in 1945. I have a copy of it somewhere...

>>Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.
>
> Smoking isn't good for you. You ought to quit.

>
>>> > The problem with "new modes" has nothing to do with the regs,
>>> > allowable bandwidths or any of the rest of the usual micro-managed
>>> > "grand plans". It's a MARKETING problem, pure and simple.
>>>
>>> You go dude!
>>
>>I ain't buying no dayum Yugo!
>
> Yugos have built-in ham transceivers?
>
> The automotive forums are way over to the right on the first floor.
> Go there. You can't miss it.
>
>> > So...where ya been...?!?!
>>
>>Keeping a lower profile. I've run a bit short of patience with this
>>funny farm.
>
> Awwww. You mean there's no more Tales of the South Pacific
> and your shooting bears from a carrier?
>
> No steam left in your catapult? We are all desolate...
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>

2039. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 01:56:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203205637.05539.00004128@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86815

In article <401d2ee5$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>In <20040128115555.12501.00005862@mb-m04.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>In article <4016b2c4$0$99194$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>>In <20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:

>>>>In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>>>>In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>writes:

>>>>>>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>>>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>>>>>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>>>writes:

>>>>>>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>>>D.
>>>>>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>>>>

>>>>>>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>>>>>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes
>(take
>>>>>>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>>>>>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>>>>>
>>>>>>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>>>>>
>>>>>It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
>>>>>pros and cons:
>>>>>
>>>>>Cons:
>>>>>
>>>>>Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
>>>>>it.
>>>
>>>>That's one. There are others:
>>>
>>>>- Allowing a free upgrade

>
>>*can be taken as*
>
>>>>proof that the material in the test which is not
>>>>taken is not necessary for the privileges.
>>>
>>>To quote from the ARRL's FAQ on their proposal:
>>>
>>>http://www.arrl.org/news/restructuring2/faq.html
>>>
>>>"The fact is that the examination bar has never been at a uniform height
>>>over ham radio's nearly 100-year history."
>
>>And I say: "So what? The question is whether there is any good reason to
>>give almost 60% of existing hams a free upgrade to the next license class,
>>even though the upgrade to that class requires only a written test from a
>>published pool.
>>
>>>Were you also opposed to giving pre-1917 hams a waiver for the 20 WPM
>>>code test?
>
>>No such waiver ever existed. What *was* waived were the 20 wpm receiving and
>>sending code tests, plus the Extra written test. The person who got the
>>waiver had to hold at least a General license, too.
>
>Now you're being pedantic.

I'm being *accurate*.

>I was describing a subset of the waiver
>given, enough for the purpose of the argument.
>You described the entire
>waiver. Both are correct, and neither contradicts my arguments.

I find it interesting that you mentioned only the code test part of the waiver,
not
the written test part. Some folks might think the waiver only applied to the
code
tests.
>
>>That was long before my time, too. And it affected maybe 2% of the licensed
>>hams at the time.
>
>So you might accept grandfathering, if it occurred at some asymptotic
>point in the past, and only affected a small minority of hams?

Depends on the situation. The old Extra waiver only began after there was no
difference
among the operating privileges of a General, Conditional, Advanced or Extra
(1952 or later). IOW it was
just a title sort of thing - didn't make any difference in practical

application. And anyone who qualified
for it was an OT from the very early days (35 years at least). By the time the
waiver meant anything
in terms of operating privileges, that gap was over 51 years.

That's a completely different scenario than offering a free *upgrade* to almost
60% of existing hams,
plus any that might get ham tickets before the rules change.

>What
>percentage would be a threshold? You say that it is wrong to
>grandfather 60% of all hams, but you might be willing to accept
>grandfathering of 2% of all hams.

And I might not. Depends on the situation.

And the more I think about it, the more I think the old Extra waiver was a bad
idea, and that there may be
no scenario that would be worthwhile.

>What about a proposal that
>grandfathers some percentage of hams in-between?

I say no to free upgrades, then.

>What would be your
>greater objection, grandfathering all of the Techs, or grandfathering
>all of the Advanced?
>
What's the difference? They're both bad ideas.

>Remember that at some time in the future, we may be looking on this
>grandfathering as occurring at some asymptotic point in the past, as
>with the pre-1917 waiver above.

You mean like when the Advanced has been unavailable for 35+ years and their
numbers are down to about 1% of the ARS total?

>You ask below what is the long-term
>plan. I say one aspect of the plan is to be able to look back on this
>grandfathering in the same way that we look upon the pre-1917 waiver.

We don't look back on it the same way.

And why was it done?
>
>>>>- Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than
>>>>those who didn't. How do we justify that?
>>>
>>>It's called "grandfathering," which is done in more regulatory contexts
>>>than can possibly be named here. Due to the need for certainty in the
>>>law, it is nearly always based on hard cutoff dates. Technologies,
>>>practices, and people change over the very long timeline that laws and
>>>regulations are required to cover. It is not possible to predict the

>>>future with certainty, so laws and regulations must change to reflect
>>>current knowledge. It is also impractical for society to retest,
>>>recertify, or revalidate every existing entity against current
>>>requirements.
>
>>None of which is proposed.
>
>But when considering alternatives, one really has to identify all
>implicit alternatives, and argue for or against them (avoiding the
>logical pitfall of false dichotomies, trichotomies, etc.). The status
>quo, which you have advocated, and might be labeled alternative #4 based
>on your exchange with Bill Sohl, is one such implicit alternative.

To put it simply: Just leave the closed-off classes alone, and let them
go away by attrition.

This is exactly what was done with the Advanced from the beginning of 1953
until 1967 - more than 14 years. What problems did it cause?

> I
>would argue against that, for the reasons I have given previously
>(streamlining of license classes, streamlining of band plans, reduction
>of regulatory burden, reduction in confusion for amateurs and the FCC,
>harmonization with the deletion of S25.5 and with other countries'
>regulations, etc.).

All it takes to keep those classes is a few sentences in Part 97.
>
>If license classes are consolidated to a smaller number, one alternative
>is simply to grandfather existing hams, which the ARRL has advocated.

A more accurate term is "free upgrade", because that's what it is.

"Grandfather" implies letting a person keep what they already have without
recertification. That's not what is proposed by the ARRL BoD for Techs and
Advanceds.

>One other implicit alternative (say, #5), is to make every Novice,
>Advanced (and possibly non-Plus, or would that be non-Plussed, Tech)
>come back in to take written tests to upgrade to the next level, or
>otherwise lose privileges.

That's the worst alternative.

>I would argue against that also, for the
>reasons I have also given previously (it is impractical to retest
>everyone,

It could easily be done over time by saying that you either retest before Date
X
or you'll be reclassified at a lower license class.

>and such existing hams are a large, stable user base such as
>that in the definition of grandfathering below).

"Large, stable user base"? We don't really know about that. How many
of those folks are active? Why have so few Advanceds upgraded to
Extra?

>>>The web site for Malvern Instrumentation gives a good definition of
>>>grandfathering in a technical context:
>>>
>>>"Grandfathering is the practice of claiming exemption of older systems
>>>from validation regulations and requirements on the basis that these
>>>systems have proved their reliability by adoption for a long period of
>>>time by a large user base."

IOW, we allow them to continue doing what they're doing because they've shown
a lack of problems in the past. But we require more of new systems.

It *doesn't* say we allow free upgrades.
>>>
>>>Grandfathering in the context of ham radio recognizes that existing hams
>>>have not only passed the tests in effect at the time, sometimes topics
>>>not covered presently (Morse code, drawing circuit diagrams, etc.), but
>>>have also gained experience beyond their initial exam topics. It is a
>>>fair, and pragmatic, distinction between existing hams and entry-level
>>>ones. Quoting again from the FAQ document:
>>>
>>>"Passing any amateur examination does not magically result in a good
>>>operator. It's just the key to the kingdom, so to speak. Experience and
>>>good mentoring create skillful and knowledgeable operators, not the
>>>relative difficulty or ease of the test."
>
>>I disagree with that assessment. YMMV.
>>>
>>>You might argue that not every existing ham has obtained the same degree
>>>of experience, or even a minimum necessary level of experience to be
>>>given a free upgrade. That would be true, but ultimately would be
>>>self-limiting, as experience would correlate with participation. An
>>>inactive ham using no privileges today would be using no more privileges
>>>if the FCC gave him a free upgrade tomorrow. Free upgrades are not a
>>>perfect solution, ideal in all cases, but are a good solution overall.
>
>>I disagree. What's wrong with simply allowing Techs, Tech Pluses and
>>Advanceds to upgrade in their own time?
>
>>What is the sudden need to eliminate those license classes? The Novice and
>>Advanced have been closed off to new issues for almost 4 years, and their
>>numbers have declined. And from 1953 to 1967, no new Advanceds were issued.
>>Did any of that cause problems?
>
>>What's the rush?
>
>>Are the written tests too hard?

Well? The current Extra was recently earned by a bright seven year old - can
we really say that it's unreasonable to expect others to do what she did for
the
same privileges?

>>>>- Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.
>>>
>>>No proposal is perfect. Weigh this one against the pros.
>>>
>>I have. The cons win.
>
>>>>>Pros:
>>>>>
>>>>>Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
>>>>>refarm the Advanced phone bands.
>>>
>>>>Why does that have to be done at all?
>>>
>>>So, are you advocating not refarming the Advanced phone bands even
>>>*after* the last Advanced class license expires? Yeah, that's a
>>>semantic nit-pick over what you wrote above, but then so is "You mean
>>>the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?" that you wrote below.
>
>>You're avoiding the question.
>
>>Why do the Advanced class subbands have to be "refarmed" at all? Who or what
>>would they be "refarmed" to? What's the longterm plan?
>>>
>>>If you do agree that the Advanced phone bands should be refarmed at some
>>>point in the future, at what point would you have it done? Would you
>>>leave it to Extras, give it to Generals, or would you otherwise split it
>>>up in some way?
>
>>Why does it need to be done at all? Is the Extra written that hard?

Why do you avoid these simple questions?
>
>So you would argue that any refarming would be done at some asymptotic
>point in the far future, indistinguishable at present between "decades"
>and "never."

I'm *asking* what the problem is with leaving some things alone.
>
>>>
>>>>>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
>>>>>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
>>>>>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
>>>>>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
>>>>>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).
>>>
>>>>Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?
>>>

>>>In this day and age, regulatory agencies seem more eager to simplify
>>>regulations. Removing regulations that are obsolete, or cover too small
>>>an intended audience to be justified on a cost basis, is likely a top
>>>priority for such agencies. Again, what is your timeline for change?
>>>Decades in the future, or never?
>
>>I don't see any reason to "refarm" them at all. Not at this time, anyway.
>
>>Note that in 4 years, the number of Advanceds has dropped by only about 16%.
>
>>Seems to be a pretty popular license even today.
>
Note also that several Advanceds have said they *don't* want an upgrade, free
or not.
I don't understand why, but that's what they've said.

>>It sounds to me like you want all Advanceds to become Extras so that the
>>Advanced subbands can become General bandspace. That's not part of the ARRL
>>proposal, though.
>
>No, I never said that.

No, you didn't. That's why I wrote "sounds to me".

>I would combine Advanced and Extra phone bands
>into just Extra phone bands, and leave the General bands as they are.

That's the status quo! It's not "refarming" at all.

>That doesn't mean that I wouldn't support frequency shifting, such as
>that proposed to make 40 meters a primary amateur allocation, or part of
>Novice band refarming. Just that I would keep the proportional amounts
>roughly the same. I realize that the current ARRL proposal splits up
>the Advanced phone bands, giving proportionally more to the General than
>the Extra phone bands on 80 and 40 meters, and proportionally less on 15
>meters (no changes on 20 meters). I do not strongly support that, but
>even that proposal isn't giving the entire Advanced phone bandwidth to
>the Generals.

And if nothing at all is done, the results are almost the same as what you
propose.
>
>>>>>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
>>>>>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
>>>>>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
>>>>>documentation forever.
>>>
>>>>If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
>>>>years, two months and 20 days or so.
>>>
>>>If by saying, "If the current rules are left alone..." you really meant
>>>leaving alone everything *except* the 5 WPM Morse code requirement

>>>(which would be eliminated for these General and below under the ARRL
>>>proposal), then, and only then, Technician-class hams will assume the
>>>HF privileges of Technician-Plus.
>
>>Whatever. I don't see why the 5 wpm code test is such a big deal as a
>>requirement.
>
>Does your "Whatever" answer above mean that you support 5 WPM Morse code
>for all HF license classes, or just for Extra?

I support a code test for all amateur licenses, period. I think the dropping of
the
code test for the Tech back in 1991 was a mistake. I argued and commented
against it then, and much of what I said would happen has come to pass.

>If the former, then
>there is a very real distinction that will continue to exist in the
>license ladder whether or not it continues to be recorded in the
>database. If so, then the expiring of Tech-Plus license in 6 years is
>not a simplification, it is a complication.
>
>>>That's still a long time in FCC
>>>enforcement (and VEC administration) years.
>
>>Why? It's been almost 4 years since the last restructuring took effect. Look
>>at the enforcement letters - Techs without code masquerading as Tech Pluses
>>isn't a big problem, from what I see.
>
>You argue that it's not an enforcement problem because few or none have
>been caught. I would argue that it is an enforcement problem because it
>would be very hard to catch someone, especially if confirming who has
>what privileges requires documentation that is no longer in the FCC
>database, and might no longer be retained by hams or VEC's. The FCC's
>limited staff time is probably being aimed at big fish, such as Advanced
>and Extra-class scofflaws engaging in power and interference violations.

You might want to read the letters. They're pretty evenly distributed, license
clas wise, except for Novices.

>>>Even if you argue that FCC
>>>action on further restructuring will take most of that six years anyway,
>>>there are still all those Novice and Advanced class licenses that will
>>>likely exist in the database for decades to come.
>
>>It makes sense to grandfather existing Novices to the "NewNovice" (or
>>whatever
>>it is called). There are only about 32,000 Novices left now, down from just
>>under 50,000 after restructuring.
>
>>What *is* the problem with Advanceds just staying as they are? Have you not
>>read from the Advanceds who say they *don't want* to become Extras?

>
>Which is as much of an argument as "Have you not read from the hams who
>say that they *don't want* to have ham radio examinations without Morse
>code?"

You keep avoiding the question.
>>>
>>>>Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the
>>>>"NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database
>>>>doesn't need to change at all.
>>>
>>>Did you notice that Novices actually lose privileges? See the FAQ
>>>document above for more details. In particular, power limits are
>>>lowered from 200 Watts PEP to 100 Watts PEP on HF bands except for 10
>>>meters, and 50 Watts PEP on 10 meters.
>
>>Is that really much of a problem? How many Novices are on the air today
>>running more than those power levels?
>
Well? You know the answer as well as I: "Very few".

>>> From the FAQ:
>>>
>>>"The reason behind the change in Novice power limits is to avoid having
>>>to examine entry-level applicants about how to evaluate amateur stations
>>>for RF safety. "
>>>
>>>I'm sure that you would argue that Technicians should retain their power
>>>limits (1500 Watts PEP) on 6 meters and up, and I would agree, but what
>>>about HF? Should Technicians lose privileges on those bands, by having
>>>their power limits lowered (from 200 Watts PEP), or should there be
>>>separate power limits for Novice and Technician on HF? This is starting
>>>to get more complicated than before.
>
>>Not at all! Where an existing ham has greater privs, those privs would be
>>retained. This has been done with Tech Pluses for almost 4 years now. FCC
>>proposed it and enacted it, btw. Why can't it be done for existing Novices
>>and Techs?
>
>So, again, as part of your status-quo alternative, you want to keep in
>place the regulations and bandplans for six classes of license, only
>five of which will be tracked in the FCC database six years from now.

Why not? Most of that is just a few lines in Part 97.

>>The 1998 proposal from ARRL Hq was for Tech Pluses and Novices to get a
>>freebie
>>to General - and FCC said no. What has changed that suddenly makes free
>>upgrades a good idea?
>
>The ARRL argues that this is now the second round of restructuring.

Then why wasn't the BoD ready for it?

>The
>FCC prefers to revisit things every few years, and do things in
>manageable chunks.

Meaning no disrespect, but - how do you know?

And if that is, indeed, the case, why not make a few changes now
(like the "NewNovice") and revisit in a few years?

>What is driving this second round is the lifting of
>the S25.5 requirement, the eventual need (in the ARRL's opinion, and
>mine) to address the shrinking pools of Novice and Advanced class
>licenses, as well as the fact that there will be no distinction in the
>FCC database between two classes of licenses with different privileges
>(Tech and Tech Plus) in the very near future.

Let's take those one at a time:

"shrinking pools of Novice and Advanced class licenses"

If the Novice is reopened to new issues and existing Novices get NewNovice
privileges as proposed by the BoD, the Novice shrinkage should stop.

Advanceds are shrinking at a very slow rate (16% in almost 4 years) so there's
no hurry in dealing with them.

"there will be no distinction in the FCC database between two classes of
licenses with different privileges
(Tech and Tech Plus) in the very near future"

Part of the proposal is for the code test for all but the Extra to go away, so
the difference between
Tech and Tech Plus becomes moot unless someone wants to get an Extra - at which
time all they
need do is present their old license or other document for Element 1 credit.

Or they can just take the code test!

So that's not an issue either.
>
>>>>>>>Rather, it is just one of
>>>>>>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until
>better
>>>>>>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>>>>>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>>>>>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC
>official's
>>>>>>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>>>>>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,
>>>>>>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>>>>>>bad

>>>>>>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>>>>>>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?

>>>>>>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really
>>>>>>such a
>>>>>>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass
>>>>>>Element 3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?

>>>>>I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
>>>>>credit.

>>>>You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?

>>>Yes, I meant the governance of the ARRL when I used the shorthand "ARRL"
>>>in the context of offering an opinion on a BoD decision. Only they can
>>>establish ARRL official policy and petition the FCC in the name of the
>>>ARRL. Who else did you think I meant?

>>Those folks are elected and paid for by members like *me*. They supposedly
>>make those proposals in *my* name and with *my* support.

>>Well, I don't support everything in that proposal.

>Welcome to the realities of representative democracy.

Been there since 1968 with ARRL.

>Both of us pay
>dues to the ARRL and elect Directors. They make proposals in both of
>our names. I don't support everything in that proposal either, but it
>is an ARRL proposal. You and I are perfectly free to submit comments to
>the FCC as "ARRL Members," but the ARRL Board of Directors will submit
>comments to the FCC as "*The* ARRL."

Which will be done in my case, as was before. The BoD needs to realize,
however, that the ARRL's position is weakened by proposing things that
much if not most of the membership opposes.

>>>>How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?

>>>You will need more than a rhetorical question to make an argument here.
>>>Instead, why don't you just come right out and say, for the benefit of
>>>the audience, which items in the ARRL proposal got enacted, and which
>>>ones didn't? And, of those that didn't get enacted, which ones you
>>>think have already been given a final "no" answer?

>>All right.

>>Fact is, almost nothing proposed by ARRL Hq in 1998 got enacted. 5 wpm for
>>General, that's about it. On everything else, FCC either:

>>- said no: free upgrades, better written tests, Techs on HF CW without a
>>formal test

>>- went far beyond what was requested: 5 wpm Extra, Advanced closed off,
>>written testing reduced dramatically

>>>>>They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
>>>>>a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
>>>>>Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
>>>>>at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
>>>>>past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
>>>>>license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
>>>>>gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
>>>>>future."

>>>>Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.

>>>But does address the subject of why they may be politically desirable,
>>>not only by leading to simplified FCC regulations, but also resulting
>>>in a more harmonious and productive amateur radio in the future by
>>>addressing most of the concerns of most factions.

>>I don't see that at all. Are the written tests so difficult, and the VE test
>>process so onerous, that free upgrades are the only answer?

>>>>I say they're not.

>>>So you've said. I'm sure that you will also say this to your
>>>representatives within the ARRL and comment on any future FCC NPRM on
>>>the subject.
>
>>Already have. In detail. More to come, too.
>
>>>I will, too. For the record, I'm not in complete
>>>agreement with the ARRL proposal, either. I don't see the regulatory
>>>justification for the retention of 5 WPM Morse code for Extra,
>
>>I do. Morse code is a big part of amateur radio, and having no code test at
>>all simply denies the reality of that.
>
>I'm sure that you will argue in more detail than "Morse code is a big
>part of ham radio, and having no code test simply denies the reality of
>that."

OK, here's some more:

One of the Basis and Purposes of the ARS is technical education and skill
development.
IOW, hams learning about how radio works. Morse skill helps in this area
because Morse-capable radio equipment can be made using a very wide variety of
technologies and complexities.

IOW, the beginner can build a very simple Morse station, and improve it as
knowledge and skill expand.

>You may also have to find new arguments beyond those that the
>FCC rejected in Docket WT 98-143, including yours.

>
That was 5 years ago. Things change. And if FCC just dumps Element 1, as they may, the Tech and Tech plus can simply merge.

>>>and I
>>>remain skeptical that a Novice license (even a restructured one) is
>>>viable today.
>
>>What we have now is a system that tends to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF
>>amateur radio, and manufactured equipment. And away from HF and homebrewing.
>>A restructured Novice could change that.
>
>Part of arguing for a new Novice license would involve identifying what
>has not worked with the present Novice license, and what changes would
>somehow "open the floodgates" with the proposed future one.

What didn't work was simply this: Getting a Novice required passing two tests (code and theory) while getting a Tech after 1991 required passing just one. So most new hams went for the Tech because it was perceived to be easier.

On top of that, the Novice didn't have 2 meters.

>You argue
>that most entry-level hams are being funneled to VHF/UHF.

They are. Look at the privileges. ALL of amateur VHF/UHF vs. four little slices of HF.

> might also
>argue that there are not very many entry-level hams at all, especially
>younger people, regardless of where they are being funneled.

Look at

http://www.ah0a.org

for numbers of new licenses granted each month.

In the past 12 months FCC issued 20,256 new amateur licenses. Is that "not very many"?

>The
>youngest members in most clubs locally are well into their mid-30's.
>The presence of teenagers has all but evaporated.

Why do you think that is?
>
>What types of realistic homebrewing are you advocating for "NewNovice"
>hams beyond 3-transistor OOK transmitters and single-conversion
>receivers? Please be specific.

What's wrong with those sorts of rigs for a start? There are also lots of good kits out there. And note that the "NewNovice" allows a wide variety of modes.

>What aspects of current communications
>technology, something that would be used and would not be a trophy or
>shop-project to be put on a shelf, can be realistically homebrewed via
>commercially-available (and presently-manufactured) parts by high-school
>age hams?

Lots of CW rigs, for a start. I built my first station from junk at age 13.

Do you think homebrewing is no longer practical? How about kits? Are
we to be nothing but appliance operators?

>When you argue for "NewNovice" privileges, are you supporting it with 5
>WPM code, or without?

I support a code test for *all* ham licenses. That probably won't happen, of
course.
But it's a good idea.

>What if almost no one wants to sign up for 5 WPM
>code as an entry-level requirement?

The ARRL proposal talks about how great the old Novice was in its heyday. 5 wpm
didn't stop hundreds of thousands of hams then - why should it do so now, when
we have more and better training methods?

The fact is that it's not the code test or the written test or the number of
license classes
which is/are the problem. It's things like lack of publicity, antenna
restrictions, and
competition from other activities.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2040. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 04:48:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040203234807.22081.00003873@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86816

In article <Xns9484CCA26AF2Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>news:20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com:
>
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>>news:<5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>...
>>>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>>> news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...
>>>>
>>>> > There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in
>>>> > any ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia"
>>>> > wideband ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk,
>>>> > the walk simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on
>>>> > the HF bands??
>>>>
>>>> Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
>>>> has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
>>>> technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
>>>> no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.
>>>
>>>> Go figure!
>>>
>>>It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
>>>nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
>>>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>>>experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>>>"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>>>anything but talk either.
>>
>> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
>>
>> Maybe you don't recognize Peter Martinez, G3PLX?
>>
>> He was experimenting with polyphase shifting networks for SSB
>> back in 1973.
>
>The original research paper on that particular topic was actually published
>in 1945. I have a copy of it somewhere...

No doubt something was done back then. A former RAF boffin named Clarke would have his geosychronous 3-satellite comm proposal published in Wireless World a couple years later. I was fortunate to read an original W.W. issue with that article. Right now ALL of the geosynchronous orbit positions are taken... :-)

Mike Gingell did his PhD thesis on the polyphase network (the four-phase version, not to be confused with other "polyphase" networks) in the UK. I have a copy of that courtesy of a UK amateur.

Several picked up on that thesis in the UK and Martinez' version was printed in Radio Communication magazine some time in 1973. My boss at RCA (Jim Hall, KD6JG) showed me that and it looked fascinating. I snitched some corporate computer time and analyzed it in LECAP, the RCA frequency-domain version of ECAP. I sent the results to Pat Hawker whose column ran the polyphase stuff and that was published in 1974 in Radio Communication.

Jim Hall is one of the "third-method" SSB innovators and his paper done at RCA remains as a footnote mention in the "Collins SSB book" although the authors got the third-method system descriptions mixed up.

Several in Yurp have used the Gingell values with success for SSB, including direct-conversion versions. One of Dan Tayloe's QRP receivers (D-C) uses that. A Japanese amateur surnamed Yoshida refined the values for even less quadrature phase error and that was published in QEX. The Gingell-Yoshida value set is most forgiving of component tolerances yet providing excellent very low error quadrature phasing across the audio voice band.

Mike Gingell moved the USA and got a U.S. amateur license, was living in an eastern state and was interested in satellite reception according to his personal website.

It's now 31 years later and most U.S. amateurs are ignorant of the Gingell circuit or haven't looked into it...most preferring to operate their ready-built, designed-by-commercial-engineers equipment.

The (Gingell) polyphase circuit has also been the subject of papers in the IEEE Transactions on Communications in the late 1970s and 1980s for applications other than SSB.

The basic PLL circuit was first described in 1932 (!) by France's H. de Bellescize but it doesn't bear a lot of resemblance to the modern PLLs using specialty ICs such as an MC145151. :-)

All things are as they were then except for some profound changes.

LHA / WMD

2041. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 07:06:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86817

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>...
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> > There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in any
> >> > ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia" wideband
> >> > ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk, the walk
> >> > simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on the HF
> >> > bands??
> >>
> >> Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
> >> has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
> >> technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
> >> no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.
> >
> >> Go figure!
> >
> >It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
> >nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
> >I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
> >anything but talk either.
> >
> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)

When did a 31 Hz wide mode become "wideband"?

> Maybe you don't recognize Peter Martinez, G3PLX?

I musta missed this one too, when did the FCC start passing out Extras
to Brits??

> He was experimenting with polyphase shifting networks for SSB
> back in 1973.

(a) When did bench-futzing SSB transmitter circuitry have anything to
do with putting a wideband signal on the air?

(b) When did SSB become "wideband"?

(c) You might note that phasing schemes for generating ssb signals
have about as much applicability to ham radio today as you have ever
had.

> >Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.
>
> Smoking isn't good for you. You ought to quit.
>
> >> > The problem with "new modes" has nothing to do with the regs,
> >> > allowable bandwidths or any of the rest of the usual micro-managed
> >> > "grand plans". It's a MARKETING problem, pure and simple.
> >>
> >> You go dude!
> >
> >I ain't buying no dayum Yugo!
>
> Yugos have built-in ham transceivers?
>
> The automotive forums are way over to the right on the first floor.
> Go there. You can't miss it.
>
> > > So...where ya been...?!?!
> >
> >Keeping a lower profile. I've run a bit short of patience with this
> >funny farm.
>
> Awwww. You mean there's no more Tales of the South Pacific
> and your shooting bears from a carrier?
>
> No steam left in your catapult? We are all desolate...

Goofy Putz.

>
> LHA / WMD

2042. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 10:54:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204055435.15923.00003581@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86818

In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
>nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>anything but talk either.

Some have amassed almost 80 countries on old-fashioned SSB, though. But that was when we had some sunspots.
>
>Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.

As is this "bandwidtj based frequency plan" thing. Note that it would essentially
knock AM and NFM off much of amateur HF. Note also that besides drastically widening the 'phone subbands, it cuts down the incentive to get an Extra.

Most of all, note the unsubstantiated statements like 'by 2010, 30% will be Novice operators' and '80% of hams on HF radiate a medium bandwidth signal' and such. Where do these numbers come from? No response.

One type of amateur HF wideband "experimentation" I know of is some folks fooling around with "enhanced SSB", which is plain old SSB with the frequency range widenend to up to 9 kHz. Some call it "single wideband". There's also some digital voice experimentation going on, but the added complexity doesn't seem to give addded results. Yet.

And to answer your question: Yes, you can put a voice signal (digitized) through a 500 Hz pass band. You just need a modulation scheme meant for that application, and the tradeoff will come in the form of needing a really good S/N and/or more than real-time to send the message.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2043. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 10:54:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204055437.15923.00003582@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 86819

In article <ttednfZXZ5e4dYLdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <401EB80F.2060406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>>I believe the term for such actions is "elmering" and at one time it
>>>>>was a major part of the amateur training process.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Yep. But there's also the aspect of "self-training", where the person with
>>>>the question tries to find the information on their own *before* asking.
>>>
>>>I came to RF from the audio and computer end of things. I probably will
>>>ask questions that may elicit a few snickers from time to time. anyone
>>>that thinks I'm an idiot is free to not answer the question! ;^) Self
>>>training is a great thing. In fact I'll use a book and study before I
>>>ask another ham.
>>
>>
>> That's all we're asking. It's one thing when someone says "Explain X to me"
>and
>> quite a different thing when someone says "I read books A, B and C on X,
>> but I still don't quite understand why you need to ....."..
>
> That's all SOME of us are asking might be more accurate.

Agreed!

>Others take umbrage at the asking.

Sad but true.
>
>>>>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>>>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>>>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>>>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>>>>with diagrams.
>>>>>
>>>>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>There's more:

>>>>
>>>>I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971.
>>>>The
>>>>study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power
>>>>supply,
>>>>filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
>>>>magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
>>>>questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license
>>>>calsses and older versions.
>>>
>>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?
>>>
>>
>> Depends entirely on the person. For some people, such nonverbal stuff is
>> easy, while for others it's really tough. Similar to the way some people
>have
>> no problem reading maps or blueprints, while others are completely
>befuddled by
>> such things.
>
>Or me with Morse! 8^) It is amazing to me that in the past year, I have
>learned DVD production authoring,learned a new 3-D rendering program,
>taught myself visual basic programming, and am learning (of all things)
>pottery making); and am now getting proficient in each. Yet I have spent
>more time on learning Morse code than all the others combined, and still
>am pretty rank at it. Not complaining, mind ya, (well maybe a little) it
>just serves to make your point.
>
Exactly. But note that you're not doing Morse to pass a license test any more.

> But ya duz what you have to do!
>
Watta concept, huh?

>>>>The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual
>>>>only, for the Advanced class.
>>>>
>>>>In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that
>>>>they
>>>>are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid
>>>>interference, and regulations.
>>>
>>> Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days.
>>
>>
>> It seems to me that a *lot* of the old exams was based on problems they
>> had experienced with hams. Hum modulation on ham signals? Ask a lot
>> of questions on rectifiers and filters. Some hams wander outside the band
>> edges? Lots of questions on band edges, frequency meters and computing the
>> tolerance of crystals an measuring systems.
>>

>>
>>>What is your
>>>opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
>>>likely easier, harder, or not much difference?
>>
>>
>> It's impossible to say for sure without the actual tests.
>>
>> However, having read all of the guides, and having taken the tests that
>way,
>> I'd say that the old exams required a prospective ham to have a better
>> understanding of radio than the modern ones. While the modern tests cover
>more
>> subjects, they do so at a much lower level.
>>
>> But what's most important is that the old guides only gave a general idea
>of
>> the
>> subject areas. For example, you knew there would be some fancy Ohm's Law
>> questions on the test (because the study guide had 'em) but you didn't know
>> exactly what they'd look like, or what the numbers would be. So you learned
>> Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and upside down just in case. And that was
>just
>> *one* subject.
>>
>> Also, the old exams used multiple choice exams with 5 choise, not 4.
>>
>> But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
>> solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier
>for
>> 99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
>> word-associate their way to a passing grade.
>
> The present pool has IIRC around 800some questions. That is getting to
>the level you speak of.

Yes and no. Memorizing the whole pool is one thing, but if there are only a few questions on one subject (say, Ohm's Law), it may be easier to just memorize or word-associate those few than to learn the material.

btw, the 1962 LM satudy guide for the Extra is 239 essay questions.

>When I studied for mine, I went over all them,
>although there is another incentive to learn the material, because
>several of the questions are similar, and the answers are shifted
>around. Question 32's answer might be "A" in the pool, but "C" on the
>real test.
>
Sure, so you don't memorize them that way. You memorize/word associate "40 dipole/66feet" or some such.

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

2044. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 11:33:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86820

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040202223625.11022.00003899@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402020326.822226@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Billy:
> >>
> >> Not hardly. Young Miss Clauson bears the unfortunate burden of being a
> >> New Age, Dumbed-Down "Nickle" Extra.
> >>
> >Larry, you're so quick to tear down the achievements of a child.
>
> Billy:
>
> Point taken, and I offer all appropriate apologies to Miss Clauson.
> However, her achievement, while a fairly notable one ***for a child,***
> is no longer noteworthy for anyone over the age of, say, 10 years,
> and certainly a meaningless one for an adult.

Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?

2045. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 11:46:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402040346.47ba943f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86821

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > >
> > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > >
> > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > >
> > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> >
> > Why?
>
> Why, Jim?

Why, Jim?

2046. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 13:28:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402040528.381e3838@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86822

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203195238.15923.00003572@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> Option is not a failure.

Lennie Anderson: "I am only hee to civilly debate the code test issue"

Obviously nt.

Steve, K4YZ

2047. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 13:34:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402040534.308e287a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86823

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203195242.15923.00003575@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> Go easy on Dave. He is busy revolutionizing the Internet by using
> it as a transporter to download hardware.

Lennie Anderson: "I am only here to civilly debate the morse code test issue".

Obviously not.

Steve, K4YZ

2048. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 13:47:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402040547.6c7374f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86824

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402031543.3ab87b59@posting.google.com>...

> Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?

Without the aforementioned database of EVERYONE'S allocations,
how would it be possible for anyone to KNOW who is "out of band" and
who's legit?

> > How am I to know from one day to the next what a Frrenchman's
> > allocations are?
>
> You're not being asked to.

(Sheeesh!)

SURE >I< am! Today I may "know" than the "F" guys can't use
52.525Mhz, but what about tomorrow...the day after...6 hours from now?

That's why it's incumbent upon the transmitting station to know
where he/she is operating...NOT me.

> I asked "if you knew that they were operating out of band, would you
> work them anyway?"

And without keeping some instantly updated database, HOW am I
supposed to know this?

> No one other than Dave, and now you, has ever proposed having to know
> all amateur allocations at all times.

Then that makes two of us who see the hillarity of your rantings
about who was "out-of-band" and who wasn't.

You and Lennie are the only two trying to make issue out of it.
Lennie tries because he's an idiot with NO license and NO experience
operating.

YOUR excuse...?!?!

> The question was, "if you knew..."

I would "know" if I had some means of being informed. I don't.
MOST U.S. Amateurs I know don't.

> Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?

Under what circumstances...I have "worked" stations out of my
"authorized" bands before. But I ALSO had good reason and

justification for it.

> > Thier government is just as likely as ours is to
> > change the rules, so without keeping a database of some sort on
> > EVERYONE'S allocations, how is a prudent American Amateur to know if
> > the guy/gal he's working is "legit" or not?
>
> That wasn't the question, and you know it. Just another diversion.
> But I'll bet they're the same as when Dave was working out-of-banders
> in downtown Dar es Salaam.

It's not a "diversion"...You are trying to insist that everyone
"know" where other Amateurs are legally operating or not...but then
you disclaim that's your intent...Your actions prove otherwise.

> So many Dave apologists, so little time.

It's not apolgetic. It's the truth.

Steve, K4YZ

2049. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 13:54:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402040554.6d79863a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86825

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203150355.21232.00004015@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> In the entire vast, much-bigger-than-amateurism world of radio
> communications there is NO NEED of radio telegraphers. That has
> been true for many years.

HEY SCUMBAG!

This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO. You yourself have
"acknowledged" that on several occassions, yet you quickly "forget"
your own assertions when you want to "make" your point.

This is NOT "commercial" radio...Not the Armed Forces or maritime
services.

Are you having a problem with this concept?

Is your ONLY "argument" that since the military allegedly doesn't
use Morse Code, then we don't?

If so, you're a bigger idiot than you let on, although that in
itself would be a pretty hard order to fill.

Steve,K4YZ

2050. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 15:04:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402109FA.6060302@psu.edu>
Source record: 86826

N2EY wrote:

> In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
>>
>
> Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here.
> Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as
> "electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a
> modem" "better modes and modulations"....

I wonder where Carl is lately? Haven't heard from him since he had the
change of heart regarding the testing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2051. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 15:34:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402040734.2415a54c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86827

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040202223625.11022.00003899@mb-m14.aol.com>...

> > achievement only points accusingly to the fact that
> > present amateur radio licensing requirements are "dumbed-down" to
> > such an unreasonably low level that even a 7-year old can attain an
> > Amateur Extra-class license.
>
> That's one way to look at it. The way I prefer to look at it is that a
> bright and motivated young child set herself a goal and achieved it.

I don't see much of a connect between your particular preferences and
the highly-probable reality in these cases. Parents and other
relatives impose expectations on kids all the time. I sure did. I
"motivated" mine any number of times into "achieving" and in some of
those cases they met my expectations just to get me off their backs.

> > And while the novelty of a 7-year old
> > Extra is certainly "news" in the Amateur Radio community, it does
> > not point to a secure future for our hobby/service.

> Why not? I don't see anything wrong with young people, or females,
> getting
> licenses. In fact, I think that sort of thing is just what ham radio
> needs *more* of!

That's not what Larry meant. Over the 100 year history of ham radio
maybe we've had what, pick a number, twenty kids under ten licensed?
Versus around 1.5 million total U.S. hams? Those kids have all been
statistical anomalies pure and simple and have not had, nor will they
have any influence at all on the course of the service in the future.

> > Any of Mattie's young peers, without the support of a licensed parent,
> > and the material support of a functional station in their home, would
> > not likely achieve the same results.

Absolutely. How many of these kids *didn't* have a ham in the
immediate family?

> So what? Part of what healthy families *DO* is support each other's
> needs
> and interests. In that family, it's clear that ham radio is a family
> thing,
> not something one family member does in seclusion from the rest.
> That's a

> good thing. It brings families together, crosses generational
> barriers, helps
> build a level of education, maturity and understanding that are
> greatly needed.

I think you're over-preaching to the choir again here James.

> And there is no better way to help a child learn than to get them
> interested in the subject. Geography? Time zones? Math, science,
> technology? An interest in ham radio helps with all of those.

Her folks shepherded her into ham radio beacause ham radio is a great
way for kids to learn geography??

> >(About the best we can hope for
> > is that other ham parents will take similar steps to induce their
> > children to become licensed, but that's about as far as it can go
> > until they become adults, with their own financial resources and the
> > adult prerogatives that go with it.

> I never got any help in the ham radio area from my folks. So I was
> delayed a few years in getting started.

Nothing unusual about that. A huge percentage of all of us kid hams
didn't have any particular "parental support" when we became hams. All
my folks cared about was that whatever it was that I was doing with a
soldering iron in the cellar didn't result in the Henny Carr the town
cop dragging me home by the scruff of my neck *again* for commiting
some bush-league juvenile atrocity or another. Worked for them and it
worked for me.

> > About the best face I can put on this is that young Mattie now has
> > the rest of her life to "grow" into the hobby. Hopefully, over the
> > years, she will acquire technical knowledge and operating skills which
> > will become equivalent to her Amateur Extra status.
>
> She got 4 wrong on Element 4. How many did you get wrong on yours?

No-counter: We all know that there is *no* relationship between
passing the tests and the level of useful knowledge reqired to put
together an HF ham station. This NG has glaring examples of same.

> > As of now,
> > however, she is more of a stunt than the real thing.
>
> How do you know?

He doesn't and neither do you. Fact is that it's not hard to find
instances of their folks pressuring kids into outstanding
accomplishments in order to have bragging rights about the kid. Which
I suspect is where Larry is coming from. Whether it's true in Mattie's
case is 100% conjecture.

> > I have no
> > doubt that when asked to engage in even a fairly low-level discussion
> > of technical and operating subjects, she will not be able to give
> > any reasonable accounting of herself, beyond perhaps the simple
> > recitation of answers to the exam questions.
>
> You might be surprised.

She's probably somewhere between the opposite poles you two guys live
in.

> Tell ya what, Larry, I'll fill a box with parts and you can come over
> and build afunctioning ham rig out of them. No instructions, no
> elmers, just parts and a book or two.
> I did it when I was 13. I doubt
> you could do it, Larry.

Virtually all yer kid ham predecessors could cobble rigs together
"Back in my day". It was almost the norm then. A lot higher
percentage of us designed and rolled our own than was the case "in
your day" a decade and a half later. By the time Larry got into ham
radio hombrewing no longer made any sense except in oddball cases so I
doubt he had any reason to even consider building his own rig. Entry
level rigs have been products of the era in which we came into the
service. YMMV and it obviously has.

> > Again, none of Mattie's inadequacies are her fault, she is just
> > the product of her parent's dreams.
>
> Nonsense, Larry. She's an individual. Kids are not robots.

C'mon, you know better than that. Seven year olds are about as
compliant as they come. They're "individuals" only to the extent that
their parents and teachers allow them to act independently.

> There are folks who walk into a test session with no ham license and
> walk out with an Extra. That was going on before the VE system, too.
> The barely-10-year-old I mentioned above had to do 13 wpm sending and
> receiving plus the old Class B/General written.

I know Janie. Her father was Jesse Bieberman W3KT who is still a
legend. Honer Roll top-ender for decades, phone and cw dx contester,
25wpm with a straight key for 48 straight. Vice Director of the
Atlantic Division for decades and one of the most powerful voices in
Newington in those days. Ran the W3 buro single-handed also for
decades. Was also a private-school high school math instructor. You
think maybe Jane just got up one morning when she was ten and outta
nowhere declared that she was gonna pursue a ham ticket??

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2052. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 15:43:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40211310.6020508@psu.edu>
Source record: 86828

N2EY wrote:
> In article <ttednfZXZ5e4dYLdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

<some snippage>

>>>That's all we're asking. It's one thing when someone says "Explain X to me"
>>
>>and
>>
>>>quite a different thing when someone says "I read books A, B and C on X,
>>>but I still don't quite understand why you need to ....."..
>>
>> That's all SOME of us are asking might be more accurate.
>
>
> Agreed!
>
>
>>Others take umbrage at the asking.
>
>
> Sad but true.
>
>>>>>>The ignorance problem is hardly a new problem. I can remember being
>>>>>>at a ham gathering circa 1965 where a guy didn't know the difference
>>>>>>between a short and an open. To have had the license he had at that
>>>>>>time he would have had to take the old essay style tests complete
>>>>>>with diagrams.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>A closed test pool is no panacea.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>There's more:
>>>>>
>>>>>I have the old ARRL License Manuals from 1948, 1951, 1954, 1962 and 1971.
>>>>>The
>>>>>study guides in those books are full of draw-a-diagram questions, power
>>>>>supply,
>>>>>filter and transmitter questions, plus all sorts of other stuff like
>>>>>magnetrons, neutralization, TV, RTTY, FM and SSB.. But there are very few
>>>>>questions on receivers and antennas, particularly in the lower license
>>>>>calsses and older versions.
>>>>
>>>> I wonder if having to draw something makes for a harder test?

>>>>
>>>
>>>Depends entirely on the person. For some people, such nonverbal stuff is
>>>easy, while for others it's really tough. Similar to the way some people
>>
>>have
>>
>>>no problem reading maps or blueprints, while others are completely
>>
>>befuddled by
>>
>>>such things.
>>
>>Or me with Morse! 8^) It is amazing to me that in the past year, I have
>>learned DVD production authoring,learned a new 3-D rendering program,
>>taught myself visual basic programming, and am learning (of all things)
>>pottery making); and am now getting proficient in each. Yet I have spent
>>more time on learning Morse code than all the others combined, and still
>>am pretty rank at it. Not complaining, mind ya, (well maybe a little) it
>>just serves to make your point.
>>
>
> Exactly. But note that you're not doing Morse to pass a license test any more.

True. Just a strange thing.

>
>> But ya duz what you have to do!
>>
>
> Watta concept, huh?

At least one person here doesn't like that sort of thing. I just
consider the source.

>
>>>>>The length of a dipole question appears exactly once - in the 1971 manual
>>>>>only, for the Advanced class.
>>>>>
>>>>>In fact, if you read the study guides carefully, it becomes clear that
>>>>>they
>>>>>are heavily focused on transmitter design and operation to avoid
>>>>>interference, and regulations.
>>>>
>>>> Yup, that was a probably a priority in those days.
>>>
>>>
>>>It seems to me that a *lot* of the old exams was based on problems they
>>>had experienced with hams. Hum modulation on ham signals? Ask a lot
>>>of questions on rectifiers and filters. Some hams wander outside the band
>>>edges? Lots of questions on band edges, frequency meters and computing the

>>>tolerance of crystals an measuring systems.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>What is your
>>>>opinion, Jim? given the study guide as a reference, were the tests
>>>>likely easier, harder, or not much difference?
>>>
>>>
>>>It's impossible to say for sure without the actual tests.
>>>
>>>However, having read all of the guides, and having taken the tests that
>>
>>way,
>>
>>>I'd say that the old exams required a prospective ham to have a better
>>>understanding of radio than the modern ones. While the modern tests cover
>>
>>more
>>
>>>subjects, they do so at a much lower level.
>>>
>>>But what's most important is that the old guides only gave a general idea
>>
>>of
>>
>>>the
>>>subject areas. For example, you knew there would be some fancy Ohm's Law
>>>questions on the test (because the study guide had 'em) but you didn't know
>>>exactly what they'd look like, or what the numbers would be. So you learned
>>>Ohm's Law backwards, forwards and upside down just in case. And that was
>>
>>just
>>
>>>>*one* subject.
>>>
>>>Also, the old exams used multiple choice exams with 5 choise, not 4.
>>>
>>>But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
>>>solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier
>>
>>for
>>
>>>99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
>>>word-associate their way to a passing grade.
>>
>> The present pool has IIRC around 800some questions. That is getting to
>>the level you speak of.
>
>

> Yes and no. Memorizing the whole pool is one thing, but if there are only a few
> questions on one subject (say, Ohm's Law), it may be easier to just memorize or
> word-associate those few than to learn the material.

I dunno. If I'm going to impress something on some brain cells, I'd just
as soon memorize Ohm's law as memorize specific test questions. Anyone
that would do elsewise is just getting what they deserve.

> btw, the 1962 LM satudy guide for the Extra is 239 essay questions.

I'd prefer it if the test were essay. not because it would be harder,
but because for me at least, it would be easier. I liked them in school,
I still like them.

>
>>When I studied for mine, I went over all them,
>>although there is another incentive to learn the material, because
>>several of the questions are similar, and the answers are shifted
>>around. Question 32's answer might be "A" in the pool, but "C" on the
>>real test.
>>
>
> Sure, so you don't memorize them that way. You memorize/word associate "40
> dipole/66feet" or some such.

For the circumstance you name, even that isn't too bad a thing. Of
course, knowing that 468/f is how you can find the length of a half wave
dipole is easier, and then you have something useful for *lots* of
frequencies.

I don't think they have any questions about quarter wave dipoles! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2053. Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 17:16:42 UTC
From: Lenny <kwm@lenstvbar.net>
Message-ID: <bvr9dmbti0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86829
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"gaffo" <gaffo@usenet.net> wrote in message
news:dAYTb.12841$6M6.4582@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...

> >>Pirate TV- I'd like to do it on a limited basis- send the signal just
> >>through my apartment building. If the signal goes any farther then that,
> >>no problem, but it's not a priority.
> I found this:
>
> Supercircuits
> 13552 Research Blvd
> Austin TX 78750
>
> This company sells a low-power TV transmitter for channels 3 thru 6 which
> appears to be of high quality ($49.95 plus $4.50 S&H). For licensed radio
> amateurs, they also sell some ham TV transmitter kits with 1 to 2 watts
> peak output power that can be adapted for use on UHF channels 14 thru 19,
> and a linear amp for boosting the output of these transmitters.
>

I heard about an unlicensed TV station in Nashville. Last time I was
down there I make an attempt to find the signal and was
successful. Although the video was not the greatest, the programming
was pretty good. A good dose of political opinion stuff, mixed
with entertainment. At times amateurish, other times professional.

Lenny
Detroit

2054. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 18:26:15 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <4021388a$0$99197$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 86830

In <20040203150355.21232.00004016@mb-m13.aol.com> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <HvGdnXPCn6KsEIPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>writes:

>>William wrote:
>>
>>> All of the portions of the band are CW portions.
>>
>>True, one can operate CW in any portion of the band, but if you are in
>>the phone band, you can answer a CW station on phone, you don't have to
>>answer in CW as opposed to if you are in the portion of the band where
>>one can not use phone, ie., must use CW, thus the "CW" portion of the
>>band, you must answer in CW.
>>>
>>> Reread the
>>>
>>>>post, it was talking about sending.
>>>
>>> This purpose of this group is Morse Code testing.
>>
>>It is? Since when? That topic is often discussed but just where does it
>>state the purpose of the group is Morse testing?

> This newsgroup was CREATED for the sole purpose of removing
> the morse code testing issue from rec.radio.amateur.miscellaneous.

[...]

Sole purpose? It seems a bit silly to try to scope any newsgroup,
especially an unmoderated one, to a "sole purpose." Nevertheless, if
you want to follow that line of argument, the historical record
disagrees with you.

During the discussion period preceding the newsgroup vote in 1991 that
realigned the rec.ham-radio.* newsgroups under rec.radio.amateur.*:

http://groups.google.com/groups?threadm=19%40shasta.Stanford.EDU

several other topics were brought up other than Morse code that could
(and eventually did) go into this newsgroup. Phil Howard, KA9WGN, did a
nice job of summarizing them:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1990Dec16.063502.22468%40ux1.cso.uiuc.edu

and they included:

1. Proposed rules and petitions to the FCC
2. NPRM's issued by the FCC
3. Local antenna/tower issues, laws, covenants
4. Scanner laws and related issues
5. Bandplans and other operating agreements
6. Repeater coordination

Other names for this newsgroup that were considered, and rejected, by group consensus included .rules, .regs, .regulations, .legal, and even .fcc. It looks like Jim Grubs, W8GRT, gets the original credit for proposing the eventually accepted suffix, which was .policy:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=774.276E7E54%40w8grt.fidonet.org

The .policy suffix was adopted specifically because it recognized the broad range of laws, rules, regulations, consensus, private legal contracts, organizational agendas, and even gentlemen's agreements/understandings, that shape amateur radio.

Over the 13-year history of the .policy newsgroup, there have been many energetically debated topic threads about policy in amateur radio other than Morse code, including:

1. The legal consequences of using non-amateur radio communications systems, or even amateur radio equipment out-of-band, in an emergency
2. FCC PRB-1 and its impact on outdoor antenna regulations and covenants
3. The no-business rule of amateur radio, and its implications (a.k.a., "The Great Usenet Pizza Autopatch Debate")
4. The legal authority of frequency coordinators to enforce band plans and usage, resolve interference disputes, or even refarm existing analog FM voice repeaters to allow more room for other modes like packet
5. Interference issues, including that between amateur radio and FCC Part 15-regulated devices, and now Broadband over Powerlines (BPL)

You say that you have been participating on this newsgroup for about 7 years now. Haven't you noticed?

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

2055. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 20:01:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40214F95.2050201@psu.edu>
Source record: 86831

Paul W. Schleck wrote:

<snippage>

> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=774.276E7E54%40w8grt.fidonet.org
>
> The .policy suffix was adopted specifically because it recognized the
> broad range of laws, rules, regulations, consensus, private legal
> contracts, organizational agendas, and even gentlemen's
> agreements/understandings, that shape amateur radio.
>
> Over the 13-year history of the .policy newsgroup, there have been many
> energetically debated topic threads about policy in amateur radio other
> than Morse code, including:
>
> 1. The legal consequences of using non-amateur radio communications
> systems, or even amateur radio equipment out-of-band, in an emergency
> 2. FCC PRB-1 and its impact on outdoor antenna regulations and
> covenants
> 3. The no-business rule of amateur radio, and its implications (a.k.a.,
> "The Great Usenet Pizza Autopatch Debate")
> 4. The legal authority of frequency coordinators to enforce band plans
> and usage, resolve interference disputes, or even refarm existing
> analog FM voice repeaters to allow more room for other modes
> like packet
> 5. Interference issues, including that between amateur radio and FCC Part
> 15-regulated devices, and now Broadband over Powerlines (BPL)

You forgot to add Kim's callsign!

> You say that you have been participating on this newsgroup for about 7
> years now. Haven't you noticed?

One might almost think the fellow is just here to bust people's chops.
Thanks for the history and Clarification, Paul.

2056. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 20:37:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204153704.01632.00000542@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 86833

In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20040202223625.11022.00003899@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0402020326.822226@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >> Billy:
>> >>
>> >> Not hardly. Young Miss Clauson bears the unfortunate burden of being a
>> >> New Age, Dumbed-Down "Nickle" Extra.
>> >
>> >Larry, you're so quick to tear down the achievements of a child.
>>
>> Billy:
>>
>> Point taken, and I offer all appropriate apologies to Miss Clauson.
>> However, her achievement, while a fairly notable one ***for a child,***
>> is no longer noteworthy for anyone over the age of, say, 10 years,
>> and certainly a meaningless one for an adult.
>
>Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?

Mental or physical age? :-)

LHA / WMD

2057. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 20:37:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204153705.01632.00000543@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 86832

In article <5c01b95b.0402040554.6d79863a@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040203150355.21232.00004015@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>
>> In the entire vast, much-bigger-than-amateurism world of radio
>> communications there is NO NEED of radio telegraphers. That has
>> been true for many years.
>
> HEY SCUMBAG!

Well, the gunnery nurse's "attitude" adjustment seems to have lasted only a few days.

That may be a record in here! :-)

> This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO. You yourself have
>"acknowledged" that on several occassions, yet you quickly "forget"
>your own assertions when you want to "make" your point.
>
> This is NOT "commercial" radio...Not the Armed Forces or maritime
>services.

Neither is it about "nursing" or "piloting," ace gunnery nurse.

However, radio is radio, and the physics of same does NOT change because an administration defines certain radio activities as "amateur."

> Are you having a problem with this concept?

No, but you are definitely still having a problem with "attitude."

> Is your ONLY "argument" that since the military allegedly doesn't
>use Morse Code, then we don't?

The U.S. military does NOT use any morse code for communications.

The U.S. military only requires morse code cognition by a relative handfull of military intelligence specialists engaged in monitoring and intercepting enemy and potential-enemy messaging.

> If so, you're a bigger idiot than you let on, although that in
>itself would be a pretty hard order to fill.

Now now, gunnery nurse, keep that B.P. down, take your blood pressure medication like a good patient...and climb down from

the table top, your fists were hitting the dining room light.

LHA / WMD

2058. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 20:37:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204153708.01632.00000544@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 86834

In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0402022032.5064c67c@posting.google.com>...
>> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>> news:<d22b54c3.0402011007.1332ce1@posting.google.com>...
>> >>
>> >> > There's virtually NO new-mode experimentation going on anywhere in any
>> >> > ham bands. We have high bands where all sorts of "multimedia" wideband
>> >> > ops are already quite legal. But all we hear is the talk, the walk
>> >> > simply isn't happening. Why would it be any different on the HF
>> >> > bands??
>> >>
>> >> Usually this mantra pops up by some of the no code faction who
>> >> has tried to promote the idea that "experimenters" in new mode
>> >> technologies would somehow come out of the woodwork >>IF<< there was
>> >> no code test to keep them off of 20M phone.
>>
>> >> Go figure!
>> >
>> >It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
>> >nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
>> >I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>> >anything but talk either.
>>
>> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
>
>When did a 31 Hz wide mode become "wideband"?

Martinez' innovation comes from scaling current wideband data
communications at high rates to the slow, real-time rates of
amateur radio environments. That involved some good application
of Information Theory and other things, not in being spoon-fed
How To Do It from the pages of QST.

>> Maybe you don't recognize Peter Martinez, G3PLX?
>
>I musta missed this one too, when did the FCC start passing out Extras
>to Brits??

"Brits?" The FCC has no jurisdiction to citizen-residents of the
United Kingdom. Did you miss out on geography and civics
classes olde-tymer?

>> He was experimenting with polyphase shifting networks for SSB
>> back in 1973.
>
>(a) When did bench-futzing SSB transmitter circuitry have anything to
>do with putting a wideband signal on the air?

"Bench-futzing" (as you so quaintly put it in tuff-guy phillytalk) is
essentially necessary to test and confirm a concept in hardware
on the bench.

Since you are unaquainted with radio-electronics design work, I may
have to explain it further for your education. "Bench-futzing" is how
all your ready-made, designed-by-others radio toys get developed.
Those don't spring into existance the moment you wave a plastic
card around in an HRO.

Define "wideband."

The narrowbanders on HF have very old concepts of "wideband"
considering they inhabit rather narrowband pieces of spectrum and
thinking that voice bandwidths of maximum 3 KHz are "wide."

>(b) When did SSB become "wideband"?

From Day One of SSB on radio. 12 KHz straight from Type C
Carrier equipment developed for Long Lines. Commercial. All
it needed was the RF end to replace the wires.

Militaries soon picked up on the commercial technique and ran
with that. Four voice-bandwidth channels over one transmitter.
Could easily handle eight TTY circuits and two voice circuits.
All on HF which "CW" (Conventional Wisdom) said couldn't be
done in 1990s even though it was running fine on HF in 1930s.

>(c) You might note that phasing schemes for generating ssb signals
>have about as much applicability to ham radio today as you have ever
>had.

Not only generating them but receiving them, olde-tymer.

Do you recognize the name Dan Tayloe? U.S. Amateur Extra.
Inventor of the Tayloe Mixer, ideally applicable to direct-
conversion receivers with excellent unwanted sideband rejection
if used with a following four-quadrature-phase network. In terms
of your great life experience longevity, an invention that was fairly
recent.

If you bother to look around at the rest of the radio environment, you might - if mental eyesight is still possible - see some startling new developments in radio communications that happened in the last half century. Even as you get red in the face reading this, there are a hundred million little cellular telephones in use in just the United States...little full-duplex HTs operating at about 1 GHz, small enough to easily hold in one hand. Those didn't exist that tiny, light, or as high in frequency three decades ago. Not an amateur radio innovation yet it has become a part of worldwide social culture.

Cordless telephones operate on up to the 5 GHz band now, are priced affordable for most in consumer electronics stores. Almost the size of cell phones and include caller ID while operating full-duplex. You won't recognize the leap in frequency increase because your radio world stops abruptly at 29.7 MHz and I doubt you can envision the uniqueness of solid-state RF circuitry, up to and including very high power solid-state that can be made modular with hot-swapping replacement of modules while operating (now the norm in high-power MF to UHF commercial transmitters). None of it was an amateur radio innovation or invention.

You have, in the past, sneered and scoffed at automatic antenna tuners yet Collins Radio designed that into the USMC-contract T-195 that became operational in 1955. First widespread use of the Bruene Detector for forward-reverse wave detection on HF. Hughes Aircraft at a Ground Division designed the AN/PRC-104 for the U.S. military, the basic manpack 20 W HF transceiver that featured an automatic antenna tuner in a battery-powered rig, operational in 1986. It has higher-powered versions for vehicular installation, still operational. Imagine that...auto antenna tuning in a portable unit! Not an amateur radio innovation or invention.

There's still testing going on with digital modulation of short-wave (HF spectrum) broadcasting but all indications are that it is a success after four years of such tests. The "CW" (Conventional Wisdom) pundits kept saying "it won't work, can't work on HF!" even though it did. Takes no more bandwidth than conventional AM yet offers more. All due to some innovation and invention by the "bench-futzers" who applied various techniques and Information Theory very cleverly. Several different ways are under investigation as to which one is best on the air. Not from amateur radio.

A quarter million manpack and vehicular radios have been made and fielded for 30 to 80 MHz use since 1989. Those feature 10 hops per second FHSS with digital voice or data and include built-in encryption/decryption secure mode in real-time. New versions are half the size of the old, the old being the same size/weight of the PRC-104. Not from amateur radio.

The number of handheld transceivers and mobile radios at VHF and higher in the commercial-government-military world easily outnumbers those HTs used by amateurs on amateur bands. The

one reason that amateur VHF-and-up equipment is available at low relative cost is that base market in the non-amateur radio field. Of course your amateur world doesn't extend above above HF so that isn't "real" amateur radio.

The Global Positioning Satellite System has become a reality, first tested in airborne reception in 1971 as NAVSTAR. Now it is a consumer item in electronics stores, useful to hikers, boaters, vehicle drivers of many kinds, farmers, among many who don't intend to drop big boom things (such as ICBMs) on nasties. It's also good for super-accurate time reference since each of the 24 GPS sats has a rubidium "atomic clock." Not an amateur radio development.

Speaking of accurate time, there's all sorts (over 30 brands) of "radio clocks" in consumer electronic stores that update themselves automatically to WWVB every day/night and display the results (including calendar info) on LCDs. Battery powered, under $30 off-the-shelf. Definitely not an amateur radio innovation-invention...very narrowband at 1 Hz digital data rate. :-)

Amateurs nowadays have HF transceivers that display operating frequency down to 10 Hz increments with "rock-solid" stability. It is taken for granted as if it was always so, yet only a couple of decades ago (slightly more) HF transceivers were of the VFO variety without the most stable rocks in the box. Very few hams have bothered to know anything but what the acronyms PLL and DDS mean, couldn't describe the frequency control system if their DXCC results depended on it. All brought about by commercial designer "bench-futzes" working with microprocessors and microcontrollers. May have been amateur radio related although such frequency control was also incorporated in commercial HF radio at the same market time.

Log-periodic antennas have been around for a half century, fine for HF, extremely broadband, useful for when new HF ham bands are allocated every quarter century or so (last big band increase was in 1979, latest in 2003). Numerical Electromagnetic Code and Method-of-Moments E-H Field Theory has been present for over a dozen years yet amateurs aren't jumping at the chance to use such computer programs to tailor them to their QTHs. Development funded by the USN, source code is free.

Well, I have to stand corrected. There just isn't that much innovation and invention IN amateur radio or BY amateur radio...and hasn't been for about the last half century.

Sunnavagun!

You keep on beeping, Kellie, tawkin tuff, and praising hum radio for raising the technical standards and leading the way in radio. CW gets through when everything else will, therefore it needs to be kept in the ham testing forever and ever.

LHA / WMD

2059. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 20:50:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <6nm220dqo9rl8lmtc5n4471uk06g9apgt8@4ax.com>
Source record: 86835

On Wed, 04 Feb 2004 15:01:25 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Paul W. Schleck wrote:
>
><snippage>
>
>> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=774.276E7E54%40w8grt.fidonet.org
>>
>> The .policy suffix was adopted specifically because it recognized the
>> broad range of laws, rules, regulations, consensus, private legal
>> contracts, organizational agendas, and even gentlemen's
>> agreements/understandings, that shape amateur radio.
>>
>> Over the 13-year history of the .policy newsgroup, there have been many
>> energetically debated topic threads about policy in amateur radio other
>> than Morse code, including:
>>
>> 1. The legal consequences of using non-amateur radio communications
>> systems, or even amateur radio equipment out-of-band, in an emergency
>> 2. FCC PRB-1 and its impact on outdoor antenna regulations and
>> covenants
>> 3. The no-business rule of amateur radio, and its implications (a.k.a.,
>> "The Great Usenet Pizza Autopatch Debate")
>> 4. The legal authority of frequency coordinators to enforce band plans
>> and usage, resolve interference disputes, or even refarm existing
>> analog FM voice repeaters to allow more room for other modes
>> like packet
>> 5. Interference issues, including that between amateur radio and FCC Part
>> 15-regulated devices, and now Broadband over Powerlines (BPL)
>
> You forgot to add Kim's callsign!

I like Paul's callsign better! :)

>
>
>
>> You say that you have been participating on this newsgroup for about 7
>> years now. Haven't you noticed?
>
>
> One might almost think the fellow is just here to bust people's chops.
>Thanks for the history and Clarification, Paul.

73, Leo

2060. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:03:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40215E2A.C8F57755@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86836

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>...

> I think you're over-preaching to the choir again here James.
>
> > And there is no better way to help a child learn than to get them
> > interested in the subject. Geography? Time zones? Math, science,
> > technology? An interest in ham radio helps with all of those.
>
> Her folks shepherded her into ham radio beacause ham radio is a great
> way for kids to learn geography??

Not necessarily, Brian, but studying for an amateur ticket gets kids fired up about learning. I can certainly see Jim's point about kids becoming interested in geography, the sciences and math. It didn't work toward interesting me in geometry though. I was caught reading QST hidden within my open geometry book.

> > I never got any help in the ham radio area from my folks. So I was
> > delayed a few years in getting started.
>
> Nothing unusual about that. A huge percentage of all of us kid hams
> didn't have any particular "parental support" when we became hams. All
> my folks cared about was that whatever it was that I was doing with a
> soldering iron in the cellar didn't result in the Henny Carr the town
> cop dragging me home by the scruff of my neck *again* for commiting
> some bush-league juvenile atrocity or another. Worked for them and it
> worked for me.

For the first few weeks of my interest, my dad actively discouraged me with talk of amateur radio being a passing fad for me. He had visions of mounds of equipment gathering dust in a closet. My mother encouraged me and was able to convince my father that some of the meager family income should be spent on a transmitter for me if I earned the money for the receiver from my paper route.

My dad had and has no technical abilities whatever. My mother was deathly afraid of electricity and wouldn't even clean my ham shack. She just knew that lightning was going to enter the house via my antennas. Both parents saw value in amateur radio as a wholesome activity, one which would nurture an interest in science and possibly lead to a career in electronics.

> I know Janie. Her father was Jesse Bieberman W3KT who is still a
> legend. Honer Roll top-ender for decades, phone and cw dx contester,
> 25wpm with a straight key for 48 straight. Vice Director of the
> Atlantic Division for decades and one of the most powerful voices in
> Newington in those days. Ran the W3 buro single-handed also for
> decades.

...and ran the W3KT outgoing QSL forwarding service for a number of
years.

Dave K8MN

2061. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:06:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86837

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>

> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
>
> Mental or physical age? :-)

At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?

Please continue your civil debate on morse code elimination.

Dave K8MN

2062. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:07:42 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yadUb.14049$K82.7461@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 86838

Thanks for the info, Jim. Yes, I suspect the youngest would be girls since males tend to mature at a later age. Check the posts in the newsgroup for proof of that ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040131165456.07984.00000358@mb-m22.aol.com...
> Interesting story and obviously a very bright kid! Homeschooled, too.
> The story documents other young hams, including the Philly area's W3OVV,
> who earned her Class B at the Philly FCC office soon after her 10th birthday -
> in 1948. This was back in the days when *all* US ham licenses required 13 wpm
> code, sending and receiving, and when the writtens were not only "secret" but
> also consisted in large part of essay and draw-a-diagram questions.
>
> One interesting side note is that these young hams are almost all girls!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> "Age requirements? We doan' need no steenkeen age requirements!"

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.577 / Virus Database: 366 - Release Date: 2/3/04

2063. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:09:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <m_-dnZ098I5C_bzdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86839

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> You forgot to add Kim's callsign!

I suppose the Super Bowl half-time act with Janet Jackson and the other moron singing with her was just the kind of low class, crass act kim really enjoys. Maybe kim should loan Jackson her callsign.

2064. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:20:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86840

Len Over 21 wrote:
>

> The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
> INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
> essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.

Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
Extra right out of the box".

Dave K8MN

2065. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:36:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86841

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> To US who were in the big-time radio communications on HF of a half
> century ago, that did not involve morse code. There were and still are
> a lot of "US" involved in that.

For some of US who've had more recent experience than yours, morse was
involved. For many of us who are actually radio amateurs and who are
participants in big-time radio HF communications today, morse code is
still involved. What are you doing in big-time HF these days?

> I was IN worldwide communications on HF over a half century ago.
> At the time I liked it fine...even felt honored to be able to serve my
> country doing just that.
>
> None of that involved morse code.

...and because you didn't use morse, no one used it at the time or
since.
A number of us have used morse professionally and as radio amateurs in
the decades after you had your "big-time".

> Tens of thousands of skilled radio operators worldwide have used
> worldwide communications effectively for decades without ever
> once having to use or know morse code. They have done so for
> over a half century.

Tens of thousands of skilled radio ops worldwide *have* used morse
effectively for worldwide communications after your day in the sun.
Tens of thousands still do so.

> The U.S. military did not require any morsemanship to use the very
> first handheld transceivers (on HF) for communications in 1940. That's
> 64 years ago. Neither did they require any morsemanship to use the
> first backpack radio (on VHF) in 1943. That's 61 years ago.

Yet the military continued to use morse. What's your point?

> The hundreds of thousands of PLMRS transceivers are not "operated"
> every day in the apparent amateur sense. The essence of such
> radios is to communicate and get information, not to "work other
> stations" to get QSL cards or to engage in "radiosport."

The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications without touching a PLMRS transceiver.

> "Broadband" is a generic term for any data, video, or other
> communications that requires a broad bandwidth in its
> propagation path. That applies to both wired, fibered, or
> radioed communications paths and the "broadness" depends
> on the rate of communications.

I see. "Broadband" means "broad bandwidth". You could have knocked me over with a feather when I read your words. So to your way of thinking on "broadness", a morse communication at 5 wpm on 10 KHz could be considered "broadband"?

Dave K8MN

2066. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:39:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204163947.21457.00003800@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 86843

In article <40214F95.2050201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> One might almost think the fellow is just here to bust people's chops.
>Thanks for the history and Clarification, Paul.

Poor baby. Feel injured, do you?

Keep the Faith and work, work, work on that morse code to prove to
the amateur community all your dedication and worthiness to the
Old Ways. They will all be proud of you. Remember, morse code
gets through when everything else will.

Don't forget Mass at St. Hiram's early in the morning.

LHA / WMD

2067. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:39:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204163949.21457.00003801@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 86842

In article <4021388a$0$99197$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
<pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>In <20040203150355.21232.00004016@mb-m13.aol.com> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over
21) writes:
>
>>In article <HvGdnXPCn6KsEIPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>>writes:
>
>>>William wrote:
>>>
>>>> All of the portions of the band are CW portions.
>>>
>>>True, one can operate CW in any portion of the band, but if you are in
>>>the phone band, you can answer a CW station on phone, you don't have to
>>>answer in CW as opposed to if you are in the portion of the band where
>>>one can not use phone, ie., must use CW, thus the "CW" portion of the
>>>band, you must answer in CW.
>>>>
>>>> Reread the
>>>>
>>>>>post, it was talking about sending.
>>>>
>>>> This purpose of this group is Morse Code testing.
>>>
>>>It is? Since when? That topic is often discussed but just where does it
>>>state the purpose of the group is Morse testing?
>
>> This newsgroup was CREATED for the sole purpose of removing
>> the morse code testing issue from rec.radio.amateur.miscellaneous.
>
> [...]
>
>Sole purpose? It seems a bit silly to try to scope any newsgroup,
>especially an unmoderated one, to a "sole purpose." Nevertheless, if
>you want to follow that line of argument, the historical record
>disagrees with you.

It "disagrees" all depending on which Google quoting is used! :-)

>During the discussion period preceding the newsgroup vote in 1991 that
>realigned the rec.ham-radio.* newsgroups under rec.radio.amateur.*:
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?threadm=19%40shasta.Stanford.EDU

>
>several other topics were brought up other than Morse code that could
>(and eventually did) go into this newsgroup. Phil Howard, KA9WGN, did a
>nice job of summarizing them:

I'm sure. :-)

<snip>

>Over the 13-year history of the .policy newsgroup, there have been many
>energetically debated topic threads about policy in amateur radio other
>than Morse code, including:

Ohhhh, there were LOTS more and most of them did NOT involve
anything at all to do with radio, let alone amateur radio. :-)

Do you REALLY want to go there? :-)

Google has nearly all of it...all the talk about choo-choo trains,
presidential politics in all its forms, U.S. foreign policy, breasts
and beasts, automobiles, flying airyplanes, small boats, morals
and morality, parenting, imaginary love lives, divorces, and
all kinds of things very much NOT concerning amateur radio.

Gosh and golly, Paul, I've only been working in radio-electronics
since 1952, didn't get into ARPANET until the 1970s, started
BBSing (as in computer-modem communications) in late 1984
and didn't have any real Internet account until 10 years ago.

I'm absolutely, positively agreeing with your vast experience
in this newsgroup. Since Day One of public-access Internet?

>You say that you have been participating on this newsgroup for about 7
>years now. Haven't you noticed?

Funny how some folks "notice" things that others don't. :-)

Tell you what, Paul, if you are really and truly upset, go to AOL
Member Services and DEMAND that they lock out my personal
access to this newsgroup. Go ahead, make everyone's day and
make it a CLOSED-to-all-but-amateur-licensees in order to "make
everyone happy." Make it ARRL-South for all I care.

Meanwhile, the FCC and other government agencies still maintain
an open-access-to-citizens policy, made even more open by the
Internet (now 13 years old?). I think that's a good thing. Lots of
folks in here want to rewrite the First Amendment and toss out
"little things" like freedom of speech and petitioning a government.

A rather long time ago I did big-time military communications (most
of it on HF) for three years and never used, nor had to know any
morse code. Never had to know or use it since. But, it seems an
Article of Faith that American Amateurism DEMANDS knowledge
of morse code demonstrated by federal testing in order to enjoy a

recreational radio activity done for personal pleasure. I don't think that's very fair or "democratic" and will keep on objecting to that unneeded test in public.

Feel free to object to my objection any which way you want. Just remember that Internetting is NOT amateur radio. My objection to your objection is probably going to happen...to you or anyone else...in any manner and form I care to use...whether or not some True Believer gets mad as heck and goes out of their way (or gourd) to toss out very clear LIBEL in a most personal way.

No problem to me. If I'm here and not in Houston, I can match anyone's shots, shot for shot, and salvo as I care to.

SO FAR in here, this forum doesn't require any amateur radio license to communicate on the Internet.

Sunnavagun! How about that? :-)

LHA / WMD

2068. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:45:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86844

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Go easy on Dave. He is busy revolutionizing the Internet by using
> it as a transporter to download hardware.
>
> Important work. Actual pioneering.

You might recall that I provided you with a definition for "firmware",
not "hardware" and I pointed you to the Ten-Tec site where downloads of
"Firmware Upgrades" can be undertaken. It looks as if anyone who
depends upon you for accurate information is doomed to disappointment.
You aren't one to let facts stand in your way.

> He'll go where no ham has gone before...

I've already been to several places where damned few have gone.
Any licensed ham is apt to have gone a number of places where you've not
been.

Dave K8MN

2069. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:47:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402041347.52235d4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86845

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040204055435.15923.00003581@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
> >nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
> >I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
> >anything but talk either.
>
> Some have amassed almost 80 countries on old-fashioned SSB, though. But that
> was when we had some sunspots.

. . . pfft . . !

> >Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.
>
> As is this "bandwidtj based frequency plan" thing. Note that it would
> essentially
> knock AM and NFM off much of amateur HF. Note also that besides drastically
> widening the 'phone subbands, it cuts down the incentive to get an Extra.

It's just plain goofy. She's advocating a new structure to "fix" the
current structure which ain't broke.

So is the ARRL by the way. They have a committee beavering away on a
similar propsal which is even *worse* than Bonnie's.

> Most of all, note the unsubstantiated statements like 'by 2010, 30% will be
> Novice operators' and '80% of hams on HF radiate a medium bandwidth signal' and
> such. Where do these numbers come from? No response.

What "Novices" with HF phone privs?? Mindless leap ahead. She's
playing ham politician but she's no good at the art.

> One type of amateur HF wideband "experimentation" I know of is some folks
> fooling around with "enhanced SSB", which is plain old SSB with the frequency
> range widenend to up to 9 kHz. Some call it "single wideband".

That garbage is simply ssb with tweeters, "hi-fi ssb", as if. Has
nothing to do with wideband digital ops. This kind of nonsense
periodically comes and goes, there have been at least a couple passes
at "supermodulation" schemes. They silently died and nobody went to
the funerals.

> There's also
> some digital voice experimentation going on, but the added complexity doesn't
> seem to give addded results. Yet.

The broadcasters have been putting an experimental 10 Khz wide AM mode called "DRM"on the air for a year or so. Runs data, text & "hi-fi" audio, no image or video so even at 10Khz wide it isn't a true multimedia mode. Existing AM/FM, swl and ham rcvrs will not process DRM signals without extensive mods and a 'puter *or* a built-to-purpose rcvr the way I understand it. So as has usually been the case with the introduction of innovations in recent decades the commercials are already there at least on an experimental basis. It'll be interesting to see how well DRM flies, it just might work well for all I know but it's gotta survive the costs then the crud in the swl bands.

To get anything like DRM running in the ham bands it'll have to impress large numbers of hams enough on a performance basis to convince them (us) to adopt a new mode which is completely incompatible with the existing equipment hams use. Historically that trick has never worked.

> And to answer your question: Yes, you can put a voice signal (digitized)
> through a 500 Hz pass band. You just need a modulation scheme meant for that
> application, and the tradeoff will come in the form of needing a really good
> S/N and/or more than real-time to send the message.

A requirement to have very good S/N ratios in the HF ham bands is two strikes against a mode like this right out of the box. Dealing with the realtime issue is probably survivable.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2070. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:51:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86846

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
> >> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
> >> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
> >> >anything but talk either.
> >>
> >> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
> >
> >When did a 31 Hz wide mode become "wideband"?
>
> Martinez' innovation comes from scaling current wideband data
> communications at high rates to the slow, real-time rates of
> amateur radio environments. That involved some good application
> of Information Theory and other things, not in being spoon-fed
> How To Do It from the pages of QST.

I noted that you didn't really provide an answer to the question. A
comment was made about wide band modes. You responded with something
about PSK-31. Now you go into what Peter Martinez scaled. You haven't
address the comment on wide band modes.

I snipped the rest of your lecture since it didn't really deal with what
was asked.

Dave K8MN

2071. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 21:56:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402041356.247bd5f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86847

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<402109FA.6060302@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
> >>
> >
> > Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here.
> > Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as
> > "electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a
> > modem" "better modes and modulations"....
>
>
>
> I wonder where Carl is lately? Haven't heard from him since he had the
> change of heart regarding the testing.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, speaking of a change of heart re: testing, check this out:

---
billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > >
> > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > >
> > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > >
> > > Why is it NOW a problem?

Almost makes you want to think!

Good thing we have the old PCTA double standard to fall back on.

73, bb

2072. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 22:55:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204175516.21955.00000298@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86848

In article <d22b54c3.0402040734.2415a54c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>...
>> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20040202223625.11022.00003899@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> > achievement only points accusingly to the fact that
>> > present amateur radio licensing requirements are "dumbed-down" to
>> > such an unreasonably low level that even a 7-year old can attain an
>> > Amateur Extra-class license.
>>
>> That's one way to look at it. The way I prefer to look at it is that a
>> bright and motivated young child set herself a goal and achieved it.
>
>I don't see much of a connect between your particular preferences and
>the highly-probable reality in these cases.

I just gave the opposite spin to Larry's.

>Parents and other
>relatives impose expectations on kids all the time.

That's part of the job.

>I sure did. I
>"motivated" mine any number of times into "achieving" and in some of
>those cases they met my expectations just to get me off their backs.
>
That's a bit different from Larry's claim that the only reason was because the mother pushed her.

>> > And while the novelty of a 7-year old
>> > Extra is certainly "news" in the Amateur Radio community, it does
>> > not point to a secure future for our hobby/service.
>
>> Why not? I don't see anything wrong with young people, or females,
>> getting
>> licenses. In fact, I think that sort of thing is just what ham radio
>> needs *more* of!
>
>That's not what Larry meant.

Sure sounded like it to me.

> Over the 100 year history of ham radio
>maybe we've had what, pick a number, twenty kids under ten licensed?

I dunno. Maybe a couple hundred.

Look up a book called "Radio Rescue" by Lynne Barasch. Ten year old ham in
1923. True story.

>Versus around 1.5 million total U.S. hams?

Where'd you get a number that big? Prolly more like a million.

>Those kids have all been
>statistical anomalies pure and simple and have not had, nor will they
>have any influence at all on the course of the service in the future.
>
Not my point at all.

Point is that two of things working against ham radio today are lack
of youngsters and the tendency of some people to avoid hobbies the whole
family can't enjoy. Family of hams beats both those trends.

>> > Any of Mattie's young peers, without the support of a licensed parent,
>> > and the material support of a functional station in their home, would
>> > not likely achieve the same results.
>
>Absolutely. How many of these kids *didn't* have a ham in the
>immediate family?

Few if any. So what? The music teacher's kid is probably going to have more
access to instruments than the plumber's.
>
>> So what? Part of what healthy families *DO* is support each other's
>> needs
>> and interests. In that family, it's clear that ham radio is a family
>> thing,
>> not something one family member does in seclusion from the rest.
>> That's a
>> good thing. It brings families together, crosses generational
>> barriers, helps
>> build a level of education, maturity and understanding that are
>> greatly needed.
>
> I think you're over-preaching to the choir again here James.

I don't.
>
>> And there is no better way to help a child learn than to get them
>> interested in the subject. Geography? Time zones? Math, science,
>> technology? An interest in ham radio helps with all of those.
>
>Her folks shepherded her into ham radio beacause ham radio is a great
>way for kids to learn geography??

Heck no - that's just a side benefit.
>
>> >(About the best we can hope for
>> > is that other ham parents will take similar steps to induce their
>> > children to become licensed, but that's about as far as it can go
>> > until they become adults, with their own financial resources and the
>> > adult prerogatives that go with it.
>
>> I never got any help in the ham radio area from my folks. So I was
>> delayed a few years in getting started.
>
>Nothing unusual about that.

'zactly. Which is why it took me a little longer. If I'd had real support, I'd
a been
really dangerous. bwaahaahaaa

>A huge percentage of all of us kid hams
>didn't have any particular "parental support" when we became hams. All
>my folks cared about was that whatever it was that I was doing with a
>soldering iron in the cellar didn't result in the Henny Carr the town
>cop dragging me home by the scruff of my neck *again* for commiting
>some bush-league juvenile atrocity or another. Worked for them and it
>worked for me.
>
'zactly. One of the biggest parental jobs is to get 'em interested in
something - anything - that's relatively harmless compared to what's out
there. Which they may get involved in anyway, but it beats taking the
hands off approach.

With some kids, a lot of support is needed. With others, the best way to kill
the kid's interest is to get involved too much.

>> > About the best face I can put on this is that young Mattie now has
>> > the rest of her life to "grow" into the hobby. Hopefully, over the
>> > years, she will acquire technical knowledge and operating skills which
>> > will become equivalent to her Amateur Extra status.
>>
>> She got 4 wrong on Element 4. How many did you get wrong on yours?
>
>No-counter: We all know that there is *no* relationship between
>passing the tests and the level of useful knowledge reqired to put
>together an HF ham station.

Of course. Point is she didn't just pass. Then again, she got 4 more
wrong than our buddy in Allentown....

> This NG has glaring examples of same.

Oh yes - including one or two who couldn't even get any ham license, despite
years-old predictions...

>> > As of now,
>> > however, she is more of a stunt than the real thing.

>>
>> How do you know?
>
>He doesn't and neither do you.

And that's the point. Larry made all kinds of statements about someone he
doesn't know at all.

>Fact is that it's not hard to find
>instances of their folks pressuring kids into outstanding
>accomplishments in order to have bragging rights about the kid. Which
>I suspect is where Larry is coming from. Whether it's true in Mattie's
>case is 100% conjecture.

Bingo.
>
>> > I have no
>> > doubt that when asked to engage in even a fairly low-level discussion
>> > of technical and operating subjects, she will not be able to give
>> > any reasonable accounting of herself, beyond perhaps the simple
>> > recitation of answers to the exam questions.
>>
>> You might be surprised.
>
>She's probably somewhere between the opposite poles you two guys live
>in.

And that's the point.
>
>> Tell ya what, Larry, I'll fill a box with parts and you can come over
>> and build afunctioning ham rig out of them. No instructions, no
>> elmers, just parts and a book or two.
>> I did it when I was 13. I doubt
>> you could do it, Larry.
>
>Virtually all yer kid ham predecessors could cobble rigs together
>"Back in my day".

I could, too. Many of my counterparts could. A few couldn't.

>It was almost the norm then. A lot higher
>percentage of us designed and rolled our own than was the case "in
>your day" a decade and a half later. By the time Larry got into ham
>radio hombrewing no longer made any sense except in oddball cases so I
>doubt he had any reason to even consider building his own rig.

Coax can be had with the connectors already on, too. And premade G5RVs
often make more sense than rolling one's own...

>Entry
>level rigs have been products of the era in which we came into the
>service. YMMV and it obviously has.

The irony is that the box of parts I'd give Larry would include many parts
that were only recently given to me by an anonymous benefactor....
>
>> > Again, none of Mattie's inadequacies are her fault, she is just
>> > the product of her parent's dreams.
>>
>> Nonsense, Larry. She's an individual. Kids are not robots.
>
>C'mon, you know better than that.

Yes I do. Kids are harder to train than robots.

>Seven year olds are about as
>compliant as they come.

HAW!!

>They're "individuals" only to the extent that
>their parents and teachers allow them to act independently.
>
I know some you oughta meet...

>> There are folks who walk into a test session with no ham license and
>> walk out with an Extra. That was going on before the VE system, too.
>> The barely-10-year-old I mentioned above had to do 13 wpm sending and
>> receiving plus the old Class B/General written.
>
>I know Janie. Her father was Jesse Bieberman W3KT who is still a
>legend. Honer Roll top-ender for decades, phone and cw dx contester,
>25wpm with a straight key for 48 straight. Vice Director of the
>Atlantic Division for decades and one of the most powerful voices in
>Newington in those days. Ran the W3 buro single-handed also for
>decades. Was also a private-school high school math instructor.

I knew him too. See above about the music teacher's kid. Only in this case
it's more like Ormandy's kid.

>You
>think maybe Jane just got up one morning when she was ten and outta
>nowhere declared that she was gonna pursue a ham ticket??

Naw, she was copying code when she was six. And still active with the same
call.

At least nobody has yet accused the VEs of "fraud" (with absolutely no
evidence)
as has happened here before.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2073. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-04 23:56:16 UTC
From: gaffo <gaffo@usenet.net>
Message-ID: <AEfUb.18860$JZ7.16620@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86849
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lenny wrote:
> "gaffo" <gaffo@usenet.net> wrote in message
> news:dAYTb.12841$6M6.4582@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
>>>>Pirate TV- I'd like to do it on a limited basis- send the signal just
>>>>through my apartment building. If the signal goes any farther then that,
>>>>no problem, but it's not a priority.
>>
>>I found this:
>>
>>Supercircuits
>>13552 Research Blvd
>>Austin TX 78750
>>
>>This company sells a low-power TV transmitter for channels 3 thru 6 which
>>appears to be of high quality ($49.95 plus $4.50 S&H). For licensed radio
>>amateurs, they also sell some ham TV transmitter kits with 1 to 2 watts
>>peak output power that can be adapted for use on UHF channels 14 thru 19,
>>and a linear amp for boosting the output of these transmitters.
>>
>
>
> I heard about an unlicensed TV station in Nashville. Last time I was
> down there I make an attempt to find the signal and was
> successful. Although the video was not the greatest, the programming
> was pretty good. A good dose of political opinion stuff, mixed
> with entertainment. At times amateurish, other times professional.
>
> Lenny
> Detroit
>
>
>

kewl.....what was their power/range?

when I lived in Austin, we had the UT TV station (out of the
Communications Building) - its range was literally about 1/2 mile. My
friend lived about 10-city blocks from that building, and with rabbit
ears it was "watchable", but not with some video noise.

where I live now we have a 200 watt church station - seems its range is
about the same (1/2 mile).

I'd Imagine that pirate TV was probably less than 200 watts, so we'd be talking of a range of literally 4-5 city blocks?

I'd love to playback a shitload of DiVx video through a 120 Gig harddrive.

obscure stuff - like

chef, prisoner, brother cadfeal, the velt, lightsout.....etc.
there is alot of good TV shows which are not played on any cable channel that I'm aware of. If they are, they are not commonly aired.

peace.

--

"I think in this case international law
stood in the way of doing the right thing (invading Iraq)."
- Richard Perle

"He (Saddam Hussein) has not developed any significant capability with respect to weapons of mass destruction. He is unable to project conventional power against his neighbours."
- Colin Powell February 24 2001

"We have been successful for the last ten years in keeping
him from developing those weapons and we will continue to be successful."

"He threatens not the United States."

"But I also thought that we had pretty
much removed his stings and frankly for ten years we really have."

'But what is interesting is that with the regime that has been in place for the past ten years, I think a pretty good job has been done of keeping him from breaking out and suddenly showing up one day and saying "look what I got." He hasn't been able to do that.'
- Colin Powell February 26 2001

2074. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:01:37 UTC
From: gaffo <gaffo@usenet.net>
Message-ID: <BJfUb.18862$R6.751@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86850
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lenny wrote:

> "gaffo" <gaffo@usenet.net> wrote in message
> news:dAYTb.12841$6M6.4582@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
>>>>Pirate TV- I'd like to do it on a limited basis- send the signal just
>>>>through my apartment building. If the signal goes any farther then that,
>>>>no problem, but it's not a priority.
>>
>>I found this:
>>
>>Supercircuits
>>13552 Research Blvd
>>Austin TX 78750
>>
>>This company sells a low-power TV transmitter for channels 3 thru 6 which
>>appears to be of high quality ($49.95 plus $4.50 S&H). For licensed radio
>>amateurs, they also sell some ham TV transmitter kits with 1 to 2 watts
>>peak output power that can be adapted for use on UHF channels 14 thru 19,
>>and a linear amp for boosting the output of these transmitters.
>>
>
>
> I heard about an unlicensed TV station in Nashville. Last time I was
> down there I make an attempt to find the signal and was
> successful. Although the video was not the greatest, the programming
> was pretty good. A good dose of political opinion stuff, mixed
> with entertainment. At times amateurish, other times professional.
>
> Lenny
> Detroit
>
>
>

oh ya.................that Austin station was no channal 9. There was another low power called KVI (i think - been awhile) channel 13. It used to be America One network and had limited range, maybe 1-2 miles. It was later bought by channel 7 (i've forgotten the call letters of this CBS affiliate) and changed to UPN.

oh ya ....we have an America One in a town north of me - it is low power with a range of at most 1-mile.

--

"I think in this case international law
stood in the way of doing the right thing (invading Iraq)."
- Richard Perle

"He (Saddam Hussein) has not developed any significant capability with
respect to weapons of mass destruction. He is unable to project
conventional power against his neighbours."
- Colin Powell February 24 2001

"We have been successful for the last ten years in keeping
him from developing those weapons and we will continue to be successful."

"He threatens not the United States."

"But I also thought that we had pretty
much removed his stings and frankly for ten years we really have."

'But what is interesting is that with the regime that has been in place
for the past ten years, I think a pretty good job has been done of
keeping him from breaking out and suddenly showing up one day and saying
"look what I got." He hasn't been able to do that.'
- Colin Powell February 26 2001

2075. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:04:59 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bvrul9$sr9$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 86751
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"gaffo" <gaffo@usenet.net> wrote in message
news:AEfUb.18860$JZ7.16620@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> I'd love to playback a shitload of DiVx video through a 120 Gig harddrive.
>
> obscure stuff - like
>
> chef, prisoner,

Now where would you have gotten those?? ;)

2076. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:05:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204190524.25517.00004090@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 86752

In article <d22b54c3.0402021032.6649605b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040201091610.15923.00003512@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402010353.2dccd37a@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >> Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.
>
>> >Did that. For one your "30M bandplan" would require both ITU and FCC
>> >approval to implement. Good luck with that one Bonnie.

>> And that's just the beginning.
>
>Right: I haven't rummaged thru it in real depth and I don't intend to
>but I'll just betcha there are more similar instances of conflicts
>with the ITU regs.

Not a big problem at all, most of ITU doesn't really care anyway.
>
>> > If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz,
>> >>then
>> >> you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my
>experience
>> >> working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that
>it
>> >> can happen in Amateur Radio.
>
>I poked around, she's apparently big on "pack radio", using digital
>military HF "tactical" gear is one piece of it. She doesn't seem to
>understand the collections of "differences" . . ?

Obviously not.
>
> > Of course it can. But will it? If the 'phone bands are as
>> drastically widened as
>> proposed, why should anyone bother with 500 Hz processed voice
>> when they have so much room for regular SSB?
>
>Is it even possible to compress digitized voice down to 500Hz?

In theory, yes. There are tradeoffs, of course.

And practice is another thing entirely.

>Violation of Shannon's Law?

Not at all. But Shannon forces tradeoffs.

Here's one way to do it....

You're familar with PSK-31, which at the most basic level is a form of amplitude and phase shift keying. (the amplitude part involves carefully shutting off the carrier during phase transitions to reduce the bandwidth).

Anyway, with the basic PSK-31 signal you get a certain number of bits in a 31.5 Hz wide channel. If you use BPSK, the bit rate is the same as the baud rate. BPSK (binary phase shift keying) simply means the system recognizes two phase states - 0 and 180 degrees.

But by adding more phase states, we can send more bits in the same bandwidth. With four states (0, 90, 180, 270), we can send twice as many bits in the same bandwidth. You can theoretically just keep on adding phase states and send more bits.

Now since one PSK-31 signal needs only 31.5 Hz, you could in theory fit about 16 of them in a 500 Hz channel, giving you 16 times as many bits.

Of course anybody who's done real engineering knows that there's always a tradeoff. And the tradeoff is signal to noise ratio. In the case of PSK, adding phase states increases the susceptibility to any phase jitter or noise in the system - receiver, transmitter or path, be it wire or radio or fiber.

>> >> In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant
>> >> band segments.
>>
>> On HF? Where are they?
>
>There really are a bunch of underutilized spaces in the 160, 80, 15 &
>10M bands James. "Spectrum banks for future expansions . . "

Where?
>
>> >What is not conjecture is the fact that there is no statistical
>> >evidence which indicates that simply having a license to operate HF
>> >somehow equates to those with any new "giveaway" HF ticket actually
>> >putting together HF stations and getting 'em on the air on a 1:1 new
>> >license privs/band occupancy ratio.
>>
>> BINGO!
>>
>> And that's not going to change much.
>
>If anything the ratio will get worse. I've seen too many examples of
>new-wave 5wpm ex-Tech Extras who have yet to make the first move
>toward putting an HF station on the air to believe otherwise.

Also ex-Tech Generals.

>I'm not
>at all convinced that expanded HF privs is all that much of an
>incentive to upgrade these days vs. earlier days. Prolly has more to
>do today with the incentive to acquire bragging rights vs. anything to
>do with actually operating.

Maybe. Or maybe the license is the easy part and the station is the tough
part.
>
>> >Quite the opposite is being demonstrated in fact. We already have tons
>> >of experience with, for example, the recent huge increase in the
>> >number of Extra Class licensees which fell out of the reduction in the
>> >code test speed for Extras.
>>
>> And the reduction in written testing for Extra.
>
>It's all one disgusting big dumbed-down bag of worms.

Which isn't going to change much anytime soon.
>
>> >I tune the Extra 75/40/20M phone setasides today and the recently
>> >enfranchised don't seem to be there. In volume. If anything the
>> >overall activity level in those setasides is noticeably down from what
>> >it was long before the code test speed was dropped.
>>
>> Don't forget sunspots.
>
>I'm talking about the much longer term thru the highs and the lows. In
>years gone by there was always chatter in the Extra phone setasides,
>not with just sunspot-affected dx, but with."locals". After the last
>FD I decided to dredge up a ragchew in the 20 phone setaside before I
>tore down. Usta be no sweat. I had to tune around for ten minutes
>until w3bv came on the air and we yakked for 45 minutes via ground
>path.. Mid day, the spots were middling and the dx was there. The only
>w's in the space were a small group of 8s & 9s and Alan (keeper of the
>k3jh pole) and I. All of us were old 1 x 2s. Message there.

Part of that is simply exhaustion after FD. Often brought about by folks
who don't know how to pace themselves. There's also the few who work
themselves into the ground for the benefit of the sidewalk superintendent
group...
>
>> > . . The dead spectrum problem has far more to do
>> >with getting the HF-enabled of all flavors off the Internet, off their
>> >dead butts, geting the radios, actually putting the HF antennas up and
>> >getting on the air than it does with any "bandwidth-based frequency
>> >plan" sorts of things.
>>
>> HEAR HEAR
>>
>> And *THAT'S* where the problem really is! Fiddling with licenses is
>> only going to have a minor effect on that, if any. License changes

>> aren't going to fix anybody's CC&Rs, or suddenly improve the
>> sunspot number, or empower vast numbers of existing hams to
>> figure out how to end feed a wire and actually get on the air.
>
>Perfect example of the results of dumbing-down.
>
>Bonnie also dumped her Master Plan into QRZ.com. Bad move. Those guys
>make us RRAPers look like wilted lilly nice guys in comparison. Check
>it out.

I did.
>
>I notice that she hasn't gone back at anybody with a single rebuttal.

That's changed, but it's basically a preaching session.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2077. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:17:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bYfUb.115$t16.180732@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86753

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040203205637.05539.00004128@mb-m16.aol.com...
> [snip]
> What didn't work was simply this: Getting a Novice required passing two
tests
> (code and theory) while getting a Tech after 1991 required passing just
one. So
> most new hams went for the Tech because it was perceived to be easier.
>

From the introduction of the no-code Tech until April of 2000, the no-code Technician license required passing two tests: the Novice written and the Technician written.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2078. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:29:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204192918.07984.00000444@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86755

In article <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Construance>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
>> INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
>> essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.
>
>Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
>meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
>newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
>Extra right out of the box".

Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.

I left active duty in 1956, moved to southern California in 1956, worked
IN radio-electronics in the aerospace industries out here. I'm still
working IN it but not at regular hours. Better than 40 hours a week
from then to now. Even did a severe major shift to go from illustration
to electronics engineering. Kept up a hobby in electronics at home
all that time. Even authored articles on electronics and ham radio
as a professional writer in spare time. Became senior staff
engineer at several large electronics corporations.

Howaboutthat? Does that "show enough interest?" I'd say making a
career out of an "interest" ought to prove something to anyone with
more than four brain cells. Nope. Not enough to mighty big dave.
To him (bless his 4-synapse grey matter) I'd have to regress and Learn
To Beep Morse and become an amatoor hum wid a reel lisense.

Geez, snarly dave, those electroshock treatments do take away
some of your smarts. Was the gunnery nurse in attendance?
Did he dance well? Who lead?

LHA / WMD

2079. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:29:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204192919.07984.00000445@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86754

In article <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
>>
>> Mental or physical age? :-)
>
>At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?

Never tried, snarly dave.

I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
field office in March 1956. Never looked back.

Now Larrah, the self-professed paragon of determination and moral
virtue, once bragged and carried on that his "summa cum laude"
standings in post-service college would get him any top spot job
in human resources after graduation. He now drives a bus.

Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

>Please continue your civil debate on morse code elimination.

As soon as you show the way, snarly dave.

So far you haven't exhibited much civility in that regard.

But, I am always optimistic and hope for the best...

Keep the morse faith. Beep.

LHA / WMD

2080. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 00:29:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204192921.07984.00000446@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 86756

In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>
>> To US who were in the big-time radio communications on HF of a half
>> century ago, that did not involve morse code. There were and still are
>> a lot of "US" involved in that.
>
>For some of US who've had more recent experience than yours, morse was
>involved. For many of us who are actually radio amateurs and who are
>participants in big-time radio HF communications today, morse code is
>still involved. What are you doing in big-time HF these days?

In big-time HF, not a heckuva lot. There's very little left of the BIG
TIME HF communications efforts of a half century ago.

Armature radio deeecksing is "big time?" Nope. Not a drop in a
bit bucket compared to the communications carriers of not too long
ago. You'd LOVE to think it was "big time" but that is only how it
is written up in QST.

The only radio service still requiring morse code for communications
is amatoor radio. All the other radio services either gave up on it or
never considered it in the first place.

>> I was IN worldwide communications on HF over a half century ago.
>> At the time I liked it fine...even felt honored to be able to serve my
>> country doing just that.
>>
>> None of that involved morse code.
>
>...and because you didn't use morse, no one used it at the time or since.
>A number of us have used morse professionally and as radio amateurs in
>the decades after you had your "big-time".

Nope, snarly dave, the Army gave up on morse code for fixed-point
to fixed-point long-distance communications back in 1948, before my
service time. The Navy's long-haul fixed comms were the same way.
Same for the USAF although all the branches maintained some
morse code proficiency requirements and circuits until the early 70s
(rather small efforts). I'm sure Department of State was able to put

some of that obsolete military equipment to good use after it had a
life in active military duty.

>> Tens of thousands of skilled radio operators worldwide have used
>> worldwide communications effectively for decades without ever
>> once having to use or know morse code. They have done so for
>> over a half century.
>
>Tens of thousands of skilled radio ops worldwide *have* used morse
>effectively for worldwide communications after your day in the sun.
>Tens of thousands still do so.

Sorry, snarly dave, that's just your Article of Faith. You WANT to
think that is true but it's far in the past and never the numbers you
can prove. The PROOF is seeing what radio circuits use what on
HF...even when HF was a mainstay of communications carriers.

Don't let me stop your rationale invention. Improve the state of the
rationale art, innovate, improvise, adapt...

>> The U.S. military did not require any morsemanship to use the very
>> first handheld transceivers (on HF) for communications in 1940. That's
>> 64 years ago. Neither did they require any morsemanship to use the
>> first backpack radio (on VHF) in 1943. That's 61 years ago.
>
>Yet the military continued to use morse. What's your point?

EVOLUTION, you throwback to failed Darwinism.

Do you need a DayGlo billboard to outline it? WAKE UP.

The state of the art of radio communications long since bypassed
morsemanship skills.

It doesn't take rocket science intellect to use, operate ANY radio.

Morsemanship needs only repetitive Pavlovian training to become
a wetware modem...provided the basic aptitude is present.

NO modern communications carrier uses any morse code. Such
skills went byebye some time ago.

Teletype Corporation didn't make a half million teleprinters during
their corporate existance to copy morse code.

>The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in
>radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications
>without touching a PLMRS transceiver.

Wow! Really?!?

No hams work in a business that has a Public Land Mobile Radio
Services radio? No hams work on railroads or in heavy trucking or
vehicle road service trucks? No hams in construction of large
buildings or engaged in HVAC or plumbing maintenance of same?

No hams are policemen or firemen or paramedics? No hams are in
the broadcast industry using remote links controlled through PLMRS
comms?

They are all on HF engaging in "radiosport" and net checking to
advance the state of the art of radio and morsemanship?

Now all that "radiosport" and "net checking" is fun and recreational
and enjoyed by many but it is hardly any sort of technical
advancement or honing skills useful in case of national need.

Your mileage on the newsgroup rageometer will, of course, vary.

Foaming at the mouth is normal, sarly dave, but don't forget to
brush after every meal.

>I see. "Broadband" means "broad bandwidth". You could have knocked me
>over with a feather when I read your words. So to your way of thinking
>on "broadness", a morse communication at 5 wpm on 10 KHz could be
>considered "broadband"?

No. I'd say that 5 words per minute on 10 KHz could possibly be
interfering with USN submarine alert frequencies. Those are on VLF.
It's not nice to interfere with boomers or sharks, big daddy dave.
Such wouldn't mean a "Riley" knocking on your door, but some very
serious "attitude" folks carrying heavy artillery.

Now show us some REAL innovations and inventions done by hams
over the last 50 years or so concerning RADIO. Other than Dan
Tayloe that I've already mentioned several times.

Or just continue to make nasty in here on the UnBelievers who
don't worship at the shrine of St. Hiram.

LHA / WMD

2081. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:09:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ApydnUgkLaFYA7zdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86765

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Gosh and golly, Paul, I've only been working in radio-electronics
> since 1952

And still dosen't know enough to be able to pass the test for a ham license.

2082. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:11:14 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ApydnUskLaGuArzdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86766

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.
>
> I left active duty in 1956, moved to southern California in 1956, worked
> IN radio-electronics in the aerospace industries out here. I'm still
> working IN it but not at regular hours. Better than 40 hours a week
> from then to now. Even did a severe major shift to go from illustration
> to electronics engineering. Kept up a hobby in electronics at home
> all that time. Even authored articles on electronics and ham radio
> as a professional writer in spare time. Became senior staff
> engineer at several large electronics corporations.
>
> Howaboutthat? Does that "show enough interest?" I'd say making a
> career out of an "interest" ought to prove something to anyone with
> more than four brain cells. Nope. Not enough to mighty big dave.
> To him (bless his 4-synapse grey matter) I'd have to regress and Learn
> To Beep Morse and become an amatoor hum wid a reel lisense.
>

All that bragging and still can't pass the test for a ham license.

2083. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:13:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <402198C6.1090708@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86757

>
>
>
>
>>And there is no better way to help a child learn than to get them
>>interested in the subject. Geography? Time zones? Math, science,
>>technology? An interest in ham radio helps with all of those.
>>
They'd need HF privs for some of that. HF propagation is needed to get
your signal to Pottsylvania...

>>
>>
>
>Her folks shepherded her into ham radio beacause ham radio is a great
>way for kids to learn geography??
>
I don't know what they do in K-12 grades now, but way back when I was a kid,
geography was taught in grades 4 thru 7. "What's the capital of South
Dakota?"
"Where is Red China?" "What voltage do they apply to the electrified
barbed wire
surrounding the Communist Bloc?" ;-) We learned about evil Godless
communism
in geography class....

>
>
>
>>>
>>>
>Nothing unusual about that. A huge percentage of all of us kid hams
>didn't have any particular "parental support" when we became hams. All
>my folks cared about was that whatever it was that I was doing with a
>soldering iron in the cellar didn't result in the Henny Carr the town
>cop dragging me home by the scruff of my neck *again* for commiting
>some bush-league juvenile atrocity or another. Worked for them and it
>worked for me.
>
>
They didn't get paranoid about your messing with dangerous electricity?
:-) My parents
knew about electricity and had no real fear of it, but my grandmother
had no clue at
all about electricity. She grew up somewhere near Scranton PA before

they had
electricity there....

>
>
>>She got 4 wrong on Element 4. How many did you get wrong on yours?
>>
3. Well, 2 on 4A and 1 on 4B.

>>
>>
>
>
>
>
>
>>Tell ya what, Larry, I'll fill a box with parts and you can come over
>>and build afunctioning ham rig out of them. No instructions, no
>>elmers, just parts and a book or two.
>> I did it when I was 13. I doubt
>>you could do it, Larry.
>>
>>
>
>Virtually all yer kid ham predecessors could cobble rigs together
>"Back in my day". It was almost the norm then. A lot higher
>percentage of us designed and rolled our own than was the case "in
>your day" a decade and a half later. By the time Larry got into ham
>radio hombrewing no longer made any sense except in oddball cases so I
>doubt he had any reason to even consider building his own rig. Entry
>level rigs have been products of the era in which we came into the
>service. YMMV and it obviously has.
>
Many novice setups were built out of junked tube TV parts and modified
AM radio
receivers. QST published many articles about such. The designs were
such that you
could have something that worked without causing a lot of TVI. Designs
that were
not fussy about adjustments and component selection. Which is what you
want in
manufacturing, something that can be thrown together and always work.

>
>
>

2084. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:22:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40219AD0.4080806@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86758

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Not necessarily, Brian, but studying for an amateur ticket gets kids
>fired up about learning. I can certainly see Jim's point about kids
>becoming interested in geography, the sciences and math. It didn't work
>toward interesting me in geometry though. I was caught reading QST
>hidden within my open geometry book.
>
Should have been a copy of Playboy..... ;-)

>
>
>
>
>>
>>
>
>For the first few weeks of my interest, my dad actively discouraged me
>with talk of amateur radio being a passing fad for me. He had visions
>of mounds of equipment gathering dust in a closet. My mother encouraged
>me and was able to convince my father that some of the meager family
>income should be spent on a transmitter for me if I earned the money for
>the receiver from my paper route.
>
>My dad had and has no technical abilities whatever. My mother was
>deathly afraid of electricity and wouldn't even clean my ham shack. She
>just knew that lightning was going to enter the house via my antennas.
>
>
Reminds me of the story about some little old lady sueing the trolley
company
because they caused a lightning bolt to run thru her bedroom late at night.
What probably happened was the trolley pole comming off the wire causing
an arc to flash. She must have went nuts during a real thunderstorm....

We once had lightning take out a tall tree in the back yard late one night.
Wooden shrapnel all over the back yard; good thing nobody was outside
when that happened. SOme of the light bulbs that were on blew out.
This was back in the early 60's, before line operated solid state
equipment was at all common. The tube stuff (all of which was off)
didn't mind.

>
>

2085. ARRL Committee's "Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:24:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402041724.10fbc51d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86759

This one is as bad a Bonnie's abomination. Maybe worse.

http://www.arrl.org/announce/reports-0307/hf-digital.html

w3rv

2086. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:27:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40219C12.1040909@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86760

>
>
>>>
>>>
>>At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
>>
>>
>
> Never tried, snarly dave.
>
> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.
>
>
>
Then learning the 5 wpm and getting the extra should be a walk in the
park then.
It took me about a month to learn 5 wpm and I'm no good at such motor
skills.

2087. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:30:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402041730.653cbbe5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86761

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40211310.6020508@psu.edu>...

> I'd prefer it if the test were essay. not because it would be harder,
> but because for me at least, it would be easier. I liked them in school,
> I still like them.

You are assuming that the volunteer examiners are capable of
evaluating something other than multiple choice.

2088. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:34:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40219DA6.35D67934@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86762

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Construance>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
> >> INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
> >> essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.
> >
> >Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
> >meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
> >newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
> >Extra right out of the box".
>
> Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.

I did go for it, Len--forty years ago, within a year of my first
exposure to amateur radio.

> I left active duty in 1956, moved to southern California in 1956, worked
> IN radio-electronics in the aerospace industries out here.

Nope. Nothing about your obtaining an amateur radio license here.

> I'm still
> working IN it but not at regular hours. Better than 40 hours a week
> from then to now. Even did a severe major shift to go from illustration
> to electronics engineering. Kept up a hobby in electronics at home
> all that time. Even authored articles on electronics and ham radio
> as a professional writer in spare time. Became senior staff
> engineer at several large electronics corporations.

No, nothing about your having obtained an amateur radio license here.

> Howaboutthat? Does that "show enough interest?"

In obtaining an amateur radio license? Why, no, none at all.

> I'd say making a
> career out of an "interest" ought to prove something to anyone with
> more than four brain cells. Nope. Not enough to mighty big dave.
> To him (bless his 4-synapse grey matter) I'd have to regress and Learn
> To Beep Morse and become an amatoor hum wid a reel lisense.

You haven't Beeped Morse nor have you Passed Any Written Exam. You've taken no action on your declared interest.

> Geez, snarly dave, those electroshock treatments do take away
> some of your smarts. Was the gunnery nurse in attendance?
> Did he dance well? Who lead?

Who did what? My smarts are fine, Len. I wrote about getting into amateur radio. Your response didn't address that, did it?

Dave K8MN

2089. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:37:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40219E5D.70207@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86763
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

gaffo wrote:

> Lenny wrote:
>
>> "gaffo" <gaffo@usenet.net> wrote in message
>> news:dAYTb.12841$6M6.4582@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>
>>>>>> Pirate TV- I'd like to do it on a limited basis- send the signal just
>>>>>> through my apartment building. If the signal goes any farther then
>>>>>> that,
>>>>>> no problem, but it's not a priority.
>>>>
>>>
>>> I found this:
>>>
>>> Supercircuits
>>> 13552 Research Blvd
>>> Austin TX 78750
>>>
>>> This company sells a low-power TV transmitter for channels 3 thru 6
>>> which
>>> appears to be of high quality ($49.95 plus $4.50 S&H). For licensed
>>> radio
>>> amateurs, they also sell some ham TV transmitter kits with 1 to 2 watts
>>> peak output power that can be adapted for use on UHF channels 14
>>> thru 19,
>>> and a linear amp for boosting the output of these transmitters.
>>
Make it interesting and get a digital TV set up. Amateur HDTV.

>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> I heard about an unlicensed TV station in Nashville. Last time I was
>> down there I make an attempt to find the signal and was
>> successful. Although the video was not the greatest, the programming
>> was pretty good. A good dose of political opinion stuff, mixed
>> with entertainment. At times amateurish, other times professional.
>>
>> Lenny
>> Detroit
>>

>>
>>
>
>
> kewl..............what was their power/range?
>
> when I lived in Austin, we had the UT TV station (out of the
> Communications Building) - its range was literally about 1/2 mile. My
> friend lived about 10-city blocks from that building, and with rabbit
> ears it was "watchable", but not with some video noise.
>
> where I live now we have a 200 watt church station - seems its range
> is about the same (1/2 mile).
>
> I'd Imagine that pirate TV was probably less than 200 watts, so we'd
> be talking of a range of literally 4-5 city blocks?
>
Back in 1977 someone put together a pirate TV station in Syracuse NY on
channel 7.
The story actually made it into the New York Times, though not front page.
The Syracuse student paper mentioned that they heard that it was built using
parts from an old gautar amp (actually reasonable if it was a tube rig,
the power
supply is already there, and the output tube could operate on VHF). It was
on for one weekend only. The nearest FCC field office was 150 miles
away, and
when Monday rolled around the pirates were gone. Syracuse was a town so
small
they had only 3 VHF and 1 UHF TV channel, all as conservitive as
anything you'd
find in the Bible Belt. 1977 was the dawn of the VCR, and they played
stuff like
porno and Star Trek episodes.

2090. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:38:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40219EA0.3F50F6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86764

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> > >
> >> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
> >>
> >> Mental or physical age? :-)
> > >
> > >At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
> >
> Never tried, snarly dave.

Well, there you have it.

> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.

I don't care about your commercial ticket. I asked about your amateur
radio license. Maybe you should look back.

> Now Larrah, the self-professed paragon of determination and moral
> virtue, once bragged and carried on that his "summa cum laude"
> standings in post-service college would get him any top spot job
> in human resources after graduation. He now drives a bus.

What has that to do with his amateur radio license and why is it of
concern to you?

> Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

You bragged *four* years ago that you'd get "an Extra right out of the
box". You still have not even the most basic amateur radio license.

Q.E.D.

> >Please continue your civil debate on morse code elimination.
> >
> As soon as you show the way, snarly dave.

> So far you haven't exhibited much civility in that regard.

I didn't state that as my "only purpose" here, Leonard. You did.

Dave K8MN

2091. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:38:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <XJOdnRmjI_jyO7zdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86774

Robert Casey wrote:

> :-)
>

Then her and kimmy can be "bosom" buddies, pun intended.

2092. Re: Well, BPL is coming to Rochester, NY :(

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:42:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40219F9E.7050201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86767

David Robbins wrote:

>i would contact w1rfi at arrl hq and ask for a procedure to make some before
>and after measurements. that way if you do get interference you are
>prepared to document the damage and help not only yourself but many others
>out. don't just write down a few s meter readings, you will want to
>document the antennas used, all radio settings, frequencies, time of day,
>other normal noise, etc. it may be best to make measurements on certain
>frequencies at certain times of the day... say 75m at mid day, 10m at night,
>etc when other band noise is minimal.
>
>
>
Be sure to make tape recordings of such before and after. Audio of the
rig output and
video of the S meter on the rig, like what they did at the ARRL web site.
BPL may have a distinctive sound pattern that ordinary interference
doesn't have.

2093. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:43:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402041743.b34bab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86768

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402040547.6c7374f7@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402031543.3ab87b59@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?
>
> Without the aforementioned database of EVERYONE'S allocations,
> how would it be possible for anyone to KNOW who is "out of band" and
> who's legit?

Steve, steve, steve, you keep extending the criterion beyond the scope
of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a QSO with another amateur that you knew was out
of band?

> > > How am I to know from one day to the next what a Frrenchman's
> > > allocations are?
> >
> > You're not being asked to.
>
> (Sheeesh!)
>
> SURE >I< am! Today I may "know" than the "F" guys can't use
> 52.525Mhz, but what about tomorrow...the day after...6 hours from now?
>
> That's why it's incumbent upon the transmitting station to know
> where he/she is operating...NOT me.

Steve, steve, steve, you keep extending the criterion beyond the scope
of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a QSO with another amateur that you knew was out
of band?

> > I asked "if you knew that they were operating out of band, would you
> > work them anyway?"
>
> And without keeping some instantly updated database, HOW am I
> supposed to know this?

Steve, steve, steve, you keep extending the criterion beyond the scope
of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a QSO with another amateur that you knew was out
of band?

> > No one other than Dave, and now you, has ever proposed having to know
> > all amateur allocations at all times.
>
> Then that makes two of us who see the hillarity of your rantings
> about who was "out-of-band" and who wasn't.

Steve, steve, steve, no one is ranting. You keep extending the
criterion beyond the scope of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a QSO with another amateur that you knew was out
of band?

> You and Lennie are the only two trying to make issue out of it.
> Lennie tries because he's an idiot with NO license and NO experience
> operating.
>
> YOUR excuse...?!?!

I see. You don't like the question. You attack me.

> > The question was, "if you knew..."
>
> I would "know" if I had some means of being informed. I don't.
> MOST U.S. Amateurs I know don't.

Steve, steve, steve, you keep extending the criterion beyond the scope
of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a QSO with another amateur that you knew was out
of band?

> > Are you saying that you would knowingly work out of band amateurs?
>
> Under what circumstances...I have "worked" stations out of my
> "authorized" bands before. But I ALSO had good reason and
> justification for it.

Of course you had a good reason.

But Steve, steve, steve, you keep extending the criterion beyond the
scope of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a non-emergency QSO with another amateur that you
knew was out of band?

> > > Thier government is just as likely as ours is to
> > > change the rules, so without keeping a database of some sort on
> > > EVERYONE'S allocations, how is a prudent American Amateur to know if
> > > the guy/gal he's working is "legit" or not?
> >
> > That wasn't the question, and you know it. Just another diversion.
> > But I'll bet they're the same as when Dave was working out-of-banders
> > in downtown Dar es Salaam.
>
> It's not a "diversion"...You are trying to insist that everyone
> "know" where other Amateurs are legally operating or not...but then
> you disclaim that's your intent...Your actions prove otherwise.

Steve, steve, steve, you keep extending the criterion beyond the scope
of my question.

It was a simple question, and I'll ask it again.

Would you engage in a QSO with another amateur that you knew was out
of band?

> > So many Dave apologists, so little time.
>
> It's not apolgetic. It's the truth.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Truth? Lets just stick to the facts.

2094. janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:48:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86769

:-)

2095. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:54:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204205427.01632.00000547@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 86771

In article <yadUb.14049$K82.7461@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Thanks for the info, Jim.

Check out the book "Radio Rescue", though. True story.

>Yes, I suspect the youngest would be girls since
>males tend to mature at a later age.

If at all.

>Check the posts in the newsgroup for
>proof of that ;)

The oldest regular poster here is the least mature, for a start.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2096. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:54:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204205428.01632.00000548@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 86770

In article <40215E2A.C8F57755@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>...
>
>> I think you're over-preaching to the choir again here James.
>>
>> > And there is no better way to help a child learn than to get them
>> > interested in the subject. Geography? Time zones? Math, science,
>> > technology? An interest in ham radio helps with all of those.
>>
>> Her folks shepherded her into ham radio beacause ham radio is a great
>> way for kids to learn geography??
>
>Not necessarily, Brian, but studying for an amateur ticket gets kids
>fired up about learning. I can certainly see Jim's point about kids
>becoming interested in geography, the sciences and math. It didn't work
>toward interesting me in geometry though. I was caught reading QST
>hidden within my open geometry book.

I got caught reading a text on electricity. Book was open to the page about
polyphase induction motors, and I had to explain the meaning of a rotating
magnetic field and a squirrel cage rotor to the teacher. In 5th grade.

>
>> > I never got any help in the ham radio area from my folks. So I was
>> > delayed a few years in getting started.
>>
>> Nothing unusual about that. A huge percentage of all of us kid hams
>> didn't have any particular "parental support" when we became hams. All
>> my folks cared about was that whatever it was that I was doing with a
>> soldering iron in the cellar didn't result in the Henny Carr the town
>> cop dragging me home by the scruff of my neck *again* for commiting
>> some bush-league juvenile atrocity or another. Worked for them and it
>> worked for me.
>
>For the first few weeks of my interest, my dad actively discouraged me
>with talk of amateur radio being a passing fad for me. He had visions
>of mounds of equipment gathering dust in a closet. My mother encouraged
>me and was able to convince my father that some of the meager family
>income should be spent on a transmitter for me if I earned the money for
>the receiver from my paper route.
>

>My dad had and has no technical abilities whatever. My mother was
>deathly afraid of electricity and wouldn't even clean my ham shack. She
>just knew that lightning was going to enter the house via my antennas.
>Both parents saw value in amateur radio as a wholesome activity, one
>which would nurture an interest in science and possibly lead to a career
>in electronics.

'zactly.

Frankly, it was kinda surreal reading Larry's diatribe about that family. We've
been subject to years of
Dr.-Laura-points-of-light-republican-cloth-coat-family- values lectures, and
then a family actually does ham radio together and the kid gets no credit.
Bleah.
>
>> I know Janie. Her father was Jesse Bieberman W3KT who is still a
>> legend. Honer Roll top-ender for decades, phone and cw dx contester,
>> 25wpm with a straight key for 48 straight. Vice Director of the
>> Atlantic Division for decades and one of the most powerful voices in
>> Newington in those days. Ran the W3 buro single-handed also for
>> decades.
>
>...and ran the W3KT outgoing QSL forwarding service for a number of
>years.

Yup, great guy, original 1x2 holder, the works.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2097. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:54:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204205430.01632.00000549@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 86772

In article <d22b54c3.0402041347.52235d4b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040204055435.15923.00003581@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
>> >nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
>> >I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>> >anything but talk either.
>>
>> Some have amassed almost 80 countries on old-fashioned SSB, though. But
>> that was when we had some sunspots.
>
>. . . pfft . . !

Real DXers don't need sunspots....
>
>> >Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.
>>
>> As is this "bandwidtj based frequency plan" thing. Note that it would
>> essentially
>> knock AM and NFM off much of amateur HF. Note also that besides drastically
>> widening the 'phone subbands, it cuts down the incentive to get an Extra.
>
>It's just plain goofy. She's advocating a new structure to "fix" the
>current structure which ain't broke.

That's exactly right. Extra class CW/digital subbands would be cut down to 10
kHz per band...
>
>So is the ARRL by the way. They have a committee beavering away on a
>similar propsal which is even *worse* than Bonnie's.

Where?

KQ6XA's proposal is much worse than ARRL's. Basically she takes the ARRL
proposal and
does more of many of the bad things.

>> Most of all, note the unsubstantiated statements like 'by 2010, 30% will be
>> Novice operators' and '80% of hams on HF radiate a medium bandwidth signal'
>> and such. Where do these numbers come from? No response.
>
>What "Novices" with HF phone privs??

That's part of the proposal. Remember that she *starts* with the ARRL proposal
and goes
on from there, as if the ARRL proposal isn't enough.

>Mindless leap ahead. She's
>playing ham politician but she's no good at the art.

Don't bet the farm that somebody won't see the buzzwords rather than the
reality and think
it's a good idea.
>
>> One type of amateur HF wideband "experimentation" I know of is some folks
>> fooling around with "enhanced SSB", which is plain old SSB with the
>> frequency range widenend to up to 9 kHz. Some call it "single wideband".
>
>That garbage is simply ssb with tweeters, "hi-fi ssb", as if. Has
>nothing to do with wideband digital ops. This kind of nonsense
>periodically comes and goes, there have been at least a couple passes
>at "supermodulation" schemes. They silently died and nobody went to
>the funerals.

That's my point exactly.
>
>> There's also
>> some digital voice experimentation going on, but the added complexity
>> doesn't seem to give addded results. Yet.
>
>The broadcasters have been putting an experimental 10 Khz wide AM mode
>called "DRM"on the air for a year or so. Runs data, text & "hi-fi"
>audio, no image or video so even at 10Khz wide it isn't a true
>multimedia mode. Existing AM/FM, swl and ham rcvrs will not process
>DRM signals without extensive mods and a 'puter *or* a
>built-to-purpose rcvr the way I understand it. So as has usually been
>the case with the introduction of innovations in recent decades the
>commercials are already there at least on an experimental basis. It'll
>be interesting to see how well DRM flies, it just might work well for
>all I know but it's gotta survive the costs then the crud in the swl
>bands.

Of course. And they miss the fact that their target audience needs simple,
not complex. The developed world will listen to them via the 'net anyway.

>To get anything like DRM running in the ham bands it'll have to
>impress large numbers of hams enough on a performance basis to
>convince them (us) to adopt a new mode which is completely
>incompatible with the existing equipment hams use. Historically that
>trick has never worked.

Bingo. What's needed is an innovation in digivoice like PSK-31 was
to RTTY.
>
>> And to answer your question: Yes, you can put a voice signal (digitized)
>> through a 500 Hz pass band. You just need a modulation scheme meant for
>> that application, and the tradeoff will come in the form of needing a really
>> good S/N and/or more than real-time to send the message.
>
>A requirement to have very good S/N ratios in the HF ham bands is two
>strikes against a mode like this right out of the box. Dealing with
>the realtime issue is probably survivable.
>
Yup. Which is why we haven't seen it yet. The commercial/military folks
have a different game to play, of course.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2098. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 01:55:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4021A2A1.BA47901A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86773

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> To US who were in the big-time radio communications on HF of a half
> >> century ago, that did not involve morse code. There were and still are
> >> a lot of "US" involved in that.
> >>
> >For some of US who've had more recent experience than yours, morse was
> >involved. For many of us who are actually radio amateurs and who are
> >participants in big-time radio HF communications today, morse code is
> >still involved. What are you doing in big-time HF these days?
>
> In big-time HF, not a heckuva lot. There's very little left of the BIG
> TIME HF communications efforts of a half century ago.

There's plenty of BIG-TIME HF communications, Leonard. You simply
aren't involved in it any more than you are amateur radio and it didn't
happen fifty years ago.

> Armature radio deeecksing is "big time?" Nope. Not a drop in a
> bit bucket compared to the communications carriers of not too long
> ago. You'd LOVE to think it was "big time" but that is only how it
> is written up in QST.

Sure, Leonard. Compared with what is available to you, it is plenty
big-time, especially if done right--big towers, big antennas, all the
power the law allows. I don't have to read about it, I'm able to
participate.

> The only radio service still requiring morse code for communications
> is amatoor radio. All the other radio services either gave up on it or
> never considered it in the first place.

I really don't care. Morse is alive and well in amateur radio. I don't
use it as my sole operating mode anyway.

> >> I was IN worldwide communications on HF over a half century ago.
> >> At the time I liked it fine...even felt honored to be able to serve my

> >> country doing just that.
> >>
> >> None of that involved morse code.
> >
> >...and because you didn't use morse, no one used it at the time or since.
> >A number of us have used morse professionally and as radio amateurs in
> >the decades after you had your "big-time".
>
> Nope, snarly dave, the Army gave up on morse code for fixed-point
> to fixed-point long-distance communications back in 1948, before my
> service time. The Navy's long-haul fixed comms were the same way.

I think you must have your facts in disarray.

> Same for the USAF although all the branches maintained some
> morse code proficiency requirements and circuits until the early 70s
> (rather small efforts).

The Air Force never used much two way CW.

> I'm sure Department of State was able to put
> some of that obsolete military equipment to good use after it had a
> life in active military duty.

I never used any surplus military gear at all, Lumpy. It was commercial
gear all the way.

> >> Tens of thousands of skilled radio operators worldwide have used
> >> worldwide communications effectively for decades without ever
> >> once having to use or know morse code. They have done so for
> >> over a half century.
> >
> >Tens of thousands of skilled radio ops worldwide *have* used morse
> >effectively for worldwide communications after your day in the sun.
> >Tens of thousands still do so.
>
> Sorry, snarly dave, that's just your Article of Faith. You WANT to
> think that is true but it's far in the past and never the numbers you
> can prove.

That isn't correct at all, Leonard. My statement is pure fact and I
have the log books to back it up. There are plenty of other sources
including logs in existence.

> The PROOF is seeing what radio circuits use what on
> HF...even when HF was a mainstay of communications carriers.

PROOF exists in my logs and the logs of countless others. Would you
like some hundreds of thousands of QSOs to peruse?

> Don't let me stop your rationale invention. Improve the state of the
> rationale art, innovate, improvise, adapt...
>

> >> The U.S. military did not require any morsemanship to use the very
> >> first handheld transceivers (on HF) for communications in 1940. That's
> >> 64 years ago. Neither did they require any morsemanship to use the
> >> first backpack radio (on VHF) in 1943. That's 61 years ago.
> >
> >Yet the military continued to use morse. What's your point?
>
> EVOLUTION, you throwback to failed Darwinism.

> Do you need a DayGlo billboard to outline it? WAKE UP.

Okay, the military continued to use morse long after the introduction of
the equipement you mentioned. This demonstrates EVOLUTION in what way?

> The state of the art of radio communications long since bypassed
> morsemanship skills.
>
> It doesn't take rocket science intellect to use, operate ANY radio.

I'd love the opportunity to sit you down in front of my Orion for a few
hours...

> Morsemanship needs only repetitive Pavlovian training to become
> a wetware modem...provided the basic aptitude is present.
>
> NO modern communications carrier uses any morse code. Such
> skills went byebye some time ago.
>
> Teletype Corporation didn't make a half million teleprinters during
> their corporate existance to copy morse code.

Vibroplex didn't make all those paddles and bugs to copy Baudot. I
frequently use Baudot though but I don't have equipment manufactured by
Teletype or Kleinschmidt. Radio amateurs still use morse regularly.
What the commercials do worries me not. I'm enjoying amateur radio as
an avocation, not as a business.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

2099. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 02:40:06 UTC
From: Anthony Mullins <notformail@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <o7b32013ogj8eierqvhta0qfgpsr8fqs7o@4ax.com>
Source record: 86775
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Wed, 04 Feb 2004 21:06:03 -0500, Lou <nomail@rr.com> wrote:

:On Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:33:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspring.com>
:wrote:
:
:
:>Bottom line is they are just too lazy to bother. And to make them feel
:>better they try and drag those of us that really care about ham radio with
:>them.
:>
:>Dan/W4NTI
:>
:
:Those that really care about ham radio, don't have Riley and the FCC
:knocking on their door. Why don't you stop the hypocrisy already. Why
:don't you come clean and tell all these nice folks your history on 75
:meters? You know. The name calling. The threats. The jamming. C'mon,
:let's hear it. Step up to the plate. Show some balls. You're always
:yapping about other people. Give us the "long version" of what you did
:on 3.901.

Dan has been a trouble maker not only on 75 meters, but also 20
meters, in this group, and just about everywhere he goes. This has
been going on for years. He is incapable of telling the truth.
Ignore him, and he'll go away. Otherwise he feeds off of the
attention.

2100. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 03:01:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <cqedncWj0PCYL7zd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86776

Leo wrote:
> On Wed, 04 Feb 2004 15:01:25 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

<snippage>

>> You forgot to add Kim's callsign!
>
>
> I like Paul's callsign better! :)
>

Yaknow, I didn't even notice till you mentioned it!
8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2101. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 03:03:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040204220307.22081.00003892@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86777

In article <400ECBCE.5010606@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

I wrote:

>>Think about it - what exactly *should* an entry-level license do? If
>>it insures that newcomers know enough to keep out of trouble (on the
>>air, anyway,) gives them a sample of what amateur radio is about, and
>>inspires them to learn and do more with ham radio, isn't that just
>>about perfect?

>An entry level license test should expect knowledge of how to know what
>frequency your transmitter is on,

Display is on the front of the rig.

>what mode,

Same

> the subbands for which modes,

Band edges for your license. Coupla questions.

>how to identify RFI problems (harmonics),

Not all RFI is harmonics, though.

> simple antennas,

Why?

>rules about IDing, no business traffic,
>operating (pick a frequency nobody else is using to call CQ, but once
>you're done it's not your frequency anymore),

All comes under rules and regs - basic "keep out of trouble" stuff.

> simple emergency traffic operations.

Sure - but how do you test for it?

All except antennas above comes under "keep out of trouble"

>>>>>>Current Element 2 is very VHF/UHF centric, and so are current Tech
>>>>>>Plus privs. The goal seems to be to strike more of a balance between
>>>>>>above and below 30 MHz privileges.

>Aside from propagation, there's really little difference from HF and
>VHF/UHF.

Well, propagation is kinda why we're on the air.

But there are other differences, like:

- the amount of available spectrum (6 meters has 250 more kHz than all 9 amateur HF/MF bands put together)

- how many people over how wide an area can hear you

- how easy it is to homebrew a simple rig that can be work stations thousands of miles away.

>Questions like "Is 80m likely to have good propagation for DX during the
>daytime?" don't really address issues of safety and interference to other
>services.

Agreed!

>A beginner
>will soon learn on the air what times and bands make sense for DX
>operations.
>
Some will, others will remain clueless for years.

One difference I note between many of today's hams and those of yesteryear is that
in the past it seemed to me that almost all new hams had a lot of experience *listening*
to the ham bands before they got their licenses and went on the air on the ham bands.
In my case, I first heard hams while SWLing, and learned the code by listening to hams
use it on the air. Plus read a lot of books on the subject. So I was no stranger to the
bands I used when I got the license and built a transmitter.

Today it seems that many hams study the book and get the license, then set about getting
a rig.

>>>>>So change the question pool, but don't dumb it down

>>>>How do we define "dumbing it down"? If 35 questions are adequate for
>>>>all amateur VHF/UHF at full meat-cooking power, plus 200 watts on
>>>>parts of HF, shouldn't 25 be adequate for the limited privs
>>>>proposed for the Novice?

>Number of questions, given all the time you want to finish the test, doesn't
>make a test easy or hard. 5 tough questions is a lot harder to pass than
>100 really easy questions.

Exactly. I can write you an essay question test that is super easy and a multiple
choice test that is super hard - on the same material.

>>How much is it reasonable to expect a newcomer to learn in order to be
>>turned loose with ~100 watts on parts of HF and ~25 watts on parts of
>>VHF/UHF?

>>>>>>>>5 wpm code test retained for Extra only

>>>>>>>Predictably, I do have a problem with that.

>>>>>>Me too. Should be at least 13 and preferably 20 wpm. Sending and
>>>>>>receiving.

>>>>>Won't happen

>>>>Probably not, but it's still a good idea.

>Why, no otehr service uses code anymore, and more modern data
>modes now exist.

Because hams *do* use code today. A ham license is for operating in
the ham bands, not for using other services.

>Yes, they require more advanced equipment, but
>modern equipment is much more reliable than the vacuum tube stuff
>we had 50 years ago.

Does that mean we don't need a theory test either?

> NASA's JPL doesn't use Morse code with
>the Mars probes.

The track record of failed Mars probes is pretty long, though. And
NASA has a somewhat bigger budget than the average ham...

>And that's really hard DX to do.

Not with the resources NASA and JPL have available.

(why do they call it the *Jet* Propulsion Lab, anyway? They all
use rockets, don't they?)

And if you're going to use that argument, consider that there are
no skilled radio operators on those probes either.

Other services haven't just done away with using Morse - they've
done away with the very *idea* of a "radio operator". Skills not
needed or wanted. You say it still takes skill to know what band
to use at a certain time of day to make a certain contact, regardless
of mode? Look at ALE - does all that for you. No operator
needed. Just a "user".

>>>>>>>Moreover, it can be now,
>>>>>>>since it has not been required by the ITU for the last six months.

>>>>>>FCC will most probably just drop it completely.

>>>>>I think they will too

>>>>Unfortunately

>What does the FCC get out of requiring code, now that the treaty doesn't
>require it anymore?

That's probably the key question. Which is kinda sad, because it used to
be "what is best for the amateur radio service" not "what does FCC get
out of it".

Between BPL, the flap over that popstar using the F word and not being fined
and
the Mr. Powell going nuts over a "wardrobe malfunction", I sometimes wonder....

>>>>>>>Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra,

>>>>>>>OK

>>>>>>Why OK? Why not simply carry the Advanceds as a separate class, as
>>>>>>has been done for the past 3 years and 9 months?

>>>>>Can't stand loose ends

>>>>What's the problem? FCC kept the Advanced on the books from 1953 to
>>>>1967
>>>>even though no new ones were issued and the license conveyed no
>>>>additional privileges at all.

>>Do those loose ends really cause any problems?

>Not that I can see. But if there is a problem, well, let's call 4 years
>of experience as an advanced the same as passing the old element 4B,
>and make them extras.

Why? What does it hurt to leave them alone? I've read posts by Advanceds
who don't want an upgrade!

>>>>>>>Some phone below 7100? No? Why not?

>>>>>>That space is needed for CW and digital modes.

>>>>>Better to keep those on the Novice freqs and refarm more useful
>>>>>spectrum to phone

>>>>Why reward the most spectrum-inefficent modes? Why not digital voice?

>Maybe designate some subbands for new and experimental modes as
>primary, and allow older modes on a secondary basis. That is, you
>have to accept interference from them, and not cause them interference.

That's what K0HB, me, and others said to FCC in response to ARRL's "novice band
refarming" proposal. Reuse the Novice subbands as experimental sandboxes. Use
any new digimode you want, as long as it's documented and fits in the subband.

>And encourage new methods of modulating the RF carrier directly
>instead of say 2m packet where everyone just injected the modem signal
>into their FM voice mode rigs. Not efficient.

Actually it was very efficient from the standpoint that you didn't need a new rig. Almost any old 2m rig would do.

And that's the Achilles' heel - whether or not a new mode means building a new rig.

>>>>>>>>Old Novice subbands replaced by additional CW/data

>Maybe we might want some Morse code beginner subbands where new users
>can feel comfortable operating and not get blown away by experts.

No real expert blows away beginners.

I've worked lots of beginners on 40 meters between 7025 and 7050.

>As an
>informal gentlemen's agreement. Need not be much bandwidth, a few "CW
>channels" should be enough.

Channels? Ugh.

>>>>>>>>Novice power level set below that requiring RF exposure evaluation

>>>>>>>OK

>>>>>>Agreed.

>Used to be 75 watts input power. Make it the level that most
>commercial yeacomwood trancievers produce "barefoot".

100 W HF, 25 W VHF/UHF.

>>>>How would you feel if it were decided to give all existing hams except
>>>>Novices a free upgrade to Extra, then have just two classes -
>>>>"Limited" (new name for Novice) and "Full" (everybody else)?

>>>I would be OK with that only if the Techs got only a limited licence.

>Then that'd be 3 classes then.
>
Which is where we are now

>>Why would Techs be singled out for a limited license? They have full
>>privs above 50 MHz.

>>>I would have no problem with giving Generals a full licence.

>>By your reasoning, there's no reason to have the Extra, then. Nor its
>>test.

>Used to be the extra only gave you a shorter callsign (if avaliable) and
>bragging rights.

That ended 36 years ago!

>>Techs with old Element 3 (licensed before March 21, 1987) can get a
>>General
>>license *today* with no additional testing. Just show up at a VE

>>session with
>>proof of such license, fill out the 605 and pay the VE fee. Instant
>>General.
>>And if such a ham can pass the Extra written (might as well try, the
>>same
>>VE fee buys that test too), they get an Extra.
>>
>That's what I did. I did study for it, though. Wanted to "lock in" my
>element 3
>and element 1 anyway (so I wouldn't need to worry about holding onto old
>copies of my tech license) and also might as well go for the whole
>enchallida
>while I was at it. Though that enchallida doesn't have a 20WPM topping...

So why are there stil over 82,000 Advanceds?
>
>>Been that way since April 15, 2000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2102. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 03:32:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jsednZJ4fq2vJLzdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86778

JJ wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>
>> You forgot to add Kim's callsign!
>
>
> I suppose the Super Bowl half-time act with Janet Jackson and the other
> moron singing with her was just the kind of low class, crass act kim
> really enjoys. Maybe kim should loan Jackson her callsign.

Now that you've started it, here is a little demonstration:

Go to www.google.com . Go to the image search. Search on Janet Jackson. Observe the pictures that pop up.

Now try to reconcile what you have just seen with CBS and MTV and the NFL' denial of any knowledge of the ugly little stunt. (yes it was ugly - that creepy outfit she wore looked like some 1970's lingerie from behind the iron curtain, and what the heck was that ugly thing on her breast? - shudder!)

They knew! And the halftime show, which used to be the way for the NFL to get women that were not interested in football to watch the show has now changed. My guess is that there will be plenty of men watching the halftime show next year.

Even if they didn't know this was going to happen, the people they hired to do the show, MTV, is pretty steeped in sleaze. Note that MTV is owned by the same company that owns CBS. So ignorance of the act would be admission of stupidity.

Maybe they'll have porn stars next year.

And lest we forget, Kid Rock comes out in a desecrated US Flag with a hole cut in the middle. Pretty damn despicable! Is this what the superbowl is about? I can only assume that the NFL approves of this kind of disrespectful behavior, and if we watch the trash they spew, we do as well!
- Mike KB3EIA -

2103. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 03:32:11 UTC
From: Sparky Voltz <sparky_unit_412@SPAMFREEyahoo.com>
Message-ID: <_OiUb.224806$xy6.1152284@attbi_s02>
Source record: 86779
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Anthony Mullins" <notformail@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:o7b32013ogj8eierqvhta0qfgpsr8fqs7o@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 04 Feb 2004 21:06:03 -0500, Lou <nomail@rr.com> wrote:
>
> :On Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:33:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspring.com>
> :wrote:
> :
> :
> :>Bottom line is they are just too lazy to bother. And to make them feel
> :>better they try and drag those of us that really care about ham radio
with
> :>them.
> :>
> :>Dan/W4NTI
> :>
> :
> :Those that really care about ham radio, don't have Riley and the FCC
> :knocking on their door. Why don't you stop the hypocrisy already. Why
> :don't you come clean and tell all these nice folks your history on 75
> :meters? You know. The name calling. The threats. The jamming. C'mon,
> :let's hear it. Step up to the plate. Show some balls. You're always
> :yapping about other people. Give us the "long version" of what you did
> :on 3.901.
>
> Dan has been a trouble maker not only on 75 meters, but also 20
> meters, in this group, and just about everywhere he goes. This has
> been going on for years. He is incapable of telling the truth.
> Ignore him, and he'll go away. Otherwise he feeds off of the
> attention.

Aw com'on. Dan's a lot of fun, and always has been. He was great
entertainment back in the ol' 14.313 Radio Wars days, and he is definitely a
stickler for keeping ham radio "real". Ignore him? Please... no good ham
ever "goes away" because he's ignored. Where's the fun in that? Not that
ol' Dr. Doozie was ever ignored, but doggone it, he's back on 3865! HOW
'BOUT THAT DUB-YA ONE TIME?

...can't we all just have a little fun?

2104. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 03:37:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <7O-dncy538IaJ7zdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86780

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <40214F95.2050201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>> One might almost think the fellow is just here to bust people's chops.
>>Thanks for the history and Clarification, Paul.
>
>
> Poor baby. Feel injured, do you?

Oh heavens no! Amused? Yes. but then I feel kind of bad about that,
because I feel kind of sorry for you.

You probably see that as a sign of weakness, which reinforces my view. :^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2105. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 03:51:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <W9-dncEGvZhDILzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86781

William wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40211310.6020508@psu.edu>...
>
>
>> I'd prefer it if the test were essay. not because it would be harder,
>>but because for me at least, it would be easier. I liked them in school,
>>I still like them.
>
>
> You are assuming that the volunteer examiners are capable of
> evaluating something other than multiple choice.

And how! That is the glaring problem with essay type questions. The grader must understand the answer, and they must be able to understand the answers that the student makes. Any less, and you have a big argument.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2106. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 04:02:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <45OdnU6mU_f7XbzdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86782

N2EY wrote:

> In article <d22b54c3.0402021032.6649605b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20040201091610.15923.00003512@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>>
>>>In article <d22b54c3.0402010353.2dccd37a@posting.google.com>,
>>
>>kelly@dvol.com
>>
>>>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>
>>>>Please refer to the new updated color chart of the frequency plan.
>>
>>>>Did that. For one your "30M bandplan" would require both ITU and FCC
>>>>approval to implement. Good luck with that one Bonnie.
>
>
>
>>>And that's just the beginning.
>>
>>Right: I haven't rummaged thru it in real depth and I don't intend to
>>but I'll just betcha there are more similar instances of conflicts
>>with the ITU regs.
>
>
> Not a big problem at all, most of ITU doesn't really care anyway.
>
>>>>If you can use technology to shoehorn a voice into 500Hz,
>>>>
>>>>then
>>>>you can transmit it anywhere in the band. You may laugh, but my
>>
>>experience
>>
>>>>working with commercial DSP digital modulation systems proves to me that
>>
>>it
>>
>>>>can happen in Amateur Radio.

>>
>>I poked around, she's apparently big on "pack radio", using digital
>>military HF "tactical" gear is one piece of it. She doesn't seem to
>>understand the collections of "differences" . . ?
>
>
> Obviously not.
>
>>
>>
>>>Of course it can. But will it? If the 'phone bands are as
>>> drastically widened as
>>>proposed, why should anyone bother with 500 Hz processed voice
>>>when they have so much room for regular SSB?
>>
>>Is it even possible to compress digitized voice down to 500Hz?
>
>
> In theory, yes. There are tradeoffs, of course.
>
> And practice is another thing entirely.
>
>
>>Violation of Shannon's Law?
>
>
> Not at all. But Shannon forces tradeoffs.
>
> Here's one way to do it....
>
> You're familar with PSK-31, which at the most basic level is a form of
> amplitude and phase shift keying. (the amplitude part involves carefully
> shutting off the carrier during phase transitions to reduce the bandwidth).
>
> Anyway, with the basic PSK-31 signal you get a certain number of bits
> in a 31.5 Hz wide channel. If you use BPSK, the bit rate is the same as
> the baud rate. BPSK (binary phase shift keying) simply means the
> system recognizes two phase states - 0 and 180 degrees.
>
> But by adding more phase states, we can send more bits in the same
> bandwidth. With four states (0, 90, 180, 270), we can send twice as
> many bits in the same bandwidth. You can theoretically just keep on
> adding phase states and send more bits.
>
> Now since one PSK-31 signal needs only 31.5 Hz, you could in theory fit
> about 16 of them in a 500 Hz channel, giving you 16 times as many bits.
>
> Of course anybody who's done real engineering knows that there's
> always a tradeoff. And the tradeoff is signal to noise ratio. In the case
> of PSK, adding phase states increases the susceptibility to any phase jitter

> or noise in the system - receiver, transmitter or path, be it wire or radio or
> fiber.
>
>
>>>>>In our present mode-based system in USA, we have a lot of nearly-dormant
>>>>>band segments.
>>>
>>>On HF? Where are they?
>>
>>There really are a bunch of underutilized spaces in the 160, 80, 15 &
>>10M bands James. "Spectrum banks for future expansions . . "
>
>
> Where?
>
>>>>What is not conjecture is the fact that there is no statistical
>>>>evidence which indicates that simply having a license to operate HF
>>>>somehow equates to those with any new "giveaway" HF ticket actually
>>>>putting together HF stations and getting 'em on the air on a 1:1 new
>>>>license privs/band occupancy ratio.
>>>
>>>BINGO!
>>>
>>>And that's not going to change much.
>>
>>If anything the ratio will get worse. I've seen too many examples of
>>new-wave 5wpm ex-Tech Extras who have yet to make the first move
>>toward putting an HF station on the air to believe otherwise.
>
>
> Also ex-Tech Generals.
>
>
>>I'm not
>>at all convinced that expanded HF privs is all that much of an
>>incentive to upgrade these days vs. earlier days. Prolly has more to
>>do today with the incentive to acquire bragging rights vs. anything to
>>do with actually operating.
>
>
> Maybe. Or maybe the license is the easy part and the station is the tough
> part.

Yup! I was woefully inept at getting a station running. Thank heavens
for my Elmers.

>>>>Quite the opposite is being demonstrated in fact. We already have tons
>>>>of experience with, for example, the recent huge increase in the
>>>>number of Extra Class licensees which fell out of the reduction in the
>>>>code test speed for Extras.
>>>

>>>And the reduction in written testing for Extra.
>>
>>It's all one disgusting big dumbed-down bag of worms.
>
>
> Which isn't going to change much anytime soon.
>
>>>>I tune the Extra 75/40/20M phone setasides today and the recently
>>>>enfranchised don't seem to be there. In volume. If anything the
>>>>overall activity level in those setasides is noticeably down from what
>>>>it was long before the code test speed was dropped.
>>>
>>>Don't forget sunspots.
>>
>>I'm talking about the much longer term thru the highs and the lows. In
>>years gone by there was always chatter in the Extra phone setasides,
>>not with just sunspot-affected dx, but with."locals". After the last
>>FD I decided to dredge up a ragchew in the 20 phone setaside before I
>>tore down. Usta be no sweat. I had to tune around for ten minutes
>>until w3bv came on the air and we yakked for 45 minutes via ground
>>path.. Mid day, the spots were middling and the dx was there. The only
>>w's in the space were a small group of 8s & 9s and Alan (keeper of the
>>k3jh pole) and I. All of us were old 1 x 2s. Message there.
>
>
> Part of that is simply exhaustion after FD. Often brought about by folks
> who don't know how to pace themselves. There's also the few who work
> themselves into the ground for the benefit of the sidewalk superintendent
> group...

Hehe, I can't even imagine being on the air right after FD ends. I go
home, have a bite to eat, and go "nappy-byes" until its time for "The
Simpsons" to come on. I suppose that might be working myself into the
ground, but its for the fun of FD and the camaraderie.

>>>>. . The dead spectrum problem has far more to do
>>>>with getting the HF-enabled of all flavors off the Internet, off their
>>>>dead butts, geting the radios, actually putting the HF antennas up and
>>>>getting on the air than it does with any "bandwidth-based frequency
>>>>plan" sorts of things.
>>>
>>>HEAR HEAR
>>>
>>>And *THAT'S* where the problem really is! Fiddling with licenses is
>>>only going to have a minor effect on that, if any. License changes
>>>aren't going to fix anybody's CC&Rs, or suddenly improve the
>>>sunspot number, or empower vast numbers of existing hams to
>>>figure out how to end feed a wire and actually get on the air.
>>
>>Perfect example of the results of dumbing-down.
>>

>>Bonnie also dumped her Master Plan into QRZ.com. Bad move. Those guys
>>make us RRAPers look like wilted lilly nice guys in comparison. Check
>>it out.
>
>
> I did.
>
>>I notice that she hasn't gone back at anybody with a single rebuttal.
>
>
> That's changed, but it's basically a preaching session.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2107. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 04:20:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040204232052.12631.00004720@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 86783

In article <20040203150351.21232.00004014@mb-m13.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>who were amateur radio operators, and almost no exposure to other hams
>>as a result. Young Mattie has an Extra-class ticket, and the same
>privileges
>>as I do, but that's where our "equality" ends. She has to melt quite a few
>>pounds of 60/40 rosin-core, and make several thousand CW and digital
>>QSO's, to get close to me!
>
> Larrah, NOBODY is as good as you...by your own definition.

Lennie:

Yup -- there are many who are a lot better. Sorry, but when we're talking about amateur radio operators, you're not one of them!

Literally.

> Are you electronically connected here and formerly on FIDONET
> BECAUSE no one could "come close to you?"

Uh, no -- mainly because I have a computer with a modem! I'm sort of surprised that you didn't know how that worked!

> Try regular bathing. It might help.

Bathing my computers? Now that you mention it, they are a bit dusty... but I doubt that tossing them into the bathtub would do them any good.

(Oooops, guess I just left you an opening you can drive a Kenworth with a 53' trailer through! Oh, well -- you need all the help you can get!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

2108. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 05:32:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205003228.22081.00003896@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86784

In article <20040204190524.25517.00004090@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>I notice that she hasn't gone back at anybody with a single rebuttal.
>
>That's changed, but it's basically a preaching session.

Does this mean we can expect another Sermon On The Antenna Mount soon?

Show us the Righteousness of the True Path...

LHA / WMD

2109. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 05:32:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205003228.22081.00003897@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86785

In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Go easy on Dave. He is busy revolutionizing the Internet by using
>> it as a transporter to download hardware.
>>
>> Important work. Actual pioneering.
>
>You might recall that I provided you with a definition for "firmware",
>not "hardware" and I pointed you to the Ten-Tec site where downloads of
>"Firmware Upgrades" can be undertaken. It looks as if anyone who
>depends upon you for accurate information is doomed to disappointment.
>You aren't one to let facts stand in your way.

Yah. Da pros only look to Ten-Tec for information on definitions.

Shure dey do, big daddy dave.

You're getting more bizarre every day.

Hmmm...your Matter Transformer must have malfunctioned in
downloading all that hardware...made you irritable and gave you
IBS.

>> He'll go where no ham has gone before...
>
>I've already been to several places where damned few have gone.
>Any licensed ham is apt to have gone a number of places where you've not
>been.

Ooooo! More foam! :-)

Hell kicked you out?!?

I've been (indirectly) to the Moon, Mars, Venus, all without needing
any license. That includes "working" a station ON the Moon. No
QSL, though, although I've got some printouts on it.

What is all this stuff about going where the damned have gone?
Is morsemanship really all that bad?

LHA / WMD

2110. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 05:32:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205003230.22081.00003898@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 86786

In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>, >kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
>> >kelly@dvol.com
>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> >>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>> >> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
>> >> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>> >> >anything but talk either.
>> >>
>> >> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
>> >
>> >When did a 31 Hz wide mode become "wideband"?
>>
>> Martinez' innovation comes from scaling current wideband data
>> communications at high rates to the slow, real-time rates of
>> amateur radio environments. That involved some good application
>> of Information Theory and other things, not in being spoon-fed
>> How To Do It from the pages of QST.
>
>I noted that you didn't really provide an answer to the question.

The question was ambiguous and did not define "wide."

Your name isn't "Kelly," sweetums. Ya gotta live near philly, eat hoagies and buy "gaz" for da car in order to impersonate Kelly.

Got that?

>A comment was made about wide band modes. You responded with something >about PSK-31. Now you go into what Peter Martinez scaled.

You wouldn't know Martinez if he had a leather suit instead of scales.

Hello? Ever hear of Shannon's Law and the relationship of data rate versus bandwidth? It's fairly simple math and proportional. That

means it can be SCALED as in relationship of numbers.

>You haven't address the comment on wide band modes.

You want an address? [I'm not available...]

How about the Gettysburg Address? "Four score and seven something."

>I snipped the rest of your lecture since it didn't really deal with what
>was asked.

Good, then you will quit trying to impersonate Kelly.

The foam at the mouth must have been something...you sent the same
thing to me in private mail. I snipped that. It was lower than the usual
spam in private mail.

LHA / WMD

2111. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:47:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205024727.06226.00002700@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86787

In article <ApydnUskLaGuArzdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>All that bragging and still can't pass the test for a ham license.

All that snarling and you ain't got either a name or a callsign.

Why is no one surprised? :-)

Go back under your bridge, troll.

LHA / WMD

2112. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:47:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205024730.06226.00002701@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86791

In article <4021A2A1.BA47901A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<snarlydave@earthlink.net> foams at the mouth and writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> >(N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>> >
>> >> To US who were in the big-time radio communications on HF of a half
>> >> century ago, that did not involve morse code. There were and still
>are
>> >> a lot of "US" involved in that.
>> >
>> >For some of US who've had more recent experience than yours, morse was
>> >involved. For many of us who are actually radio amateurs and who are
>> >participants in big-time radio HF communications today, morse code is
>> >still involved. What are you doing in big-time HF these days?
>>
>> In big-time HF, not a heckuva lot. There's very little left of the BIG
>> TIME HF communications efforts of a half century ago.
>
>There's plenty of BIG-TIME HF communications, Leonard. You simply
>aren't involved in it any more than you are amateur radio and it didn't
>happen fifty years ago.

So, you are saying the Army Command and Administrative Network
"didn't exist fifty years ago?" There was no such thing?!?

Mais non. ACAN existed very much, very big, running more traffic
every month through one station than the fabled NTS could ever
"work" in a year.

You weren't there. You couldn't know. But, you pretend you do.

Pretense is what you are. Try a tranquilizer. You won't be as tense.

>> Armature radio deeecksing is "big time?" Nope. Not a drop in a
>> bit bucket compared to the communications carriers of not too long
>> ago. You'd LOVE to think it was "big time" but that is only how it

>> is written up in QST.
>
>Sure, Leonard. Compared with what is available to you, it is plenty
>big-time, especially if done right--big towers, big antennas, all the
>power the law allows. I don't have to read about it, I'm able to
>participate.

My, my, back to the old puerile comparison of genitalia in radio?

Snarly dave, you don't know squat what "I've got available to me."

All you got left is HOBBY activities.

Long past the "pioneering of HF" period in hamdom.

>> The only radio service still requiring morse code for communications
>> is amatoor radio. All the other radio services either gave up on it or
>> never considered it in the first place.
>
>I really don't care. Morse is alive and well in amateur radio. I don't
>use it as my sole operating mode anyway.

So, if you "really don't care," why are you foaming at the mouth so
much, making nasty to all those that don't kiss your asterisk?

Okay, you love and adore morse code.

So, why must everyone ALSO love and adore morse code and keep
the morse code test forever and ever in amateur regulations?

Who really cares WHAT you use, snarly dave?

>> >> I was IN worldwide communications on HF over a half century ago.
>> >> At the time I liked it fine...even felt honored to be able to serve
>my
>> >> country doing just that.
>> >>
>> >> None of that involved morse code.
>> >
>> >...and because you didn't use morse, no one used it at the time or since.
>> >A number of us have used morse professionally and as radio amateurs in
>> >the decades after you had your "big-time".
>>
>> Nope, snarly dave, the Army gave up on morse code for fixed-point
>> to fixed-point long-distance communications back in 1948, before my
>> service time. The Navy's long-haul fixed comms were the same way.
>
>I think you must have your facts in disarray.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. No. Try swinging YOUR disarray away from some
imaginary time. Your front-to-back ratio is terrible.

Sweetums, I WORKED IN that Big Leagues of military comms in the
Pacific back then and know several who were there at the same time,

including one civilian. It was REAL. All kinds of documentation on
it.

Why do you keep on DENYING it so much?

Are you afraid your imaginary beliefs will be exposed?

>> Same for the USAF although all the branches maintained some
>> morse code proficiency requirements and circuits until the early 70s
>> (rather small efforts).
>
>The Air Force never used much two way CW.

What? You were some comms chief in the USAF "in charge" of
Globecom or something?

>> I'm sure Department of State was able to put
>> some of that obsolete military equipment to good use after it had a
>> life in active military duty.
>
>I never used any surplus military gear at all, Lumpy. It was commercial
>gear all the way.

I said Department of State, wonder ham.

I really don't care. State never had any network close to the military's
and still doen't. Access to the DSN now may be argued as being
"part of it" but only you and your kind of morsemen would try to stretch
things that far.

>> >> Tens of thousands of skilled radio operators worldwide have used
>> >> worldwide communications effectively for decades without ever
>> >> once having to use or know morse code. They have done so for
>> >> over a half century.
>> >
>> >Tens of thousands of skilled radio ops worldwide *have* used morse
>> >effectively for worldwide communications after your day in the sun.
>> >Tens of thousands still do so.
>>
>> Sorry, snarly dave, that's just your Article of Faith. You WANT to
>> think that is true but it's far in the past and never the numbers you
>> can prove.
>
>That isn't correct at all, Leonard. My statement is pure fact and I
>have the log books to back it up. There are plenty of other sources
>including logs in existence.

You've got "logs" all over, snarly dave.

No one really cares what kind of "P-51 time" you noted in. :-)

[old aviation joke...snarly dave wouldn't understand]

>
>> The PROOF is seeing what radio circuits use what on
>> HF...even when HF was a mainstay of communications carriers.
>
>PROOF exists in my logs and the logs of countless others. Would you
>like some hundreds of thousands of QSOs to peruse?

Digitize them and send them out if that makes you happy.

Now, how do you authenticate all of those?

Do we take you as supremely "honest?"

As much as anyone takes spammers "honesty."

>> Don't let me stop your rationale invention. Improve the state of the
>> rationale art, innovate, improvise, adapt...
>>
>> >> The U.S. military did not require any morsemanship to use the very
>> >> first handheld transceivers (on HF) for communications in 1940.
>That's
>> >> 64 years ago. Neither did they require any morsemanship to use the
>> >> first backpack radio (on VHF) in 1943. That's 61 years ago.
>> >
>> >Yet the military continued to use morse. What's your point?
>>
>> EVOLUTION, you throwback to failed Darwinism.
>
>> Do you need a DayGlo billboard to outline it? WAKE UP.
>
>Okay, the military continued to use morse long after the introduction of
>the equipement you mentioned. This demonstrates EVOLUTION in what way?

"Equipement?" :-)

The U.S. military does not use any morse code for communications now.
It quit doing so several years ago. Many several years in fact.

No communications carrier service in the USA uses any morse code.
Railroads don't use it. Shipping on land doesn't use it. Businesses
don't use it, even if they are making-selling morse code devices.

Tens of thousands of olde-tyme hammes use morse code. Amateurs.

Are they thinking they are "advancing the state of the radio art" by
doing so? Are they "pioneering the airways" as was done in the 20s
and 30s? Or don't they know any better way to communicate?

>> The state of the art of radio communications long since bypassed
>> morsemanship skills.
>>
>> It doesn't take rocket science intellect to use, operate ANY radio.
>
>I'd love the opportunity to sit you down in front of my Orion for a few
>hours...

Oh wow! Snarly dave is going to overwhem me with complicated
knobs and switches and instructions on a box of electronics!

Snarly dave, you important, electronically impotent sot, ALL
electronics and radio systems ARE complicated, complex, and
must be some kind of arcane magic to you. I know because I've
seen the same self-importancy demonstrated before, even once
about a system I helped design and develop. :-)

Yeah, snarly dave, I'll "sit down in front of your orion." If and only
if you sit down in front of any radio system I've used in the last
decade. Can you afford air fare and lodging to Pasadena? I can
show you some of the JPL Deep Space Network...after the Rover
missions, please, they are a bit busy right now. You can't sit down
in the avionics compartments of an F-18 or F-16 but you can get an
idea, maybe a glimmering of what those are about...except you'll
quickly get snowed even with a Have Quick. I can get you into
KNBC and the master control in Burbank; they have tours for that
sort of thing, no problem. You've never "ridden" a modern TV control
board, have you? I can get a Novice license holder to show you how
it all works...Tom won two Emmys for TV direction, different years.

All of that involves RADIO, snarly dave. None of it is amateur. It is
all very professional/commercial. You will get snowed in mentally
worse than the northeast has ever gotten.

But...you ARE TESTED FOR MORSE CODE AND AN EXTRA!

You can afford an expensive radio toy to pursue your "radiosport."
And, of course, tell everyone about and go nyah, nyah, "you ain't
as good as dave!"

If YOU had to test for morse code then everyone else MUST.

It's the law. That law can never be changed, right?

>
>> Morsemanship needs only repetitive Pavlovian training to become
>> a wetware modem...provided the basic aptitude is present.
>>
>> NO modern communications carrier uses any morse code. Such
>> skills went byebye some time ago.
>>
>> Teletype Corporation didn't make a half million teleprinters during
>> their corporate existance to copy morse code.
>
>Vibroplex didn't make all those paddles and bugs to copy Baudot. I
>frequently use Baudot though but I don't have equipment manufactured by
>Teletype or Kleinschmidt. Radio amateurs still use morse regularly.
>What the commercials do worries me not. I'm enjoying amateur radio as
>an avocation, not as a business.

Most of Teletype Corporation's hundreds of thousands of Teletypes
didn't use "Baudot" as in the old 5-level code. They used the 8-level

ASCII. The half-millionth Teletype was on display in gold plating at many electronics industry trade shows in the 1980s. Too bad you couldn't have seen one. But, you are an amateur and not in the business. It would make your Vibroplex just vibrate all over! :-)

You are "enjoying amateur radio" so that you can make like a big shot (with the O stretched vertically) and snarl at those who don't care to take any code test...or those who worked in BIG HF comms before your time...or those who won't kneel down and kiss your asterisk. Or all of the above.

Nice not talking to you, snarly dave. Have fun "on the bands." All below 30 MHz, that is, in tiny little bands below 10 meters.

LHA / WMD

2113. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:47:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205024731.06226.00002702@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86789

In article <20040204232052.12631.00004720@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larrah TyRoll the Wonder Ham) writes:

>In article <20040203150351.21232.00004014@mb-m13.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>who were amateur radio operators, and almost no exposure to other hams
>>>as a result. Young Mattie has an Extra-class ticket, and the same
>>privileges
>>>as I do, but that's where our "equality" ends. She has to melt quite a few
>>>pounds of 60/40 rosin-core, and make several thousand CW and digital
>>>QSO's, to get close to me!
>>
>> Larrah, NOBODY is as good as you...by your own definition.
>
>Lennie:
>
>Yup -- there are many who are a lot better. Sorry, but when we're
>talking about amateur radio operators, you're not one of them!
>
>Literally.

No kidding? You got soma come loud ratings in college for all
that reasoning? Did you get a brain cell graft or something.

Here's a Clue, bus driver: The FCC doesn't require a single
commissioner or staff to hold amateur radio licenses in order to
MAKE the amateur radio regulations or enforce them.

>> Are you electronically connected here and formerly on FIDONET
>> BECAUSE no one could "come close to you?"
>
>Uh, no -- mainly because I have a computer with a modem! I'm sort of
>surprised that you didn't know how that worked!

I'm surprised you know how to dial into an ISP without using morse
code. Modems don't have morse keys.

>> Try regular bathing. It might help.
>
>Bathing my computers? Now that you mention it, they are a bit dusty...
>but I doubt that tossing them into the bathtub would do them any good.

Using them the way you do doesn't do anyone much good.

>(Oooops, guess I just left you an opening you can drive a Kenworth with
>a 53' trailer through! Oh, well -- you need all the help you can get!)

Not really needing your "help," sweatbreath.

You just keep tawking tuff to the group on how you got all those great grades in college and could get any personnel job you wanted...all through the dedication and resolve that made you Wonder Ham with morse code.

You never used any 63/37 solder? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Have you learned to solder yet?

LHA / WMD

2114. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205024733.06226.00002704@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86788

In article <40219C12.1040909@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
>>
>> Never tried, snarly dave.
>>
>> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
>> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.
>>
>Then learning the 5 wpm and getting the extra should be a walk in the park
then.
>It took me about a month to learn 5 wpm and I'm no good at such motor skills.

Gosh, olde-tymer, I've walked in many fine parks in my time but not
a single one of them required any morse code proficiency to walk.

Never saw any "Keep Off The Code Keys" signs either.

Birdies in the trees chirped "tweet, tweet," not "beep, beep."

You must have lived in different cities than I.

"Motor skills" I learned as a teenager, got my first drivers license
without having to test for morse code. In Illinois...obviously a
regressive state, right? :-)

Psycho-motor skill I learned in middle school (we called it
"junior high school" back then before educational PC) was typing
at tested maximum of 60 WPM. On typewriters that had no key
markings. :-)

None in the typing class had to copy any morse code. More's
the pity, right? I later cruised on 60 WPM Teletypes just dandy.

Now, let's concentrate on WHY there's still a morse code test for
an AMATEUR radio license...and WHY it must remain law forever
and ever. Or, at least until the last PCTA has their code key
forcibly removed from their cold, dead fingers.

Is morse code not so wonderful that the feds have to keep the
morse test in law so that cute little seven-year-olds can have
radio playmates? Or forty-seven-year-olds and older?

Ever wonder why morse code is the SECOND most used mode
on HF, a distant second behind voice? All the HF hams had to
test for code but so few continued to use it. I guess it must not be
so wonderful, so popular after all.

Morse code gets through when everything else will...

LHA / WMD

2115. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205024733.06226.00002703@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86790

In article <40219EA0.3F50F6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <snarly k8mn@earthlink.net aka "Mr. Warmth"> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
>> >>
>> >> Mental or physical age? :-)
>> >>
>> >At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
>>
>> Never tried, snarly dave.
>
>Well, there you have it.

Have what? I don't have any amateur license. Got several others.

>> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
>> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.
>
>I don't care about your commercial ticket. I asked about your amateur
>radio license. Maybe you should look back.

Snarly dave, I don't care about your amateur wonderfulness and vindictiveness and bigotry to non-amateurs. I'm a pro, like it or no.

You do NOT get to choose anything about what anyone is "supposed" to say, to reply to, or anydamnthingelse. You keep thinking you do every time you put on the SS uniform with the monocle. Try keeping the armband off, it's so 40-ish.

Shave the head and learn to smile. That will make you more like Colonel Klink. Lose several pounds too.

>> Now Larrah, the self-professed paragon of determination and moral
>> virtue, once bragged and carried on that his "summa cum laude"
>> standings in post-service college would get him any top spot job

>> in human resources after graduation. He now drives a bus.
>
>What has that to do with his amateur radio license and why is it of
>concern to you?

What have you to do with anything? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, snarly dave, all you seem to do is try to fight with
others who don't bow down and kiss your asterisk.

>> Quod Erat Demonstrandum.
>
>You bragged *four* years ago that you'd get "an Extra right out of the
>box". You still have not even the most basic amateur radio license.
>
>Q.E.D.

Ah, so in "correct" amateurism, any statement anyone says in the
past MUST be kept forever and ever? Even casual throwaway
mentions? :-)

I changed my mind, sweetums. Stuff it. :-)

I saw the way you acted in here and didn't want to become a snarly
dave clone. Or a gunnery nurse.

>> >Please continue your civil debate on morse code elimination.
>>
>> As soon as you show the way, snarly dave.
>
>> So far you haven't exhibited much civility in that regard.
>
>I didn't state that as my "only purpose" here, Leonard. You did.

So, snarly dave, your purpose in here is to make nasty to everyone
that doesn't agree with you and kiss your asterisk?

I'm very glad the State Department never had you on any official
negotiating team. We would all be nuclear toast, clicking counters
for a very long half-after life.

Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue.
You keep trying to turn all of this into some personal vendetta by
making all that nasty. Is that what all the extra ham lifers do?

LHA / WMD

2116. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:50:18 UTC
From: Philip de Cadenet <Philstheboss@thebbc.fslife.co.uk>
Message-ID: <hlP1Zzc6WfIAFwM7@philstheboss.freeserve.co.uk>
Source record: 86792
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TV TX power is not cheap.

It's all in the antenna and HAAT.

Back in the 70's a London AM pirate station dabbled with TV and played with a couple of watts and a simple colour bar generator to feed it. Using a simple yagi antenna atop a local hill they were received around 15 miles away albeit line of sight.

Good quality antennas such as panels are not cheap and in fact for a low power station, say up to 10 watts the antenna system costs more than the transmitter.

However, for an economical vertically polarised antenna at low power one can get away with a wideband co-linear which is only a few hundred dollars.

You do need good bandwidth.
--
Philip de Cadenet
Transmitters 'R' Us
http://www.transmittersrus.com

2117. Can I get my old WN6 call back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 07:54:52 UTC
From: Sofa Slug <sofaslug_SPAMNOT@arts.ucla.edu>
Message-ID: <bvsssj$454$1@daisy.noc.ucla.edu>
Source record: 86793

OK... forgive me if this is the wrong place for this, and/or it's been asked before...

I used to have a novice class license back in the early seventies that I let run out. I'm interested in becoming a ham again, and I wondered if I could still get my old callsign back.

TNX,

-S

2118. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 10:28:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205052801.29660.00002753@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 86794

In article <bYfUb.115$t16.180732@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040203205637.05539.00004128@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> [snip]
>> What didn't work was simply this: Getting a Novice required passing two
>tests
>> (code and theory) while getting a Tech after 1991 required passing just
>one. So
>> most new hams went for the Tech because it was perceived to be easier.
>>
>
>From the introduction of the no-code Tech until April of 2000, the no-code
>Technician license required passing two tests: the Novice written and the
>Technician written.
>
Right you are, Dee! I should have written "just one *type* of test".

Either way, the principle is the same - take two written tests on related
material, or one written and one code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2119. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 11:58:31 UTC
From: Tom <N2xxx@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <etb4205fjh89co4n24i3881dsi5a9idq9g@4ax.com>
Source record: 86795
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Wed, 04 Feb 2004 21:06:03 -0500, Lou <nomail@rr.com> wrote:

>On Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:33:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspring.com>
>wrote:
>
>
>>Bottom line is they are just too lazy to bother. And to make them feel
>>better they try and drag those of us that really care about ham radio with
>>them.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
>Those that really care about ham radio, don't have Riley and the FCC
>knocking on their door. Why don't you stop the hypocrisy already. Why
>don't you come clean and tell all these nice folks your history on 75
>meters? You know. The name calling. The threats. The jamming. C'mon,
>let's hear it. Step up to the plate. Show some balls. You're always
>yapping about other people. Give us the "long version" of what you did
>on 3.901.

Do you really think that Mr. "I'm a better operator than everyone
else" is going to come clean?

2120. Re: ARRL Committee's "Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 12:16:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205071604.25517.00004101@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 86796

In article <d22b54c3.0402041724.10fbc51d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>This one is as bad a Bonnie's abomination. Maybe worse.
>
>http://www.arrl.org/announce/reports-0307/hf-digital.html

How is it as bad or worse? I think it's much better!

First off, it does not widen the 'phone bands anywhere near as much as the KQ6XA plan. Nor does it decrease the Extra segments.

Second, the 200/500/2700 Hz rules are for a *voluntary bandplan*, not FCC regs.

Third, it actually acknowledges that hams use modes like CW and Baudot RTTY.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2121. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 12:38:24 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <q1e420laa56f4j0hu7t6b3degmaodmf2rc@4ax.com>
Source record: 86797

On 05 Feb 2004 05:32:30 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator
>k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

LOL, SCAOTP

OK, Len, that's it - you owe me a new keyboard for that one.....this
one's covered in coffee now, an^% jhfsd75 87t8 *^%^ 94w057y

>>snip
>
> LHA / WMD

%^& 73, $%Leo ^%%6g h76347&dhgfhh

2122. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 14:50:42 UTC
From: Okracoke Mailcall <eeashey3003@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c824f$4022584b$d1cc49b1$4290@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 86799
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Lou" <nomail@rr.com> wrote in message
news:sj83205vqiectaib7rqtn3cbqbpnddjgsi@4ax.com...
>
> Why don't you come clean and tell all these nice folks your history on 75
> meters? You know. The name calling. The threats. The jamming. C'mon,
> let's hear it. Step up to the plate. Show some balls. You're always
> yapping about other people. Give us the "long version" of what you did
> on 3.901.

Why is it that ham radio op's are always so hung up
on stupid 75 and 20 meter radio crap that took
place over 5 and 10 Years ago? Can someone tell
us why they always have to go and dig up shi+ that
everyone else has forgotten about a looooong time ago?
You'd think they'd come up with new material and
perhaps a new schtick by now....oy!

2123. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 14:50:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4022584B.BA773B99@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86798

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Go easy on Dave. He is busy revolutionizing the Internet by using
> >> it as a transporter to download hardware.
> >>
> >> Important work. Actual pioneering.
> >
> >You might recall that I provided you with a definition for "firmware",
> >not "hardware" and I pointed you to the Ten-Tec site where downloads of
> >"Firmware Upgrades" can be undertaken. It looks as if anyone who
> >depends upon you for accurate information is doomed to disappointment.
> >You aren't one to let facts stand in your way.
>
> Yah. Da pros only look to Ten-Tec for information on definitions.
>
> Shure dey do, big daddy dave.
>
> You're getting more bizarre every day.

Maybe it slipped your mind that the definition did not come from
Ten-Tec, old boy. Again, I provided you with a definition and a link to
the Ten-Tec site containing the term. Take it up with the providers of
the serveral definitions I found online and/or with Ten-Tec. They don't
seem to support your earlier statements on the topic.

> Hmmm...your Matter Transformer must have malfunctioned in
> downloading all that hardware...made you irritable and gave you
> IBS.

I'll correct you once again. I never wrote of downloading hardware. I
wrote of downloading firmware upgrades. Do try and keep things
straight.

> >> He'll go where no ham has gone before...
> >
> >I've already been to several places where damned few have gone.
> >Any licensed ham is apt to have gone a number of places where you've not
> >been.
>
> Ooooo! More foam! :-)

Naw, Len, just more fact.

> Hell kicked you out?!?
>
> I've been (indirectly) to the Moon, Mars, Venus, all without needing
> any license. That includes "working" a station ON the Moon. No
> QSL, though, although I've got some printouts on it.

As far as I'm concerned, Leonard, you're still waaaaay out there.

> What is all this stuff about going where the damned have gone?
> Is morsemanship really all that bad?

I see you in an amateur radio purgatory--still waiting for a decision on whether you'll be in or out.

Dave K8MN

2124. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 14:56:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4022598C.B377A323@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86800

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator
> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
> >> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
> >> >> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
> >> >> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
> >> >> >anything but talk either.
> >> >>
> >> >> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
> >> >
> >> >When did a 31 Hz wide mode become "wideband"?
> >>
> >> Martinez' innovation comes from scaling current wideband data
> >> communications at high rates to the slow, real-time rates of
> >> amateur radio environments. That involved some good application
> >> of Information Theory and other things, not in being spoon-fed
> >> How To Do It from the pages of QST.
> >
> >I noted that you didn't really provide an answer to the question.
>
> The question was ambiguous and did not define "wide."
>
> Your name isn't "Kelly," sweetums. Ya gotta live near philly, eat
> hoagies and buy "gaz" for da car in order to impersonate Kelly.
>
> Got that?

I've had it all along. I never for a moment believed that I was anyone
named Kelly. The confusion is yours.

> >A comment was made about wide band modes. You responded with something
> >about PSK-31. Now you go into what Peter Martinez scaled.
>
> You wouldn't know Martinez if he had a leather suit instead of scales.

Really? I beg to differ. At any rate, how would you be in a position
to know what I know?

> Hello? Ever hear of Shannon's Law and the relationship of data rate
> versus bandwidth? It's fairly simple math and proportional. That
> means it can be SCALED as in relationship of numbers.

That is simply more misdirection on your part. Tell us about the new
wideband modes.

> >You haven't address the comment on wide band modes.
>
> You want an address? [I'm not available...]

It is apparent that you are unavailable. You don't seem to be able to
address the question about wideband modes. Tell us about PSK-31 as a
wideband mode.

Dave K8MN

2125. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 14:57:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402259D5.D957F800@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86901

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <ApydnUskLaGuArzdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >All that bragging and still can't pass the test for a ham license.
>
> All that snarling and you ain't got either a name or a callsign.

Do you have a callsign, Len?

Dave K8MN

2126. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 15:13:27 UTC
From: BIAS COMMS <biascomms@blueyonder.co.uk>
Message-ID: <r4tUb.7165$mX5.65700006@news-text.cableinet.net>
Source record: 86902
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Philip de Cadenet wrote:

> TV TX power is not cheap.
>
> It's all in the antenna and HAAT.
>
> Back in the 70's a London AM pirate station dabbled with TV and played
> with a couple of watts and a simple colour bar generator to feed it.
> Using a simple yagi antenna atop a local hill they were received around
> 15 miles away albeit line of sight.

You've forgotten the early 80s "Thameside TV" broadcasts over one Christmas.
They were at quite high power (erp of a few kilowatts) from Crystal Palace.
CP was chosen because it's very high, and there are already other TV
transmitters up there - so all the rooftop yagis point at that area! It
was possible to get a P5 picture over much of west London!

--
BIAS COMMS

Everything gets easier with practice, except getting up in the morning!

2127. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 16:04:13 UTC
From: Tom <N2xxx@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a3q420t87616hv29uc2u8a301pmib9kdgb@4ax.com>
Source record: 86903
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 5 Feb 2004 09:50:42 -0500, "Okracoke Mailcall"
<eeashey3003@nospam.yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>"Lou" <nomail@rr.com> wrote in message
>news:sj83205vqiectaib7rqtn3cbqbpnddjgsi@4ax.com...
>>
>> Why don't you come clean and tell all these nice folks your history on 75
>> meters? You know. The name calling. The threats. The jamming. C'mon,
>> let's hear it. Step up to the plate. Show some balls. You're always
>> yapping about other people. Give us the "long version" of what you did
>> on 3.901.
>
>Why is it that ham radio op's are always so hung up
>on stupid 75 and 20 meter radio crap that took
>place over 5 and 10 Years ago? Can someone tell
>us why they always have to go and dig up shi+ that
>everyone else has forgotten about a looooong time ago?
>You'd think they'd come up with new material and
>perhaps a new schtick by now....oy!

Head on over to Dan's new hang out "alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf", and you'll
see why. Everyday we have to hear how he is God's gift to Amateur
Radio, yet he has more skeletons in his closet than anyone. People
that live in glass houses, shouldn't throw stones.

2128. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 17:31:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40227DF3.1C5E590D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86904

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:

> >The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in
> >radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications
> >without touching a PLMRS transceiver.
>
> Wow! Really?!?
>
> No hams work in a business that has a Public Land Mobile Radio
> Services radio? No hams work on railroads or in heavy trucking or
> vehicle road service trucks? No hams in construction of large
> buildings or engaged in HVAC or plumbing maintenance of same?
> No hams are policemen or firemen or paramedics? No hams are in
> the broadcast industry using remote links controlled through PLMRS
> comms?

Oh, I see your confusion. You thought I meant *other than on the ham
bands*!

> They are all on HF engaging in "radiosport" and net checking to
> advance the state of the art of radio and morsemanship?

Did I write "all" or did you just gather it from the ether?

> Now all that "radiosport" and "net checking" is fun and recreational
> and enjoyed by many but it is hardly any sort of technical
> advancement or honing skills useful in case of national need.

How do you know much about it--by having someone you know tell you of
it? By reading about it on the web? By browsing through the pages of
QST at your local library? Were you under the impression that hams are
mandated to participate in technical advancement? Are there no
operational skills needed by the nation?

> Your mileage on the newsgroup rageometer will, of course, vary.
>
> Foaming at the mouth is normal, sarly dave, but don't forget to

> brush after every meal.
>
> >I see. "Broadband" means "broad bandwidth". You could have knocked me
> >over with a feather when I read your words. So to your way of thinking
> >on "broadness", a morse communication at 5 wpm on 10 KHz could be
> >considered "broadband"?
>
> No. I'd say that 5 words per minute on 10 KHz could possibly be
> interfering with USN submarine alert frequencies. Those are on VLF.
> It's not nice to interfere with boomers or sharks, big daddy dave.
> Such wouldn't mean a "Riley" knocking on your door, but some very
> serious "attitude" folks carrying heavy artillery.

I know in which part of the spectrum 10 KHz is located. That you didn't care to answer the question is noted. We'll just accept your definition of "broadband" as, well....broadband.

> Now show us some REAL innovations and inventions done by hams
> over the last 50 years or so concerning RADIO. Other than Dan
> Tayloe that I've already mentioned several times.

No radio amateur anywhere has done anything if you haven't known about it.
It can't have happened. Nothing you have no knowledge of can possibly have happened. You are the ONLY PROFESSIONAL in radio. *snicker*

> Or just continue to make nasty in here on the UnBelievers who
> don't worship at the shrine of St. Hiram.

Worship? You aren't even baptised as a licensed ham, Leonard. You have naught to do with amateur radio. You're among the unwashed.

Several decades of declared interest in amateur radio + over seven years of windy, condescending posts here + four years of inaction on your "Extra right out of the box" = Leonard H. Anderson, potential radio amateur :-)

Dave K8MN

2129. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 18:40:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <P6wUb.11213$jH6.8504@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86905
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Anthony Mullins" <notformail@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:o7b32013ogj8eierqvhta0qfgpsr8fqs7o@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 04 Feb 2004 21:06:03 -0500, Lou <nomail@rr.com> wrote:
>
> :On Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:33:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspring.com>
> :wrote:
> :
> :
> :>Bottom line is they are just too lazy to bother. And to make them feel
> :>better they try and drag those of us that really care about ham radio
with
> :>them.
> :>
> :>Dan/W4NTI
> :>
> :
> :Those that really care about ham radio, don't have Riley and the FCC
> :knocking on their door. Why don't you stop the hypocrisy already. Why
> :don't you come clean and tell all these nice folks your history on 75
> :meters? You know. The name calling. The threats. The jamming. C'mon,
> :let's hear it. Step up to the plate. Show some balls. You're always
> :yapping about other people. Give us the "long version" of what you did
> :on 3.901.
>
> Dan has been a trouble maker not only on 75 meters, but also 20
> meters, in this group, and just about everywhere he goes. This has
> been going on for years. He is incapable of telling the truth.
> Ignore him, and he'll go away. Otherwise he feeds off of the
> attention.

Well I know what group you belong to then. Only people I go after are
jammers, BARF members and malcontents. What size shoe is that again?

Dan/W4NTI

2130. Re: Can I get my old WN6 call back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 19:54:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40229F8C.1090408@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86906

Sofa Slug wrote:

>OK... forgive me if this is the wrong place for this, and/or it's been asked before...
>
>I used to have a novice class license back in the early seventies that I let run out. I'm interested in becoming a ham again, and I wondered if I could still get my old callsign back.
>
>
>

Via the vanity callsign program, yes. This assumes nobody else holds it, which
seems unlikely in your case. But you need to get a ham license first. The FCC
will assign you some random callsign first. Then you can trade that in for the
vanity callsign. It does cost something like $20 for every ten years thereafter
(the FCC marks your license as vanity, so they know to charge money again).

>
>

2131. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 19:59:57 UTC
From: Real Deal <real@dealbigal.net>
Message-ID: <bvu7bn$sb9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:P6wUb.11213$jH6.8504@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Well I know what group you belong to then. Only people I go after are
> jammers, BARF members and malcontents. What size shoe is that again?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

it would seem you still have some dedicated fans out there Dan.
the posters in this thread using the handles "Lou" & "Tom" are
sock puppets of the same person. both posts trace to
new jersey. any chance it is w2kp ???

Real Deal
Las Vegas NV
catch me on 3803 nightly

2132. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150022.23307.00006468@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86912

In article <q1e420laa56f4j0hu7t6b3degmaodmf2rc@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 05 Feb 2004 05:32:30 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator
>>k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>LOL, SCAOTP
>
>OK, Len, that's it - you owe me a new keyboard for that one.....this
>one's covered in coffee now, an^% jhfsd75 87t8 *^%^ 94w057y

Download a new keyboard from Ten-Tec. Charge it to my account:
Heil's Hum Radio and Storm Door Company.

[used to be an earlier airline outfit under a woman CEO...]

<outer space for rent...>

LHA / WMD

2133. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150022.23307.00006467@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86915

In article <4022598C.B377A323@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Fibber
k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator
>> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>,
>> >kelly@dvol.com
>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
>> >> >kelly@dvol.com
>> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
>> >> >> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the
>Extra
>> >> >> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
>> >> >> >anything but talk either.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Is PSK31 chopped liver? :-)
>> >> >
>> >> >When did a 31 Hz wide mode become "wideband"?
>> >>
>> >> Martinez' innovation comes from scaling current wideband data
>> >> communications at high rates to the slow, real-time rates of
>> >> amateur radio environments. That involved some good application
>> >> of Information Theory and other things, not in being spoon-fed
>> >> How To Do It from the pages of QST.
>> >
>> >I noted that you didn't really provide an answer to the question.
>>
>> The question was ambiguous and did not define "wide."
>>
>> Your name isn't "Kelly," sweetums. Ya gotta live near philly, eat
>> hoagies and buy "gaz" for da car in order to impersonate Kelly.
>>
>> Got that?

>
>I've had it all along.

We know. You are incurable.

Some Tums would ease your gaz pains.

>> You wouldn't know Martinez if he had a leather suit instead of scales.
>
>Really? I beg to differ. At any rate, how would you be in a position
>to know what I know?

Extras shouldn't beg. That's unseemly.

ANYONE'S "in a position to know" you don't know, snarly dave.

Four neurons can't hold more than 16 bits of data.

>> Hello? Ever hear of Shannon's Law and the relationship of data rate
>> versus bandwidth? It's fairly simple math and proportional. That
>> means it can be SCALED as in relationship of numbers.
>
>That is simply more misdirection on your part.

Hokay...the entire rest of the radio world is familiar with Shannon's
Law and the mathematical relationship of bandwidth, noise,
information rate, and probability of error. They agree it is correct.

But, as an amateur you disagree, calling it "misdirection."

You need more than four neurons, senior alzheimer. Download some
from Ten-Tec and improve your cognitive capability.

>Tell us about the new wideband modes.

Why? You are an amateur keeping alive the Living Museum of
Archaic Radio and imagining you are in a Star Trek universe with
matter transporters.

On-off carrier keying is the limit of your profound radio knowledge.

We can't disappoint you with reality of the rest of the radio world.
You are a proud and noble amateur, better than all professionals.

Hail Ceasar and all the other salads...

>You don't seem to be able to
>address the question about wideband modes.

It is at 79 Wistfull Vista.

McGee, don't open that closet again... ... ... too late!

LHA / WMD

2134. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150023.23307.00006469@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86909

In article <4022584B.BA773B99@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <emineminent scientist
k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:

>Maybe it slipped your mind that the definition did not come from
>Ten-Tec, old boy.

Noooo...I provided the definition based on the whole rest of the
electronics industry.

>Again, I provided you with a definition and a link to
>the Ten-Tec site containing the term. Take it up with the providers of
>the serveral definitions I found online and/or with Ten-Tec. They don't
>seem to support your earlier statements on the topic.

Snarly dave, stay in retirement on that pension...you couldn't get
a job in the real electronics industry under your daffynitions.

Go play with your radios and try to understand the instructions for
your mighty orion. Are they written in English?

>I'll correct you once again. I never wrote of downloading hardware. I
>wrote of downloading firmware upgrades. Do try and keep things
>straight.

It's hard to play straight in this radio vaudeville slapstick. :-)

Don't forget the HCF instruction!

>I see you in an amateur radio purgatory--still waiting for a decision on
>whether you'll be in or out.

Poor baby. Your imagination giving you poor pictures again?

Develop them. I suggest Kodak D-76.

Dial up Ten-Tec and see if they have some fantasy firmware to
download. Upgrade your imagination.

LHA / WMD

2135. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150024.23307.00006471@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86910

In article <7O-dncy538IaJ7zdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <40214F95.2050201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>> One might almost think the fellow is just here to bust people's chops.
>>>Thanks for the history and Clarification, Paul.
>>
>> Poor baby. Feel injured, do you?
>
> Oh heavens no! Amused? Yes. but then I feel kind of bad about that,
>because I feel kind of sorry for you.

Awwww...that's so swweeeeet! :-)

> You probably see that as a sign of weakness, which reinforces my view.

Nah. I write it off as one too many hockey puck impacts on the helmet.

That and all the sticking probably increased the ear hissing.

So...how's the pool going? Has the gunnite dried on the walls yet?

LHA / WMD

2136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150024.23307.00006470@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86911

In article <402259D5.D957F800@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <ApydnUskLaGuArzdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>> writes:
>>
>> >All that bragging and still can't pass the test for a ham license.
>>
>> All that snarling and you ain't got either a name or a callsign.
>
>Do you have a callsign, Len?

Several. :-)

I just put up a new one on Roscoe Boulevard: "Call Snarly Dave For
Your Latest Orion Firmware!"

I charged the sign rental to your SDR company (Storm Door Radio).

beep, beep.

LHA / WMD

PS: I miss Grace L. Ferguson, R.I.P.

2137. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150025.23307.00006472@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86908

In article <W9-dncEGvZhDILzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>William wrote:
>
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<40211310.6020508@psu.edu>...
>>
>>> I'd prefer it if the test were essay. not because it would be harder,
>>>but because for me at least, it would be easier. I liked them in school,
>>>I still like them.
>>
>> You are assuming that the volunteer examiners are capable of
>> evaluating something other than multiple choice.
>
> And how! That is the glaring problem with essay type questions. The
>grader must understand the answer, and they must be able to understand
>the answers that the student makes. Any less, and you have a big argument.

Don't all those VEs know all there is to know about radio?

Gosh, to hear the Extras talk in here they DO!

Since They Know All There Is To Know, there should be NO questions!

No questions, no discussion, they are supremely qualified by law.

Just demonstrate morsemanship skills and everyone is qualified to
operate on HF!

LHA / WMD

2138. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150026.23307.00006473@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86914

In article <40227DF3.1C5E590D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <confused in the
east...and north...and south k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> >(N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>
>> >The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in
>> >radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications
>> >without touching a PLMRS transceiver.
>>
>> Wow! Really?!?
>>
>> No hams work in a business that has a Public Land Mobile Radio
>> Services radio? No hams work on railroads or in heavy trucking or
>> vehicle road service trucks? No hams in construction of large
>> buildings or engaged in HVAC or plumbing maintenance of same?
>> No hams are policemen or firemen or paramedics? No hams are in
>> the broadcast industry using remote links controlled through PLMRS
>> comms?
>
>Oh, I see your confusion. You thought I meant *other than on the ham
>bands*!

Who knows what lurks in your four neurons, snarly dave?

[da shadow do?]

>> They are all on HF engaging in "radiosport" and net checking to
>> advance the state of the art of radio and morsemanship?
>
>Did I write "all" or did you just gather it from the ether?

No, nitrous oxide.

I have to take an anaesthetic when I go in here to read all this "expert
radio nowledge stuf." One needs to dull the senses down to the
extra level...

>> Now all that "radiosport" and "net checking" is fun and recreational
>> and enjoyed by many but it is hardly any sort of technical
>> advancement or honing skills useful in case of national need.
>
>How do you know much about it--by having someone you know tell you of
>it? By reading about it on the web? By browsing through the pages of
>QST at your local library? Were you under the impression that hams are
>mandated to participate in technical advancement? Are there no
>operational skills needed by the nation?

Why are you asking?

You are an Extra. You know Everything because you are Qualified
by a federal agency, complete with pretty little certificate (suitable
for framing)!

>I know in which part of the spectrum 10 KHz is located.

Did you download that firmware fact from Ten-Tec too?

>No radio amateur anywhere has done anything if you haven't known about it.

Awwww...now you are acting all peevish. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Worship? You aren't even baptised as a licensed ham, Leonard.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, pope dave the furst become a religious sellout?

The Church doesn't issue ham licenses, snarly dave.

The FDA grades ham.

>You have naught to do with amateur radio.

I haven't gotten around to tuning in the naught, snarly dave.

Nothing to listen to in the naught.

>You're among the unwashed.

Untrue! I just downloaded an extra shower from Ten-Tec's very firm
ware download section. Was inexpensive economy model but was
complete with 100 gallons of hot water. Soap extra.

Took a long time to download. I would need DSL for the most
expensive model's download. Is that the firm ware download you
got, snarly dave? Come clean, now...

>Several decades of declared interest in amateur radio + over seven years
>of windy, condescending posts here + four years of inaction on your
>"Extra right out of the box" = Leonard H. Anderson, potential radio
>amateur :-)

Didn't you forget my claim that I was going to invent anti-gravity?

I'm still working on that one, but something's holding me down...

Now sit down in front of your orion, snarly dave. Amaze yourself.

We are all amazed at you. Of you. On you. Whatever...

LHA / WMD

2139. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 20:00:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205150028.23307.00006474@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86913

In article <40219DA6.35D67934@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Congeniality k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Construance>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> >> The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
>> >> INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
>> >> essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.
>> >
>> >Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
>> >meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
>> >newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
>> >Extra right out of the box".
>>
>> Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.
>
>I did go for it, Len--forty years ago, within a year of my first
>exposure to amateur radio.

...and you are still undeveloped.

>Nope. Nothing about your obtaining an amateur radio license here.

Oh? Is this a requirement to be in the electronics industry?

Strange, isn't it, not one single personnel person (that's "human resources" profession to bus drivers) said anything about needing any amateur radio license to work in electronics or aerospace.

Where is "here," snarly dave?

In your imagination? In your fantasy? On Fantasy Island waiting for da blane?

>No, nothing about your having obtained an amateur radio license here.

Now now, docktah no, you are getting churlish and unseemly again.

Did you download your definition of "interest in radio" from Ten-Tec, too? Right...along with the FIRM ware, the shower, and your undeveloped exposures.

>> Howaboutthat? Does that "show enough interest?"
>
>In obtaining an amateur radio license? Why, no, none at all.

No, no, no, sweetums, you equated INTEREST IN RADIO to
GETTING A HAM LICENSE plus adding "learning morse code."

Try to keep those four neurons in line.

>You haven't Beeped Morse nor have you Passed Any Written Exam. You've
>taken no action on your declared interest.

I have NO interest, declared or otherwise, on "beeping morse," bleeping
dave. Never claimed otherwise.

Is that a requirement in your SS view of amateur radio?

I passed four written exams at an FCC field office in Chicago, 1956.
I passed all kinds of college exams after that, a California driver's
license written exam among others (despite a non-interest in
becoming a professional driver).

Does one have to Post Bans on "interest in radio?" Must be so at
the Church of St. Hiram.

Sorry deacon dave, I don't worship at that church.

>Who did what? My smarts are fine, Len.

Your four neurons are indeed fine and firing in sequence.

Dial up Ten-Tec and download some more neuron firmware.
Four isn't enough. Upgrade!

>I wrote about getting into amateur radio.

Nah, you scribbled nastygrams about "getting an amateur radio license
IN ORDER TO SHOW INTEREST IN RADIO."

>Your response didn't address that, did it?

Here's an official address: 445 12th St. SW, Washington, D.C., 20554

I've addressed several things to that address.

Are you still wearing address?

LHA / WMD

2140. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 22:17:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <a6SdnajbWqDWX7_dRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86917

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
>
> All that snarling and you ain't got either a name or a callsign.

Got both and the license certificate to prove it. Where is yours? Oh,
forgot, you can't pass the test.

2141. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 22:19:22 UTC
From: Real Deal <real@dealbigal.net>
Message-ID: <bvufh4$d9u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 86916
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Tom" <N2xxx@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a3q420t87616hv29uc2u8a301pmib9kdgb@4ax.com...
> Head on over to Dan's new hang out "alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf", and you'll
> see why. Everyday we have to hear how he is God's gift to Amateur
> Radio, yet he has more skeletons in his closet than anyone. People
> that live in glass houses, shouldn't throw stones.

sooo "Tom" "Lou," jest what wuz we supposed to see when we
scooted over to alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf ?????????
bubba Dan wuz jest doing hisself usual thing.....that be giving out
good solid lectronic advise and mixin it wid a few
vetnam stories.............so what??????? whats ur point
"Tom" "Lou" mister toll ???????

2142. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 22:58:18 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2ai520tsgorvo8q5193da00siulc519v2n@4ax.com>
Source record: 86918

On 05 Feb 2004 20:00:23 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>snip

> Poor baby. Your imagination giving you poor pictures again?
>
> Develop them. I suggest Kodak D-76.

Now THAT brought back memories - rolling 620 Verichrome Pan film into the developing tank under that @#$%^ dark green safelight....mixing the developer and getting it to exactly 68 degrees F.......another hobby, another time - long ago.

D-76 is good for B&W film only, though. These discussions are far too colourful for anything less than Ektachrome.....definitely Kodak moments, though!

>snip
>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

2143. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 23:19:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402051519.6c40da61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86919

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040205150025.23307.00006472@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <W9-dncEGvZhDILzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
> >William wrote:
> >
> >> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:<40211310.6020508@psu.edu>...
> >>
> >>> I'd prefer it if the test were essay. not because it would be harder,
> >>>but because for me at least, it would be easier. I liked them in school,
> >>>I still like them.
> >>
> >> You are assuming that the volunteer examiners are capable of
> >> evaluating something other than multiple choice.
> >
> > And how! That is the glaring problem with essay type questions. The
> >grader must understand the answer, and they must be able to understand
> >the answers that the student makes. Any less, and you have a big argument.
>
> Don't all those VEs know all there is to know about radio?
>
> Gosh, to hear the Extras talk in here they DO!
>
> Since They Know All There Is To Know, there should be NO questions!
>
> No questions, no discussion, they are supremely qualified by law.
>
> Just demonstrate morsemanship skills and everyone is qualified to
> operate on HF!
>
> LHA / WMD

Why, Len, just the other day I heard The Amateur Formerly Known As
(TAFKA) Rev. Jim say that the Morse Code test was a disincentive to
use CW on HF.

Maybe the earth has reversed polarity!

Or maybe he just got his tie stuck in his zipper.

2144. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 23:21:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402051521.6fac4012@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86920

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >
> > >For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> >
> > For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at all.
> > >
> > > (1) Amateur Basic.
> > >
> > > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> > > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
> >
> > Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
> > use of the band?
> >
> > > Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
> >
> > You mean same as Extras have now?
>
> I believe he does. Is that a problem?
>
> > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> >
> > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > incentive to use voice only!
>
> Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known as Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> or greater disincentive since 1912.
>
> Why is it NOW a problem?
>
> > >Limit 100 watts output on any band.
> >
> > Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?
> > >
> > > (2) Amateur Advanced.
> > >
> > > Additional written examination.
> >

> > OK
> >
> > > All presently HF-licensed
> > > Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.
> >
> > Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!
> >
> > > Privileges
> > > same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement required
> > > for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
> > >previously
> > > code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New licensees
> > >(not
> > > grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
> >
> > See above about code test.
> > >
> > > (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
> > >
> > > (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
> > >Extra)
> >
> > I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.
>
> It gets Steve out of bed in the morning.
>
> > > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
> >
> > How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you make a
> > case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the others?
> >
> > > REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
> > >
> > > test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional phone
> > > allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
> > >classifi-
> > > cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
> > >
> > > Why?
> >
> > Three levels - good.
> > Incremental power and privs - good
>
> You once told me when we had 7 license class distinctions that we
> needed more classes.
>
> Why the change now?
>
> bb

TAFKA Rev. Jim, has the cat got your tongue?

2145. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 23:22:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402051522.1d36e348@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86921

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402040346.47ba943f@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > > >
> > > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > > >
> > > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > > >
> > > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> > >
> > > Why?
> >
> > Why, Jim?
>
> Why, Jim?

Jim, don't you know why you say the things you say?

2146. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 23:25:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RhAUb.11657$jH6.841@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 86922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Real Deal" <real@dealbigal.net> wrote in message
news:bvu7bn$sb9$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:P6wUb.11213$jH6.8504@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Well I know what group you belong to then. Only people I go after are
> > jammers, BARF members and malcontents. What size shoe is that again?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
No, its probably WB2PDW, Vincent Diak, he is a world class jammer. Been
on for 20 years. His thing now is to fire up super amplifier and play
computer generated tones on it.

I nailed his arse the other night on 20 meters and sicked the feds on him.
So now he has the arse and is playing here.

Nothing new under the sun.

But thanks for the 'reminder'

Dan/W4NTI

2147. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-05 23:32:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402051532.23d43113@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86923

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<402109FA.6060302@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
> >>
> >
> > Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here.
> > Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as
> > "electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a
> > modem" "better modes and modulations"....
>
>
>
> I wonder where Carl is lately?

Probably tied up with work and work related travel.

> Haven't heard from him since he had the
> change of heart regarding the testing.

Everyone's allowed to change their minds, Mike. Even when they
say "never"....

Here's a prediction for you:

Hopefully BPL will not completely trash the HF spectrum - if that
garbage takes over, all bets are off. Assuming it is defeated or at
least contained:

There will be proposals and more proposals. FCC will someday do
another NPRM,
there will be a lot of comments, lots of arguing, and then eventually
FCC will
do another R&O which will consist mostly of what's easiest for FCC to
implement.
At the rate they're going, late 2005 before the rules change. (Yes, I
have't forgotten The Pool)

They'll dump Element 1, simplify the entry level test even more,
reshuffle
some other regs, etc., regardless of what the majority wants, what
arguments
are given pro and con, etc. Free upgrades? Maybe.

We'll see a surge of new hams and a surge of upgrades - for a while.
But not
much will actually change, because they're not addressing the real
problems
like CC&Rs, lack of publicity, lifestyle changes, etc.

You watch and see if I'm right.

Meanwhile some of us will have been having a lot of fun with ham
radio. I know I have, and will continue to do so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2148. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 01:04:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <e5SdnWuZZvyQdb_dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86924

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <7O-dncy538IaJ7zdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <40214F95.2050201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>> One might almost think the fellow is just here to bust people's chops.
>>>>Thanks for the history and Clarification, Paul.
>>>
>>> Poor baby. Feel injured, do you?
>>
>> Oh heavens no! Amused? Yes. but then I feel kind of bad about that,
>>because I feel kind of sorry for you.
>
>
> Awwww...that's so swweeeeet! :-)

Glad you approve! :-)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2149. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 01:21:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4022EC2F.55D9A333@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86925

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040204190524.25517.00004090@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >>I notice that she hasn't gone back at anybody with a single rebuttal.
> > >
> > >That's changed, but it's basically a preaching session.
>
> Does this mean we can expect another Sermon On The Antenna Mount
> soon?
>
> Show us the Righteousness of the True Path...

It should be apparent to you, Leonard. They're discussing matters
dealing with amateur radio. You've delivered bushels of sermons here
but you have zip to do with amateur radio. Instead, you entertain us
with tales of how the commercials do things and of your military
exploits of fifty years back.

Your claims of being here only to engage in civil debate on morse
testing elimination ring very hollow.

Dave K8MN

2150. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 01:27:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4022ED6C.55B1405B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86926

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040204232052.12631.00004720@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larrah TyRoll the Wonder Ham) writes:

> >Lennie:
> >
> >Yup -- there are many who are a lot better. Sorry, but when we're
> >talking about amateur radio operators, you're not one of them!
> >
> >Literally.
>
> No kidding? You got soma come loud ratings in college for all
> that reasoning? Did you get a brain cell graft or something.
>
> Here's a Clue, bus driver: The FCC doesn't require a single
> commissioner or staff to hold amateur radio licenses in order to
> MAKE the amateur radio regulations or enforce them.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Not really needing your "help," sweatbreath.
>
> You just keep tawking tuff to the group on how you got all those great
> grades in college and could get any personnel job you wanted...all
> through the dedication and resolve that made you Wonder Ham with
> morse code.

Entertain us with your credentials once again, won't you, Len. Then
tell us about that "Extra right out of the box". After more than seven
years of posting your diatribes in an amateur radio newsgroup, you're no
closer to obtaining even the most basic no-code amateur radio license.

Dave K8MN

2151. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 01:33:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <otmdnaSF4Yt_c7_dRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86927

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<402109FA.6060302@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
>>>>
>>>
>>>Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here.
>>>Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as
>>>"electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a
>>>modem" "better modes and modulations"....
>>
>>
>>
>>I wonder where Carl is lately?
>
>
> Probably tied up with work and work related travel.
>
>
>>Haven't heard from him since he had the
>>change of heart regarding the testing.
>
>
> Everyone's allowed to change their minds, Mike. Even when they
> say "never"....

Oh yes! But they have to face the consequenses of changing their mind.
But there is some pretty severe damage to credibility when the change
involves basic principles.

> Here's a prediction for you:
>
> Hopefully BPL will not completely trash the HF spectrum - if that
> garbage takes over, all bets are off. Assuming it is defeated or at
> least contained:
>

> There will be proposals and more proposals. FCC will someday do
> another NPRM,
> there will be a lot of comments, lots of arguing, and then eventually
> FCC will do another R&O which will consist mostly of what's easiest for FCC to
> implement. At the rate they're going, late 2005 before the rules change. (Yes, I
> have't forgotten The Pool)
>
> They'll dump Element 1, simplify the entry level test even more,
> reshuffle some other regs, etc., regardless of what the majority wants, what
> argumentsare given pro and con, etc. Free upgrades? Maybe.
>
> We'll see a surge of new hams and a surge of upgrades - for a while.
> But not much will actually change, because they're not addressing the real
> problems like CC&Rs, lack of publicity, lifestyle changes, etc.
>
> You watch and see if I'm right.

I wouldn't bet against that! Sounds within a order of mag with my
prediction.

> Meanwhile some of us will have been having a lot of fun with ham
> radio. I know I have, and will continue to do so.

Me too. Glad I didn't listen to those that told me that "Morse code is
going to go away any day now." ~Three extra years on HF and counting.......

- Mike KB3EIA

2152. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 01:35:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4022EF72.DA58C3FF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86928

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40219C12.1040909@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >>>At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
> >>
> >> Never tried, snarly dave.
> >>
> >> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
> >> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.
> >>
> >Then learning the 5 wpm and getting the extra should be a walk in the park
> then.
> >It took me about a month to learn 5 wpm and I'm no good at such motor skills.
>
> Gosh, olde-tymer, I've walked in many fine parks in my time but not
> a single one of them required any morse code proficiency to walk.

That "Extra right out of the box" park requires it at the breakneck pace
of f i v e w o r d s p e r m i n u t e.

> Psycho-motor skill I learned in middle school (we called it
> "junior high school" back then before educational PC) was typing
> at tested maximum of 60 WPM. On typewriters that had no key
> markings. :-)

There's no typing test involved in the Amateur Extra. Just a morse test
of f i v e w o r d s p e r m i n u t e.

> Now, let's concentrate on WHY there's still a morse code test for
> an AMATEUR radio license...and WHY it must remain law forever
> and ever. Or, at least until the last PCTA has their code key
> forcibly removed from their cold, dead fingers.

At the rate you're progressing toward that Extra Class ticket, there
won't be any amateur radio license at all to pry from your cold, dead
fingers.

> Is morse code not so wonderful that the feds have to keep the
> morse test in law so that cute little seven-year-olds can have
> radio playmates? Or forty-seven-year-olds and older?

It still gets you that mere children can obtain that which you covet,
doesn't it?

> Ever wonder why morse code is the SECOND most used mode
> on HF, a distant second behind voice? All the HF hams had to
> test for code but so few continued to use it.

Let's see.....hmmm....It is probably because the overwhelming majority
can already talk? Operating on SSB would seem to be as easy
as...talking.

> I guess it must not be
> so wonderful, so popular after all.

...but you'll have to continue to rely upon second-hand information.

Dave K8MN

2153. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 02:34:30 UTC
From: ejxit@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <4022FD35.E0A6CAE5@yahoo.com>
Source record: 86929
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Do you have a phone number, web site or email address for this SuperCircuits
store?

gaffo wrote:

> Lenny wrote:
>
> > "gaffo" <gaffo@usenet.net> wrote in message
> > news:dAYTb.12841$6M6.4582@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >>>>Pirate TV- I'd like to do it on a limited basis- send the signal just
> > >>>>through my apartment building. If the signal goes any farther then that,
> > >>>>no problem, but it's not a priority.
> > >>
> > >>I found this:
> > >>
> > >>Supercircuits
> > >>13552 Research Blvd
> > >>Austin TX 78750
> > >>
> > >>This company sells a low-power TV transmitter for channels 3 thru 6 which
> > >>appears to be of high quality ($49.95 plus $4.50 S&H). For licensed radio
> > >>amateurs, they also sell some ham TV transmitter kits with 1 to 2 watts
> > >>peak output power that can be adapted for use on UHF channels 14 thru 19,
> > >>and a linear amp for boosting the output of these transmitters.
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > I heard about an unlicensed TV station in Nashville. Last time I was
> > > down there I make an attempt to find the signal and was
> > > successful. Although the video was not the greatest, the programming
> > > was pretty good. A good dose of political opinion stuff, mixed
> > > with entertainment. At times amateurish, other times professional.
> > >
> > > Lenny
> > > Detroit
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > oh ya.................that Austin station was no channal 9. There was
> > another low power called KVI (i think - been awhile) channel 13. It used
> > to be America One network and had limited range, maybe 1-2 miles. It was

> later bought by channel 7 (i've forgotten the call letters of this CBS
> affiliate) and changed to UPN.
>
> oh ya ....we have an America One in a town north of me - it is low
> power with a range of at most 1-mile.
>
> --
>
> "I think in this case international law
> stood in the way of doing the right thing (invading Iraq)."
> - Richard Perle
>
> "He (Saddam Hussein) has not developed any significant capability with
> respect to weapons of mass destruction. He is unable to project
> conventional power against his neighbours."
> - Colin Powell February 24 2001
>
> "We have been successful for the last ten years in keeping
> him from developing those weapons and we will continue to be successful."
>
> "He threatens not the United States."
>
> "But I also thought that we had pretty
> much removed his stings and frankly for ten years we really have."
>
> 'But what is interesting is that with the regime that has been in place
> for the past ten years, I think a pretty good job has been done of
> keeping him from breaking out and suddenly showing up one day and saying
> "look what I got." He hasn't been able to do that.'
> - Colin Powell February 26 2001

2154. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 02:54:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040205215433.01019.00000323@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 86930

In article <jsednZJ4fq2vJLzdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Kid Rock comes out in a desecrated US Flag with a
>hole cut in the middle. Pretty

[expletive deleted]

>despicable!

I agree 100%.

When the halftime show started I changed the channel. Flipped back at one point and saw "Kid", flipped back to something else. Missed JJ - no big loss.

Note that the flap over her "wardrobe malfunction" has deflected attention from that flag desecration.

>Is this what the
>superbowl is about? I can only assume that the NFL approves of this kind
>of disrespectful behavior, and if we watch the trash they spew, we do as
>well!

I think it's evidence of a basic law of entertainment physics: "conservation of goodstuff". IOW there's only so much good programming. Some years back, the superbowl consisted mostly of rather unexciting games but really good shows and commercials. Then the games got better and the shows and commercials worse.

It's not just the superbowl - most of what's on broadcast TV is JUNK. Pure and simple. If some people in the LA area are offended - tough.

The irony of the situation is that the people who are really responsible won't be fined, but the stations who simply carried the network feed will be.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2155. Re: Can I get my old WN6 call back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 03:12:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MCDUb.342$t16.368858@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86931

"Sofa Slug" <sofaslug_SPAMNOT@arts.ucla.edu> wrote in message
news:bvsssj$454$1@daisy.noc.ucla.edu...
OK... forgive me if this is the wrong place for this, and/or it's been asked
before...

I used to have a novice class license back in the early seventies that I let
run out. I'm interested in becoming a ham again, and I wondered if I could
still get my old callsign back.

TNX,

-S

Once you become licensed again, you can apply for your old call under the
vanity program. If no one else has it, you would be able to get it assigned
to you. But first you must get a current license and call.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2156. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 03:17:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040205221713.06226.00002731@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86933

In article <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>:-)

I think the call WH0RE fits her better.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2157. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 03:17:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86932

In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Billy:
>>
>> Point taken, and I offer all appropriate apologies to Miss Clauson.
>> However, her achievement, while a fairly notable one ***for a child,***
>> is no longer noteworthy for anyone over the age of, say, 10 years,
>> and certainly a meaningless one for an adult.
>
>Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?

Billy:

I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
old at the time. My figuring may be a bit off, as I'm somewhat bleary-eyed
due to it being past my bedtime.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2158. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 03:19:18 UTC
From: gaffo <gaffo@usenet.net>
Message-ID: <WIDUb.51$1X2.19197084@newssvr11.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86934
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ejxit@yahoo.com wrote:

> Do you have a phone number, web site or email address for this SuperCircuits
> store?
>
>
>

nope sorry - I sure don't - try the on-line yellowpages maybe?

all I have is what I posted - literally.

--

"I think in this case international law
stood in the way of doing the right thing (invading Iraq)."
- Richard Perle

"He (Saddam Hussein) has not developed any significant capability with
respect to weapons of mass destruction. He is unable to project
conventional power against his neighbours."
- Colin Powell February 24 2001

"We have been successful for the last ten years in keeping
him from developing those weapons and we will continue to be successful."

"He threatens not the United States."

"But I also thought that we had pretty
much removed his stings and frankly for ten years we really have."

'But what is interesting is that with the regime that has been in place
for the past ten years, I think a pretty good job has been done of
keeping him from breaking out and suddenly showing up one day and saying
"look what I got." He hasn't been able to do that.'
- Colin Powell February 26 2001

2159. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 04:20:10 UTC
From: Tom Desmond <tdesmond@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <402315F9.1C26BE62@sprynet.com>
Source record: 86935
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> Make it interesting and get a digital TV set up. Amateur HDTV.

That would be cool...unfortunately, it would also be a price buster, as I'm not aware of anything remotely inexpensive that would let you transmit ATSC digital television in SD -- let alone in high definition.

Still, the nice thing is that it would take very little power since low powered digital signals can travel pretty well.

2160. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 05:16:08 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bvv58h$t0e$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 86936
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tom Desmond" <tdesmond@sprynet.com> wrote in message
news:402315F9.1C26BE62@sprynet.com...
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Make it interesting and get a digital TV set up. Amateur HDTV.
>
> That would be cool...unfortunately, it would also be a price buster, as
> I'm not aware of anything remotely inexpensive that would let you
> transmit ATSC digital television in SD -- let alone in high definition.
>
> Still, the nice thing is that it would take very little power since low
> powered digital signals can travel pretty well.

Actually, they don't travel as well as an analog signal.. In areas where
there is at least a viewable (albeit snowy and/or ghosty) analog signal,
there is no receivable digital signal at all. This is practical experience
in Portland, Oregon, where the analog and digital signals are coming from
~2000' HAAT..

2161. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 05:34:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40232748.C8F2698B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86937

Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:
>
> In article <40219EA0.3F50F6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <snarly
> k8mn@earthlink.net aka "Mr. Warmth"> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
> >> >>
> >> >> Mental or physical age? :-)
> >> >>
> >> >At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
> >>
> >> Never tried, snarly dave.
> >>
> >Well, there you have it.
>
> Have what? I don't have any amateur license. Got several others.

In the context of this newsgroup, that means just what?

> >> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
> >> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.
> >>
> >I don't care about your commercial ticket. I asked about your amateur
> >radio license. Maybe you should look back.
>
> Snarly dave, I don't care about your amateur wonderfulness and
> vindictiveness and bigotry to non-amateurs. I'm a pro, like it or no.

If you don't care, why are you still haunting a newsgroup dealing with amateur radio? It is clear that you are not a radio amateur and that you are not, after all these years, "getting into amateur radio". Haunt some radio professionals, using the endearing manner you've displayed here and see how long they put up with your condesent. I worked professionally in radio and electronics. A number of us here have done

so or do so. What sets you apart is that you are a non-amateur who seems to get his jollies taking potshots at radio amateurs.

> You do NOT get to choose anything about what anyone is "supposed"
> to say, to reply to, or anydamnthingelse. You keep thinking you do
> every time you put on the SS uniform with the monocle. Try keeping
> the armband off, it's so 40-ish.

Get it straight, Len. This is an open newsgroup dealing with amateur radio. You are in no way involved with amateur radio. I am free to choose to respond to anything posted here and shall do so as the spirit moves me.

> Shave the head and learn to smile. That will make you more like
> Colonel Klink. Lose several pounds too.

As a last resort, you can always go to your strength and bring in the Nazi images.

> >> Now Larrah, the self-professed paragon of determination and moral
> >> virtue, once bragged and carried on that his "summa cum laude"
> >> standings in post-service college would get him any top spot job
> >> in human resources after graduation. He now drives a bus.
> >
> >What has that to do with his amateur radio license and why is it of
> >concern to you?
>
> What have you to do with anything? :-)

Let's see. Amateur radio newsgroup. I'm a radio amateur. Now, back to the question: What does your comment have to do with Larry's amateur radio license and of concern is his job to you? It seems to be karma that forces you to live up to the N2EY profile of your likely actions.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, snarly dave, all you seem to do is try to fight with
> others who don't bow down and kiss your asterisk.

Actually, old boy, you have quite the attitude toward radio amateurs. You're insulting, rude and immature. If you're waiting for radio amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely going to be disappointed.

> >> Quod Erat Demonstrandum.
> >
> >You bragged *four* years ago that you'd get "an Extra right out of the
> >box". You still have not even the most basic amateur radio license.
> >
> >Q.E.D.
>
> Ah, so in "correct" amateurism, any statement anyone says in the
> past MUST be kept forever and ever? Even casual throwaway
> mentions? :-)

It wasn't a casual, throwaway mention and your newsgroup statements of the past are here for a long, long time. If you wish to now retract your statement, I have no problem with that.

> I changed my mind, sweetums. Stuff it. :-)

I haven't changed my mind about you, Len. You're a victim of your own inertia and braggadocio. To twist a phrase: If you haven't done it, it is most certainly bragging. You haven't obtained a license and aren't likely to do so. Consider yourself stuffed.

> I saw the way you acted in here and didn't want to become a snarly
> dave clone. Or a gunnery nurse.

That "fox and grapes" routine of your is a classic.

> >> >Please continue your civil debate on morse code elimination.
> >>
> >> As soon as you show the way, snarly dave.
> >
> >> So far you haven't exhibited much civility in that regard.
> >
> >I didn't state that as my "only purpose" here, Leonard. You did.
>
> So, snarly dave, your purpose in here is to make nasty to everyone
> that doesn't agree with you and kiss your asterisk?

I haven't stated a purpose here, Leonid.

> I'm very glad the State Department never had you on any official
> negotiating team. We would all be nuclear toast, clicking counters
> for a very long half-after life.
>
> Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue.

As Steve so often tells you, you're a liar, Leonora.

Dave K8MN

2162. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 05:38:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40232862.B1D42573@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86938

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <q1e420laa56f4j0hu7t6b3degmaodmf2rc@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >On 05 Feb 2004 05:32:30 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >
> >>In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator
> >>k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> >LOL, SCAOTP
> >
> >OK, Len, that's it - you owe me a new keyboard for that one.....this
> >one's covered in coffee now, an^% jhfsd75 87t8 *^%^ 94w057y
>
> Download a new keyboard from Ten-Tec. Charge it to my account:
> Heil's Hum Radio and Storm Door Company.
>
> [used to be an earlier airline outfit under a woman CEO...]
>
>
> <outer space for rent...>

"Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue."

--Leonard H. Anderson, 5 Feb. 2004

Dave K8MN

2163. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 05:51:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40232B6F.76C7CA5B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86939

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4022598C.B377A323@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Fibber
> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male impersonator
> >> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>,
> >> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >> >news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
Some Tums would ease your gaz pains.
>
> >> You wouldn't know Martinez if he had a leather suit instead of scales.
> >>
> >Really? I beg to differ. At any rate, how would you be in a position
> >to know what I know?
>
> Extras shouldn't beg. That's unseemly.
>
> ANYONE'S "in a position to know" you don't know, snarly dave.

You aren't anyone.

> Four neurons can't hold more than 16 bits of data.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> Hello? Ever hear of Shannon's Law and the relationship of data rate
> >> versus bandwidth? It's fairly simple math and proportional. That

> >> means it can be SCALED as in relationship of numbers.
> >
> >That is simply more misdirection on your part.
>
> Hokay...the entire rest of the radio world is familiar with Shannon's
> Law and the mathematical relationship of bandwidth, noise,
> information rate, and probability of error. They agree it is correct.
>
> But, as an amateur you disagree, calling it "misdirection."

Wrong, friendly old gent. As an amateur, I don't disagree with Shannon.
I disagree with your misdirection with talk of Shannon and scaling when
you were asked if PSK-31 is wideband.

> You need more than four neurons, senior alzheimer. Download some
> from Ten-Tec and improve your cognitive capability.

Ten-Tec has only firmware upgrades, Foghorn Lenhorn. They can't fix
your inability to answer a question.

> >Tell us about the new wideband modes.
>
> Why?

Because you were asked about them and responded with some drivel about
PSK-31.

> You are an amateur keeping alive the Living Museum of
> Archaic Radio and imagining you are in a Star Trek universe with
> matter transporters.

Yes, I'm a radio amateur. You got that much correct. Then you got
tangled up when you couldn't decide if I'm pursuing the past or the
future.

> On-off carrier keying is the limit of your profound radio knowledge.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> We can't disappoint you with reality of the rest of the radio world.
> You are a proud and noble amateur, better than all professionals.

Who is "we"?

I am a proud radio amateur and I spent a career in radio as a
professional. You, on the other hand...

> >You don't seem to be able to
> >address the question about wideband modes.

>
> It is at 79 Wistfull Vista.

...Apartment PSK-31.

Dave K8MN

2164. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 05:55:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40232C4F.88A4B174@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86940

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4022584B.BA773B99@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <emineminent scientist
> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
>
> >Maybe it slipped your mind that the definition did not come from
> >Ten-Tec, old boy.
>
> Noooo...I provided the definition based on the whole rest of the
> electronics industry.

You provided? Your statement seems at odds with the other definitions
in existence.

> >Again, I provided you with a definition and a link to
> >the Ten-Tec site containing the term. Take it up with the providers of
> >the serveral definitions I found online and/or with Ten-Tec. They don't
> >seem to support your earlier statements on the topic.
>
> Snarly dave, stay in retirement on that pension...you couldn't get
> a job in the real electronics industry under your daffynitions.
>
> Go play with your radios and try to understand the instructions for
> your mighty orion. Are they written in English?

I'll take that as your only way of conceding a point.

> >I'll correct you once again. I never wrote of downloading hardware. I
> >wrote of downloading firmware upgrades. Do try and keep things
> >straight.
>
> It's hard to play straight in this radio vaudeville slapstick. :-)

I'll bet it is, especially when you have no material. You'll have to
fall back on your usual, the tap dancing routine.

Dave K8MN

2165. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 05:57:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40232CBF.A4D30418@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86941

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <402259D5.D957F800@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <ApydnUskLaGuArzdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
> ><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >All that bragging and still can't pass the test for a ham license.
> >>
> >> All that snarling and you ain't got either a name or a callsign.
> >
> >Do you have a callsign, Len?
>
> Several. :-)

Wrong answer, Pops. :-)

Dave K8MN

2166. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 06:10:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40232FD0.F492989E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86942

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40227DF3.1C5E590D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <confused in the
> east...and north...and south k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >> >(N2EY)
> >> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in
> >> >radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications
> >> >without touching a PLMRS transceiver.
> >>
> >> Wow! Really?!?
> >>
> >> No hams work in a business that has a Public Land Mobile Radio
> >> Services radio? No hams work on railroads or in heavy trucking or
> >> vehicle road service trucks? No hams in construction of large
> >> buildings or engaged in HVAC or plumbing maintenance of same?
> >> No hams are policemen or firemen or paramedics? No hams are in
> >> the broadcast industry using remote links controlled through PLMRS
> >> comms?
> >
> >Oh, I see your confusion. You thought I meant *other than on the ham
> >bands*!
>
> Who knows what lurks in your four neurons, snarly dave?
>
> [da shadow do?]

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> They are all on HF engaging in "radiosport" and net checking to
> >> advance the state of the art of radio and morsemanship?
> >
> >Did I write "all" or did you just gather it from the ether?
>
> No, nitrous oxide.

In your case, nitrous obnoxide.

> I have to take an anaesthetic when I go in here to read all this "expert
> radio nowledge stuf." One needs to dull the senses down to the
> extra level...

Just more civil debate on the elimination of morse testing, Leonid?

> >> Now all that "radiosport" and "net checking" is fun and recreational
> >> and enjoyed by many but it is hardly any sort of technical
> >> advancement or honing skills useful in case of national need.
> >
> >How do you know much about it--by having someone you know tell you of
> >it? By reading about it on the web? By browsing through the pages of
> >QST at your local library? Were you under the impression that hams are
> >mandated to participate in technical advancement? Are there no
> >operational skills needed by the nation?
>
> Why are you asking?

In the expectation of receiving a straight answer. How do you know that
radiosport and public service work in amateur radio are fun? Who told
you?

> You are an Extra. You know Everything because you are Qualified
> by a federal agency, complete with pretty little certificate (suitable
> for framing)!

You're right about one part: I am an Amateur Extra, but I now about what
hams do because I am a part of it, an active participant. I don't get
my knowledge of amateur radio on a second-hand basis.

> >I know in which part of the spectrum 10 KHz is located.
>
> Did you download that firmware fact from Ten-Tec too?

No, Leonard. Ten-Tec has firmware upgrades available. Would you like
the definition of firmware again?

> >No radio amateur anywhere has done anything if you haven't known about it.
>
> Awwww...now you are acting all peevish. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> >Worship? You aren't even baptised as a licensed ham, Leonard.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, pope dave the furst become a religious sellout?
>

> The Church doesn't issue ham licenses, snarly dave.

That's strange. Weren't you the fellow who brought up a particular
church? You seemed to have snipped that portion.

> The FDA grades ham.

...leaving you to handle the degrading.

> >Several decades of declared interest in amateur radio + over seven years
> >of windy, condescending posts here + four years of inaction on your
> >"Extra right out of the box" = Leonard H. Anderson, potential radio
> >amateur :-)
>
> Didn't you forget my claim that I was going to invent anti-gravity?

Haven't heard of that one. Don't worry too much though. It can't make
you look any more foolish than your "Extra right out of the box" claim.

> I'm still working on that one, but something's holding me down...

That'd seem to be a necessity. Hot air has a tendency to rise.

> Now sit down in front of your orion, snarly dave. Amaze yourself.

I do that quite frequently, Leonid.

Dave K8MN

2167. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 06:22:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4023329A.6601D3DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86943

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40219DA6.35D67934@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Congeniality
> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Construance>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
> >> >> INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
> >> >> essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.
> >> >
> >> >Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
> >> >meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
> >> >newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
> >> >Extra right out of the box".
> >>
> >> Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.
> >
> >I did go for it, Len--forty years ago, within a year of my first
> >exposure to amateur radio.
>
> ...and you are still undeveloped.

That's rich! You've sat on your duff for almost an equivalent period
and are still writing about "getting into amateur radio". Thanks for the
laughs, Leonard.

> >Nope. Nothing about your obtaining an amateur radio license here.
>
> Oh? Is this a requirement to be in the electronics industry?

Was that under discussion? I could have sworn that amateur radio was
the topic in which you decided to submit your PROFESSIONAL credentials.

> Strange, isn't it, not one single personnel person (that's "human
> resources" profession to bus drivers) said anything about needing
> any amateur radio license to work in electronics or aerospace.

You must want alt.jobs.wanted.aerospace.

> Where is "here," snarly dave?

Right there.

> >> Howaboutthat? Does that "show enough interest?"
> >
> >In obtaining an amateur radio license? Why, no, none at all.
>
> No, no, no, sweetums, you equated INTEREST IN RADIO to
> GETTING A HAM LICENSE plus adding "learning morse code."

That is incorrect, Leona. You have your facts scrambled. I'll be happy
to quote the post if you're having trouble remembering.

> >You haven't Beeped Morse nor have you Passed Any Written Exam. You've
> >taken no action on your declared interest.
>
> I have NO interest, declared or otherwise, on "beeping morse," bleeping
> dave. Never claimed otherwise.

I understand that. There is an amateur license available which requires
no morse test. It requires a pretty straightforward written test. You
haven't tackled it.

> Is that a requirement in your SS view of amateur radio?

What kind of view?

> I passed four written exams at an FCC field office in Chicago, 1956.
> I passed all kinds of college exams after that, a California driver's
> license written exam among others (despite a non-interest in
> becoming a professional driver).

Bully for you. You haven't passed an amateur license exam.

> Does one have to Post Bans on "interest in radio?" Must be so at
> the Church of St. Hiram.

> Sorry deacon dave, I don't worship at that church.

I'm sure you don't. I see you as more of an agnostic deist, sort of
covering all bets.

> >I wrote about getting into amateur radio.
>
> Nah, you scribbled nastygrams about "getting an amateur radio license
> IN ORDER TO SHOW INTEREST IN RADIO."

Incorrect again, Leonid. You just can't remember anything anymore.

Dave K8MN

2168. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 12:07:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206070740.29815.00003135@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86944

In article <otmdnaSF4Yt_c7_dRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> Everyone's allowed to change their minds, Mike. Even when they
>> say "never"....
>
>Oh yes! But they have to face the consequenses of changing their mind.
>But there is some pretty severe damage to credibility when the change
>involves basic principles.

Yep. Fact is, I support the "NewNovice" concept, except for it being a
nocodetest license. But I strongly oppose the free upgrades.
>
>> Here's a prediction for you:
>>
>> Hopefully BPL will not completely trash the HF spectrum - if that
>> garbage takes over, all bets are off. Assuming it is defeated or at
>> least contained:
>>
>> There will be proposals and more proposals. FCC will someday do
>> another NPRM,
>> there will be a lot of comments, lots of arguing, and then eventually
>> FCC will do another R&O which will consist mostly of what's easiest for FCC
>>to
>> implement. At the rate they're going, late 2005 before the rules change.
>> (Yes, I have't forgotten The Pool)
>>
>> They'll dump Element 1, simplify the entry level test even more,
>> reshuffle some other regs, etc., regardless of what the majority wants,
>> what
>> arguments are given pro and con, etc. Free upgrades? Maybe.
>>
>> We'll see a surge of new hams and a surge of upgrades - for a while.
>> But not much will actually change, because they're not addressing the real
>> problems like CC&Rs, lack of publicity, lifestyle changes, etc.
>>
>> You watch and see if I'm right.
>
>I wouldn't bet against that! Sounds within a order of mag with my
>prediction.

They're not addressing the real problems.
>
>> Meanwhile some of us will have been having a lot of fun with ham
>> radio. I know I have, and will continue to do so.

>
> Me too. Glad I didn't listen to those that told me that "Morse code is
>going to go away any day now." ~Three extra years on HF and counting.....
>
ARRL prez W5JBP sez (see "Amateur Radio Newsline" interview) he doesn't
expect FCC to finally act until late 2005. I would not be surprised if that
were the case. 5 years on amateur HF/MF for you by then. 38 for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2169. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 12:07:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206070741.29815.00003136@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86946

In article <45OdnU6mU_f7XbzdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> Or maybe the license is the easy part and the station is the tough
>> part.
>
>Yup! I was woefully inept at getting a station running. Thank heavens
>for my Elmers.

Which is why futzing with the license tests isn't going to change much. They're
looking in the wrong place.

>> Part of that is simply exhaustion after FD. Often brought about by folks
>> who don't know how to pace themselves. There's also the few who work
>> themselves into the ground for the benefit of the sidewalk superintendent
>> group...
>
> Hehe, I can't even imagine being on the air right after FD ends. I go
>home, have a bite to eat, and go "nappy-byes" until its time for "The
>Simpsons" to come on.

I kinda think you earned it, Mike.

One thing I have noticed for years is that the chatter on the repeaters on the
way
to FD is much greater than on the way home...

>I suppose that might be working myself into the
>ground, but its for the fun of FD and the camaraderie.

'zactly. Even when I did it single-handed.

There's also the element of history, both personal and as a group. Most people
can't tell you what they were doing the 4th weekend of June for the past 36
years, but some of us can.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2170. New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 12:07:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206070742.29815.00003137@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 86945

In article <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
>Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
>old at the time.

What a great new game! I'll play:

I was born April 24, 1954. I got my Novice ticket October 14, 1967. I got my Extra September 26, 1970. (Dates are when the actual license arrived - passed the tests about six weeks earlier). I reckon that made me 16 years, 5 months, 2 days old when the Extra came in the mail. That 2 year experience requirement held me up at least a year).

Anybody else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

.

2171. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 12:46:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sdednfWI5J8uEb7dRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86947

N2EY wrote:
> In article <45OdnU6mU_f7XbzdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>Or maybe the license is the easy part and the station is the tough
>>>part.
>>
>>Yup! I was woefully inept at getting a station running. Thank heavens
>>for my Elmers.
>
>
> Which is why futzing with the license tests isn't going to change much. They're
> looking in the wrong place.

One of the side effects of the internet as relates to Ham radio is the new ham that has looked at a lot of web pages, studied a lot of books, and has been woefully short of personal dealings with actual hams.(red faced, raising my hand) I think that the ARRL is pretty aware of this, witness their new Elmering program, which will take some steps in getting more one on one or several on one interaction. Unfortunately they also presented a dopey restructuring plan to go along with it.

>>>Part of that is simply exhaustion after FD. Often brought about by folks
>>>who don't know how to pace themselves. There's also the few who work
>>>themselves into the ground for the benefit of the sidewalk superintendent
>>>group...
>>
>> Hehe, I can't even imagine being on the air right after FD ends. I go
>>home, have a bite to eat, and go "nappy-byes" until its time for "The
>>Simpsons" to come on.
>
>
> I kinda think you earned it, Mike.
>
> One thing I have noticed for years is that the chatter on the repeaters on the
> way
> *to* FD is much greater than on the way home...

Ours is pretty silent until the Sunday evening net.

>
>>I suppose that might be working myself into the
>>ground, but its for the fun of FD and the camaraderie.
>

>
> 'zactly. Even when I did it single-handed.

One of these years I will have to try that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2172. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 12:57:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <l8idnWPFdqXQEr7dRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86948

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>
>>I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
>>Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
>>old at the time.
>
>
> What a great new game! I'll play:
>
> I was born April 24, 1954. I got my Novice ticket October 14, 1967. I got my
> Extra September 26, 1970. (Dates are when the actual license arrived - passed
> the tests about six weeks earlier). I reckon that made me 16 years, 5 months,
> 2 days old when the Extra came in the mail. That 2 year experience requirement
> held me up at least a year).
>
> Anybody else?

Born June 9, 1954

Technician license October 21, 1999 - tested Williamsport PA

General license June 25, 2001 - E-2 Butler, E-1 State College PA

Extra License February 26, 2002- Tested Lock Haven PA

So I was 45 when I got my Tech, 47 for my General, and 47 for my Extra.

Just a baby!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2173. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 13:28:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <elSdnX0BLoofC77d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86949

Dave Heil wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>In article <4022584B.BA773B99@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <emineminent scientist
>>k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>>>
>>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>>
>>>>writes:
>>
>>>Maybe it slipped your mind that the definition did not come from
>>>Ten-Tec, old boy.
>>
>> Noooo...I provided the definition based on the whole rest of the
>> electronics industry.
>
>
> You provided? Your statement seems at odds with the other definitions
> in existence.

Like:

http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/firmware

http://dict.die.net/firmware/

http://www.phonescoop.com/glossary/term.php?gid=112

http://playground.sun.com/1275/bindings/devices/html/isa-pic-1_1d.html

hmm, even the IEEE has it wrong too! ;^)

http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/0,,sid9_gci212127,00.html

http://www.atis.org/tg2k/_firmware.html

http://www.cheap-computers-and-cheap-laptops.com/Firmware.html

http://iroi.seu.edu.cn/books/ee_dic/whatis/firmware.htm

The internet, superb source of information that it is, wasn't able to
provide any other definitions of firmware.

>
>>>Again, I provided you with a definition and a link to
>>>the Ten-Tec site containing the term. Take it up with the providers of
>>>the serveral definitions I found online and/or with Ten-Tec. They don't
>>>seem to support your earlier statements on the topic.
>>
>> Snarly dave, stay in retirement on that pension...you couldn't get
>> a job in the real electronics industry under your daffynitions.
>>
>> Go play with your radios and try to understand the instructions for
>> your mighty orion. Are they written in English?
>
>
> I'll take that as your only way of conceding a point.
>
>
>>>I'll correct you once again. I never wrote of downloading hardware. I
>>>wrote of downloading firmware upgrades. Do try and keep things
>>>straight.
>>
>> It's hard to play straight in this radio vaudeville slapstick. :-)
>
>
> I'll bet it is, especially when you have no material. You'll have to
> fall back on your usual, the tap dancing routine.

Be nice, Dave! ;^)

2174. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 13:40:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>
Source record: 86950

On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 05:34:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:

>If you're waiting for radio
>amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely
>going to be disappointed.

I must admit, I've taken a shot or three at Len over exactly the same
issue - no Amateur callsign = no valid opinion on Amateur issues.

However, a little research reveals that this distinction would be
irrelevant in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
request to persons with appropriate Professional license
qualifications.

An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:

==========

Persons holding any of the following Canadian certificates may be
issued an authorization to operate in the amateur radio service with
the same operating privileges as the holder of an Amateur Radio
Operator Certificate with Basic, Morse Code and Advanced
Qualifications: (** NOTE: equivalent to US Amateur Extra license)

- Radiocommunication Operatorï¿½s General Certificate (Maritime)
- Radio Operator's First Class Certificate
- Radio Operator's Second Class Certificate

Persons holding any of the following Canadian certificates may be
issued an authorization to operate in the amateur radio service with
the same operating privileges as the holder of an Amateur Radio
Operator Certificate with Basic Qualification: (** NOTE -
approximately equivalent to US Technician license)

- Radiotelephone Operatorï¿½s General Certificate (Aeronautical)
- Radiotelephone Operatorï¿½s General Certificate (Maritime)
- Radiotelephone Operatorï¿½s General Certificate (Land)
- First-class Radioelectronic Certificate

The full text of IC RIC-3 is available at:

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/$FILE/ric3.pdf

==========

It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is radio operation, and the Pros have made a career of it - and invested considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than would be possible for most hobbyists. After all, it would be pretty silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!

After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy to pass, even without a formal education in electronics. Too easy, I'd say, but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2 syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)

A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?

I'm not sure if Len's First Class license is equal to any of the Canadian ones listed in RIC-3 above - but if they are, the Canadian equivalent to his license would be sufficient to acquire a VEx callsign absolutely free upon request.

Well, for a 49-cent stamp, anyway :)

>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

2175. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 13:45:29 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ng67205t934b071v5apesetrm0065pa8re@4ax.com>
Source record: 86851

On 06 Feb 2004 03:17:13 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>>
>>:-)
>
>I think the call WH0RE fits her better.

An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......

http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_Type1&call_
pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517

>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

73, Leo

2176. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 14:13:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <e487201jmlaeqfisikl0g4g58rv81j0g1b@4ax.com>
Source record: 86852

On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 13:45:29 GMT, Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote:

>On 06 Feb 2004 03:17:13 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>wrote:
>
>>In article <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>>>
>>>:-)
>>
>>I think the call WH0RE fits her better.
>snip

Oh yeah, almost forgot - I was going to suggest N1PLE, but it looks
like some guy in Massachusetts got that one first :)

73, Leo

2177. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 14:54:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206095440.21955.00000323@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 86853

In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>qualifications.

In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
required).
>
>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:

>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>radio operation,

Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV broadcast
transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.

>and the Pros have made a career of it

All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of something
most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession). Those
people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their profession,
don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-) They
must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)

> - and invested
>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
>would be possible for most hobbyists.

Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back when
the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most to be
at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.

But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing of
the
amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.

And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters and put
them
on the air without any certification?

>After all, it would be pretty
>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!

>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.

Agreed! But at least it still exists.

>Too easy,
>I'd say,

The FCC disagrees.

>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)

And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public info,
too.

Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether or not
she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?

>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>US?

No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
because they were essentially the same in both services.

The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in the USA
that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge of
amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license test
alone.
And that's still the case.

>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?

No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests include
the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact. For the USA to make the
same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were changed.
Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the amateur-radio-related
questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an amateur
radio station.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2178. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 15:26:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kpmdnR8--baOL77dRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86854

Leo wrote:
> On 06 Feb 2004 03:17:13 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
>
>>In article <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>:-)
>>
>>I think the call WH0RE fits her better.
>
>
> An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
> the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>
> http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_Type1&cal
l_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517

Here is my take on the whole thing, Leo. Ms Jackson is free to expose herself under appropriate circumstances. If she wants to do a dance routine and have Justin Timberlake tear off part of her outfit. That is also okay - tho she might want to use a less weird presentation.

There are appropriate television venues for that, such as HBO, Cinemax, etc. Late night TV kind of stuff.

But not on the super bowl halftime show. Not on Teletubbies or Barney or Blues Clues or fishing shows. Those just aren't the places for that sort of thing. Even my favorite, the History channel, has some shows that deal with sex and show nudity. They put them on late at night when the kids are in bed, and any viewing is strictly voluntary. No one harmed.

For some reason, some people don't want to watch simulated kinky sex while their kids are watching the same.

Everything in it's time and place, and the superbowl isn't the time or place IMO.

The NFL has been trying to pander to a different audience the last few years. I remember when a sb halftime show was put on by "Up With People", of all things. Now it's simulated intercourse and exposed body parts. yawn.

I hope they realize that the "edgy" stuff was a miserable failure for
the XFL.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2179. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 15:51:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402060751.150d8abd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86855

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040204153705.01632.00000543@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> Well, the gunnery nurse's "attitude" adjustment seems to have lasted
> only a few days.

Oh no, Lennie...My attitude about YOU will enver change. You've
proven to me that you are without redeeming character, unable to tell
the truth, and unwilling to do the things yuo say you'll do...

No change there.

> > This is NOT "commercial" radio...Not the Armed Forces or maritime
> >services.
>
> Neither is it about "nursing" or "piloting," ace gunnery nurse.
>
> However, radio is radio, and the physics of same does NOT change
> because an administration defines certain radio activities as
> "amateur."

IT'S NOT ABOUT THE PHYSICS, SCUMBAG.

It's about the application. Always has been...always will be.

> > Are you having a problem with this concept?
>
> No, but you are definitely still having a problem with "attitude."

Above retierated.

> > Is your ONLY "argument" that since the military allegedly doesn't
> >use Morse Code, then we don't?
>
> The U.S. military does NOT use any morse code for communications.

Wrong. proven over and over. That they don't get YOUR approval
to do so is YOUR tough luck...Sorry.

> The U.S. military only requires morse code cognition by a relative
> handfull of military intelligence specialists engaged in monitoring
> and intercepting enemy and potential-enemy messaging.

As far as YOU know...Others (who have PRACTICAL experience) have
dicreditied your assertions on more than one occassion.

Now...Go dig out Momma Lennie's correspondence texts and look up
"pathological liar", and if you have just ONE lucid, objective moment,

you MIGHT understand why no one here has any respect for you.

I DOUBT it, but you MIGHT.

Steve, K4YZ

2180. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 16:06:58 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <vcb720pnvip3c9quf08jer86bvkn45i6g3@4ax.com>
Source record: 86856

On 06 Feb 2004 14:54:40 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>>qualifications.
>
>In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
>left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
>because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
>required).
>>
>>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
>
>>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>>radio operation,
>
>Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV broadcast
>transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.

Of course not - operating RTTY on the Amateur bands is dead easy -
connect the transmitter to your sound card, install a software
program, make a couple of tests and adjustments, and away you go!
And, if you make a few mistakes along the way, or if it takes a week
to get it running, so what? You're experimenting, and that's what
amateur radio is all about.

Now, make a couple of mistakes and knock WNEP-TV off the air for a
couple of minutes - you might be an unemployed professional!

>
>>and the Pros have made a career of it
>
>All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
>on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of something
>most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).

Politicians? :)

>Those people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their profession,
>don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
>question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-) They
>must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
>do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)

I'll take your word for it, having no personal experience with the profession that you are referring to. If you say they're good, Jim, then they're good! :)

Generally speaking, though, professionals are more knowledgable than lay people because they are involved in their field full time, and are held to standards of conduct and proficiency set by not only the regulators but by their employers. And, rather than just sounding like experts, they are expected to demonstrate their proficiency - that's what they get paid for! 'Stay current or move out' is the rule of the technically-oriented workplace.

>
>> - and invested
>>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
>>would be possible for most hobbyists.
>
>Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back when
>the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most to be
>at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.
>
>But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing of
>the
>amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.

Of course not - they don't teach professional photographers how to take amateur pictures either....

But the rules and regs can be learned pretty easily - the pros are used to keeping abreast (sorry)! of the laws and regulations pertaining to their field....it goes with the territory!

>
>And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters and put
>them
>on the air without any certification?

Nope - this is what the Amateur bands are for (type approval not required, unlike the commercial frequencies).

In fact, there are precious few Amateurs left who could do that, Jim, even though our bands permit it. Passing any one of the current ARS tests does not require that sort of undestanding of electronics anymore. Not like when you first got involved - it has changed a lot since then.

>
>>After all, it would be pretty
>>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!
>
>>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.
>

>Agreed! But at least it still exists.

Sort of, in vestigial format.

>
>>Too easy,
>>I'd say,
>
>The FCC disagrees.

Unfortunately.

IC has been advised of this under the recommendations that the RAC
made to them following WRC-03 - I sincerely hope that they listen!

>
>>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
>>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)
>
>And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public info,
>too.

True, but if one did that, they'd have a tough time staying employed
with it - employers have a nasty habit of asking their staff to
demonstrate their abilities empirically, on a frequent basis!

Rote memorization was what my point was about, though - and I'm sure
that was the case.

>
>Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether or not
>she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?

Well, if she can, she certainly is a prodigy alright. Grade 11 math
in Grade 2 - that is impressive! I'd say highly unlikely. Ever talk
to a 7-year old kid, Jim? They just don't operate at that level.
Good memories, though - like a sponge!

She is an Extra, though - I'll just bet she could build her own
transmitter from scratch (forgetting for a moment that 7-year olds
generally have enough trouble making neat letters with a pencil, let
alone operating a soldering iron....) - unlike the chief engineer at
your local NBC affiliate, who is merely a professional in his field
:)

You know, everyone seems to be holding this event up as a great
accomplishment for Amateur Radio. And I applaud the little girl's
dedication to memorizing the material and passing all of the required
tests. That took a lot of effort on her part.

But it is a clear indication that the testing procedure is far too
easy - IMHO. It can be memorized, which removes any requirement to

comprehend the material. Do you believe that a 7-year old can
comprehend the theories of complex numbers as they relate to impedance
in a resonant circuit? Bull.

>
>>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>>US?
>
>No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
>because they were essentially the same in both services.
>
>The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in the USA
>that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge of
>amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
>qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license test
>alone.
>And that's still the case.
>
>>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>
>No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests include
>the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
> its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact.

IC disagrees. But I'll ask them to take your opinion under advisement
:)

Personally I'd think, for example, that the guy who sits in a control
tower accurately vectoring planes all over our busy airspace is far
better equipped to carry on a two-way conversation on 2-meters than
the average amateur who passed a relatively simple test! He could
learn all of the operating procedures that he needs by reading a
couple of sections of the RAC study guide....a couple of nights would
be all it would take. And, in a real emergency, that's the guy that I
would want to see on the radio, coordinating things! Not the guy with
the mag mount 2-meter antenna on his callsigned baseball cap at the
local hamfest.....(I swear he goes to every hamfest in the world -
you've seen him at yours, haven't you? :))

>For the USA to make the
>same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were changed.
>Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
>for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the amateur-radio-related
>questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an amateur
>radio station.

...unless they can find a 7-year old to elmer them, that is. That is some prettty tough material to master! LOL!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2181. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 16:13:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402060813.5b1f620a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86857

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040204192921.07984.00000446@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >> writes:
>
> >> To US who were in the big-time radio communications on HF of a half
> >> century ago, that did not involve morse code. There were and still are
> >> a lot of "US" involved in that.
> >>
> >For some of US who've had more recent experience than yours, morse was
> >involved. For many of us who are actually radio amateurs and who are
> >participants in big-time radio HF communications today, morse code is
> >still involved. What are you doing in big-time HF these days?
>
> In big-time HF, not a heckuva lot. There's very little left of the BIG
> TIME HF communications efforts of a half century ago.

More evidence that you aren't in touch with reality, Lennie.

> Armature radio deeecksing is "big time?" Nope. Not a drop in a
> bit bucket compared to the communications carriers of not too long
> ago. You'd LOVE to think it was "big time" but that is only how it
> is written up in QST.

Lennie, from someone who is constantly trying to discredit
Amateurs as not being in touch with the "radio world outside of CT", I
am absolutely appalled that YOU demonstrate such
ignorance....Well...No I'm not...you've pretty well proven your
ignorance over and over.

> The only radio service still requiring morse code for communications
> is amatoor radio. All the other radio services either gave up on it or
> never considered it in the first place.

Because the APPLICATIONS are different. This is NOT "PLMRS",
Public Service, the Armed Forces, or Citizens Band.

If you continue to fight THIS tide, you'll only die tired, Putzy
One.

> >> I was IN worldwide communications on HF over a half century ago.
> >> At the time I liked it fine...even felt honored to be able to serve my
> >> country doing just that.
> >>
> >> None of that involved morse code.
> >
> >...and because you didn't use morse, no one used it at the time or since.
> >A number of us have used morse professionally and as radio amateurs in
> >the decades after you had your "big-time".
>
> Nope, snarly dave, the Army gave up on morse code for fixed-point
> to fixed-point long-distance communications back in 1948, before my
> service time. The Navy's long-haul fixed comms were the same way.
> Same for the USAF although all the branches maintained some
> morse code proficiency requirements and circuits until the early 70s
> (rather small efforts). I'm sure Department of State was able to put
> some of that obsolete military equipment to good use after it had a
> life in active military duty.

We have first-hand testimony from participants in this forum who
are/were in a position to know BETTER than you that this was/is false.

Why do you persist in perpetuating a falsehood?

> >> Tens of thousands of skilled radio operators worldwide have used
> >> worldwide communications effectively for decades without ever
> >> once having to use or know morse code. They have done so for
> >> over a half century.
> >
> >Tens of thousands of skilled radio ops worldwide *have* used morse
> >effectively for worldwide communications after your day in the sun.
> >Tens of thousands still do so.
>
> Sorry, snarly dave, that's just your Article of Faith. You WANT to
> think that is true but it's far in the past and never the numbers you
> can prove. The PROOF is seeing what radio circuits use what on
> HF...even when HF was a mainstay of communications carriers.

Nope...no "Article of Faith", Lennie.

Truth. DOCUMENTED truth.

> Don't let me stop your rationale invention. Improve the state of the
> rationale art, innovate, improvise, adapt...

And don't let us stop your rant even though it's already been
disproven over and over.

> >> The U.S. military did not require any morsemanship to use the very
> >> first handheld transceivers (on HF) for communications in 1940. That's
> >> 64 years ago. Neither did they require any morsemanship to use the
> >> first backpack radio (on VHF) in 1943. That's 61 years ago.
> >
> >Yet the military continued to use morse. What's your point?

>
> EVOLUTION, you throwback to failed Darwinism.
>
> Do you need a DayGlo billboard to outline it? WAKE UP.
>
> The state of the art of radio communications long since bypassed
> morsemanship skills.

Obviously not, according to a poll recently conducted by "CQ"
magazine...AND judging by the amount of CW traffic one can hear at any
given moment on teh HF bands, Lennie.

Again, you persist in trying to make an assertion that's EASILY
disproven with simply procured evidence...ie: turning on any receiver
capable of covering the HF band.

> It doesn't take rocket science intellect to use, operate ANY radio.

Obviously it does since you seem to be unable (or is it
UNWILLING?) to turn one on and see for yourself that the facts don't
jive with YOUR "jive".

> Morsemanship needs only repetitive Pavlovian training to become
> a wetware modem...provided the basic aptitude is present.
>
> NO modern communications carrier uses any morse code. Such
> skills went byebye some time ago.

"modern communicaitons carrier"...?!?! Not a COMMERCIAL one, but
since this is NOT a forum about any other radio service than the
AMATEUR Radio Service, it's NOT GERMANE.

> Teletype Corporation didn't make a half million teleprinters during
> their corporate existance to copy morse code.

And your mommy obviously didn't make you capable of being polite,
responsible or truthful, yet the potential exists.

> >The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in
> >radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications
> >without touching a PLMRS transceiver.
>
> Wow! Really?!?
>
> No hams work in a business that has a Public Land Mobile Radio
> Services radio? No hams work on railroads or in heavy trucking or
> vehicle road service trucks? No hams in construction of large
> buildings or engaged in HVAC or plumbing maintenance of same?
> No hams are policemen or firemen or paramedics? No hams are in
> the broadcast industry using remote links controlled through PLMRS
> comms?

I am sure that had a purpose, but whatever it was, it didn't make
it to the surface.

> They are all on HF engaging in "radiosport" and net checking to
> advance the state of the art of radio and morsemanship?
>
> Now all that "radiosport" and "net checking" is fun and recreational
> and enjoyed by many but it is hardly any sort of technical
> advancement or honing skills useful in case of national need.

Wrong again. Proven over and over, EVEN in the 21st Century.

> Your mileage on the newsgroup rageometer will, of course, vary.

No rage needed here. The comments of hundreds of disaster relief
workers, EMA managers, governmental agencies, etc to the contrary
suffice.

> Foaming at the mouth is normal, sarly dave, but don't forget to
> brush after every meal.

Trying to dodge responsibility for your own errors, either overt
or of ommission, will not change the fact that YOU are wrong,
Lennie...

No matter HOW many times you repeat your untruthful bile in this
forum, hundreds of OTHER media sources prove you wrong, and that just
tickles me to death.

> >I see. "Broadband" means "broad bandwidth". You could have knocked me
> >over with a feather when I read your words. So to your way of thinking
> >on "broadness", a morse communication at 5 wpm on 10 KHz could be
> >considered "broadband"?
>
> No. I'd say that 5 words per minute on 10 KHz could possibly be
> interfering with USN submarine alert frequencies. Those are on VLF.
> It's not nice to interfere with boomers or sharks, big daddy dave.
> Such wouldn't mean a "Riley" knocking on your door, but some very
> serious "attitude" folks carrying heavy artillery.
>
> Now show us some REAL innovations and inventions done by hams
> over the last 50 years or so concerning RADIO. Other than Dan
> Tayloe that I've already mentioned several times.
>
> Or just continue to make nasty in here on the UnBelievers who
> don't worship at the shrine of St. Hiram.

At least he has a shrine. You just have a shriek.

Steve, K4YZ

2182. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 16:18:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <g0f72016okl4lrvqq1g5freot7d5da47rk@4ax.com>
Source record: 86858

On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 10:26:10 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> On 06 Feb 2004 03:17:13 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>:-)
>>>
>>>I think the call WH0RE fits her better.
>>
>>
>> An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
>> the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>>
>> http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_Type1&ca
ll_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
>
> Here is my take on the whole thing, Leo. Ms Jackson is free to expose
>herself under appropriate circumstances. If she wants to do a dance
>routine and have Justin Timberlake tear off part of her outfit. That is
>also okay - tho she might want to use a less weird presentation.
>
> There are appropriate television venues for that, such as HBO, Cinemax,
>etc. Late night TV kind of stuff.
>
> But not on the super bowl halftime show. Not on Teletubbies or Barney
>or Blues Clues or fishing shows. Those just aren't the places for that
>sort of thing. Even my favorite, the History channel, has some shows
>that deal with sex and show nudity. They put them on late at night when
>the kids are in bed, and any viewing is strictly voluntary. No one harmed.
>
> For some reason, some people don't want to watch simulated kinky sex
>while their kids are watching the same.
>
> Everything in it's time and place, and the superbowl isn't the time or
>place IMO.
>
> The NFL has been trying to pander to a different audience the last few

>years. I remember when a sb halftime show was put on by "Up With
>People", of all things. Now it's simulated intercourse and exposed body
>parts. yawn.
>
> I hope they realize that the "edgy" stuff was a miserable failure for
>the XFL.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Actually, Mike, I don't disagree with you at all - what she did was quite inappropriate for the venue. But it ain't really that big a deal....

Read the article that I referenced, if you have time - it presents an interesting perspective on what tends to constitute "obscenity". Sex bad, violence good - you know. And, as always, Jack Nicholson's comment is priceless :)

Example - I watched a bit of "Full Metal Jacket" on TBS a while back. While all of the profanity and sexual references had been 'sanitized', most of the gore and violence remained (it was funny, though, to see Sgt. Hartman saying "Darn" and "Heck" and such, even though his lips clearly had other intentions...).

Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but violence is OK? Is that really what we want to teach our children?

Not me!

73, Leo

2183. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 16:21:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402060821.70130bca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86859

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >It's been something like twelve years since the first of the piles of
> >nocodes hit the bands >30Mhz. Mayber it's happened and I missed it but
> >I have yet to see or hear of a single example of a nocode
> >experimenting with a new wide mode. For that matter none of the Extra
> >"wideband digigeeks"who have bleated the same refrain have done
> >anything but talk either.
>
> Is PSK31 chopped liver?
>
> Maybe you don't recognize Peter Martinez, G3PLX?

Maybe, Lennie...JUST maybe, if you KNEW something about Amateur
Radio licensing, you'd realize that Mr. Martinez has a full-privilege
license from Great Britain, and that as such he is a Morse Code tested
licensee.

Now I know that you were just as tickled as can be with yourself
over this attempt to "prove" something, but it is just one more
glaring example of your arrogant ignorance.

> He was experimenting with polyphase shifting networks for SSB
> back in 1973.

And he was a Morse Code tested Amateur then, Lennie.
>
> >Worn out transparent old smokescreen, all of it.
>
> Smoking isn't good for you. You ought to quit.

YOU ought to quit trying to pawn yourself of as someone who knows
something about Amateur Radio.

You don't.

> No steam left in your catapult? We are all desolate...

The desolation is you being apart from the real world, Lennie.

If you'd stop lying, fighting and antagonizing, YOU could be a
part of it...

But alas, you're lost...

Steve, K4YZ

2184. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 17:39:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4MCdnYJglJjVTL7dRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86860

Leo wrote:

> On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 10:26:10 -0500, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>
>>>On 06 Feb 2004 03:17:13 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <4021A0D1.7090000@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>:-)
>>>>
>>>>I think the call WH0RE fits her better.
>>>
>>>
>>>An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
>>>the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>>>
>>>http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_Type1&ca
ll_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
>>
>> Here is my take on the whole thing, Leo. Ms Jackson is free to expose
>>herself under appropriate circumstances. If she wants to do a dance
>>routine and have Justin Timberlake tear off part of her outfit. That is
>>also okay - tho she might want to use a less weird presentation.
>>
>> There are appropriate television venues for that, such as HBO, Cinemax,
>>etc. Late night TV kind of stuff.
>>
>> But not on the super bowl halftime show. Not on Teletubbies or Barney
>>or Blues Clues or fishing shows. Those just aren't the places for that
>>sort of thing. Even my favorite, the History channel, has some shows
>>that deal with sex and show nudity. They put them on late at night when
>>the kids are in bed, and any viewing is strictly voluntary. No one harmed.
>>
>> For some reason, some people don't want to watch simulated kinky sex

>>while their kids are watching the same.
>>
>> Everything in it's time and place, and the superbowl isn't the time or
>>place IMO.
>>
>> The NFL has been trying to pander to a different audience the last few
>>years. I remember when a sb halftime show was put on by "Up With
>>People", of all things. Now it's simulated intercourse and exposed body
>>parts. yawn.
>>
>> I hope they realize that the "edgy" stuff was a miserable failure for
>>the XFL.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Actually, Mike, I don't disagree with you at all - what she did was
> quite inappropriate for the venue. But it ain't really that big a
> deal....
>
> Read the article that I referenced, if you have time - it presents an
> interesting perspective on what tends to constitute "obscenity". Sex
> bad, violence good - you know. And, as always, Jack Nicholson's
> comment is priceless :)
Ahh, smilin' Jack. Gotta admit, he's honest. Probably says what most of
us want to say and don't have the cojones for. See his comments re
Brittany Spears in GQ!

> Example - I watched a bit of "Full Metal Jacket" on TBS a while back.
> While all of the profanity and sexual references had been 'sanitized',
> most of the gore and violence remained (it was funny, though, to see
> Sgt. Hartman saying "Darn" and "Heck" and such, even though his lips
> clearly had other intentions...).

Darn good movie that! I don't watch a lot of movies with violence in
them, but that one was worth it. I couldn't imagine it without the
profanity, though.

> Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
> violence is OK? Is that really what we want to teach our children?

Dunno! I don't allow kids to watch the nasty violent stuff either. I'm
talking about stuff like FMJ.As good as the movie was, it was plenty
disturbing. Three Stooges are fine, as well as the other tame stuff.
Normal kids are fully capable of figuring out that when Moe hits curly
on the head with a pipe wrench, and it makes a sound like a hammer
hitting a frying pan, or when Bugs bunny blows up daffy duck, and
Daffy's bill is then upside down and on the back of his head, that's all
just fun.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2185. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 19:10:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402061110.4850ee4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86861

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40215E2A.C8F57755@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>...

> > Her folks shepherded her into ham radio beacause ham radio is a great
> > way for kids to learn geography??
>
> Not necessarily, Brian, but studying for an amateur ticket gets kids
> fired up about learning. I can certainly see Jim's point about kids
> becoming interested in geography, the sciences and math.

I dunno, I guess but experiences, perceptions and observations vary all over the lot when it comes to educating kids. Never mind opinions on the subject. I'll cite my own case. As were all four of my parent's kids I was a pretty early and prolific reader. Implanting the joy of reading was the big gift our parents bestowed on us and they both worked at it. Hard. Once that bug was firmly installed we were pretty much left alone to find our own paths without much if any "hands-on participation" in our interests on their parts.

To wit: Geography was one of my hot buttons going way back long before I had the first clue about ham radio. Usta love to cruise the maps which came with National Geo. Any maps. Still do. When I finally bumped into ham radio and disovered that hams could actually communicate with people in those far off places I'd read about my course was set: I absolutely was gonna become a ham so I could go dxing. I did and I still do. It was my interest in geography which led me to ham radio. I don't give ham radio any credit at all for my interest in science. If I hadn't already had an interest in science I wouldn't have developed an interest in ham radio to start with. I was into building electric motors before I got interested in ham radio for instance. And in geology, bugs and weather science. I didn't have any interest at all in math as such until I was halfway thru engineering school with a General and it finally dawned on me that I was actually sort of enjoying the stuff.

> It didn't work
> toward interesting me in geometry though. I was caught reading QST
> hidden within my open geometry book.

Geometry was no sweat here but I got tossed outta 10th grade English class twice for laying out equipment panels at the back of the class. Then the flaming fairy teach caught Sally Leinhauser and I playing footsie. Such "activities" apparently really annoy fairies. No

problem, life coulda been a *helluva* lot worse than sitting out in the hallway with Sally.

During the same year I built an AM BC rcvr which used five of the tiny AG-1 flashbulb envelope subminiature tubes and stuffed the whole thing into a small Band-Aid can which I carried in my shirt pocket. Walkman Numero Uno. I went into biology class one day and strung the wire antenna to an overhead lamp fixture, put on the earplug "speaker" and started tuning around. The teacher, good 'ole Floyd Neff finally noticed the antenna and stormed to the back of the room, "What are you doing, what is that thing?" I cupped my ear, "Uh, it's my hearing aid, could you speak up a bit please?" Tossed outta class again.

You brought back a lot of hilarious memories of "electronerd educations" gone awry David. Gawd we had fun . . !

> For the first few weeks of my interest, my dad actively discouraged me
> with talk of amateur radio being a passing fad for me.
> He had visions
> of mounds of equipment gathering dust in a closet.

He was right, I've seen it happen . . !

> My mother encouraged
> me and was able to convince my father that some of the meager family
> income should be spent on a transmitter for me if I earned the money for
> the receiver from my paper route.

You got lucky, I got NOTTING in the way of economic support for diddling with radios despite the volume of coin my parents had. Their policy was that if some pursuit or another was important enough to their kids we could bloody well work out how to pay for it on our own or drop it. With the notable exception of cheerfully paying the expenses related to Boy Scouting. I *really* needed radio gear so I had a couple paper routes, peddled magazine subsciptions, painted house numbers on curbs in December, etc. Got the equipment and some early lessons on how much work hot buttons can actually cost.

> My dad had and has no technical abilities whatever. My mother was
> deathly afraid of electricity and wouldn't even clean my ham shack. She
> just knew that lightning was going to enter the house via my antennas.
> Both parents saw value in amateur radio as a wholesome activity, one
> which would nurture an interest in science and possibly lead to a career
> in electronics.

Once more we all obviously came from very different directions to a sort of convergence here. My Dad excused himself from an orphanage at age 14 and became an apprentice tool and die maker. Eventually he moved on into the U of P med school research labs as a creative guru in the electrical instrumentation, glass-blowing and mechanical shops. Mom became a secretary-turned-lab-assistant in the same research facility where they met in 1933 or so and here I is. Mom had a much older civil engineering student brother who "fiddled with radios all

night" and who might have been an early ham. He passed away before he graduated so I'll never know if he was a ham or not. Bottom line here being that when I got into ham radio and hung wires all over the yard none of it particularly attracted much parental attention. At dinner one night I puffily announced that I'd worked Africa for the first time the night before, a ZS6 on 80 CW. "That's nice dear. Did you clean your bedroom yet?" Career guidance via ham radio? Ha! As if.

Just after WW2 they put together the family tool and die works in which all four of their offspring were raised. So of course we all became gearheads, even the girl knows wrenches. Two mechanical engineers, another tool and die maker (turned statistician and programmer), the girl got into computer programming about the time the first punch card decks showed up. What I have gotten out of ham radio as it relates to my career is a *much* better grip on EE sorts of things than the average ME has. Has proven to be a very big asset on many occasions.

I raised my three daughters pretty much the way I was raised and none of 'em are slouches in their various professional technical fields.

>
> > I know Janie. Her father was Jesse Bieberman W3KT who is still a
> > legend. Honer Roll top-ender for decades, phone and cw dx contester,
> > 25wpm with a straight key for 48 straight. Vice Director of the
> > Atlantic Division for decades and one of the most powerful voices in
> > Newington in those days. Ran the W3 buro single-handed also for
> > decades.
>
> ...and ran the W3KT outgoing QSL forwarding service for a number of
> years.

I forgot all about that, tnx.

Speaking of QSL card handling Joe Arcure W3HNK is in this neighborhood, I gotta look him up.

>
> Dave K8MN

Brian w3rv

2186. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 19:52:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402061152.1d2b0928@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86862

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402051522.1d36e348@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402040346.47ba943f@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > > > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > > > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> > > > >
> > > > > Why?
> > > >
> > > > Why, Jim?
> > >
> > > Why, Jim?
>
> Jim, don't you know why you say the things you say?

C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?

2187. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 20:03:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <q7s720tddban89gt6ksb6ke0goqvp5t6fp@4ax.com>
Source record: 86863

On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 12:39:19 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

> Dunno! I don't allow kids to watch the nasty violent stuff either. I'm
>talking about stuff like FMJ.As good as the movie was, it was plenty
>disturbing. Three Stooges are fine, as well as the other tame stuff.
>Normal kids are fully capable of figuring out that when Moe hits curly
>on the head with a pipe wrench, and it makes a sound like a hammer
>hitting a frying pan, or when Bugs bunny blows up daffy duck, and
>Daffy's bill is then upside down and on the back of his head, that's all
>just fun.

Sounds safe enough!

!!WARNING - OFF TOPIC MATERIAL FOLLOWS!!

Hmmm - Mike, if you have a high speed internet connection. check out
the following newsgroups:

alt.binaries.multimedia.3-stooges
alt.binaries.multimedia.cartoons.looneytunes

You can download complete episodes there, which should amuse the
little ones (and you too!) for quite a while. New ones are uploaded to
these groups every day.

And, unlike this group, there are only a total of 6 stooges to be
found! :)

/offtopic

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2188. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 21:08:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4024025F.7050008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86864
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tom Desmond wrote:

>Robert Casey wrote:
>
>
>
>>Make it interesting and get a digital TV set up. Amateur HDTV.
>>
>>
>
>That would be cool...unfortunately, it would also be a price buster, as
>I'm not aware of anything remotely inexpensive that would let you
>transmit ATSC digital television in SD -- let alone in high definition.
>
>Still, the nice thing is that it would take very little power since low
>powered digital signals can travel pretty well.
>
>
In the trade mag _TV Technology_ page 29 Dr Kraus has a few DTV
transmitters for ham
radio operators. Email is krausue at uni-wuppertal dot de hoping to
avoid spambots
Use them in the 70cm and 23 cm bands. Don't know what price, though.

2189. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 21:13:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86865

>
>
>
>Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>violence is OK?
>
Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids, but
would
sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....

> Is that really what we want to teach our children?
>
I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
school.

>
>
>

2190. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 21:22:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4024058E.6070704@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86866

Born Aug 1 53. Got my old style Tech (took tests at the old FCC field
office
in NYC) October 76. Upgraded to Extra on Restructuring Day (April 15, 2000)
and got the paperwork the next week. So that works out as 0, 23, and 46
years. Aug 1, 1953 was my zeroth birthday.

> -
>
>
>

2191. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 21:24:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <402405EE.4010601@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 86867

>
>
>
>
Len, just get the dammed license. It's more fun to operate then to
whine.....

2192. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 21:35:26 UTC
From: Harold Burton <hwburton@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <102822lgmdsgg0f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 86868

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >
> >Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
> >violence is OK?
> >
> Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids, but
> would
> sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....
>
> > Is that really what we want to teach our children?
> >
> I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
> school.

When you get right down to it, except for a few shameful and widely
publicized exceptions, todays kids suffer from too little rather than too
much
physical punishment. Worst form of abuse for todays kids is to let'em grow
up with no self control or discipline. That was true in earlier generations,
too.
Look at Bill Clinton and, for that matter, the younger days of our current
President. Sometimes they grow out of it and sometimes they don't.

HWB

2193. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1382 – February 6, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 21:44:39 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206164439.28383.00001564@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 86869

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1382 – February 6, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1382 with a release date of Friday, February 6, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A major problem for Amsat Oscar 40, a surprise BPL rollout in Pennsylvania, UPS says that illegal 10 meter radios will be ordered out of company trucks and another view of the ARRL's restructuring proposal. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1382 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AO-40 SUFFERS CATASTROPHIC POWER FAILURE

The main battery pack on board the AMSAT Oscar 40 satellite has failed and controllers are unsure if the bird can be brought back to life on the reserve power system. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, tells us what happened on-orbit:

--

According to AMSAT Executive Vice President Rick Hambly, W2GPS, AO-40 began its tumble to obscurity on Sunday, January 25th. That's when the satellites battery voltage momentarily dropped to 24 point 5 volts. This triggered a fail-safe that shut down the satellites passbands. Then, at the beginning of the eclipse on orbit 1486 the battery voltage rapidly dropped just below the cutoff voltage of 24.0 volts and this shut down the transmitters to protect the battery and other on board equipment.

AMSAT controllers kept a close eye on the bird and on Tuesday the 27th the battery voltage suddenly dropped from to 14V. Mission commanders currently believe that more battery cells short circuited. Control stations immediately began transmitting blind commands to the spacecraft in an attempt to switch over to the auxiliary battery. Eventually, the auxiliary battery pack came on line, but in parallel with the main pack. This means that the shorted main Ni-Cad battery is loading down the back-up Nickel Metal Hydride cells are clamping the voltage low and keeping the auxiliary battery from fully powering the spacecraft.

AMSAT is hopeful that one of the cells in the main battery will eventually fail open circuit. This would effectively remove the damaged battery from service and permit the back up battery to assume the full load of AO-40. In the meantime its a waiting game with fingers crossed that no other catastrophic failures to other parts of the satellite take place.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, in Scottsdale Arizona.

--

A set of spare A0-40 back-up batteries were found at the AMSAT lab in Orlando Florida. Using them Stan Wood, WA4NFY and Lou Mc Fadin, W5DID performed a series of tests that showed the auxiliary battery pack on board the satellite should work well if they are otherwise undamaged. Unfortunately, than will only happen if the main battery pack can be pulled off line.

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: MIKE FOALE TALKS HOME

Still with ham radio in space, Wednesday, January 28th was a very special day on board the International Space Station for Astronaut Mike Foale. That’s because the space traveler got the chance to speak to students at the school he used to attend and he did so using Amateur Radio. Take a listen:

--
Contact Audio no print transcript
--

The contact between Foale on board the I-S-S and the kids at The King’s School, Canterbury, England began at 17:42 UTC when the I-S-S answered the call of G-B-4-F-U-N. That station was operated by G-Zero-A-K-I and the audience kept its breath as Foale answered 12 questions.

--
Contact Audio - No print transcript
--

Media coverage of this contact was impressive. Meridian TV, BBC TV, BBC Radio Kent, Invicta Radio and the Kent Gazette interviewed the students and put reports in the main newscasts. The BBC World Service and the Press Association asked for information and contact transcripts. (ARISS, ON4WF)

**
THE BPL FIGHT: PA HAMS ORGANIZE TO FIGHT ALLENTOWN ROLLOUT

Hams in Northampton County in eastern Pennsylvania, just outside of Allentown, are organizing a campaign to protest announced plans by PP&L to offer Broadband Internet Service over power lines in a development in Hanover Township. The Allentown-based utility has been doing field tests of the technology in nearby Emmaus, Pa.

The ARRL's Eastern Pennsylvania Section Manager Eric Olena, WB3FPL says PP&L sent out 2,000 letters to residents in a section of Hanover Township and already has received replies from 200 people interested in subscribing to the service.

Olena says an ARRL District Emergency Coordinator and other hams met with township officials to warn them about the massive inteference Broadband over Power Lines brings to the radio spectrum, including fire and emergency

frequencies. But, he says, the officials apparently were swayed by the utility's assurances no such interference exists.

An interview with Olena and others involved in the battle, coming in next week's Newsline. (ARNewsline(tm), NT3V)

**

ENFORCEMENT: EVEN MORE COOPERATION COMBATTING 10 METER PIRATES FROM UPS

A follow-up to our recent story concerning the use of unlicensed 10 meter radio gear on-board United Parcel Service Trucks. As reported, back on January 7th the FCC notified the U-P-S offices in Elkhart Indinana and Middleburg Heights Ohio of its findings. The company offered its full cooperation to end the problem.

Now comes word from the FCC that they have been contacted by UPS national corporate headquarters has contacted the regulatory agency and the company did not mince any words. It told the FCC that the agency has its full cooperation in removing any unlicensed radio gear and any non-certified two-way gear from their delivery fleet, nation wide.

According to UPS, the only personally owned radio gear permitted in their trucks under a collective bargaining agreement with their union drivers are commercially built unmodified C-B sets, and that only on a regional as-needed basis. No other radios are allowed. (FCC, UPS, others)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THE FCC ACTIVE IN A NUMBER OF CASES

Meantime, the FCC has been active in a number of other enforcement issues involving ham radio operators. The agency’s Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, has more:

--
Duckworth: “An Extra class license was downgraded to Technician class due to a failure to appear for a retest in Solidad California. Also, cancellation of an Extra class license in Medera California for the same reason.

A notice for retesting was sent to a General class licensee in Hialeah Florida. The deadline for that one is March 1st.

A letter requesting additional information pursuant to Section 308(b) of the Communications Act -- in order to make a decision on a General class renewal went out to Newton Square PA..

A letter settling enforcement action with a General class licensee in Bart VT. has resulted in voice operation prohibited for three years on 20 meters.

Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, reporting.
--

Even though its still not naming names of alleged violators the FCC is making sure that those thinking about breaking its rules know its still around. (FCC, RAIN)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WA3PBD repeater serving Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: ANOTHER LOOK AT THE ARRL PROPOSAL

Even though there are more than a dozen restructuring proposals before the FCC, its the American Radio Relay Leagues recent filing that really has the world of Amateur Radio talking. The obvious question is why, and thats what we asked correspondant Mark Abramovich, NT3V, to find out:

--

As more amateurs find out what the ARRL has to say, they're starting to pay attention.

When the ARRL speaks, the FCC generally listens. In the past, the FCC has used the organization's proposals as a foundation for decisions.

To understand where the ARRL is coming from, you might want to get some perspective from the past. Who better to offer it than Harry Dannals W2HD - elected ARRL president in 1972 and re-elected to five consecutive terms. Now retired and living in Charlottesville, Va., Dannals is on top of the debate.

"It's a long cry from the days of incentive licensing when we did have people who resigned their membership, withdrew their membership, or did not renew their membership, just to show their disappointment and utter dissatisfaction with the incentive licensing proposal as it was named," Dannals recalls. "Because that was indeed (what it was), in the minds of the ARRL board headed at that time by President Herb Hoover.

He believed that in order for us to show that we were improving ourselves and becoming better at what we do that we should upgrade our license structure."

Dannals says the claim the ARRL proposal for a "no code" HF license "dumbs down" the hobby is off the mark.

"I think the new proposal, despite the criticism by those who say: 'I had to do it and therfore, you have to do it,' I think the new proposal will bring more people into amateur radio than the 'no code' proposal ever did," Dannals says.

Dannals says the Novice concept will go a long way in revitalizing interest.

"The introductory grade of license will give them some of the things that will make amateur radio mean more, the long-distance communication, the long friendships that develop over the many thousands of miles," Dannals says. "And I do believe we need this."

Dannals laughs at the fears that we'll need hundreds of FCC types to police the new hams.

"I think if the amateurs themselves who have experience, the older timers - and they don't have to be white-haired and grizzly old-timers - they can be relatively newcomers, maybe 5-10 years," Dannals says. "They can take care of tutoring the newcomers more than adequately."

Dannals says local radio clubs are the key to success for any license restructuring.

"Put out a handshake and say: 'Come on board. We'll help you, we'll teach the courses that you can use to get your license and we'll help you once you've got your license.' The old Elmering still is working."

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

Keep an ear open for more on this from both Harry Dannals and Mark Abramovich as all of the restructuring petitions wind their way through the FCC rules making process over the next several months. ARNewsline(tm))

**

ON RAIN: JIM HASYNIE W5JBP

Meantime an in-depth conversation about this issue with ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, is available from RAIN -- the Radio Amateur Information Network. Its in cyberspace at www.rainreport.com or on the phone at area code 847-827-7246. (RAIN)

**

REGULATORY: CROSS BORDER RADIO DISPUTE BETWEEN US AND MEXICO BROADCASTERS

A cross border radio war may be brewing between the United States and Mexico. This as complaints of massive interference to United States broadcast operations from a new station on 560 kHz in Tecate Tijuana Mexico lead to a high level telephone call between the FCC and the Mexico’s SCT on Thursday, January 29th. A call that many hoped will defuse the situation before it escalates any further.

According to the CGC Communicator, the SCT which is Mexico's telecommunications regulator is said to have promised swift action in eliminating the interference that XEKTT is currently causing to U.S. stations. But the story does not end here. Concern for Mexico's planned operations as XESS on 780 kHz and XEDD 920 kHz, also in the vicinity of Tijuana continues to mount. A printed copy the authorization for 780 kHz has surfaced. It confirms that operation with 20 kilowatts dayside and 10 kilowatts night with non-directional facilities both times and a quarter-wave tall broadcast tower is in fact sanctioned by the SCT.

The CGC Communicator says that this confirms the power figures it published a few weeks ago and establishes what it terms as more blow torch situations. Meanwhile, additional broadcasters are joining the list of companies concerned

with the current 560 kHz interference. (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THE FCC VS. THE SUPERBOWL HALFTIME SHOW

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has ordered an investigation of the telecast of last weeks Superbowl half-time show in which rock performer Justin Timberlake ripped part Janet Jackson costume on-camera. The stunt brought a massive number of complaints to the regulatory agency from viewers of the game.

In a press release obtained by the Amateur Radio Newsline, Powell states: “I am outraged at what I saw during the halftime show of the Super Bowl. Like millions of Americans, my family and I gathered around the television for a celebration. Instead, that celebration was tainted by a classless, crass and deplorable stunt. Our nation’s children, parents and citizens deserve better.”

CBS which aired the game denied that the incident was preplanned. None-the-less, Powell instructed the Commission to open an investigation into the broadcast. He also stated that the inquiry will be thorough and swift.

At least in theory, each station that permitted the video to be aired could be fined or have its license designated for as hearing if the investigation finds that the material was either indecent or obscene. (FCC release)

**

RESCUE RADIO: AGENCY WARNS OF BIG FIRE SEASON IN THE SOUTHWEST

Hams involved in emergency communications in the Western United States should get ready for a rather busy fire season. At least that’s what a recently released preliminary outlook for 2004 seems to imply. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has the retails:

--

According to Jay Miller, W-A-5-W-H-N and Raleigh Stout A-C-5-J-W, the Southwest Area Coordination Center in Albuquerque, issued the report. The center is a multiagency hub for the region's wildfire operations and it says that persistent drought and millions of dead or dying trees have set the stage for a fire season as bad or worse than 2002. That’s when millions of acres burned across the region.

In southeastern Arizona and southern New Mexico, field surveys reveal that the snow pack holds less than 20% of the average moisture of a normal mid-winter. Coupled with the 2003 monsoon season being one of the driest in a century, the center says that tinderbox conditions are manifest.

And its going to get worse. With little relief in sight, the fire season, which usually begins in April, could start a month or more earlier. Public land managers are being urged to complete training and preparations sooner than usual and to put more firefighters on duty. It also means that hams involved in support of firefighting efforts will need to hone their skills a lot earlier

this year in order to be prepared.

For the Amateur Radio Nerwsline, I’m Bill Passternak, WA6ITF

--

Its beginning to look as if firefighters and the ham radio operators who support them may have a tough fire season ahead. (ARNewslin(tm), WA5WHN)

**

RESCUE RADIO: TEXAS CELLPHONE HERO

A 40-year-old flight attendant in El Paso, Texas is being hailed as a hero. This, for her fast and efficient handling of 15 to 20 9-1-1 calls which were sent to her home phone due to a routing error at S-B-C Communications.

News reports say that Maria Chaidez Karam processed the calls for help - including several emergencies - during the 41-minute glitch. In fact, she relayed details via her own cellular telephone to the police dispatch center's seven-digit non-emergency number.

Complete details about this story are on the web at http://www.borderlandnews.com/stories/borderland/20040119-70359.shtml (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: ABRAMS VS. RPV - ANOTHER WIN

An update on the case of radio site owner Mark Abrams WA6DPB versus the city of Rancho Palos Verdes California. Abrams has been embroiled in litigation against the city for several years and has won every round, This is no different. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on Thursday, January 15th, that Abrams is entitled to damages, attorneys fees and court costs from the city, but there is a catch. Abrams says that the decision only entitles him to a trial to determine the amount of money involved. It does not set an award amount. (WA6DPB)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE WAR ON TERROR: SECURITY ALERT FOR CELL PHONE GUNS

Don't be surprised if you're asked to make a call on your cellphone the next time you go through airport security. Time Magazine quotes sources as saying handguns disguised as regular cellular telephones have been seized in several

drug raids across Europe.

The potentially deadly devices look exactly like a normal cellular handset but are capable of rapidly firing four .22-caliber rounds of ammunition. They are manufactured in Croatia and are fired by punching buttons on the keypad

So far, none of the phony cellphones are known to have surfaced in the United States. Aviation security experts say screening equipment now in use can detect these cellphone guns as well as all other improvised explosive devices.. The rest is on-line at http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1101040202-581402,00.html (CGC, Time Magazine)

**

POSTAL PROBLEMS: CQ INVESTIGATES DAMAGED MAGAZINES

If you are wondering why your ham radio and other magazines have been showing up with torn covers or their insides missing, you are not alone. So were the folks at CQ who were receiving complaints from their readers. So they launched their own probe and what they found that its likely a problem at the United States Postal Service.

According to CQ Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, the postal system has installed new equipment that’s designed to speed up the processing of mail through automated sorting. Ross says that it usually works quite well but unofficial information coming to him says that the units can cause problems if they are even slightly out of adjustment. As Ross says, it sounds as if the new technology demands maintenance far beyond having a service crew fix it when it breaks.

Ross says that his magazines have already taken steps to get around the problem until the postal service finds a permanent fix. This includes new imported paper for the magazine covers.

What Dick Ross found out about the foibles of the postal services automated sorting system makes good reading. You can find it on page 4 of the February issue of CQ Magazine. (CQ)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: FCC ENGINEER MICHAEL J. MARCUS HONORED BY IEEE

A word of congratulations to Dr. Michael J. Marcus, N3JMM, of the FCC’s Office of Engineering and Technology. This, after recently being conferred as a Fellow by the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers based on his extraordinary record of accomplishment.

The IEEE chosen to honor Marcus’ contributions in the field of radio technologies with specific recognition to his creative technological vision that significantly advanced policies. This helped to lead to the deployment of spread spectrum and Wi- Fi technologies.

Dr. Marcus joined Office of Engineering and Technology in 1979 and currently serves as its Associate Chief for Technology. He received his bachelor's and doctorate degrees in electrical engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Before joining the FCC, Dr. Marcus worked for Bell Laboratories, the U. S. Air Force, and the Institute for Defense Analyses. (FCC release)

**

HAMFESTS: AM EXPO 2004 IN NEW JERSEY IN APRIL

Turning to the ham radio social calander, AmExpo, an event within an event will take place on Friday April 30 through Sunday May 2nd 2004 at the Millville Airport located in Millville, New Jersey. In addition to the hamfest, the 2004 "Wheels & Wings" air show is occurring at the Millville Airport at the same. This event features many extraordinary aerobatic exhibitions including the Air Force Thunderbirds. (

Meantime, Hugh McElroy, W2AVN says that AmExpo itself is a celebration of the evolution of communications. Included will be demonstrations of ham radio satellites, Echolink, along with HF, VHF and UHF radio communication in every mode. More information is on-line at www.p49millville.org. (W2AVN)

**

SEMINARS: COMM ACADEMY IN WASHINGTON IN MARCH

The sixth annual Communications Academy set for March 20th and 21st at the Shoreline Conference Center, in Shoreline, Washington just north of Seattle. This years theme is Interoperability and the Expanding Role of Amateur Radio Communications. The keynote speaker is retired Police Chief Gerald W. Boyd, KW7J. Boyd is the author of five books including three on amateur radio emergency communications. You can find out more in cyberspace at www.commacademy.org (Press release)

**

CONFERENCES: EASTERN VHF CONFERENCE IN CT. IN APRIL

And the 30th Annual Eastern VHF/UHF Conference will be held on April 16th to the 18th at the Radisson Hotel in Enfield, Connecticut. Guest speakers to date include Dan Henderson, N1ND, on the status of ARRL VHF/UHF Contesting & Awards, Del Schier, K1UHF, with a talk called What's New at West Mountain Radio and many others. And, as a special thank-you to all those who have supported the conference the planners are providing a free dinner to all who register for the event. More, including registration forms can be found on-line at www.newsvhf.com (VHF REflector)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: WORKED ALL BRITAIN AGM ON FEB 15

In international news, the Worked All Britain Awards Group Annual General Meeting will take place on the 15th of February. The venue is the Radiosport Communications and Computer Show at Stevenage in the United Kingdom. Nominations for the committee to consider should be sent to G0NLX at her call

book address no later than February 13th. (RSGB)

**

CONTEST OPERATIONS: K7BV TO TURKS AND CAICOS FOR ARRL DX CW

From the contest calendar word that Dennis Motschenbacher K7BV will be in the Turks and Caicos Islands from Feb 19th to the 26th. This, to operate in the ARRL DX CW contest using the probable call sign of VP5M. He will use VP5 stroke K7BV outside the contest with operating emphasis placed on the WARC, 6 and 2 meter bands. VHF WSJT meteor scatter scheduled contacts can be arranged. QSL via KU9C. (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In DX, word that five German operators are from Tobago active as 9Y4 slash their home calls through the 14th of February. Look for them around 14.277, 21.377 and 28.377 Mhz. (GB2RS)

And F6AIG is currently on the air from Mayotte. Look for him around 17.00 UTC on about 14.130 Mhz. (GB2RS)

Lastly, DL2GAC is again active as H44MS from Honiara in the Solomon Islands. He plans to stay there a while and is active on 80 through 10 meters on SSB. For all of these operations, please QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: BROADBAND OVER POWERLINES - AUSTRALIA SHOULD WAIT AND SEE

And finally this week, the pitfalls of broadband over powerlines technology have been highlighted down-under by a group calling itself The Spectrum Issues Group Australia or S-I-G-A. This, in a letter published in the Sydney Morning Herald and The Age news papers. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB has the details.

--

While BPL holds out the promise of always-on internet availability from every household power point, overseas experience with this new technology shows Australia should not rush into adopting it.

BPL/PLC systems installed here would cause significant interference to high frequency communications users across Australia which include emergency services, aircraft, police, rural and remote services, maritime, government agencies and private users such as we Radio Amateurs.

Roger Harrison, VK2ZRH, speaking for the group says they are an informal alliance of organisations and individuals across Australia with interests in RF communications and technologies. Alliance members come from broadcasting, community service bodies, consultancies, emergency services, equipment manufacturers and suppliers, government, industry bodies, the radio amateur community and other radiocommunications users.

Graham Kemp, VK4BB.

--

The S-I-G-A letter makes fascinating reading no matter where you are in the world. It can be viewed on line at the Fairfax f2 website. That U-R-L is in this weeks printed Amateur Radio Nerwsline report.

(DO NOT READ: http://smh.com.au/articles/2004/01/19/1074360700131.html)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the newly created Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is up and operating. We already have signed up over two dozen hams who are willing to assist others. If you can help, or if you need assistance please drop a note with your name, address, hone number and area of expertise to mentor@arnewsline.org and we will get back to you as fast as we can.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Davis, W2JKD, 73 and saying thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

2194. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 22:02:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402061402.4deed2b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86870

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<sdednfWI5J8uEb7dRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <45OdnU6mU_f7XbzdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

> >>>Or maybe the license is the easy part and the station is the tough
> >>>part.

> >>Yup! I was woefully inept at getting a station running. Thank heavens
> >>for my Elmers.

> > Which is why futzing with the license tests isn't going to change much.
> > They're looking in the wrong place.

(line was from "Raiders of the Lost Ark")
>
> One of the side effects of the internet as relates to Ham radio is the
> new ham that has looked at a lot of web pages, studied a lot of books,
> and has been woefully short of personal dealings with actual hams.(red
> faced, raising my hand)

Nothing new there! When I was a newbie, most of my Elmers were books.

> I think that the ARRL is pretty aware of this,
> witness their new Elmering program, which will take some steps in
> getting more one on one or several on one interaction.

Hopefully.

> Unfortunately
> they also presented a dopey restructuring plan to go along with it.

Part dopey, part good idea.

> >>I suppose that might be working myself into the
> >>ground, but its for the fun of FD and the camaraderie.
> >
> > 'zactly. Even when I did it single-handed.
>
> One of these years I will have to try that.
>
It's one end of the continuum, and can be as laid-back or
extreme-challenge
as you want it to be. 2003 was laid-back for me - setup took about 2
hours
tops, and teardown less than an hour. 1B-1 Battery, lotta fun, 230+ CW

QSOs. 1995 was an allout effort - made 629 CW and 11 FM simplex QSOs in 1B-1. Putting
up the 41 foot homebrew portable mast by myself in the rain was a bit of a challenge....

Both were great learning experiences.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2195. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 22:55:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SXUUb.497$t16.507671@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86871

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040206070742.29815.00003137@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
> >Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
> >old at the time.
>
> What a great new game! I'll play:
>
> I was born April 24, 1954. I got my Novice ticket October 14, 1967. I
got my
> Extra September 26, 1970. (Dates are when the actual license arrived -
passed
> the tests about six weeks earlier). I reckon that made me 16 years, 5
months,
> 2 days old when the Extra came in the mail. That 2 year experience
requirement
> held me up at least a year).
>
> Anybody else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Born December 31st, 1950. Passed tests for Novice written, Tech written, and 5wpm code on May 5, 1992. Passed Extra code and written late fall of 1992. My Extra ticket was dated January 29, 1993 if my memory serves me right.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2196. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 22:57:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vZUUb.498$t16.507914@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86873

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:sdednfWI5J8uEb7dRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <45OdnU6mU_f7XbzdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
> >>I suppose that might be working myself into the
> >>ground, but its for the fun of FD and the camaraderie.
> >
> >
> > 'zactly. Even when I did it single-handed.
>
> One of these years I will have to try that.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

It is fun. I never did it solo but I and my 2nd husband did. We set up in the bay of our local volunteer fire department, borrowed their generator, strung a couple of random wires and we were off and running.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2197. Re: ARRL Committee's "Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 23:00:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402061500.66df6919@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86872

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040205071604.25517.00004101@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402041724.10fbc51d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >This one is as bad a Bonnie's abomination. Maybe worse.
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/announce/reports-0307/hf-digital.html
>
> How is it as bad or worse? I think it's much better!

It's worse because Bonnie is a no-counter, the guys who wrote the ARRL
version should have known better. I looked all of 'em up to find out
where they come from. One is a VHFer, two or three others are big into
HF APRS and HF Echolink sorts of interests. Lotta TAPR connections.
Only one, maybe two of 'em do much with conventional HF modes. The
real kicker is that the two really heavy hitters on the committee
bailed away from it. We all know who G3PLX is and what he's done but
his reason for resigning from the committeee is publicly unkown. The
other is KH6TY who invented DigiPan PSK31 and PSK 63 and is the
recipient of the 2000 ARRL Technical Excellence Award. He disagrees
with the final output and supposedly will craft his own version of the
report.

> First off, it does not widen the 'phone bands anywhere near as much as the
> KQ6XA plan.

The phone bands *will* get widened and this report won't have anything
to do with it.

> Nor does it decrease the Extra segments.

Minor point overall but at least they had enough sense not to mess
with that bag of worms.

> Second, the 200/500/2700 Hz rules

So where's the 10/8Khz wide digital stuff gonna run? DRM will be
excluded?

> are for a *voluntary bandplan*, not FCC regs.

Bandplans work on bands >30 Mhz because Riley can enforce 'em when and
where they actually matter. Voluntary bandplans for MF/HF have been
out there for eons and they *don't* work. All adopting this proposal
would do is generate more opportunities to bust bandplans.

> Third, it actually acknowledges that hams use modes like CW and Baudot RTTY.

Wunnerful. Hang dividing lines somwhere around the bottom edges of
what are now the lower limits of the phone bands. All modes above
those limits gotta be 8-10 Khz wide max, everything below can't exceed
1 Khz wide and let the market sort 'em out.

None of it matters anyway, we're both blowing hot air. This report was
submitted almost two years ago and has gone nowhere. I'm not holding
my breath waiting for the BoD to even address it let alone adopt it
then dump anything even close to it on the FCC.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2198. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 23:01:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <P0VUb.500$t16.508574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 86874

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 05:34:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> I'm not sure if Len's First Class license is equal to any of the
> Canadian ones listed in RIC-3 above - but if they are, the Canadian
> equivalent to his license would be sufficient to acquire a VEx
> callsign absolutely free upon request.
>
> Well, for a 49-cent stamp, anyway :)
>

At least they have to take the initiative to request it and that would make all the difference. Len has made no effort that anyone can see to get an amateur license. He appears to want to make changes without being a member of the affected group. It's rather like complaining about your congressman when you don't bother to vote.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2199. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-06 23:18:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402061518.4857895c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86875

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<vcb720pnvip3c9quf08jer86bvkn45i6g3@4ax.com>...
> On 06 Feb 2004 14:54:40 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
> >>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
> >>qualifications.
> >
> >In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
> >left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
> >because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
> >required).
> >>
> >>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
>
> >>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
> >>radio operation,
> >
> >Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV broadcast
> >transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.
>
> Of course not - operating RTTY on the Amateur bands is dead easy -
> connect the transmitter to your sound card, install a software
> program, make a couple of tests and adjustments, and away you go!

Are those "tests and adjustments" covered in the "professional"
license
tests?

Are the amateur frequencies where RTTY is allowed, and what types of
RTTY are allowed, covered in the professional license tests?

> And, if you make a few mistakes along the way, or if it takes a week
> to get it running, so what?

Depends on the mistake.

> You're experimenting, and that's what
> amateur radio is all about.

Then why have any ham radio tests or licenses at all? You're arguing
for the end of all testing for a ham license, Leo.
>

> Now, make a couple of mistakes and knock WNEP-TV off the air for a
> couple of minutes - you might be an unemployed professional!

Which acts as an incentive to know what you're doing.

Does WNEP-TV change frequency, or have to listen first before
transmitting?

> >>and the Pros have made a career of it

> >All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
> >on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of something
> >most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).
>
> Politicians? :)

Some say politicians are a subset of the oldest profession. ;-)
>
> >Those people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their
> >profession,
> >don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
> >question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-) They
> >must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
> >do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> I'll take your word for it, having no personal experience with the
> profession that you are referring to. If you say they're good, Jim,
> then they're good! :)

I wouldn't know - I'm only an amateur in that field too.

> Generally speaking, though, professionals are more knowledgable than
> lay people because they are involved in their field full time, and are
> held to standards of conduct and proficiency set by not only the
> regulators but by their employers.

Generally speaking. However, commercial radio and amateur radio are
different fields. Being a "professional in radio", by itself, is no
indication of qualification to operate an amateur radio station, and
even less of an
indication of qualification to determine amateur radio policy.

> And, rather than just sounding like
> experts, they are expected to demonstrate their proficiency - that's
> what they get paid for! 'Stay current or move out' is the rule of the
> technically-oriented workplace.

Current with what? Most TV stations are still broadcasting NTSC
signals, based
on a mode that's at least 50 years old. If you don't care about color,
a 1946
NTSC TV (if you can find one that works) is still usable. Then there's
FM

broadcasting which is about as old and good old MW AM, which goes back
to the
1920s.

> >> - and invested
> >>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
> >>would be possible for most hobbyists.
> >
> >Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back
> >when
> >the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most to be
> >at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.
> >
> >But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing of
> >the
> >amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.
>
> Of course not - they don't teach professional photographers how to
> take amateur pictures either....

Then they are not qualified.
>
> But the rules and regs can be learned pretty easily

Then there's no problem with requiring them to take a test
for an amateur license.

> >
> >And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters and put
> >them
> >on the air without any certification?
>
> Nope - this is what the Amateur bands are for (type approval not
> required, unlike the commercial frequencies).

Then the "pros" aren't necessarily qualified in that area, either.
>
> In fact, there are precious few Amateurs left who could do that, Jim,
> even though our bands permit it.

I can, and have.

> Passing any one of the current ARS
> tests does not require that sort of undestanding of electronics
> anymore. Not like when you first got involved - it has changed a lot
> since then.

It was not required when I got started either. The US tests went to
all-multiple-choice in 1960. Pick enough right answers on the written
tests and you pass, regardless of whether you understand the material
or not.

Canada may be different. But I don't live there.
>
> >>After all, it would be pretty
> >>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
> >>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!
>
> >>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
> >>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.
> >
> >Agreed! But at least it still exists.
>
> Sort of, in vestigial format.

You seem to be arguing that such licenses aren't really needed
anymore.
> >
> >>Too easy, I'd say,
> >
> >The FCC disagrees.
>
> Unfortunately.

They're PROFESSIONALS, Leo! They have to "keep current or move out",
right?
It's their JOB to know what's needed, right? Who are we poor dumb old
broken
down amateurs to question them? ;-)

Must not question the professionals. Their egos can't take it.
>
> IC has been advised of this under the recommendations that the RAC
> made to them following WRC-03 - I sincerely hope that they listen!

Me too.
>
> >>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
> >>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
> >>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
> >>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)
> >
> >And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public info,
> >too.
>
> True, but if one did that, they'd have a tough time staying employed
> with it - employers have a nasty habit of asking their staff to
> demonstrate their abilities empirically, on a frequent basis!

How often does the average employee at WNEP have to demonstrate
knowledge
of calculation of squares, logs and complex numbers?
>
> Rote memorization was what my point was about, though - and I'm sure
> that was the case.

How do you know for sure?
> >
> >Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether or
> >not she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?
>
> Well, if she can, she certainly is a prodigy alright. Grade 11 math
> in Grade 2 - that is impressive! I'd say highly unlikely.

Not Grade 11 stuff. Squares are 4th grade stuff around here. Logs
maybe
6th grade. Complex numbers probably 9th or 10th.

The 7 year old in question is homeschooled, btw.

> Ever talk to a 7-year old kid, Jim?

At least daily.

> They just don't operate at that level.

Some of them do. It depends on the child and the environment. Ever had
a
barely-7-year-old read "Watership Down" to you, and not miss a single
word? I have.

> Good memories, though - like a sponge!

Much of what's on the test (band edges, regs) is pure memory stuff.
>
> She is an Extra, though - I'll just bet she could build her own
> transmitter from scratch (forgetting for a moment that 7-year olds
> generally have enough trouble making neat letters with a pencil, let
> alone operating a soldering iron....)

The 7 year olds I know write and draw quite well. Also use computers
and
do math.

In one local second grade class, one of the first week's assignments
was to
write what you did over the summer. Expectation was 1-1/2 to 2-1/2
pages after
editing. (The kids are expected to do a rough draft, edit and final.
By the end of third grade it's outline, rough draft, edit, final). One
7 year old turned in a 31 page story (after editing) in the required
time. It was quite readable, legible, accurate and had all the
required elements.

I built my first transmitter at age 13. From junk parts. Worked quite
well. Of course I had previously built a couple of receivers and used
them
to learn the Morse code off the air.

Since then I've homebrewed-from-scratch at least 7 transmitters,
8 receivers, 3 transceivers, and their related power supplies, antenna

tuners, control systems, accessories, test equipment, antennas and
shack
furniture.

The above does not include kits built and rebuilt, old gear restored
to
operation, military surplus converted to ham use, repairs and
adjustments,
and stuff done for other hams. Of which I've done plenty...

It's easy and fun. Too many hams don't know what they're missing.

> - unlike the chief engineer at
> your local NBC affiliate, who is merely a professional in his field
> :)

He probably doesn't have a license and probably never built a
transmitter.

> You know, everyone seems to be holding this event up as a great
> accomplishment for Amateur Radio.

It points out that the tests aren't that hard. Which some of us have
been saying for years.

> And I applaud the little girl's
> dedication to memorizing the material and passing all of the required
> tests. That took a lot of effort on her part.
>
> But it is a clear indication that the testing procedure is far too
> easy - IMHO. It can be memorized, which removes any requirement to
> comprehend the material. Do you believe that a 7-year old can
> comprehend the theories of complex numbers as they relate to impedance
> in a resonant circuit?

I'm sure some can.

>Bull.

Have you ever been around really bright children whose talents are
recognized and supported, Leo? They're capable of far more than
many adults give them credit for.

Complex numbers are simply a way of dealing with a pair of related
electrical quantities. There's no need to have a detailed
understanding of that whole
field of math just to do some LCR calculations.

And there is *no* requirement that *any* ham understand complex
numbers.

> >>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
> >>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
> >>US?

> >
> >No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
> >because they were essentially the same in both services.
> >
> >The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in the USA
> >that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge of
> >amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
> >qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license test
> >alone.
> >And that's still the case.
> >
> >>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
> >>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
> >>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
> >>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
> >>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
> >
> >No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests include
> >the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
> > its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact.
>
> IC disagrees. But I'll ask them to take your opinion under advisement
> :)

Wrong is wrong. But the IC are professionals, aren't they?
>
> Personally I'd think, for example, that the guy who sits in a control
> tower accurately vectoring planes all over our busy airspace is far
> better equipped to carry on a two-way conversation on 2-meters than
> the average amateur who passed a relatively simple test!

Maybe. But there's no requirement that he have any sort of radio
operator's license. He doesn't need to know how the radios work.
Complex numbers?

> He could
> learn all of the operating procedures that he needs by reading a
> couple of sections of the RAC study guide....a couple of nights would
> be all it would take. And, in a real emergency, that's the guy that I
> would want to see on the radio, coordinating things!

maybe - if he knows the environment.

> Not the guy with
> the mag mount 2-meter antenna on his callsigned baseball cap at the
> local hamfest.....(I swear he goes to every hamfest in the world -
> you've seen him at yours, haven't you? :))

No. I'm too busy looking at rigs and parts.
>
> >For the USA to make the
> >same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were changed.

> >Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
> >for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the amateur-radio-related
> >questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an amateur
> >radio station.
>
> ...unless they can find a 7-year old to elmer them, that is. That is
> some prettty tough material to master! LOL!

Would you talk that way to a 7 year old, Leo?

btw, when I was in EE school, I wound up elmering my faculty advisor.
He was a
PhD EE but didn't know much about radio, because radio is only a small
part of EE. He knew *his* part of EE backwards and forwards, but
needed *me* to help
him figure out ham radio. I was glad to help, of course.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2200. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 00:24:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <rm9820htq9qdcqad62kf46p5vbuhhtfvh2@4ax.com>
Source record: 86876

On 6 Feb 2004 15:18:39 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<vcb720pnvip3c9quf08jer86bvkn45i6g3@4ax.com>...
>> On 06 Feb 2004 14:54:40 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>> >>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>> >>qualifications.
>> >
>> >In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
>> >left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
>> >because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
>> >required).
>> >>
>> >>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
>>
>> >>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>> >>radio operation,
>> >
>> >Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV broadcast
>> >transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.
>>
>> Of course not - operating RTTY on the Amateur bands is dead easy -
>> connect the transmitter to your sound card, install a software
>> program, make a couple of tests and adjustments, and away you go!
>
>Are those "tests and adjustments" covered in the "professional"
>license
>tests?
>
>Are the amateur frequencies where RTTY is allowed, and what types of
>RTTY are allowed, covered in the professional license tests?

Well, the Canadian bandplans are not mandated by IC - they are
voluntary, and developed by the amaueur community themselves.
Therefore, not covered on the Amateur exam. Neither was RTTY, as I
recall - that was learned later, after licensing!
>
>> And, if you make a few mistakes along the way, or if it takes a week
>> to get it running, so what?
>

>Depends on the mistake.

Well, other than operating out of band, there ain't much that a
"sorry" wouldn't cover!
>
>> You're experimenting, and that's what
>> amateur radio is all about.
>
>Then why have any ham radio tests or licenses at all? You're arguing
>for the end of all testing for a ham license, Leo.

Not at all - I'm suggesting that (many of) the radio skills acquired
in the acquisition of a commercial license are directly applicable to
the Amateur service. Transferrable skills.
>>
>> Now, make a couple of mistakes and knock WNEP-TV off the air for a
>> couple of minutes - you might be an unemployed professional!
>
>Which acts as an incentive to know what you're doing.

Yup!

>
>Does WNEP-TV change frequency, or have to listen first before
>transmitting?

That is a pretty simple skill - I'm sure the broadcast engineers could
figure it out rather quickly :)
>
>> >>and the Pros have made a career of it
>
>> >All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
>> >on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of something
>> >most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).
>>
>> Politicians? :)
>
>Some say politicians are a subset of the oldest profession. ;-)

Fully agreed! :)

>>
>> >Those people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their
>> >profession,
>> >don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
>> >question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-) They
>> >must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
>> >do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>
>> I'll take your word for it, having no personal experience with the
>> profession that you are referring to. If you say they're good, Jim,
>> then they're good! :)

>
>I wouldn't know - I'm only an amateur in that field too.
>
>> Generally speaking, though, professionals are more knowledgable than
>> lay people because they are involved in their field full time, and are
>> held to standards of conduct and proficiency set by not only the
>> regulators but by their employers.
>
>Generally speaking. However, commercial radio and amateur radio are
>different fields. Being a "professional in radio", by itself, is no
>indication of qualification to operate an amateur radio station, and
>even less of an
>indication of qualification to determine amateur radio policy.

Two different concepts.

Being a licensed professional in radio implies a knowledge of radio theory and concepts - many of which are tranferrable from one area (commercial) to another (amateur). By nature, amateur activities have much greater margins for error than professional ones - they are hobby based, after all!

Amateur radio policy, on the other hand, is made by legislators, none of whom require any knowledge of radio to carry out the responsibilities of their office.
.
>
>> And, rather than just sounding like
>> experts, they are expected to demonstrate their proficiency - that's
>> what they get paid for! 'Stay current or move out' is the rule of the
>> technically-oriented workplace.
>
>Current with what? Most TV stations are still broadcasting NTSC
>signals, based
>on a mode that's at least 50 years old. If you don't care about color,
>a 1946
>NTSC TV (if you can find one that works) is still usable. Then there's
>FM
>broadcasting which is about as old and good old MW AM, which goes back
>to the
>1920s.

With equipment that is vastly more complex than what the average amateur is using, though. If you get the opportunity, have a look inside a cellular base station sometime - all of the equipment in there is computer controlled - nothing even resembling a piece of radio gear to be seen.

The signal out, though, is Hertzian, and as old as the universe....
>
>> >> - and invested
>> >>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than

>> >>would be possible for most hobbyists.
>> >
>> >Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back
>> >when
>> >the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most to be
>> >at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.
>> >
>> >But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing of
>> >the
>> >amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.
>>
>> Of course not - they don't teach professional photographers how to
>> take amateur pictures either....
>
>Then they are not qualified.
>>
>> But the rules and regs can be learned pretty easily
>
>Then there's no problem with requiring them to take a test
>for an amateur license.

Sure, but according to IC, that isn't a concern!
>
>> >
>> >And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters and put
>> >them
>> >on the air without any certification?
>>
>> Nope - this is what the Amateur bands are for (type approval not
>> required, unlike the commercial frequencies).
>
>Then the "pros" aren't necessarily qualified in that area, either.
>>
>> In fact, there are precious few Amateurs left who could do that, Jim,
>> even though our bands permit it.
>
>I can, and have.

I know - but they just ain't making them like you anymore!
>
>> Passing any one of the current ARS
>> tests does not require that sort of undestanding of electronics
>> anymore. Not like when you first got involved - it has changed a lot
>> since then.
>
>It was not required when I got started either. The US tests went to
>all-multiple-choice in 1960. Pick enough right answers on the written
>tests and you pass, regardless of whether you understand the material
>or not.
>
>Canada may be different. But I don't live there.

Same, actually. 100 questions, 60 correct gets you a basic license.

>>
>> >>After all, it would be pretty
>> >>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>> >>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!
>>
>> >>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>> >>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.
>> >
>> >Agreed! But at least it still exists.
>>
>> Sort of, in vestigial format.
>
>You seem to be arguing that such licenses aren't really needed
>anymore.

No - I'm arguing that they are becoming meaningless - simple memory
work that a child can do.

>> >
>> >>Too easy, I'd say,
>> >
>> >The FCC disagrees.
>>
>> Unfortunately.
>
>They're PROFESSIONALS, Leo! They have to "keep current or move out",
>right?
>It's their JOB to know what's needed, right? Who are we poor dumb old
>broken
>down amateurs to question them? ;-)

They are regulators and politicians, actually....

>
>Must not question the professionals. Their egos can't take it.

Well, I'm sure that if you asked a holder of a first class radio
license who has worked in the field for years a radio theory question,
they'd probably get it right! :)

>>
>> IC has been advised of this under the recommendations that the RAC
>> made to them following WRC-03 - I sincerely hope that they listen!
>
>Me too.
>>
>> >>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
>> >>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>> >>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>> >>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)
>> >

>> >And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public info,
>> >too.
>>
>> True, but if one did that, they'd have a tough time staying employed
>> with it - employers have a nasty habit of asking their staff to
>> demonstrate their abilities empirically, on a frequent basis!
>
>How often does the average employee at WNEP have to demonstrate
>knowledge
>of calculation of squares, logs and complex numbers?

The receptionist - never. The hands-on technical people - rarely -
but they would need it to complete their formal education in radio
theory, I'd reckon.

>>
>> Rote memorization was what my point was about, though - and I'm sure
>> that was the case.
>
>How do you know for sure?

I don't - but I'd say the odds are pretty heavily in my favour. :)

>> >
>> >Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether or
>> >not she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?
>>
>> Well, if she can, she certainly is a prodigy alright. Grade 11 math
>> in Grade 2 - that is impressive! I'd say highly unlikely.
>
>Not Grade 11 stuff. Squares are 4th grade stuff around here. Logs
>maybe
>6th grade. Complex numbers probably 9th or 10th.

Not Grade 2, though :)

As I recall, Grade 2 was time for "Fun With Dick And Jane", not "Fum
With Maxerll And Hertz".

>
>The 7 year old in question is homeschooled, btw.
>
>> Ever talk to a 7-year old kid, Jim?
>
>At least daily.

Listen often too?

>
>> They just don't operate at that level.
>
>Some of them do. It depends on the child and the environment. Ever had
>a

>barely-7-year-old read "Watership Down" to you, and not miss a single
>word? I have.

Yup - I have yet to meet one who could read a schematic, or calculate
impedance though - no wonder the watership went down!

>
>> Good memories, though - like a sponge!
>
>Much of what's on the test (band edges, regs) is pure memory stuff.

Thought the Extra was more theoretical than regulation based?

>>
>> She is an Extra, though - I'll just bet she could build her own
>> transmitter from scratch (forgetting for a moment that 7-year olds
>> generally have enough trouble making neat letters with a pencil, let
>> alone operating a soldering iron....)
>
>The 7 year olds I know write and draw quite well. Also use computers
>and
>do math.
>
>In one local second grade class, one of the first week's assignments
>was to
>write what you did over the summer. Expectation was 1-1/2 to 2-1/2
>pages after
>editing. (The kids are expected to do a rough draft, edit and final.
>By the end of third grade it's outline, rough draft, edit, final). One
>7 year old turned in a 31 page story (after editing) in the required
>time. It was quite readable, legible, accurate and had all the
>required elements.
>
>I built my first transmitter at age 13. From junk parts. Worked quite
>well. Of course I had previously built a couple of receivers and used
>them
>to learn the Morse code off the air.

There is a huge difference between 7 and 13, Jim. Big difference.
>
>Since then I've homebrewed-from-scratch at least 7 transmitters,
>8 receivers, 3 transceivers, and their related power supplies, antenna
>tuners, control systems, accessories, test equipment, antennas and
>shack
>furniture.
>
>The above does not include kits built and rebuilt, old gear restored
>to
>operation, military surplus converted to ham use, repairs and
>adjustments,
>and stuff done for other hams. Of which I've done plenty...
>

>It's easy and fun. Too many hams don't know what they're missing.

Absolutely.

But you're not 7!

>
>> - unlike the chief engineer at
>> your local NBC affiliate, who is merely a professional in his field
>> :)
>
>He probably doesn't have a license and probably never built a
>transmitter.

Is that a requirement for an Amateur license? Wasn't on my test....

>
>> You know, everyone seems to be holding this event up as a great
>> accomplishment for Amateur Radio.
>
>It points out that the tests aren't that hard. Which some of us have
>been saying for years.

Agreed.

>
>> And I applaud the little girl's
>> dedication to memorizing the material and passing all of the required
>> tests. That took a lot of effort on her part.
>>
>> But it is a clear indication that the testing procedure is far too
>> easy - IMHO. It can be memorized, which removes any requirement to
>> comprehend the material. Do you believe that a 7-year old can
>> comprehend the theories of complex numbers as they relate to impedance
>> in a resonant circuit?
>
>I'm sure some can.

Sure, Jim.

The whole point of putting that on the test was to encourage people to
learn technical material, not memory walk through it.

>
>>Bull.
>
>Have you ever been around really bright children whose talents are
>recognized and supported, Leo? They're capable of far more than
>many adults give them credit for.
>
>Complex numbers are simply a way of dealing with a pair of related
>electrical quantities. There's no need to have a detailed
>understanding of that whole

>field of math just to do some LCR calculations.

Agreed - and any idiot can learn to plug numbers into a formula. The
idea was to learn the root concepts and theories!

>
>And there is *no* requirement that *any* ham understand complex
>numbers.

There is, if he really wants to figure out why his 50 ohm antenna has
an SWR of 2.6 to 1......

>
>> >>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>> >>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>> >>US?
>> >
>> >No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
>> >because they were essentially the same in both services.
>> >
>> >The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in the USA
>> >that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge of
>> >amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
>> >qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license test
>> >alone.
>> >And that's still the case.
>> >
>> >>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>> >>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>> >>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>> >>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>> >>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>> >
>> >No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests include
>> >the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
>> > its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact.
>>
>> IC disagrees. But I'll ask them to take your opinion under advisement
>> :)
>
>Wrong is wrong. But the IC are professionals, aren't they?

Yep - professional regulators. Them who makes the rules!

>>
>> Personally I'd think, for example, that the guy who sits in a control
>> tower accurately vectoring planes all over our busy airspace is far
>> better equipped to carry on a two-way conversation on 2-meters than
>> the average amateur who passed a relatively simple test!
>
>Maybe. But there's no requirement that he have any sort of radio
>operator's license. He doesn't need to know how the radios work.

>Complex numbers?

They aren'r required - you just told me that....

>
>> He could
>> learn all of the operating procedures that he needs by reading a
>> couple of sections of the RAC study guide....a couple of nights would
>> be all it would take. And, in a real emergency, that's the guy that I
>> would want to see on the radio, coordinating things!
>
>maybe - if he knows the environment.
>
>> Not the guy with
>> the mag mount 2-meter antenna on his callsigned baseball cap at the
>> local hamfest.....(I swear he goes to every hamfest in the world -
>> you've seen him at yours, haven't you? :))
>
>No. I'm too busy looking at rigs and parts.

Look up - he's there, along with the guys who look like the local
homeless shelter burnt down!

>>
>> >For the USA to make the
>> >same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were changed.
>> >Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
>> >for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the amateur-radio-related
>> >questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an amateur
>> >radio station.
>>
>> ...unless they can find a 7-year old to elmer them, that is. That is
>> some prettty tough material to master! LOL!
>
>Would you talk that way to a 7 year old, Leo?

Why not?

>
>btw, when I was in EE school, I wound up elmering my faculty advisor.
>He was a
>PhD EE but didn't know much about radio, because radio is only a small
>part of EE. He knew *his* part of EE backwards and forwards, but
>needed *me* to help
>him figure out ham radio. I was glad to help, of course.

Yep, you're quite the guy alright!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2201. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 02:38:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <vrCdnZV8fqZd0rndRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 86877

Leo wrote:
> On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 12:39:19 -0500, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
>> Dunno! I don't allow kids to watch the nasty violent stuff either. I'm
>>talking about stuff like FMJ.As good as the movie was, it was plenty
>>disturbing. Three Stooges are fine, as well as the other tame stuff.
>>Normal kids are fully capable of figuring out that when Moe hits curly
>>on the head with a pipe wrench, and it makes a sound like a hammer
>>hitting a frying pan, or when Bugs bunny blows up daffy duck, and
>>Daffy's bill is then upside down and on the back of his head, that's all
>>just fun.
>
>
> Sounds safe enough!
>
> !!WARNING - OFF TOPIC MATERIAL FOLLOWS!!
>
> Hmmm - Mike, if you have a high speed internet connection. check out
> the following newsgroups:
>
> alt.binaries.multimedia.3-stooges
> alt.binaries.multimedia.cartoons.looneytunes
>
> You can download complete episodes there, which should amuse the
> little ones (and you too!) for quite a while. New ones are uploaded to
> these groups every day.
>
> And, unlike this group, there are only a total of 6 stooges to be
> found! :)

Thanks, Leo! I'm checkin it out now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2202. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 02:57:11 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <i3k820hqv4h0p70d84pvak51m4nl500g5c@4ax.com>
Source record: 86878

On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 21:38:55 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>snip
>
> Thanks, Leo! I'm checkin it out now.

Cool. You'll need to locate a copy of WinRAR (a decompression program
similar to ZIP) and perhaps a few others as you go along. Just give
me a holler if you need any help.

For your reference, some info on the various file types you will
encounter, and what to do with 'em, is here:

http://www.warezfaq.com/file_types.htm

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2203. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 03:13:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206221352.01692.00000478@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86881

In article <40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>>violence is OK?
>>
>Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids,

"Robert Casey, you bold brazen article, how dare you talk like that!"

>but would sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....

In my experience, such things would make them violent. In fact almost
anything could make an IHM nun violent. Bunch of nutcases, actually.
>
>> Is that really what we want to teach our children?

No!

>I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
>school.

Nor I!

What all that violence really taught kids was that violence was the
preferred method to solve problems and get your way. As if.

The irony is that they were responsible for the creation of millions
of ex-catholics.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2204. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 03:13:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206221357.01692.00000479@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86880

In article <rm9820htq9qdcqad62kf46p5vbuhhtfvh2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 6 Feb 2004 15:18:39 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:<vcb720pnvip3c9quf08jer86bvkn45i6g3@4ax.com>...
>>> On 06 Feb 2004 14:54:40 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>> >In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>> >writes:
>>> >
>>> >> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>>> >>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>>> >>qualifications.
>>> >
>>> >In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
>>> >left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
>>> >because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
>>> >required).
>>> >>
>>> >>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
>>>
>>> >>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>>> >>radio operation,
>>> >
>>> >Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV
>broadcast
>>> >transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.

>>> Of course not - operating RTTY on the Amateur bands is dead easy -
>>> connect the transmitter to your sound card, install a software
>>> program, make a couple of tests and adjustments, and away you go!

>>Are those "tests and adjustments" covered in the "professional"
>>license tests?
>>
>>Are the amateur frequencies where RTTY is allowed, and what types of
>>RTTY are allowed, covered in the professional license tests?
>
>Well, the Canadian bandplans are not mandated by IC - they are
>voluntary, and developed by the amaueur community themselves.

Not talking about bandplans.

>Therefore, not covered on the Amateur exam. Neither was RTTY, as I
>recall - that was learned later, after licensing!

Band edges. Power limits. Amateur operating practices. Requirements to
ID. Content limitations. All different for hams. Not covered in commercial
license exams.
>>
>>> And, if you make a few mistakes along the way, or if it takes a week
>>> to get it running, so what?
>>
>>Depends on the mistake.
>
>Well, other than operating out of band, there ain't much that a
>"sorry" wouldn't cover!

So when somebody decides to run ten or twenty times the legal power,
a "sorry" is supposed to cover it? Or when somebody uses ham radio
for commercial purposes, or music, etc.. a "sorry" is supposed to cover it?

Sorry, that's not good enough.

>>> You're experimenting, and that's what
>>> amateur radio is all about.

>>Then why have any ham radio tests or licenses at all? You're arguing
>>for the end of all testing for a ham license, Leo.
>
>Not at all -

Yes, you are. If a "sorry" can cover most violations, there's no need for most
of the tests.

>I'm suggesting that (many of) the radio skills acquired
>in the acquisition of a commercial license are directly applicable to
>the Amateur service. Transferrable skills.

Maybe. But most of what a ham needs to know is not covered by a
commercial license test.

>>> Now, make a couple of mistakes and knock WNEP-TV off the air for a
>>> couple of minutes - you might be an unemployed professional!
>>
>>Which acts as an incentive to know what you're doing.
>
>Yup!

>>Does WNEP-TV change frequency, or have to listen first before
>>transmitting?
>
>That is a pretty simple skill - I'm sure the broadcast engineers could
>figure it out rather quickly :)

I don't think so. They're used to doing all the talking and none of the
listening.

>>> >>and the Pros have made a career of it

>>> >All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
>>> >on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of
>something
>>> >most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).
>>>
>>> Politicians? :)
>>
>>Some say politicians are a subset of the oldest profession. ;-)
>
>Fully agreed! :)

So we should listen to those professionals?

>>> >Those people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their
>>> >profession,
>>> >don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
>>> >question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-) They
>>> >must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
>>> >do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>>
>>> I'll take your word for it, having no personal experience with the
>>> profession that you are referring to. If you say they're good, Jim,
>>> then they're good! :)
>>
>>I wouldn't know - I'm only an amateur in that field too.
>>
>>> Generally speaking, though, professionals are more knowledgable than
>>> lay people because they are involved in their field full time, and are
>>> held to standards of conduct and proficiency set by not only the
>>> regulators but by their employers.
>>
>>Generally speaking. However, commercial radio and amateur radio are
>>different fields. Being a "professional in radio", by itself, is no
>>indication of qualification to operate an amateur radio station, and
>>even less of an
>>indication of qualification to determine amateur radio policy.
>
>Two different concepts.

That's right. Amateur radio and commercial radio are two different concepts.
>
>Being a licensed professional in radio implies a knowledge of radio
>theory and concepts - many of which are tranferrable from one area
>(commercial) to another (amateur).

Some. Not many.

>By nature, amateur activities have
>much greater margins for error than professional ones - they are hobby
>based, after all!

Then why have licenses at all?

>Amateur radio policy, on the other hand, is made by legislators, none
>of whom require any knowledge of radio to carry out the
>responsibilities of their office.

They need to understand certain concepts of radio in order to do the job.
Doesn't mean they all do.

>>> And, rather than just sounding like
>>> experts, they are expected to demonstrate their proficiency - that's
>>> what they get paid for! 'Stay current or move out' is the rule of the
>>> technically-oriented workplace.
>>
>>Current with what? Most TV stations are still broadcasting NTSC
>>signals, based
>>on a mode that's at least 50 years old. If you don't care about color,
>>a 1946
>>NTSC TV (if you can find one that works) is still usable. Then there's
>>FM
>>broadcasting which is about as old and good old MW AM, which goes back
>>to the
>>1920s.
>
>With equipment that is vastly more complex than what the average
>amateur is using, though.

So what? They don;t have to buy it with their own money, nor take
care of it with their own money in their spare time. Amateurs do.
Makes all the difference in the world.

>If you get the opportunity, have a look
>inside a cellular base station sometime - all of the equipment in
>there is computer controlled

Which means no licensed operators are needed at all.

Elimination of operators has been a major goal of commercial and
military radio services for years. One less warm body to pay. Just
like the railroads eliminated most block operators years ago, and the
telephone company went to dial equipment, and the airlines went to
planes that can be flown by two, not three.

> - nothing even resembling a piece of
>radio gear to be seen.

Only if you don't know what it looks like ;-)
>
>The signal out, though, is Hertzian, and as old as the universe....

If it's as old as the universe, it existed before Hertz.
>>
>>> >> - and invested
>>> >>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than

>>> >>would be possible for most hobbyists.
>>> >
>>> >Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back
>
>>> >when
>>> >the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most
>to be
>>> >at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.
>>> >
>>> >But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing
>of
>>> >the
>>> >amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.
>>>
>>> Of course not - they don't teach professional photographers how to
>>> take amateur pictures either....
>>
>>Then they are not qualified.
>>>
>>> But the rules and regs can be learned pretty easily
>>
>>Then there's no problem with requiring them to take a test
>>for an amateur license.
>
>Sure, but according to IC, that isn't a concern!

IC is just wrong.
>>
>>> >And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters
>and put
>>> >them
>>> >on the air without any certification?
>>>
>>> Nope - this is what the Amateur bands are for (type approval not
>>> required, unlike the commercial frequencies).
>>
>>Then the "pros" aren't necessarily qualified in that area, either.
>>>
>>> In fact, there are precious few Amateurs left who could do that, Jim,
>>> even though our bands permit it.
>>
>>I can, and have.
>
>I know - but they just ain't making them like you anymore!

Yes, they are. There are plenty of hams like me around, building,
operating, using Morse code....That sort of thing really bothers
some people.
>>
>>> Passing any one of the current ARS
>>> tests does not require that sort of undestanding of electronics

>>> anymore. Not like when you first got involved - it has changed a lot
>>> since then.
>>
>>It was not required when I got started either. The US tests went to
>>all-multiple-choice in 1960. Pick enough right answers on the written
>>tests and you pass, regardless of whether you understand the material
>>or not.
>>
>>Canada may be different. But I don't live there.
>
>Same, actually. 100 questions, 60 correct gets you a basic license.

60% passing? At least here it's ~74%.

>>> >>After all, it would be pretty
>>> >>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>>> >>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!
>>>
>>> >>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>>> >>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.
>>> >
>>> >Agreed! But at least it still exists.
>>>
>>> Sort of, in vestigial format.
>>
>>You seem to be arguing that such licenses aren't really needed
>>anymore.
>
>No - I'm arguing that they are becoming meaningless - simple memory
>work that a child can do.

If they're meaningless they aren't needed.

Has the licensing of young children caused any problems for the ARS?
Are they making a mess of the bands?

btw, Canada used to have an age requirement of 15 for any class of
amateur license. Would you have them put that requirement back?

The USA never had an age requirement for a ham license, but at
least one frequent poster here petitioned the FCC to add an age requirement
of 14 years. Fortunately the FCC did not do so.
>
>>> >>Too easy, I'd say,
>>> >
>>> >The FCC disagrees.
>>>
>>> Unfortunately.
>>
>>They're PROFESSIONALS, Leo! They have to "keep current or move out",
>>right?
>>It's their JOB to know what's needed, right? Who are we poor dumb old

>>broken
>>down amateurs to question them? ;-)
>
>They are regulators and politicians, actually....

They're still PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO. Who are you or I to question them? ;-)

>>Must not question the professionals. Their egos can't take it.
>
>Well, I'm sure that if you asked a holder of a first class radio
>license who has worked in the field for years a radio theory question,
>they'd probably get it right! :)

I've seen them get it wrong. Some don't even know what firmware is.

>>> IC has been advised of this under the recommendations that the RAC
>>> made to them following WRC-03 - I sincerely hope that they listen!
>>
>>Me too.
>>>
>>> >>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
>>> >>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>>> >>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>>> >>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)
>>> >
>>> >And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public
>info,
>>> >too.
>>>
>>> True, but if one did that, they'd have a tough time staying employed
>>> with it - employers have a nasty habit of asking their staff to
>>> demonstrate their abilities empirically, on a frequent basis!
>>
>>How often does the average employee at WNEP have to demonstrate
>>knowledge
>>of calculation of squares, logs and complex numbers?
>
>The receptionist - never. The hands-on technical people - rarely -
>but they would need it to complete their formal education in radio
>theory, I'd reckon.

Is formal education necessary for the license?

>>> Rote memorization was what my point was about, though - and I'm sure
>>> that was the case.
>>
>>How do you know for sure?
>
>I don't - but I'd say the odds are pretty heavily in my favour. :)

They are - but you wrote as if there were no other possibility.
>

>>> >Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether
>or
>>> >not she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?
>>>
>>> Well, if she can, she certainly is a prodigy alright. Grade 11 math
>>> in Grade 2 - that is impressive! I'd say highly unlikely.
>>
>>Not Grade 11 stuff. Squares are 4th grade stuff around here. Logs
>>maybe
>>6th grade. Complex numbers probably 9th or 10th.
>
>Not Grade 2, though :)

Nope. But not grade 11 either.
>
>As I recall, Grade 2 was time for "Fun With Dick And Jane", not "Fum
>With Maxerll And Hertz".

"Fun with Dick And Jane" is long gone.
>
>>The 7 year old in question is homeschooled, btw.
>>
>>> Ever talk to a 7-year old kid, Jim?
>>
>>At least daily.
>
>Listen often too?
>
At least daily.

How about you?

>>> They just don't operate at that level.
>>
>>Some of them do. It depends on the child and the environment. Ever had
>>a
>>barely-7-year-old read "Watership Down" to you, and not miss a single
>>word? I have.
>
>Yup - I have yet to meet one who could read a schematic, or calculate
>impedance though - no wonder the watership went down!

You obviously never read the book.
>
>>> Good memories, though - like a sponge!
>>
>>Much of what's on the test (band edges, regs) is pure memory stuff.
>
>Thought the Extra was more theoretical than regulation based?

None of them are heavy on theory. Not anymore.
>

>>> She is an Extra, though - I'll just bet she could build her own
>>> transmitter from scratch (forgetting for a moment that 7-year olds
>>> generally have enough trouble making neat letters with a pencil, let
>>> alone operating a soldering iron....)
>>
>>The 7 year olds I know write and draw quite well. Also use computers
>>and do math.
>>
>>In one local second grade class, one of the first week's assignments
>>was to
>>write what you did over the summer. Expectation was 1-1/2 to 2-1/2
>>pages after
>>editing. (The kids are expected to do a rough draft, edit and final.
>>By the end of third grade it's outline, rough draft, edit, final). One
>>7 year old turned in a 31 page story (after editing) in the required
>>time. It was quite readable, legible, accurate and had all the
>>required elements.
>>
>>I built my first transmitter at age 13. From junk parts. Worked quite
>>well. Of course I had previously built a couple of receivers and used
>>them
>>to learn the Morse code off the air.
>
>There is a huge difference between 7 and 13, Jim. Big difference.

Sure. But the point is that simple transmitter building isn't that hard. And
there's no requirement that a ham build anything.

>>Since then I've homebrewed-from-scratch at least 7 transmitters,
>>8 receivers, 3 transceivers, and their related power supplies, antenna
>>tuners, control systems, accessories, test equipment, antennas and
>>shack
>>furniture.
>>
>>The above does not include kits built and rebuilt, old gear restored
>>to
>>operation, military surplus converted to ham use, repairs and
>>adjustments,
>>and stuff done for other hams. Of which I've done plenty...
>>
>>It's easy and fun. Too many hams don't know what they're missing.
>
>Absolutely.
>
>But you're not 7!

I'm not 13 either.

>>> - unlike the chief engineer at
>>> your local NBC affiliate, who is merely a professional in his field
>>> :)

>>
>>He probably doesn't have a license and probably never built a
>>transmitter.
>
>Is that a requirement for an Amateur license? Wasn't on my test....

Then why does it matter?

>>> You know, everyone seems to be holding this event up as a great
>>> accomplishment for Amateur Radio.
>>
>>It points out that the tests aren't that hard. Which some of us have
>>been saying for years.
>
>Agreed.

>>> And I applaud the little girl's
>>> dedication to memorizing the material and passing all of the required
>>> tests. That took a lot of effort on her part.
>>>
>>> But it is a clear indication that the testing procedure is far too
>>> easy - IMHO. It can be memorized, which removes any requirement to
>>> comprehend the material. Do you believe that a 7-year old can
>>> comprehend the theories of complex numbers as they relate to impedance
>>> in a resonant circuit?
>>
>>I'm sure some can.
>
>Sure, Jim.

There are plenty of older hams who can't do it either. Would you take their
licenses away?
>
>The whole point of putting that on the test was to encourage people to
>learn technical material, not memory walk through it.

Hasn't worked, has it? It's just a hoop most hams have to jump through, isn't
it?

>>>Bull.

Horse.
>>
>>Have you ever been around really bright children whose talents are
>>recognized and supported, Leo? They're capable of far more than
>>many adults give them credit for.
>>
>>Complex numbers are simply a way of dealing with a pair of related
>>electrical quantities. There's no need to have a detailed
>>understanding of that whole
>>field of math just to do some LCR calculations.
>

>Agreed - and any idiot can learn to plug numbers into a formula.

Why such a nasty tone? "Idiots"?

>The idea was to learn the root concepts and theories!
>
Hasn't worked, has it?

>>And there is *no* requirement that *any* ham understand complex
>>numbers.
>
>There is, if he really wants to figure out why his 50 ohm antenna has
>an SWR of 2.6 to 1......

Not at all.

And why would a 50 ohm antenna have such a high SWR if it's 50 ohms?
>
>>> >>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>>> >>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>>> >>US?
>>> >
>>> >No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
>>> >because they were essentially the same in both services.
>>> >
>>> >The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in
>the USA
>>> >that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge
>of
>>> >amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
>>> >qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license
>test
>>> >alone.
>>> >And that's still the case.
>>> >
>>> >>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>>> >>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>>> >>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>>> >>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>>> >>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>>> >
>>> >No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests
>include
>>> >the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
>>> > its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact.
>>>
>>> IC disagrees. But I'll ask them to take your opinion under advisement
>>> :)
>>
>>Wrong is wrong. But the IC are professionals, aren't they?
>
>Yep - professional regulators. Them who makes the rules!

PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!

>>> Personally I'd think, for example, that the guy who sits in a control
>>> tower accurately vectoring planes all over our busy airspace is far
>>> better equipped to carry on a two-way conversation on 2-meters than
>>> the average amateur who passed a relatively simple test!
>>
>>Maybe. But there's no requirement that he have any sort of radio
>>operator's license. He doesn't need to know how the radios work.
>>Complex numbers?
>
>They aren'r required - you just told me that....

Exactly. Nor band edges, or power limits, etc.
>
>>> He could
>>> learn all of the operating procedures that he needs by reading a
>>> couple of sections of the RAC study guide....a couple of nights would
>>> be all it would take. And, in a real emergency, that's the guy that I
>>> would want to see on the radio, coordinating things!
>>
>>maybe - if he knows the environment.
>>
>>> Not the guy with
>>> the mag mount 2-meter antenna on his callsigned baseball cap at the
>>> local hamfest.....(I swear he goes to every hamfest in the world -
>>> you've seen him at yours, haven't you? :))
>>
>>No. I'm too busy looking at rigs and parts.
>
>Look up - he's there, along with the guys who look like the local
>homeless shelter burnt down!

Gee, you sure have a high opinion of your fellow hams.
>
>>> >For the USA to make the
>>> >same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were
>changed.
>>> >Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
>
>>> >for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the
>amateur-radio-related
>>> >questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an
>amateur
>>> >radio station.
>>>
>>> ...unless they can find a 7-year old to elmer them, that is. That is
>>> some prettty tough material to master! LOL!
>>
>>Would you talk that way to a 7 year old, Leo?
>
>Why not?

>
How much time *do* you spend with children?

>>btw, when I was in EE school, I wound up elmering my faculty advisor.
>>He was a
>>PhD EE but didn't know much about radio, because radio is only a small
>>part of EE. He knew *his* part of EE backwards and forwards, but
>>needed *me* to help
>>him figure out ham radio. I was glad to help, of course.
>
>Yep, you're quite the guy alright!

Glad you figured that out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2205. Re: ARRL Committee's "Bandwidth-Based Frequency Plan"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 03:13:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040206221359.01692.00000480@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86879

In article <d22b54c3.0402061500.66df6919@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040205071604.25517.00004101@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402041724.10fbc51d@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >This one is as bad a Bonnie's abomination. Maybe worse.
>> >
>> >http://www.arrl.org/announce/reports-0307/hf-digital.html
>>
>> How is it as bad or worse? I think it's much better!
>
>It's worse because Bonnie is a no-counter, the guys who wrote the ARRL
>version should have known better. I looked all of 'em up to find out
>where they come from. One is a VHFer, two or three others are big into
>HF APRS and HF Echolink sorts of interests. Lotta TAPR connections.
>Only one, maybe two of 'em do much with conventional HF modes. The
>real kicker is that the two really heavy hitters on the committee
>bailed away from it. We all know who G3PLX is and what he's done but
>his reason for resigning from the committeee is publicly unkown. The
>other is KH6TY who invented DigiPan PSK31 and PSK 63 and is the
>recipient of the 2000 ARRL Technical Excellence Award. He disagrees
>with the final output and supposedly will craft his own version of the
>report.

And KQ6XA'z is worse.
>
>> First off, it does not widen the 'phone bands anywhere near as much as the
>> KQ6XA plan.
>
>The phone bands *will* get widened and this report won't have anything
>to do with it.

True, and that's a good point.
>
>> Nor does it decrease the Extra segments.
>
> Minor point overall but at least they had enough sense not to mess
>with that bag of worms.
>
>> Second, the 200/500/2700 Hz rules
>

>So where's the 10/8Khz wide digital stuff gonna run? DRM will be
>excluded?
>
>> are for a *voluntary bandplan*, not FCC regs.
>
>Bandplans work on bands >30 Mhz because Riley can enforce 'em when and
>where they actually matter. Voluntary bandplans for MF/HF have been
>out there for eons and they *don't* work. All adopting this proposal
>would do is generate more opportunities to bust bandplans.

Agreed!
>
>> Third, it actually acknowledges that hams use modes like CW and Baudot
>RTTY.
>
>Wunnerful. Hang dividing lines somwhere around the bottom edges of
>what are now the lower limits of the phone bands. All modes above
>those limits gotta be 8-10 Khz wide max, everything below can't exceed
>1 Khz wide and let the market sort 'em out.
>
Bingo.

> This report was submitted almost two years ago and has gone nowhere.

That says it all. It's a nocounter going nowhere.

End of story..

73 de Jim, N2EY

2206. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 03:25:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402061925.73fdf12e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86882

ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20040206070742.29815.00003137@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
> >Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
> >old at the time.
>
> What a great new game! I'll play:
>
> I was born April 24, 1954. I got my Novice ticket October 14, 1967. I got my
> Extra September 26, 1970. (Dates are when the actual license arrived - passed
> the tests about six weeks earlier). I reckon that made me 16 years, 5 months,
> 2 days old when the Extra came in the mail. That 2 year experience requirement
> held me up at least a year).
>
> Anybody else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

. . . Move over ya newbies, ALLYA, the OF has logged in . .

b. 05Mar37

Novice ticket, wn3yik some time or another in the 1953-54 timeframe.
16-17 years old. Novice WAS on 80. Most memorable Q: Wire blew down
overnite. I "inductively coupled" my sleeping brother to the ARC-5
output and worked a guy in Pittsburgh mid-morning.

General 10 months later. Give or take. First Q as a General was G5ZK.
On 80 of course.

Extra whenever it was in the late '60s when ya had to pass the stupid
test or get booted outta the dx hot slices. 30-31 years old?

w3rv
CP 30 circa 1955
DXCC mixed #10k & DXCC Phone
WAZ
5BDXCC #142/'72

2207. Re: Can I get my old WN6 call back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 03:56:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040206225619.23307.00006507@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86883

In article <bvsssj$454$1@daisy.noc.ucla.edu>, "Sofa Slug"
<sofaslug_SPAMNOT@arts.ucla.edu> writes:

>OK... forgive me if this is the wrong place for this, and/or it's been =
>asked before...
>
>I used to have a novice class license back in the early seventies that I =
>let run out. I'm interested in becoming a ham again, and I wondered if I =
>could still get my old callsign back.
>
>TNX,

Sofa:

Just plug the old call sign into QRZ.com, and see if it is available. If so,
you can request it as a Vanity Call Sign. You can find the details on how to
do that right on that site, or you can Czech out ARRL.org.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2208. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 03:56:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040206225620.23307.00006508@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 86884

In article <20040205024731.06226.00002702@mb-m19.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Lennie:
>>
>>Yup -- there are many who are a lot better. Sorry, but when we're
>>talking about amateur radio operators, you're not one of them!
>>
>>Literally.
>
> No kidding? You got soma come loud ratings in college for all
> that reasoning? Did you get a brain cell graft or something.
>
> Here's a Clue, bus driver:

Lennie:

Again, more jealousy over the fact that I have an occupation which I enjoy and which allows me to help people on a daily basis. You have my sympathy.

> The FCC doesn't require a single
> commissioner or staff to hold amateur radio licenses in order to
> MAKE the amateur radio regulations or enforce them.

Really? Hmmm -- I guess that would explain why we don't hear many of them on-the-air (or you, for that matter!)

>>> Are you electronically connected here and formerly on FIDONET
>>> BECAUSE no one could "come close to you?"
>>
>>Uh, no -- mainly because I have a computer with a modem! I'm sort of
>>surprised that you didn't know how that worked!
>
> I'm surprised you know how to dial into an ISP without using morse
> code. Modems don't have morse keys.

Don't look now, Lennie, but Modems don't use Morse code, therefore no key is required.

>>> Try regular bathing. It might help.
>>
>>Bathing my computers? Now that you mention it, they are a bit dusty...
>>but I doubt that tossing them into the bathtub would do them any good.
>
> Using them the way you do doesn't do anyone much good.
>

>>(Oooops, guess I just left you an opening you can drive a Kenworth with
>>a 53' trailer through! Oh, well -- you need all the help you can get!)
>
> Not really needing your "help," sweatbreath.

I'm glad to see that my obsessive dental hygiene has paid off!

> You just keep tawking tuff to the group on how you got all those great
> grades in college and could get any personnel job you wanted...all
> through the dedication and resolve that made you Wonder Ham with
> morse code.

I haven't talked about that lately, mainly because you keep bringing
it up!

> You never used any 63/37 solder? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Nope, never hoid of it. Must be something special. What's it used for?

> Have you learned to solder yet?

Yes, around age 10. Since then, I've soldered everything from water pipe
joints to printed circuits. But nothing requiring 63/37, yet. I guess that
leaves me way out of your league. Oh well.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2209. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 05:32:38 UTC
From: Tom Desmond <tdesmond@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <40247874.D58E574E@sprynet.com>
Source record: 86885
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brenda Ann wrote:

> Actually, they don't travel as well as an analog signal.. In areas where
> there is at least a viewable (albeit snowy and/or ghosty) analog signal,
> there is no receivable digital signal at all. This is practical experience
> in Portland, Oregon, where the analog and digital signals are coming from
> ~2000' HAAT..

My experience here in Dallas is just the opposite -- very low powered
digital signals from a 1500' HAAT transmitter site come in perfectly at
my home 35 miles away, while analog signals at remotely similar power
levels are extremely snowy.

2210. Re: Pirate TV- A few questions :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 05:47:22 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <c01retqoa1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 86886
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tom Desmond" <tdesmond@sprynet.com> wrote in message
news:40247874.D58E574E@sprynet.com...
> Brenda Ann wrote:
>
> > Actually, they don't travel as well as an analog signal.. In areas
where
> > there is at least a viewable (albeit snowy and/or ghosty) analog signal,
> > there is no receivable digital signal at all. This is practical
experience
> > in Portland, Oregon, where the analog and digital signals are coming
from
> > ~2000' HAAT..
>
> My experience here in Dallas is just the opposite -- very low powered
> digital signals from a 1500' HAAT transmitter site come in perfectly at
> my home 35 miles away, while analog signals at remotely similar power
> levels are extremely snowy.

Tom,

The problem is, with digital, it's either there or it's not. There is no fringe area. In Oregon, and other mountainous states, it's much different than Texas, Oklahoma or Kansas, where it's mostly flat. Even within the city of Portland, there are large numbers of places that are not line-of-sight, even from antennas at 2000' HAAT.. and the digital signals are not there at all in the shadows of any of the hills, nor are they available out on the coast, whereas analog signals, although relatively poor, are..

2211. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015733.06226.00002767@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86899

In article <20040206095440.21955.00000323@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>>qualifications.
>
>In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
>left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
>because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
>required).

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you should look again. But, that's not "amateur
radio" is it? :-)

>>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
>
>>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>>radio operation,
>
>Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV broadcast
>transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.

I don't know of any TV transmitter sending RTTY.

I don't know of any amateur sending live television of 160 meter
wavelength either.

Weird choice of analogies. :-)

>>and the Pros have made a career of it
>
>All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
>on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of something
>most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).

You are one of those right now (unless you got fired). By your own
admission.

>Those
>people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their profession,
>don't you think? ;-)

You should know...

>We should revere what they say and do, and not
>question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, "revere and not question?!?"

No one who is a professional in radio-electronics have demanded such
in here...not even when the MMMs have demanded exclusive control
and decision over amateur radio matters solely by the licensed.

>They
>must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
>do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)

Thank you for admitting some truth, however hollow it rings.

>> - and invested
>>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
>>would be possible for most hobbyists.
>
>Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back
>when
>the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most to
>be
>at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.

"Was considered" by those who held an Amateur Extra. :-)

Complete the sentence without the selective editing, lest the Ding
Dong Schoolmaster rap your knuckles, naughty boy.

>But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing of
>the
>amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.

Why in the world would professional engineer licenses in the USA
have ANYTHING about amateur radio?

>And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters and
>put them on the air without any certification?

It's done routinely in the USA, by those WITHOUT any license.

Don't you just hate it when your rant point falls down and goes boom?

>>After all, it would be pretty
>>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!
>
>>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.
>
>Agreed! But at least it still exists.

Yes. Seven year olds can pass it.

What does that say about your vaunted federal merit badge?

>>Too easy,
>>I'd say,
>
>The FCC disagrees.

This isn't a debate with the FCC and you are not a federal insider.

>>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
>>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)
>
>And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public info,
>too.

And that of several other commercial radio licenses you didn't mention
because you don't know they exist...

>Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether or
>not she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?

Do you know the honesty and integrity of the VEs who adminstered
the test? Would that hold up in a court of law?

[your reply is already guessed in several rationales so don't bother typing]

>>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>>US?
>
>No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
>because they were essentially the same in both services.

Yes, morse code gets through when everything else will.

>The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in the USA
>that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge of
>amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
>qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license test
>alone. And that's still the case.

You KNOW this for certain, even back in 1956? :-)

Go to Ebay and buy some clues to who uses radios in the USA.
The first hint is that they aren't amateurs. The second hint is that
they don't have to test for morse code to be perfectly authorized to
communicate.

Don't take off the ARRL blinders just yet...your mental optic nerves
might not take the overload.

>>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges

>>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>
>No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests include
>the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
> its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact. For the USA to make the
>same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were changed.
>Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
>for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the amateur-radio-related
>questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an amateur
>radio station.
>

"Plain and simple fact: the government of Canada is derelict in its duty
to the ARS." My, my, aren't you the War Crimes prosecutor about to
Make a Case!

Tell us, oh Noble Lord, why does the government of Canada HAVE to
do any duty to the ARS? Can't they just govern their own amateurs and
not have some "obligation" to the rest of the Americas?

Most Noble Lord of the Inquisition, you once again confuse "qualification"
with "authoritzation" or "grant." Adminstrations don't "qualify" any radio
operators in the USA, but they do AUTHORIZE them certain privileges
according to the radio service they were tested in.

My Lord, please step up to this pile of twigs and try on these ropes.
We want to "light your fire," so to speak. :-)

You want some fries with that?

LHA / WMD

2212. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015736.06226.00002768@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86900

In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 05:34:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:
>
>>If you're waiting for radio
>>amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely
>>going to be disappointed.
>
>I must admit, I've taken a shot or three at Len over exactly the same
>issue - no Amateur callsign = no valid opinion on Amateur issues.

No problem to me. :-) Somebody shoots at me in the newsgroup
and I shoot back...which bothers the hokey heck out some. :-)

What's fun, sort of, is to watch the adamantly stubborn they-are-
right-no-matter-if-they-are-wrong-but-try-to-rationalize-their-
wrongness-by-not-very-creative-spin. Usually I find those folks are
to ones who get personal amusement at others' misfortunes of
whatever kind. If someone doesn't have misfortunes they imagine
one and apply it to them, one way or another.

>However, a little research reveals that this distinction would be
>irrelevant in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>qualifications.

I think that is perfectly fine, but don't make book on any of the
PCTA newsgroupies to agree with that. They are hidebound with
gold leaf edging to hold utterly fast to their own beliefs and
standards...curiously enough exactly those when They first got
licensed (authorized, not qualified).

>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:

<snip of very informative material>

>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>radio operation, and the Pros have made a career of it - and invested
>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
>would be possible for most hobbyists. After all, it would be pretty
>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!

Careful, they won't know who Karsh is/was...a decided narrowing
of other interests and some lack of familiarity outside of hum radio
among these newsgroupies...:-)

>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics. Too easy,
>I'd say, but that is another issue.....(when 7 year olds can pass
>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)

...consider also benevolent, grandfatherly VEs over here, such
as the ones "passing" the written exams of two six year olds about
three years (?) or so ago. :-)

>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>
>I'm not sure if Len's First Class license is equal to any of the
>Canadian ones listed in RIC-3 above - but if they are, the Canadian
>equivalent to his license would be sufficient to acquire a VEx
>callsign absolutely free upon request.
>
>Well, for a 49-cent stamp, anyway :)

Actually, I'm not absolutely interested in "being qualified" by a
pretty certificate (suitable for framing) from our FCC. I got
really and truly qualified to do that a half century ago, operating
HF transmitters having RF power outputs of 1 to 40 KW. The
operating word ought to be "authorized," not qualified. Our FCC
exists to regulate U.S. civil radio and interstate communications
(NTIA oversees military and government agency communications)
and their use of licenses is as a regulatory tool.

Besides, my 'first phone got changed to a General Radiotelephone
(Commercial) license some time ago. Watch this space since the
resident gunnery nurse is going to come in on that with six-guns
blazing, cussing up a storm but getting only misfires and overcast.
:-) heh heh heh.

Over 40 years ago I joined a grass-roots campaign for a young
senator from Massachusetts wanting to become President of the
USA. J.F.K. was Catholic but I had no desire to become Catholic.
Neither did I want any political position, favor, or anything else as a
result of such voluntary work on his behalf. Kennedy won by a
narrow margin. It was a "cause" that was just personal, nothing else
to justify it.

Some of the anal-retentive olde-tyme hammes in here DEMAND a justification for action, all but invoking a death penalty if one doesn't live up to their demands. Good grief, those are Charley Browns that Sparky never drew...except the maybe beagle dreaming of being a WW1 fighter ace in his Sopwith Camel. They dream of Being In Charge, of being some kind of "ace" in radio through their mighty macho morsemanship. [that kind of "ace" is not spelled with a C or E but with two Ss...:-)] Maybe its some kind of "radio testosterone"? Most of the time those MMMs just try to use a humiliation ploy with the incessant "I've got a license and you ain't, nyah, nyah, nyah." Geez, its only a HOBBY license but you would think they got promoted to Chief of Staff of Amateur Signals with some kind of field grade rank (colonel to general, complete with flag on front car bumper)... :-)

My only objective overall is to be one of many advocating the elimination of the morse code test for a license. That's it. But, there's another element that may be at work with some of the MMMs: If the morse code test is eliminated, they will lose bragging rights to their fabled rank, their status as guru radio operator gods in amateurism. That is extremely hard on their personal self-esteem and they get all steamed over such perceived blows to their boilers. They elevated themselves (without "bootstrap" circuit) to lofty positions and had most of their pedestals yanked away. They lost federal support for their mental hernias. They are but mortal and their works are not that mighty after all (to paraphrase Tenneyson). Nobody cares to admire their deeds and doings to standards and practices of 70 years ago, a time when they did not exist.

As far as I'm concerned, by all objective measure, there's just no need for any government to require a morse code test for any amateur radio license. There's no ITU requirement to "obey." Not since July of last year. The IARU agrees, despite the spin of the ARRL trying to indicate otherwise. The ARRL doesn't agree. PCTAs don't, indeed can't agree since the loss of the code test as a requirement would be an ego blow equivalent to mass destruction.

The familiar argument heard in here is to the effect that "ONLY amateurs can discuss, direct, or implement rules and regulations of and about amateurs." That's a base falsity. The United States Constitution, in its First Amendment, grants the right of ALL U.S. citizens to petition our government for the redress of grievances. We have a number of similar rights which don't discriminate in the favor of elitist, special interest groups. Our FCC was created by an Act of our Congress in 1934. In all the time since then (almost 70 years) there has been absolutely NO law or condition that any Commissioner or staff member hold any amateur radio license in order to make, change, or enforce amateur radio regulations. None. No such law exists...except in the imaginary posse commitatus fantasy of a small group of would-be tyrants of opinion...some of them in here parading around in the false patriotism of "honor and respect and tradition for 'the service.'" BS...a food group already processed through by male bovines.

All of the MMMs who parrot their false patriotism and elitism are really only trying to elevate themselves to lofty but imaginary positions of glory and gradeur that don't exist. Not a good role model for enhancing any interest in a fun, recreational activity involving radio. But, it satisfies them no end for, in their imaginary ego world, they are absolute champions of whatever they have done. All others are non-existant.

Actually, in such an environment, there is no possibility of rational, civilized discussion. Except for one little thing.

This is (so far) an open, public newsgroup, unmoderated. There are no guards checking credentials at any door, there are only the self-styled Waffen SS equivalents roaming about, snarling about "qualifications."

Interesting place, this newsgroup. Kraft-Ebbing could have had a second edition to cover it for the psychiatric professionals. Some get oriongasms even... :-)

LHA / WMD

2213. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015739.06226.00002769@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87002

In article <40232748.C8F2698B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Ding Dong Schoolmaster
brandishing his Ruler k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:
>>
>> In article <40219EA0.3F50F6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <snarly
>> k8mn@earthlink.net aka "Mr. Warmth"> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
>> >> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >> >
>> >> >> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Mental or physical age? :-)
>> >> >
>> >> >At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
>> >>
>> >> Never tried, snarly dave.
>> >
>> >Well, there you have it.
>>
>> Have what? I don't have any amateur license. Got several others.
>
>In the context of this newsgroup, that means just what?

Yup. You need to UPGRADE your neurons.

Hint: You made a general statement. I gave you a specific answer.

You didn't like the answer. You never do. TS. :-)

>> Snarly dave, I don't care about your amateur wonderfulness and
>> vindictiveness and bigotry to non-amateurs. I'm a pro, like it or no.
>
>If you don't care, why are you still haunting a newsgroup dealing with
>amateur radio?

Boooooo! I haunt you! :-)

Snarly dave, I said I don't care about YOUR amateur wonderfulness.

YOURS, snarly dave. You are NOT U.S. amateur radio. [thank
the Lord...the League membership drive would be in hell if so...]

>It is clear that you are not a radio amateur and that
>you are not, after all these years, "getting into amateur radio".

Snarly dave, it isn't in your power to demand "motivations" since
you are NOT a moderator in here, a judge, a jury, and certainly
not an executioner (although I'm sure you would relish the task
and with a side of fries to go with that).

I've been trying to argue the elimination of the morse code test
for ANY U.S. radio license.

Problem is, some of you and your ilk (ilk are similar to huns but
are not, unfortunately, a vanishing species) DEMAND "motivation"
and some kind of perverse "unquestioning love of a service" that
is supposed to be a fun, recreational activity about radio. As a
result you spend hours and waste Internet bandwidth insulting all
those who do not agree with your wonderfulness, etc.

>Haunt
>some radio professionals, using the endearing manner you've displayed
>here and see how long they put up with your condesent.

It's "condescension," not "condesent" or even 'condiment' although
it must spice up your life on here.

I've worked with professionals in radio and electronics a long time
and they don't come across with the kind of stuff you and the
gunnery nurse and other "proud SERVICE members" do.

>I worked professionally in radio and electronics.

Of course you did. In the "foreign service," right? :-)

[NBC likes the term "fleecing of America" and that might apply? :-)]

>A number of us here have done so or do so.

Yes. And? :-)

>What sets you apart is that you are a non-amateur who
>seems to get his jollies taking potshots at radio amateurs.

Only CERTAIN amateurs...such as those pretending to be radio gods
and the like. Look in a mirror to meet one.

The salient point should be that I am still here! There have been many
others participating in here that did not possess amateur licenses.
Most, nearly all in fact, quit, dropped out, probably in irritation at the
self-important personal wonderfulness expressed by those definitely
NOT representative-of-the-amateur-community-but-insisted-they-
ARE-amateur-radio. :-)

You can't handle persistence by others who oppose your viewpoints.

All you can do is attempt insult and demeaning of those persons
instead of addressing the subjects. QED most of today's mail package.

With all those many years of amateur radio experience you could have
been doing great things for U.S. amateur radio...instead of trying to
"get" certain personalities on this newsgroup. It's counterproductive
and wastes bandwidth and others' time.

>> You do NOT get to choose anything about what anyone is "supposed"
>> to say, to reply to, or anydamnthingelse. You keep thinking you do
>> every time you put on the SS uniform with the monocle. Try keeping
>> the armband off, it's so 40-ish.
>
>Get it straight, Len. This is an open newsgroup dealing with amateur
>radio. You are in no way involved with amateur radio. I am free to
>choose to respond to anything posted here and shall do so as the spirit
>moves me.

Get it straight, snarly dave. This is an open newsgroup, without any
moderator, accessible by anyone.

If you get honked by anyone with an opposing view, you can't fall back
on insults and pejoratives and nastygrams against the person instead
of the subject. THAT DOESN'T ALWAYS WORK. [obviously not...:-)]

Try not to "threaten" anyone. That only makes you look more like the
Waffen SS officer you seem to emulate.

Remember something which the gunnery nurse must have forgotten:
Do as the spirit moves you, NOT as the spirits move you.

If something doesn't work, stubbornness isn't a cure. You are doing
it WRONG when no results come. CHANGE.

>> Shave the head and learn to smile. That will make you more like
>> Colonel Klink. Lose several pounds too.
>
>As a last resort, you can always go to your strength and bring in the
>Nazi images.

Nein, Herr Robust, Wehrmacht, perhaps the military of Prussia of old,
not the "nazis." Das ist der "image" presented.

"That seemed to write itself." Remember that braggadoccio? :-)

>Let's see. Amateur radio newsgroup. I'm a radio amateur.

Congratulations. I'll bet you have a nice license certificate suitable for
framing.

>Now, back to
>the question: What does your comment have to do with Larry's amateur
>radio license and of concern is his job to you?

Back to your official position as Ding Dong Schoolmaster: Whoinheck appointed you anything that you can DEMAND answers? :-)

Quit shaking that ruler around. You can't slap anyone's wrist for writing anything in here. Try to realize that you are POWERLESS in that regard.

>It seems to be karma
>that forces you to live up to the N2EY profile of your likely actions.

TAFKA Reverend Jim has his own problems and those are not your concern. He's just another newsgroupie but with a bad case of thinking he has to comment on everyone's postings all the time. :-)

>Actually, old boy, you have quite the attitude toward radio amateurs.

ONLY to CERTAIN ones. Tag, you're IT. :-)

The best man at my wedding is still a radio amateur. The best work manager I ever had is still a radio amateur, now moved to mid-California where my wife and I were overnight guests. I don't have any "attitude" towards the group (or "community" as some wish to lump it), just CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

>You're insulting, rude and immature.

Self-professed gods seem to get that impression! TS. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, "some things seem to write themselves," don't they?

>If you're waiting for radio
>amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely
>going to be disappointed.

Oh, my, judging all others by the things YOU do? :-)

Poor baby, haven't you realized that I am retired? I don't HAVE to "impress anyone." I did what I did. Now I don't have to take any BS* from anyone on how "important" THEY are. Neither am I "impressed" by complex radios or electronic systems, having been around many such things, some far more complex than any product of Ten-Tec. If you have one and are amazed by it, be my guest. Just quit making out How Good You Are Because You Have One.

I got into the whole big entire world of radio because it was very interesting, a fun job despite some obvious challenges in some technological areas. It also paid well if a good job was done. I got paid reasonably well. As TAFKA Rev. Jim once quoted: "It ain't braggin' if ya done it." I did it.

* abbreviation for Brussel Sprouts, used to avoid any "[expletive deleted]" quotations by the anal-retentive moralists.

>It wasn't a casual, throwaway mention and your newsgroup statements of
>the past are here for a long, long time.

Boooooo! Let it HAUNT you forever and ever! :-)

Like I've said many times, feel free to cut and paste everything I ever
wrote from Google archives. Get your own newsgroup if you like.
Will that cure your vindictiveness? I doubt it. You will be angry
anyway. It's your personality.

>I haven't changed my mind about you, Len.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, stubborn as they come (you should be sitting in front
of your orion when that happens).

You will NOT ever retract anything you've said, you will rationalize the
beejums out of what you said in order to make you look good to
yourself. Few give a darn. Feel self-triumphant as much as you want.
It's a free country. Except in this newsgroup where one MUST have
an amateur callsign officially bestowed on their cub scout uniforms
or claim they have one while remaining anomalous. :-)

>You're a victim of your own inertia and braggadocio.

Nope. Just a Fatal Attraction to balloon-popping of the self-important,
the self-grandiose, the self-proclaimed god-gurus of hum radio. :-)

That's so much fun! :-)

>To twist a phrase: If you haven't done it, it
>is most certainly bragging. You haven't obtained a license and aren't
>likely to do so.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, snarly dave. Still at it. You never learn.

I have obtained licenses (note the plural) in radio. Amateur hasn't
been one of them. That includes station as well as operator.

I may still get a hum license. I may not. Why is that a concern?

I'm still a citizen of the United States of America with all the rights
thereof. No self-important, self-officious SOB* is going to take
those rights away from me. At least one other SOB* tried but
failed (miserably).

Amateur radio is supposed to be a fun recreational activity involving
radio and the radio arts. From the actions of a few who do NOT
adequately represent the "amateur community," it seems to be a
vindictive group of ego-honed Cassius Clay imitators who assume
the invisible mantle of gods of radio. They should get better tailors
and see what happened to Muhammed Ali in later life. A few in
that category think that amateur radio is a "service" like the military
and assume rank and insignia demanding respect (and salutes).
Those should be arrested for impersonating officers. :-)

The ARRL does not adequately represent the "amateur community"
either since their published numbers indicate a decided member-
ship less than a quarter of all licensed U.S. amateurs. They like to
think they control everything but they don't. The more-public access

granted by the Internet has shown the FCC that the ARRL is just a special interest group and not really that representative.

* SOB: abbreviation for Son Of a Beeper, again for the morally outraged purists who want to keep everyone pristine and pure like they claim they are...

>Consider yourself stuffed.

It's after supper and I am adequately filled, thank you for your concern.

My wife is a good cook, we have a newly remodeled kitchen, a comfortable income and life, yet she scolds me for playing with the seven-year-olds in radio expertise in a newsgroup. She's right. :-)

Bye.

Have fun with your oriongasms.

LHA / WMD

2214. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015741.06226.00002771@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86887

In article <4022ED6C.55B1405B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Entertain us with your credentials once again, won't you, Len.

How can I do it "again" when you didn't like it the first time?

Tell the stage manager to change the lights or maybe change
the flats.

Do something about the floor, please. It's all messy after you've
been amazing yourself sitting with your orion.

>Then tell us about that "Extra right out of the box".

Extras don't come in a box. They do it in front of orions.

>After more than seven
>years of posting your diatribes in an amateur radio newsgroup, you're no
>closer to obtaining even the most basic no-code amateur radio license.

Was never my intent to GET a ham license any class.

After seven years you are no closer to understanding that. You
desperately need to UPGRADE your neuron count! Download
some more from Ten-Tec. You can do it.

LHA / WMD

2215. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015741.06226.00002770@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86895

In article <4022EF72.DA58C3FF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40219C12.1040909@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>> >>>At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
>> >>
>> >> Never tried, snarly dave.
>> >>
>> >> I passed my First Phone exam on the first try in Chicago at an FCC
>> >> field office in March 1956. Never looked back.
>> >>
>> >Then learning the 5 wpm and getting the extra should be a walk in the park
>> then.
>> >It took me about a month to learn 5 wpm and I'm no good at such motor
>skills.
>>
>> Gosh, olde-tymer, I've walked in many fine parks in my time but not
>> a single one of them required any morse code proficiency to walk.
>
>That "Extra right out of the box" park requires it at the breakneck pace
>of f i v e w o r d s p e r m i n u t e.

Y o u t y p e f u n n y .

Y o u r o r i o n t u n e s to V O A s l o w E n g l i s h ?

>> Psycho-motor skill I learned in middle school (we called it
>> "junior high school" back then before educational PC) was typing
>> at tested maximum of 60 WPM. On typewriters that had no key
>> markings. :-)
>
>There's no typing test involved in the Amateur Extra. Just a morse test
>of f i v e w o r d s p e r m i n u t e.

T h a n k y o u f o r h e a d s u p.

>> Now, let's concentrate on WHY there's still a morse code test for
>> an AMATEUR radio license...and WHY it must remain law forever
>> and ever. Or, at least until the last PCTA has their code key
>> forcibly removed from their cold, dead fingers.
>
>At the rate you're progressing toward that Extra Class ticket, there

>won't be any amateur radio license at all to pry from your cold, dead
>fingers.

So goes the glory of the world. [sic transit gloria mundi]

You seem to be in sick transit. Get well fast.

>> Is morse code not so wonderful that the feds have to keep the
>> morse test in law so that cute little seven-year-olds can have
>> radio playmates? Or forty-seven-year-olds and older?
>
>It still gets you that mere children can obtain that which you covet,
>doesn't it?

Covet? C o v e t ? ! ?

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAEEHEEHEE
HEEHEEHEEHEEHAWHAWHAWHAW - gasp - snickersnicker

Y o u a r e f u n n e e !

>> Ever wonder why morse code is the SECOND most used mode
>> on HF, a distant second behind voice? All the HF hams had to
>> test for code but so few continued to use it.
>
>Let's see.....hmmm....It is probably because the overwhelming majority
>can already talk? Operating on SSB would seem to be as easy
>as...talking.

It is, Ding Dong Schoolmaster. I did just that in 1954. On SSB.

Very easy. Had to use English, though, language of the Waffen SS
wasn't allowed.

>> I guess it must not be
>> so wonderful, so popular after all.
>
>...but you'll have to continue to rely upon second-hand information.

No, the CIA.

According to the gunnery nurse, amateur radio is a super-secret
organization that ABSOLUTELY no one can know about until they
get their very own license and certificate (suitable for framing).

Send me a free copy of "Now You're Talking" and I'll study up on
the matter.

Do I need a DoD or Q Clearance to read that?

LHA / WMD

2216. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015742.06226.00002772@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86892

In article <4022EC2F.55D9A333@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Ding Dong Schoolmaster k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>It should be apparent to you, Leonard. They're discussing matters
>dealing with amateur radio.

Yes, Janet Jackson's breast, U.S. foreign policy, the local weather, national societal morals to name just four common "amateur radio" subjects.

:-)

>You've delivered bushels of sermons here
>but you have zip to do with amateur radio.

And snarly dave has delivered tonnes of diatribes against individuals for having the temerity to disagree with a radio god such as He!

So...is there anything NEW? :-)

>Instead, you entertain us
>with tales of how the commercials do things and of your military
>exploits of fifty years back.

You don't seem very entertained? Shall I strap on my Haney plates?

"Military exploits?" I don't think I've ever exploited anyone while serving my country in the U.S. Army.

Okay, maybe a couple gals in Red Bank, New Jersey, but that was long ago, probably before you got diapers.

>Your claims of being here only to engage in civil debate on morse
>testing elimination ring very hollow.

The Ding Dong Schoolmaster done ring his chimes!

Snarly dave, don't they have any rest homes in your neck of the woods? You could go out there and berate some Alzheimer's patient about losing their memory and not getting a ham license.

Better yet, accost an Orthodox Jew and start lecturing them about ham.

That's your style, what else you do for kicks? [as if anyone cared]

Go play with your orion. Amaze yourself. Have an oriongasm.

LHA / WMD

2217. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015743.06226.00002773@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86891

In article <1e4e3692.0402051522.1d36e348@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0402040346.47ba943f@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
>> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
>> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> > > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> > > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> > > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
>> > > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and
>as an
>> > > > > incentive to use voice only!
>> > > >
>> > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very
>same
>> > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
>> > > >
>> > > Why is it NOW a problem?
>> > >
>> > Why?
>> >
>> Why, Jim?
>>
>> Why, Jim?
>
>Jim, don't you know why you say the things you say?

In the past it's been "his way or the highway."

I reckon he's on the highway now...

LHA / WMD

2218. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015746.06226.00002775@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86890

In article <otmdnaSF4Yt_c7_dRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> Meanwhile some of us will have been having a lot of fun with ham
>> radio. I know I have, and will continue to do so.
>
> Me too. Glad I didn't listen to those that told me that "Morse code is
>going to go away any day now." ~Three extra years on HF and counting.....

Keep on truckin, radio pioneer.

Make sure that all other hams keep the Faith and worship regularly
at the Church of St. Hiram, beeping in mass formation, following
the catechisms of morse down to every procode, pledging allegiance
to the league and the morse code.

Above all, force everyone to accept present law as a Divine one,
never to be changed by mortal man, that morse code testing
shall remain forever and ever. That is the Way of True Faith of
the American Amateur. According to the Church of St. Hiram.

Status quo uber alles...unless the BoD changes their mind again.

LHA / WMD

2219. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015746.06226.00002774@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87001

In article <40232FD0.F492989E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40227DF3.1C5E590D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <confused in the
>> east...and north...and south k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.com
>> >> >(N2EY)
>> >> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >The hundreds of thousands of amateur radio ops work DX, engage in
>> >> >radiosport, check into nets or engage in public service communications
>> >> >without touching a PLMRS transceiver.
>> >>
>> >> Wow! Really?!?
>> >>
>> >> No hams work in a business that has a Public Land Mobile Radio
>> >> Services radio? No hams work on railroads or in heavy trucking or
>> >> vehicle road service trucks? No hams in construction of large
>> >> buildings or engaged in HVAC or plumbing maintenance of same?
>> >> No hams are policemen or firemen or paramedics? No hams are in
>> >> the broadcast industry using remote links controlled through PLMRS
>> >> comms?
>> >
>> >Oh, I see your confusion. You thought I meant *other than on the ham
>> >bands*!
>>
>> Who knows what lurks in your four neurons, snarly dave?
>>
>> [da shadow do?]
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
>> >> They are all on HF engaging in "radiosport" and net checking to
>> >> advance the state of the art of radio and morsemanship?
>> >
>> >Did I write "all" or did you just gather it from the ether?
>>
>> No, nitrous oxide.
>
>In your case, nitrous obnoxide.
>
>> I have to take an anaesthetic when I go in here to read all this "expert
>> radio nowledge stuf." One needs to dull the senses down to the
>> extra level...
>
>Just more civil debate on the elimination of morse testing, Leonid?
>
>> >> Now all that "radiosport" and "net checking" is fun and recreational
>> >> and enjoyed by many but it is hardly any sort of technical
>> >> advancement or honing skills useful in case of national need.
>> >
>> >How do you know much about it--by having someone you know tell you of
>> >it? By reading about it on the web? By browsing through the pages of
>> >QST at your local library? Were you under the impression that hams are
>> >mandated to participate in technical advancement? Are there no
>> >operational skills needed by the nation?
>>
>> Why are you asking?
>
>In the expectation of receiving a straight answer. How do you know that
>radiosport and public service work in amateur radio are fun? Who told
>you?
>
>> You are an Extra. You know Everything because you are Qualified
>> by a federal agency, complete with pretty little certificate (suitable
>> for framing)!
>
>You're right about one part: I am an Amateur Extra, but I now about what
>hams do because I am a part of it, an active participant. I don't get
>my knowledge of amateur radio on a second-hand basis.
>
>> >I know in which part of the spectrum 10 KHz is located.
>>
>> Did you download that firmware fact from Ten-Tec too?
>
>No, Leonard. Ten-Tec has firmware upgrades available. Would you like

>the definition of firmware again?
>
>> >No radio amateur anywhere has done anything if you haven't known about it.
>>
>> Awwww...now you are acting all peevish. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>>
>> >Worship? You aren't even baptised as a licensed ham, Leonard.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, pope dave the furst become a religious sellout?
>>
>> The Church doesn't issue ham licenses, snarly dave.
>
>That's strange. Weren't you the fellow who brought up a particular
>church? You seemed to have snipped that portion.
>
>> The FDA grades ham.
>
>...leaving you to handle the degrading.

I only degrade the biodegradeable amateurs in here.

You know, the Few, the Overly-Proud, the (white) Men of the
Amateur Copse waving in the breeze of their own unoriginality
bravely holding to the standards and practices of 1930s
amateurisms but bragging they are state of the art by buying
the latest radio toy designed by someone else and built by
someone else and thinking they are potential Nobel laureates
for doing so.

You biodegradeables get your jollies not by operating them radio
toys so much as acting like you are radio gods in here and
snarling degredations at others who don't have your lofty
opinions. Worse yet, you aren't even original in your perjoratives.

>> Didn't you forget my claim that I was going to invent anti-gravity?
>
>Haven't heard of that one. Don't worry too much though. It can't make
>you look any more foolish than your "Extra right out of the box" claim.

Said that once before. You can find it in Google (you were going to
cut and paste everything I ever wrote before in here...that will be
included).

I'm still working on anti-gravity. Something is holding me down, though.

>> Now sit down in front of your orion, snarly dave. Amaze yourself.
>
>I do that quite frequently, Leonid.

Herr Robust, you need to get some radio technology EDUCATION.

In the KH2D gentle way of beginning such, here's a basic formula to
memorize: E = I * R where E is voltage, I is current, R is resistance.

Got that? No? Too complex for you? It's very, very basic law.

Fella named Ohm came up with that. Lot's of others accept it...does not have to be explained by Ten-Tec on their website.

That's just the beginning. We can work on components of radios later, all the amazing things that happen behind the front panel using L and C and things called "transistors" and "integrated circuits!"

Isn't that something, though! "Magic" happens when you move knobs and switches in the correct way. Electrons can do your bidding and create fields and waves in free space!

Did you know that others have made actual electronic surrogates for adding machines and calculators? Yes! A long time ago, even before WW2 in Ohio, courtesy of John Atanasoff (forgive me if I spelled it wrong, John, you are not a Hun). I even have one on my watch! That watch has no moving parts and tells time very accurately.

Well, here's the most amazing magic of all: Others have found ways to combine those electronic calculators and "magical" radios. Those are called "SDR" or Software Defined Radios!" Memorize the word "software" in that acronym. Learn the difference soft versus firm.

Yes, it's true! In the office here is a "radio clock," no moving parts, battery powered, that tunes itself in to WWVB after midnight, corrects itself if necessary according to NIST's prime time standard, gives the date, day, compensates for leap years, even the "leap second" and (additionally) tells the office temperature! Sunnavagun. All that and the display doesn't have to glow!

That one is big, easy to read from anywhere in the room, have had it for a year. There's a smaller one in the other room, had that for three years, does everything except for the room temperature. Each one cost less than $30. No moving parts. No controls need be touched to be accurate to within one second every day. No license needed, no morse code required to have one or use one!

A little microcontroller inside each radio clock is the heart; a quartz crystal is the heartbeat and NIST's atomic standard of time and Boulder Colorado transmitter is the pacemaker. You know how to program a microcontroller, snarly dave? I do. We can work on your learning basic computerstuff later...first you have to master radio technology (a snap since you've passed your 20 WPM morse test).

Later, much much later, you can approach basic programming and its application to SDRs of the future. Note: There's a little micro-controller at the heart of nearly every over-the-counter ham radio today. Has "magic" in it...but later we will discover that it isn't any legerdemain, just some digital logic arranged in a logical way so that imagination and innovation can be used to make that micro-controller do your bidding!

Just think. The future has promise for you. Not only can you expand your efforts at trying to make people do your bidding, but you can make electronics do your bidding also! Another heaven for radio gods and control freaks!

Now, you just set yourself down in front of your orion (named for the mythical but mighty hunter) and imagine what you can do in the future. Once you learn some basics. Lots of basics. Remember that electrons don't care squat about all your pretty certificates or years as an amateur anything, cannot be influenced by human emotions or egos, will only obey THEIR laws, not those of the ARRL. Excuse me, FCC. Success is yours ahead. Just not at the rate you are going.

[the offer on the bier is still there...can you take that lying down?]

LHA / WMD

2220. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015748.06226.00002776@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86898

In article <4023329A.6601D3DF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <charm school dropout
from the foreign service k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40219DA6.35D67934@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Congeniality
>> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss
>Construance>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> >> The question-topic of the morse code test pertains to GETTING
>> >> >> INTO amateur radio below 30 MHz. Some have misconstrued the
>> >> >> essence of amateur radio as being a skilled radiotelegrapher.
>> >> >
>> >> >Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
>> >> >meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
>> >> >newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
>> >> >Extra right out of the box".
>> >>
>> >> Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.
>> >
>> >I did go for it, Len--forty years ago, within a year of my first
>> >exposure to amateur radio.
>>
>> ...and you are still undeveloped.
>
>That's rich! You've sat on your duff for almost an equivalent period
>and are still writing about "getting into amateur radio". Thanks for the
>laughs, Leonard.

Thanks for the laffs, snarly dave, but Don Rickles doesn't have
to worry about you stealing his act.

You have the moronic insult of "insult humor" down pat, but grade
ZERO on the humor part. Work on that.

Hello? Are you alive? I said "interested in radio," non-compost-
mentat-intellect.* ALL of it, not just amateur activities. I got into
a lot of the rest of the world of amateur radio, lots more than you

you ever did while engaged in the Fleecing of America as a
"foreign service" member.

* Those who've never read Frank Herbert's "Dune" novels will
not understand the pun. Those should go back to ancient Ayn
Rand.

>> >Nope. Nothing about your obtaining an amateur radio license here.
>>
>> Oh? Is this a requirement to be in the electronics industry?
>
>Was that under discussion? I could have sworn that amateur radio was
>the topic in which you decided to submit your PROFESSIONAL credentials.

Nooooo. You got it WRONG again, herr robust.

I've submitted my professional credentials to professional organizations
and got the jobs. Unlike some in here bragging of their "human
resources" fantastic grades and abilities and then going out and
becoming bus drivers. I'm still getting the professional jobs but the
work isn't as intense as before now that I don't keep regular hours.
It's fun, challenging work. You ought to try that sometime...a heckuva
lot better than spending "foreign service" time fleecing America in
some backwater African country.

>> Strange, isn't it, not one single personnel person (that's "human
>> resources" profession to bus drivers) said anything about needing
>> any amateur radio license to work in electronics or aerospace.
>
>You must want alt.jobs.wanted.aerospace.

Nooooo. I can get all kinds of jobs involving electronics and even
radio. I don't care to. I've had a full career as an electronics
design engineer. My income isn't all from the U.S. Treasury as a
"foreign service key person." [did you change the locks often
while a key person?]

>> Where is "here," snarly dave?
>
>Right there.

Where is "there," snarly dave? Illustrate your point. :-)

>That is incorrect, Leona. You have your facts scrambled. I'll be happy
>to quote the post if you're having trouble remembering.

What are you going to state as a "location" next, elsewhere? :-)

Feel free to cut and paste every single post, word for word, from
Google to illustrate whatever blunted point you think you have.

All you will do is annoy all the other readers, the regular
newsgroupies. All you will do is demonstrate that you have ZERO
originality, ZERO creativity, are nothing but a bundle of overly-

proud puffery, vindictive almost to the gunnery nurse's standards.

You really ought to TRY to get close to the subjects in this newsgroup, not just being an exhibitionist for over-the-top raging vindictiveness.

>I understand that. There is an amateur license available which requires >no morse test. It requires a pretty straightforward written test. You >haven't tackled it.

Explain WHY that is some kind of "requirement."

This is a newsgroup with open access, no moderator, straight-forward (except for some PCTAs bent over backwards to get back to the 1930s). No license of any kind required here. Not even poetic license.

You have NO concept of the discussion over the retention or elimination of the morse code test. All you can think of is an unyielding spit-de-corpse adherence to the very same rules you had to follow long ago in order to get that treasured and adored federal merit badge. Your insistance on all of present day to Get The Morse Test or even Get A Ham License makes you a prime believer worthy of the Waffen SS. Do not think! Follow orders! Yap! Yap! Bark! Bark!

All that for a radio HOBBY... :-)

LHA / WMD

2221. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015750.06226.00002778@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86888

In article <1e4e3692.0402051519.6c40da61@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Why, Len, just the other day I heard The Amateur Formerly Known As
>(TAFKA) Rev. Jim say that the Morse Code test was a disincentive to
>use CW on HF.
>
>Maybe the earth has reversed polarity!
>
>Or maybe he just got his tie stuck in his zipper.

I'll have to ignore it. Must have been some NCTA hacker that got
in here and forged the reverend's screen name. Gotta be false.

Does the reverend have zippers?

I thought the Amish only used button holes and hooks...

LHA / WMD

2222. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015750.06226.00002777@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86894

In article <1e4e3692.0402051521.6fac4012@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>> >
>> > >For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>> >
>> > For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing at
>all.
>> > >
>> > > (1) Amateur Basic.
>> > >
>> > > Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz,
>21mHz,
>> > > 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
>> >
>> > Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of increasing
>> > use of the band?
>> >
>> > > Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
>> >
>> > You mean same as Extras have now?
>>
>> I believe he does. Is that a problem?
>>
>> > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
>> > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>> >
>> > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
>> > incentive to use voice only!
>>
>> Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known as Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
>> or greater disincentive since 1912.
>>
>> Why is it NOW a problem?
>>
>> > >Limit 100 watts output on any band.
>> >

>> > Requires RF exposure eval on higher bands. Why not 100/25?
>> > >
>> > > (2) Amateur Advanced.
>> > >
>> > > Additional written examination.
>> >
>> > OK
>> >
>> > > All presently HF-licensed
>> > > Amateurs except Extras grandfathered to new license.
>> >
>> > Even Novices and Techs? That's a worse giveaway than ARRL proposes!
>> >
>> > > Privileges
>> > > same as for former Advanced Class. Morse Code endorsement
>required
>> > > for operation in lower 100kHz of any band EXCEPT for those
>> > >previously
>> > > code tested or already holding an Element 1 CSCE. New
>licensees
>> > >(not
>> > > grandfathered operators) limit to 500 watts on any band.
>> >
>> > See above about code test.
>> > >
>> > > (3) Amateur Radio-God Expert for Life
>> > >
>> > > (OK...that was for Lennie's benefit...>>I'D<< call it Amateur
>> > >Extra)
>> >
>> > I have no idea why you bother with him, Steve.
>>
>> It gets Steve out of bed in the morning.
>>
>> > > Comprehensive closed-pool written test.
>> >
>> > How? "Son Of Bash" would make it open pool quickly. Plus, how can you
>make a
>> > case that only the top ticket gets a closed pool but open is OK for the
>others?
>> >
>> > > REQUIRED 5wpm Morse Code
>> > >
>> > > test. Full Amateur allocations and privileges. Additional
>phone
>> > > allocations (or "wideband", if you prefer non-mode specific
>> > >classifi-
>> > > cations) from previous Novice class bands. Full power.
>> > >
>> > > Why?

>> >
>> > Three levels - good.
>> > Incremental power and privs - good
>>
>> You once told me when we had 7 license class distinctions that we
>> needed more classes.
>>
>> Why the change now?
>>
>> bb
>
>TAFKA Rev. Jim, has the cat got your tongue?

It's sleeping on his bug.

Don't wake the dead.

LHA / WMD

2223. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015751.06226.00002779@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86896

In article <40232C4F.88A4B174@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <4022584B.BA773B99@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <emineminent
>scientist
>> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>>
>> >Maybe it slipped your mind that the definition did not come from
>> >Ten-Tec, old boy.
>>
>> Noooo...I provided the definition based on the whole rest of the
>> electronics industry.
>
>You provided? Your statement seems at odds with the other definitions
>in existence.

Poor baby. You've never programmed a PLD or even erased and
re-burned an EPROM, have you? You don't know what "microcode"
for a minicomputer is (the instruction set decoder and router) and
haven't programmed a single CPU

You haven't had an associate membership in the ACM and I'll bet
you don't know what the acronym stands for. Your acrimony stands
in the way of understanding acronyms not defined by ARRL.

Put you in front of a Microchip PIC Assembler Development Program
and you would be LOST, even for the "entry-level" PIC, the 16F84.
You wouldn't know any details of the PIC 16F71 that AADE uses
(it's used in Neil's neat little frequency counter sold to many hams).

You don't know the difference between Assembler and Interpreter
and Compiler programs, haven't done squat about learning any of
that, or using them in any sort of designed-by-self application, yet
you have the puerile perfidy to accuse working electronics
engineers of "not knowing something."

All you can do is BEEP, little fella, and walk around stuffy and
like the south end of a mule going north bray a bunch of nonsense

you don't know about. You talk only bullstuff BLUFF, herr robust.

>I'll take that as your only way of conceding a point.

Noooooo. Snarly dave, you just can't take anything.

Your idea of "concession" in opinions is to CONCEDE to your
nonsense BLUFF at knowing anything about electronics-radio
hardware and theory.

>I'll bet it is, especially when you have no material. You'll have to
>fall back on your usual, the tap dancing routine.

Had a pair of Haney Plates once...but you have NO idea what
those are, either, do you?

Snarly dave, to make amends, I'd like to buy you a bier...except
I know you wouldn't take that lying down...

LHA / WMD

2224. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015752.06226.00002780@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86893

In article <2ai520tsgorvo8q5193da00siulc519v2n@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 05 Feb 2004 20:00:23 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>snip
>
>> Poor baby. Your imagination giving you poor pictures again?
>>
>> Develop them. I suggest Kodak D-76.
>
>Now THAT brought back memories - rolling 620 Verichrome Pan film into
>the developing tank under that @#$%^ dark green safelight....mixing
>the developer and getting it to exactly 68 degrees F.......another
>hobby, another time - long ago.
>
>D-76 is good for B&W film only, though. These discussions are far too
>colourful for anything less than Ektachrome.....definitely Kodak
>moments, though!

You had a safelight? I was so poor I had to catch fireflies and keep
them in an old jelly jar for a safelight. Only had the red-orange fire-
flies in my growing-up town, no green. :-)

I'll omit mentions of Microdol, forced development to extend Super-
XX film speed, Promicrol film developer or FR monobaths, the lovely
odor of acetic acid stop-bath, DuPont Varigam filters, bulk-load 5-
roll-packs of 35mm and double changing bags, SLRs and the
ability to hold depth-of-field as you wanted it while composing the
picture in the pentaprism viewfinder. Those have nothing to do with
amateur radio policy discussions about Janet Jackson's breast
or her sister Michael.

I still have the old developing trays and print dryer, long since
converted to etching trays for PCBs and a heater for the trays to
use the last, loaded ferric chloride etchant in the jug. All my
photography has gone digital and "processing" done in the
computer.

All but one of the PCTAs in here buy ready-made rigs, don't
make their own. The holdout PCTA "designs his own ham
equipment" such as the Elecraft K2 kit he made. :-) All are
"advancing the state of the amateur art" and showing "the unique
ability of the amateur to extend good will" (as stated in FCC's
47 C.F.R. 97.1). :-)

How a boot dat, ey? :-)

LHA / WMD

2225. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015754.06226.00002782@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86889

In article <40232862.B1D42573@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>"Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue."
>
>--Leonard H. Anderson, 5 Feb. 2004

Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue.

Leonard H. Anderson, 6 February 2004

Laminate that and put it in your wallet, Herr Robust.

Can't you access the NTS to send your Nastygrams via ham radio?

Now quit trying to close-order drill the inhabitants of here. Your
SS rank was never qualified for pushing around newsgroupies.

LHA / WMD

2226. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 06:57:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207015754.06226.00002781@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86897

In article <40232B6F.76C7CA5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <4022598C.B377A323@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Fibber
>> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <40216974.57645F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <male
>impersonator
>> >> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402032306.459f8a20@posting.google.com>,
>> >> >kelly@dvol.com
>> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >> >> >news:<20040203195240.15923.00003574@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> >> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402031148.14f0f2a7@posting.google.com>,
>> >> >> >kelly@dvol.com
>> >> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> Some Tums would ease your gaz pains.
>>
>> >> You wouldn't know Martinez if he had a leather suit instead of
>scales.
>> >
>> >Really? I beg to differ. At any rate, how would you be in a position
>> >to know what I know?
>>
>> Extras shouldn't beg. That's unseemly.
>>
>> ANYONE'S "in a position to know" you don't know, snarly dave.
>
>You aren't anyone.

Not even chopped liver?

(snarly dave won't get it, goyishe as he are...:-)

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Ah...still having to quote others. No originality left. Tsk, tsk.

Arf, arg, the little doggie keeps yipping a vendetta.

Git along, little doggie...

>Wrong, friendly old gent. As an amateur, I don't disagree with Shannon.

Heh. You can't even comprehend Claude Elwood's 1948 paper.

>I disagree with your misdirection with talk of Shannon and scaling when
>you were asked if PSK-31 is wideband.

Disagreement noted. And noted. And noted. And noted.

(I hope Office Max has enough note paper for your effronts)

>Ten-Tec has only firmware upgrades, Foghorn Lenhorn. They can't fix
>your inability to answer a question.

Oh? There was a QUESTION?!?!?

Herr Robust is now the Questionmeister in here?

Ach zo! Seig heil das questionmeister! Gruss gott.

>Because you were asked about them and responded with some drivel about
>PSK-31.

Drivel questions get drivel answers. That's only fair...

>Yes, I'm a radio amateur. You got that much correct.

Amateur...not only in radio. :-)

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

Bleep bleep expletive deleted... :-)

Still no signs of originality. Tsk, tsk. Have you thought of attending an
adult night school class in Written English?

>I am a proud radio amateur and I spent a career in radio as a
>professional. You, on the other hand...

PROUD! Do you have dress blues you wear with a ceremonial
sword? Do you sing "The Amateur's Hymn" and say catch-phrases
like "distemper fidelis?" Do you celebrate Hamorial Day at the
Tomb of the Unknown Amateur? A little hamflag flutters from
the amateur antenna of your SUV? You attend Mass formation at
the Church of St. Hiram every Field Day?

Is your First General Order "I shall key my code in a military manner, keeping always on the alert and observing all the stations within sight and hearing?" Do you do close-order drill with slung HTs?

Snarly dave, I betcha you got one of those shiny shield badges that proclaims you a "raddio kopp" in a neat real-leather buzzer holder!

I'll bet you go up to strangers on the street, grab them by the collar and shout "I am fully authorized by the federal authorities to operate a ham radio station!" Must make you feel proud as all-get-out.

Official. Authoritative. Boring. Get out.

>> >You don't seem to be able to
>> >address the question about wideband modes.
>>
>> It is at 79 Wistfull Vista.
>
>...Apartment PSK-31.

Such a baby. "79 Wistfull Vista" was the address of Fibber McGee and Molly. Old radio show. Entertained millions once a week on radio. You are too young to hear of it? Tsk, tsk. On RADIO, snarly dave, on RADIO. You missed all that fun while prepping for your rank, status, privilege as a mighty macho morseman as a fully authorized (by a federal government) radio AMATEUR!

I now return control of the newsgroup to amateur radio policy subjects such as Janet Jackson's breast...

LHA / WMD

2227. The new ham policy in CEPT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 12:15:28 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <d505c524f77ab87265071571237172aa@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 87003

```
CW CQ = NO ANSWER

PSK31 CQ = ANSWER

End of CW rulezzzzzzz .....
```

2228. End of CW in the CEPT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 12:15:29 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <0d30dbebc0a442271858829329be02fa@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 87004

The new CEPT T/R 61-02 recommendation has
been adopted by vote during the last
CEPT meeting on this week. The new text
will be on http://www.ero.dk next week.

Bye bye CW !

2229. Re: The new ham policy in CEPT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 13:49:25 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <F16Vb.244731$na.403901@attbi_s04>
Source record: 87005

Hey George ...a bit of advice .... try the bottom 50 kcs of each band and
don't forget to connect the antenna ...

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

ps .... I did not ever read here that CW "rulezzzsss" but I'll tell you a
fact ...concerning me ......my wife does.
"George Orwell" <nobody@mixmaster.it> wrote in message
news:d505c524f77ab87265071571237172aa@mixmaster.it...
>
> CW CQ = NO ANSWER
>
> PSK31 CQ = ANSWER
>
> End of CW rulezzzzzzz .....
>
>

2230. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 14:55:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207095504.12631.00004760@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 87006

In article <d22b54c3.0402061925.73fdf12e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>. . . Move over ya newbies, ALLYA, the OF has logged in . .

Hans hasn't played the game yet, tho.
>
>b. 05Mar37
>
>Novice ticket, wn3yik some time or another in the 1953-54 timeframe.
>16-17 years old. Novice WAS on 80. Most memorable Q: Wire blew down
>overnite. I "inductively coupled" my sleeping brother to the ARC-5
>output and worked a guy in Pittsburgh mid-morning.
>
>General 10 months later. Give or take. First Q as a General was G5ZK.
>On 80 of course.
>
>Extra whenever it was in the late '60s when ya had to pass the stupid
>test or get booted outta the dx hot slices. 30-31 years old?
>
>w3rv
>CP 30 circa 1955
>DXCC mixed #10k & DXCC Phone
>WAZ
>5BDXCC #142/'72
>
Also known as the Big Barracuda....

bwaahaahaaa....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2231. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 14:55:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207095504.12631.00004761@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 87007

In article <P0VUb.500$t16.508574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Len has made no effort that anyone can see to get an
>amateur license.

Len does not want an amateur radio license.

>He appears to want to make changes without being a member
>of the affected group.

He wants amateur radio as we know it to disappear. What he wants is a multiband high power version of cb. Or nothing at all.

He also appears to enjoy insulting and berating anyone who is not in complete agree with his opinions. There's a complete description of his behavior around someplace - he proves its correctness with each of his posts...

>It's rather like complaining about your congressman
>when you don't bother to vote.

His hobby is wasting time. Your time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2232. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 15:23:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <op7Vb.575$t16.635978@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87008

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040207095504.12631.00004761@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <P0VUb.500$t16.508574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Len has made no effort that anyone can see to get an
> >amateur license.
>
> Len does not want an amateur radio license.
>
> >He appears to want to make changes without being a member
> >of the affected group.
>
> He wants amateur radio as we know it to disappear. What he wants
> is a multiband high power version of cb. Or nothing at all.
>
> He also appears to enjoy insulting and berating anyone who is
> not in complete agree with his opinions. There's a complete
> description of his behavior around someplace - he proves its
> correctness with each of his posts...
>
> >It's rather like complaining about your congressman
> >when you don't bother to vote.
>
> His hobby is wasting time. Your time.
>
>

Exactly. Which is why I killfiled him and so see only what others may
choose to quote from him. Thank goodness!!

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2233. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 16:15:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402070815.644f9a96@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87009

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402041356.247bd5f9@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<402109FA.6060302@psu.edu>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > In article <mOGdnVif-9TDIIbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
> > >> Carl will be very upset you put *this* idea in people minds too! ;^)
> > >>
> > >
> > > Carl has expressed his disdain for the concept of skilled radio operators here.
> > > Look up some of his posts under his old call (WA6VSE) and phrases such as
> > > "electronic paintball wars" "stomp into the dust" "wetware modem" "emulate a
> > > modem" "better modes and modulations"....
> >
> >
> >
> > I wonder where Carl is lately? Haven't heard from him since he had the
> > change of heart regarding the testing.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Mike, speaking of a change of heart re: testing, check this out:
>
> --------------------
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > > >
> > > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > > >
> > > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same

> > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > > >
> > > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> ----------
>
> Almost makes you want to think!

Like I said, almost.

bb

2234. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 16:26:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402070826.7766445f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87010

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040207015750.06226.00002778@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402051519.6c40da61@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Why, Len, just the other day I heard The Amateur Formerly Known As
> >(TAFKA) Rev. Jim say that the Morse Code test was a disincentive to
> >use CW on HF.
> >
> >Maybe the earth has reversed polarity!
> >
> >Or maybe he just got his tie stuck in his zipper.
>
> I'll have to ignore it. Must have been some NCTA hacker that got
> in here and forged the reverend's screen name. Gotta be false.
>
> Does the reverend have zippers?
>
> I thought the Amish only used button holes and hooks...
>
> LHA / WMD

You're right - MUST have been an imposter. Since the same
disincentive has been in place since 1912, I can't imagine TAFKA Rev.
Jim flubbing up like that. Not in a million years.

Whoever forged that post had to have been a complete moron.

My apologies to TAFKA Rev. Jim.

2235. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 16:31:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207113126.13960.00000533@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87011

In article <kpmdnR8--baOL77dRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Ms Jackson is free to expose
>herself under appropriate circumstances. If she wants to do a dance
>routine and have Justin Timberlake tear off part of her outfit. That is
>also okay - tho she might want to use a less weird presentation.
>
> There are appropriate television venues for that, such as HBO, Cinemax,

>etc. Late night TV kind of stuff.
>
> But not on the super bowl halftime show. Not on Teletubbies or Barney
>or Blues Clues or fishing shows. Those just aren't the places for that
>sort of thing. Even my favorite, the History channel, has some shows
>that deal with sex and show nudity.

I gotta get cable...

> They put them on late at night when
>the kids are in bed, and any viewing is strictly voluntary. No one harmed.

I agree 100%, Mike, but I'd put it this way:

The big problem isn't the content but whether it's expected or not when the
viewer tunes in. Shows like "Sex in the City" and "Coupling" pretty much
tell you what to expect by the name of the show. Other shows have warnings,
ratings and writeups in the program guides.

The problem with the "wardrobe malfunction" was that nobody expected it except
Ms. Jackson. Yet she will not incur any fine or penalty. That's just wrong.
>
>Everything in it's time and place, and the superbowl isn't the time or
>place IMO.

Agreed - particularly without any warning.

Some may say this whole thing ahs nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
the exact opposite is true. The big problem with that "wardrobe malfunction"
was its unexpected nature. Since amateur radio is unscheduled, crosses time
zones and no licensee owns a frequency, the standards of all amateur on-air
activity have to be "G-rated".
>
> The NFL has been trying to pander to a different audience the last few
>years. I remember when a sb halftime show was put on by "Up With
>People", of all things.

Well, it's just a different sort of "up"...
>
> I hope they realize that the "edgy" stuff was a miserable failure for
>the XFL.

Who? ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2236. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 16:31:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207113127.13960.00000534@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87012

In article <102822lgmdsgg0f@corp.supernews.com>, "Harold Burton"
<hwburton@cableone.net> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>> >violence is OK?
>> >
>> Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids, but
>> would
>> sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....
>>
>> > Is that really what we want to teach our children?
>> >
>> I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
>> school.
>
>
>When you get right down to it, except for a few shameful and widely
>publicized exceptions, todays kids suffer from too little rather than too
>much physical punishment.

I disagree! Beating children simply means the beater can't think of
a better way to deal with the kid.

It also teaches the kid at a very primeval level that violence is a
legitimate method of getting what you want from others.

>Worst form of abuse for todays kids is to let'em grow
>up with no self control or discipline. That was true in earlier generations,
>too.

I agree 100%, except that I'd call it "neglect" rather than "abuse". And in
some cases neglect is worse because it tells the kid he's not worth bothering
with.

>Look at Bill Clinton and, for that matter, the younger days of our current
>President.

Not just the younger days, either.

>Sometimes they grow out of it and sometimes they don't.

Exactly!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2237. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 16:33:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402070833.629faae9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87013

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040206070742.29815.00003137@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
> >Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
> >old at the time.
>
> What a great new game! I'll play:
>
> I was born April 24, 1954. I got my Novice ticket October 14, 1967. I got my
> Extra September 26, 1970. (Dates are when the actual license arrived - passed
> the tests about six weeks earlier). I reckon that made me 16 years, 5 months,
> 2 days old when the Extra came in the mail. That 2 year experience requirement
> held me up at least a year).
>
> Anybody else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> .

Born 1958, passed Novice exam in November 1986.

bb

2238. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 16:54:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207115433.01019.00000342@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87014

In article <op7Vb.575$t16.635978@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040207095504.12631.00004761@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <P0VUb.500$t16.508574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >Len has made no effort that anyone can see to get an
>> >amateur license.
>>
>> Len does not want an amateur radio license.
>>
>> >He appears to want to make changes without being a member
>> >of the affected group.
>>
>> He wants amateur radio as we know it to disappear. What he wants
>> is a multiband high power version of cb. Or nothing at all.
>>
>> He also appears to enjoy insulting and berating anyone who is
>> not in complete agree with his opinions. There's a complete
>> description of his behavior around someplace - he proves its
>> correctness with each of his posts...
>>
>> >It's rather like complaining about your congressman
>> >when you don't bother to vote.
>>
>> His hobby is wasting time. Your time.
>
>Exactly. Which is why I killfiled him and so see only what others may
>choose to quote from him.

Me too. And one other.

The antics of "the organ grinder and his red-hatted monkey" (as Hans so
perfectly described them) become repetitive and tiresome very quickly.

> Thank goodness!!
>
Yep!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2239. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 18:57:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4025352A.31850FA5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87015

Leo wrote:
>
> On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 05:34:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:
>
> >If you're waiting for radio
> >amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely
> >going to be disappointed.
>
> I must admit, I've taken a shot or three at Len over exactly the same
> issue - no Amateur callsign = no valid opinion on Amateur issues.
>
> However, a little research reveals that this distinction would be
> irrelevant in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
> request to persons with appropriate Professional license
> qualifications.

So all our Leonard needs do is move to Canada and see if professional
credentials are recognized there. Then he can apply for an amateur
radio license.

It does not work that way here nor should it. With Len's professional
credentials, it should be a snap for him to obtain an amateur radio
license in his own country. The fact is, Len doesn't care about
obtaining an amateur radio license. He is only a self-appointed
advocate for change in an endeavor in which he is not a participant.

> It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
> radio operation, and the Pros have made a career of it - and invested
> considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
> would be possible for most hobbyists. After all, it would be pretty
> silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
> Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!

I'm not so sure about that. I've had communications professionals try
to have me QSY an RTTY circuit from a 9 MHz frequency in late afternoon
to a 24 MHz frequency for a path which was only several hundred miles.
Most hams with any experience can tell you that such a path regulary
requires lower frequencies, not higher ones.

> After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
> to pass, even without a formal education in electronics. Too easy,
> I'd say, but that is another issue.....(when 7 year olds can pass
> exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and

> complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
> syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)

If it is so easy, a (and let me use Len's term) RADIO PROFESSIONAL should have no trouble at all passing it. What would be the motivation for a licensing "gimme"?

> A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
> professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
> US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
> who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
> qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
> when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
> arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?

There is no such mechanism available in the United States. A U.S. citizen licensed in Canada may not use his Canadian license when operating from the U.S.

Dave K8MN

2240. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 19:11:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40253872.ACFC300B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87016

Leo wrote:

> Actually, Mike, I don't disagree with you at all - what she did was
> quite inappropriate for the venue. But it ain't really that big a
> deal....

If it is a big deal for a segment of the population, it is a big deal
for the network, the FCC and MTV.

> Read the article that I referenced, if you have time - it presents an
> interesting perspective on what tends to constitute "obscenity". Sex
> bad, violence good - you know. And, as always, Jack Nicholson's
> comment is priceless :)

I've not read or heard anything about obsenity being the issue. The
halftime show was quite inappropriate. Everyone is making the noise
about Janet Jackson but the lyrics used by P. Diddy, Nelly and Kid Rock
were offensive. Kid Rock's defacing of the American Flag and his use of
it as a poncho were offensive.

> Example - I watched a bit of "Full Metal Jacket" on TBS a while back.
> While all of the profanity and sexual references had been 'sanitized',
> most of the gore and violence remained (it was funny, though, to see
> Sgt. Hartman saying "Darn" and "Heck" and such, even though his lips
> clearly had other intentions...).
>
> Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
> violence is OK? Is that really what we want to teach our children?

Songs about the use of women as sexual objects, about multiple casual
sexual partners, about the glorification of drug use, drinking and
criminal behavior in a public performance on prime-time TV are among the
things I'd rather children didn't see or hear because they cater to the
lowest, base side of humanity.

Dave K8MN

2241. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 19:28:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40253C6F.2D2714D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87017

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40215E2A.C8F57755@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0402030551.1114f49a@posting.google.com>...

> During the same year I built an AM BC rcvr which used five of the tiny
> AG-1 flashbulb envelope subminiature tubes and stuffed the whole thing
> into a small Band-Aid can which I carried in my shirt pocket. Walkman
> Numero Uno. I went into biology class one day and strung the wire
> antenna to an overhead lamp fixture, put on the earplug "speaker" and
> started tuning around. The teacher, good 'ole Floyd Neff finally
> noticed the antenna and stormed to the back of the room, "What are you
> doing, what is that thing?" I cupped my ear, "Uh, it's my hearing aid,
> could you speak up a bit please?" Tossed outta class again.

Young Don Newell was the crucifer one Sunday at St. Andrew's Episcopal
Church in Oak Hill. After the processional and after my father had
begun the service, Don fished a tiny crystal radio from his cassock,
stuffed the earphone into his ear and attached a wire with an alligator
clip to the cross. As the service ended, my dad whispered to him, "I'd
like a word after church".

> You brought back a lot of hilarious memories of "electronerd
> educations" gone awry David. Gawd we had fun . . !

The best I've ever heard was deliverd at the Dayton banquet one year by
Jean Shepherd.

> > For the first few weeks of my interest, my dad actively discouraged me
> > with talk of amateur radio being a passing fad for me.
> > He had visions
> > of mounds of equipment gathering dust in a closet.
>
> He was right, I've seen it happen . . !

I can still get a laugh from him these days whenever I ask if he thinks
I'll tire of the stuff and let it sit in the closet.

> > My mother encouraged
> > me and was able to convince my father that some of the meager family
> > income should be spent on a transmitter for me if I earned the money for
> > the receiver from my paper route.

>
> You got lucky, I got NOTTING in the way of economic support for
> diddling with radios despite the volume of coin my parents had. Their
> policy was that if some pursuit or another was important enough to
> their kids we could bloody well work out how to pay for it on our own
> or drop it. With the notable exception of cheerfully paying the
> expenses related to Boy Scouting. I *really* needed radio gear so I
> had a couple paper routes, peddled magazine subsciptions, painted
> house numbers on curbs in December, etc. Got the equipment and some
> early lessons on how much work hot buttons can actually cost.

Well, in my case it was a one-time Christmas deal--the one BIG present
and that was second-hand from Allied's big, used equipment list. The
receiver I saved for was also from the same list. More newspaper
deliveries, an after-school job at the local hobby shop several days
each week and the writing of a sports column for the local newspaper
provided coaxial cable and connectors, a key, antenna wire and the
like. Some of that money was also spent on a big U.S. call area map and
some (sorry, no choice of color) QSL cards from WRL.

> > > I know Janie. Her father was Jesse Bieberman W3KT who is still a
> > > legend. Honer Roll top-ender for decades, phone and cw dx contester,
> > > 25wpm with a straight key for 48 straight. Vice Director of the
> > > Atlantic Division for decades and one of the most powerful voices in
> > > Newington in those days. Ran the W3 buro single-handed also for
> > > decades.
> >
> > ...and ran the W3KT outgoing QSL forwarding service for a number of
> > years.
>
> I forgot all about that, tnx.

I used Jesse's outgoing card forwarding service in the days preceeding
the ARRL's outgoing bureau.

> Speaking of QSL card handling Joe Arcure W3HNK is in this
> neighborhood, I gotta look him up.

Joe used to be a regular at the DX hospitality suites at Dayton. I
haven't seen him in a number of years.

All of this nostalgia has me fired up to grab my collection of the West
Coast DX Bulletin to re-read some of Cass's gems.

Dave K8MN

2242. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 19:39:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40253EE8.508B214F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87018

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040206095440.21955.00000323@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo
> ><nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
> >>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
> >>qualifications.
> >
> >In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
> >left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
> >because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
> >required).
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you should look again. But, that's not "amateur
> radio" is it? :-)
>
> >>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
> >
> >>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
> >>radio operation,
> >
> >Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV broadcast
> >transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.
>
> I don't know of any TV transmitter sending RTTY.
>
> I don't know of any amateur sending live television of 160 meter
> wavelength either.

Precisely. By golly, you might be getting the hang of things, Leonard.

> >They
> >must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
> >do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)

> Thank you for admitting some truth, however hollow it rings.

Whoosh! Right over your head...

> >But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing of
> >the

> >amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.
>
> Why in the world would professional engineer licenses in the USA
> have ANYTHING about amateur radio?

Precisely. You ARE getting the hang of it.

> >Agreed! But at least it still exists.
>
> Yes. Seven year olds can pass it.

Leonard the Fox: "Those grapes are probably sour."

> What does that say about your vaunted federal merit badge?

It says that a mere child is one up on you. She has the badge. You
don't.

Dave K8MN

2243. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 20:16:15 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <47ea20h3uqs179ne6608gkncj5vpkk8jgi@4ax.com>
Source record: 87019

On 07 Feb 2004 03:13:57 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <rm9820htq9qdcqad62kf46p5vbuhhtfvh2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 6 Feb 2004 15:18:39 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:<vcb720pnvip3c9quf08jer86bvkn45i6g3@4ax.com>...
>>>> On 06 Feb 2004 14:54:40 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@noway.com>
>>>> >writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>>>> >>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>>>> >>qualifications.
>>>> >
>>>> >In the USA, there are almost no professional radio operator licenses
>>>> >left. There's the GROL and some radiotelegraph licenses, the latter
>>>> >because Morse operation on ships is still permitted (but no longer
>>>> >required).
>>>> >>
>>>> >>An excerpt from Industry Canada's Radio Information Circular follows:
>>>>
>>>> >>It would seem to me that this makes perfect sense - radio operation is
>>>> >>radio operation,
>>>> >
>>>> >Is it? Then why all the various endorsements? Is "operating" a TV
>>broadcast
>>>> >transmitter the same thing as 160 meter RTTY operation? I don't think so.
>>>
>>>> Of course not - operating RTTY on the Amateur bands is dead easy -
>>>> connect the transmitter to your sound card, install a software
>>>> program, make a couple of tests and adjustments, and away you go!
>>>
>>>Are those "tests and adjustments" covered in the "professional"
>>>license tests?
>>>
>>>Are the amateur frequencies where RTTY is allowed, and what types of
>>>RTTY are allowed, covered in the professional license tests?
>>
>>Well, the Canadian bandplans are not mandated by IC - they are

>>voluntary, and developed by the amaueur community themselves.
>
>Not talking about bandplans.

Uh - you were, Jim - those would define the frequencies where RTTY is
allowed, no?

>
>>Therefore, not covered on the Amateur exam. Neither was RTTY, as I
>>recall - that was learned later, after licensing!
>
>Band edges. Power limits. Amateur operating practices. Requirements to
>ID. Content limitations. All different for hams. Not covered in commercial
>license exams.

True, but I guess that our Government trusts those who have achieved a
commercial licence to look these things up before going on the air.

Or are you aware of specific instances where this policy has caused a
problem?

>>>
>>>> And, if you make a few mistakes along the way, or if it takes a week
>>>> to get it running, so what?
>>>
>>>Depends on the mistake.
>>
>>Well, other than operating out of band, there ain't much that a
>>"sorry" wouldn't cover!
>
>So when somebody decides to run ten or twenty times the legal power,
>a "sorry" is supposed to cover it? Or when somebody uses ham radio
>for commercial purposes, or music, etc.. a "sorry" is supposed to cover it?
>
>Sorry, that's not good enough.

Those aren't mistakes, Jim - they are violations of law. Commercial
licensees operate within similar limitations...
>
>>>> You're experimenting, and that's what
>>>> amateur radio is all about.
>
>>>Then why have any ham radio tests or licenses at all? You're arguing
>>>for the end of all testing for a ham license, Leo.
>>
>>Not at all -
>
>Yes, you are. If a "sorry" can cover most violations, there's no need for most
>of the tests.

How so? Are you suggesting that a testing plan capable of being
passed by 7-year olds ensures that these violations do not occur?

That's silly, Jim. I've heard different on the bands....

>
>>I'm suggesting that (many of) the radio skills acquired
>>in the acquisition of a commercial license are directly applicable to
>>the Amateur service. Transferrable skills.
>
>Maybe. But most of what a ham needs to know is not covered by a
>commercial license test.

And can easily be looked up - it ain't that hard!

>
>>>> Now, make a couple of mistakes and knock WNEP-TV off the air for a
>>>> couple of minutes - you might be an unemployed professional!
>>>
>>>Which acts as an incentive to know what you're doing.
>>
>>Yup!
>
>>>Does WNEP-TV change frequency, or have to listen first before
>>>transmitting?
>>
>>That is a pretty simple skill - I'm sure the broadcast engineers could
>>figure it out rather quickly :)
>
>I don't think so. They're used to doing all the talking and none of the
>listening.

Hmmm - you don't happen to work there, do you? :)

>
>>>> >>and the Pros have made a career of it
>
>>>> >All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and gentlemen
>>>> >on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of
>>something
>>>> >most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).
>>>>
>>>> Politicians? :)
>>>
>>>Some say politicians are a subset of the oldest profession. ;-)
>>
>>Fully agreed! :)
>
>So we should listen to those professionals?

Coming from a guy with a BSEE and an MSEE, Jim, that sounds a bit
silly - would you not consider yourself to be educated far in excess
of the Amateur requirements? Perhaps even a pro yourself?

>
>>>> >Those people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their

>>>> >profession,
>>>> >don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
>>>> >question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-) They
>>>> >must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
>>>> >do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>>>
>>>> I'll take your word for it, having no personal experience with the
>>>> profession that you are referring to. If you say they're good, Jim,
>>>> then they're good! :)
>>>
>>>I wouldn't know - I'm only an amateur in that field too.
>>>
>>>> Generally speaking, though, professionals are more knowledgable than
>>>> lay people because they are involved in their field full time, and are
>>>> held to standards of conduct and proficiency set by not only the
>>>> regulators but by their employers.
>>>
>>>Generally speaking. However, commercial radio and amateur radio are
>>>different fields. Being a "professional in radio", by itself, is no
>>>indication of qualification to operate an amateur radio station, and
>>>even less of an
>>>indication of qualification to determine amateur radio policy.
>>
>>Two different concepts.
>
>That's right. Amateur radio and commercial radio are two different concepts.

Creative reading, Jim !

>>
>>Being a licensed professional in radio implies a knowledge of radio
>>theory and concepts - many of which are tranferrable from one area
>>(commercial) to another (amateur).
>
>Some. Not many.

Electronics is the same in both areas - the rest is regulations ad
protocol, which can be learned quite easily. Most folks I know have
had the most trouble with the electronics theory - not learning the
regs or operating procedures!

>
>>By nature, amateur activities have
>>much greater margins for error than professional ones - they are hobby
>>based, after all!
>
>Then why have licenses at all?

Duh.

>
>>Amateur radio policy, on the other hand, is made by legislators, none

>>of whom require any knowledge of radio to carry out the
>>responsibilities of their office.
>
>They need to understand certain concepts of radio in order to do the job.
>Doesn't mean they all do.

Yup. Most are politicians, though, not radio people.

>
>>>> And, rather than just sounding like
>>>> experts, they are expected to demonstrate their proficiency - that's
>>>> what they get paid for! 'Stay current or move out' is the rule of the
>>>> technically-oriented workplace.
>>>
>>>Current with what? Most TV stations are still broadcasting NTSC
>>>signals, based
>>>on a mode that's at least 50 years old. If you don't care about color,
>>>a 1946
>>>NTSC TV (if you can find one that works) is still usable. Then there's
>>>FM
>>>broadcasting which is about as old and good old MW AM, which goes back
>>>to the
>>>1920s.
>>
>>With equipment that is vastly more complex than what the average
>>amateur is using, though.
>
>So what? They don;t have to buy it with their own money, nor take
> care of it with their own money in their spare time. Amateurs do.
>Makes all the difference in the world.

Really? That's the most ridiculous statement I believe that I have
ever heard! The tech working on a $500,000 base station is less
committed or less competent than an amateur operator because he did
not buy it with his own money?

It's his career, Jim. Vastly more important than a hobby.

>
>>If you get the opportunity, have a look
>>inside a cellular base station sometime - all of the equipment in
>>there is computer controlled
>
>Which means no licensed operators are needed at all.

Absolutely correct - those licenses are no longer issued for most
radio professions, Jim - you told me that!

>
>Elimination of operators has been a major goal of commercial and
>military radio services for years. One less warm body to pay. Just
>like the railroads eliminated most block operators years ago, and the

>telephone company went to dial equipment, and the airlines went to
>planes that can be flown by two, not three.
>
>> - nothing even resembling a piece of
>>radio gear to be seen.
>
>Only if you don't know what it looks like ;-)

You bet I do, after 15 years in the field. Looks more like a
mainframe computer than a radio. What sort of equipment do you work
with, Jim?

>>
>>The signal out, though, is Hertzian, and as old as the universe....
>
>If it's as old as the universe, it existed before Hertz.

But Hertzian, all the same - named after him, you know.
>>>
>>>> >> - and invested
>>>> >>considerably more education, time, effort and ongoing training than
>>>> >>would be possible for most hobbyists.
>>>> >
>>>> >Maybe - remember that most of them got the license *before* the job. Back
>>
>>>> >when
>>>> >the USA granted such things, the old Extra written was considered by most
>>to be
>>>> >at least the equivalent of the First 'Phone.
>>>> >
>>>> >But now here's the big one: do the professional licenses include testing
>>of
>>>> >the
>>>> >amateur rules, regulations, and operating practices? USA ones don't.
>>>>
>>>> Of course not - they don't teach professional photographers how to
>>>> take amateur pictures either....
>>>
>>>Then they are not qualified.
>>>>
>>>> But the rules and regs can be learned pretty easily
>>>
>>>Then there's no problem with requiring them to take a test
>>>for an amateur license.
>>
>>Sure, but according to IC, that isn't a concern!
>
>IC is just wrong.

I'll take your expert opinion under advisement, sir.

>>>
>>>> >And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters
>>and put
>>>> >them
>>>> >on the air without any certification?
>>>>
>>>> Nope - this is what the Amateur bands are for (type approval not
>>>> required, unlike the commercial frequencies).
>>>
>>>Then the "pros" aren't necessarily qualified in that area, either.
>>>>
>>>> In fact, there are precious few Amateurs left who could do that, Jim,
>>>> even though our bands permit it.
>>>
>>>I can, and have.
>>
>>I know - but they just ain't making them like you anymore!
>
>Yes, they are. There are plenty of hams like me around, building,
>operating, using Morse code....That sort of thing really bothers
>some people.

Not many, sad to say. Less every day.

>>>
>>>> Passing any one of the current ARS
>>>> tests does not require that sort of undestanding of electronics
>>>> anymore. Not like when you first got involved - it has changed a lot
>>>> since then.
>>>
>>>It was not required when I got started either. The US tests went to
>>>all-multiple-choice in 1960. Pick enough right answers on the written
>>>tests and you pass, regardless of whether you understand the material
>>>or not.
>>>
>>>Canada may be different. But I don't live there.
>>
>>Same, actually. 100 questions, 60 correct gets you a basic license.
>
>60% passing? At least here it's ~74%.

Yup - we have asked IC to raise the bar considerably on the tests.

>
>>>> >>After all, it would be pretty
>>>> >>silly for the folks at the local photo club to argue that Yosuf
>>>> >>Karsh's pictures were pretty good, but not up to "Amateur" standards!
>>>>
>>>> >>After all, the testing done for Amateur licences today is pretty easy
>>>> >>to pass, even without a formal education in electronics.
>>>> >
>>>> >Agreed! But at least it still exists.

>>>>
>>>> Sort of, in vestigial format.
>>>
>>>You seem to be arguing that such licenses aren't really needed
>>>anymore.
>>
>>No - I'm arguing that they are becoming meaningless - simple memory
>>work that a child can do.
>
>If they're meaningless they aren't needed.

Agreed. Either make 'em meaningful, or drop the charade.

>
>Has the licensing of young children caused any problems for the ARS?
>Are they making a mess of the bands?

Don't think so!

>
>btw, Canada used to have an age requirement of 15 for any class of
>amateur license. Would you have them put that requirement back?

No - I fully support children becoming involved with Amateur Radio.
What I don't support is testing for the highest levels of
qualification made so simple that 7-year olds can memorize their way
through!

>
>The USA never had an age requirement for a ham license, but at
>least one frequent poster here petitioned the FCC to add an age requirement
>of 14 years. Fortunately the FCC did not do so.
>>
>>>> >>Too easy, I'd say,
>>>> >
>>>> >The FCC disagrees.
>>>>
>>>> Unfortunately.
>>>
>>>They're PROFESSIONALS, Leo! They have to "keep current or move out",
>>>right?
>>>It's their JOB to know what's needed, right? Who are we poor dumb old
>>>broken
>>>down amateurs to question them? ;-)
>>
>>They are regulators and politicians, actually....
>
>They're still PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO. Who are you or I to question them? ;-)

Say what? Nice twist, Jim!

>
>>>Must not question the professionals. Their egos can't take it.

>>
>>Well, I'm sure that if you asked a holder of a first class radio
>>license who has worked in the field for years a radio theory question,
>>they'd probably get it right! :)
>
>I've seen them get it wrong. Some don't even know what firmware is.

heh - Software that resides in non-volatile memory, usually EEPROM.
This one does! :)

>
>>>> IC has been advised of this under the recommendations that the RAC
>>>> made to them following WRC-03 - I sincerely hope that they listen!
>>>
>>>Me too.
>>>>
>>>> >>but that is another issue......(when 7 year olds can pass
>>>> >>exams with questions requiring calculation of squares, logs and
>>>> >>complex numbers - which sure as heck weren't part of my kids Grade 2
>>>> >>syllabus - I start thinking rote memorization of question pools....)
>>>> >
>>>> >And that's not going to change any time soon. The GROL pool is public
>>info,
>>>> >too.
>>>>
>>>> True, but if one did that, they'd have a tough time staying employed
>>>> with it - employers have a nasty habit of asking their staff to
>>>> demonstrate their abilities empirically, on a frequent basis!
>>>
>>>How often does the average employee at WNEP have to demonstrate
>>>knowledge
>>>of calculation of squares, logs and complex numbers?
>>
>>The receptionist - never. The hands-on technical people - rarely -
>>but they would need it to complete their formal education in radio
>>theory, I'd reckon.
>
>Is formal education necessary for the license?

Not to my knowledge! But i think that someone would have a difficult
time passing a commercial test without some training - there is no
"Now You're Talking" book for the GROL......

>
>>>> Rote memorization was what my point was about, though - and I'm sure
>>>> that was the case.
>>>
>>>How do you know for sure?
>>
>>I don't - but I'd say the odds are pretty heavily in my favour. :)
>

>They are - but you wrote as if there were no other possibility.

I really don't believe that there is. Of course, if I was the type
who believed that holding an Extra ticket was the epitomy of amateur
radio knowledge, I'd want to believe that the girl was extremely
bright and well above average intelligence and capabilities for her
age.

Say....you don't know anyone like that, Jim - do you?

>>
>>>> >Do you know the 7 year old in question? If not, how can you say whether
>>or
>>>> >not she's qualified or knows how to do the required math?
>>>>
>>>> Well, if she can, she certainly is a prodigy alright. Grade 11 math
>>>> in Grade 2 - that is impressive! I'd say highly unlikely.
>>>
>>>Not Grade 11 stuff. Squares are 4th grade stuff around here. Logs
>>>maybe
>>>6th grade. Complex numbers probably 9th or 10th.
>>
>>Not Grade 2, though :)
>
>Nope. But not grade 11 either.

It is here - complex numbers are on the Grade 11 curriculum.

>>
>>As I recall, Grade 2 was time for "Fun With Dick And Jane", not "Fum
>>With Maxerll And Hertz".
>
>"Fun with Dick And Jane" is long gone.

So are Maxwell and Hertz, for that matter - you forgot to point that
out! :)

It was "Dick and Jane" when we were ther, though - remember?

And, whatever it is today - it is still primary education - not
electronics, math and regs.

>>
>>>The 7 year old in question is homeschooled, btw.
>>>
>>>> Ever talk to a 7-year old kid, Jim?
>>>
>>>At least daily.
>>
>>Listen often too?
>>
>At least daily.
>

>How about you?

Daily, for a year. Twice. Then they hit 8 :)

>
>>>> They just don't operate at that level.
>>>
>>>Some of them do. It depends on the child and the environment. Ever had
>>>a
>>>barely-7-year-old read "Watership Down" to you, and not miss a single
>>>word? I have.
>>
>>Yup - I have yet to meet one who could read a schematic, or calculate
>>impedance though - no wonder the watership went down!
>
>You obviously never read the book.

I did - twice, out loud. Just humour, Jim - you should try it
sometime! :)

As I recall, the book involved a bunch of rabbits looking for a home,
and avoiding danger. Perhaps, in your edition of the book, the
rabbits learned about electromagnetism and current flow and morse code
and band edges and operating protocols and Q-codes and mathematics and
perhaps a smattering of quantum mechanics along the way.

In the version I read to my kids, there were a bunch of rabbits
looking for a home.......and avoiding danger......the end.

>>
>>>> Good memories, though - like a sponge!
>>>
>>>Much of what's on the test (band edges, regs) is pure memory stuff.
>>
>>Thought the Extra was more theoretical than regulation based?
>
>None of them are heavy on theory. Not anymore.

I see. Good thing too, for the young kids....

>>
>>>> She is an Extra, though - I'll just bet she could build her own
>>>> transmitter from scratch (forgetting for a moment that 7-year olds
>>>> generally have enough trouble making neat letters with a pencil, let
>>>> alone operating a soldering iron....)
>>>
>>>The 7 year olds I know write and draw quite well. Also use computers
>>>and do math.
>>>
>>>In one local second grade class, one of the first week's assignments
>>>was to
>>>write what you did over the summer. Expectation was 1-1/2 to 2-1/2
>>>pages after

>>>editing. (The kids are expected to do a rough draft, edit and final.
>>>By the end of third grade it's outline, rough draft, edit, final). One
>>>7 year old turned in a 31 page story (after editing) in the required
>>>time. It was quite readable, legible, accurate and had all the
>>>required elements.
>>>
>>>I built my first transmitter at age 13. From junk parts. Worked quite
>>>well. Of course I had previously built a couple of receivers and used
>>>them
>>>to learn the Morse code off the air.
>>
>>There is a huge difference between 7 and 13, Jim. Big difference.
>
>Sure. But the point is that simple transmitter building isn't that hard. And
>there's no requirement that a ham build anything.

If you mean building a kit, I agree. If you mean building from
scratch (which is the first level that I consider a project of mine to
be homebrew), that's quite a bit harder.....

>
>>>Since then I've homebrewed-from-scratch at least 7 transmitters,
>>>8 receivers, 3 transceivers, and their related power supplies, antenna
>>>tuners, control systems, accessories, test equipment, antennas and
>>>shack
>>>furniture.
>>>
>>>The above does not include kits built and rebuilt, old gear restored
>>>to
>>>operation, military surplus converted to ham use, repairs and
>>>adjustments,
>>>and stuff done for other hams. Of which I've done plenty...
>>>
>>>It's easy and fun. Too many hams don't know what they're missing.
>>
>>Absolutely.
>>
>>But you're not 7!
>
>I'm not 13 either.

You were when you were building radio stuff - say, why didn't you get
off your behind and get your Extra at 7 like that bright little girl
did, Jim?

It took you 9 more years than her to get that ticket, Jim - you were
at least as smart as her, weren't you?

Or maybe it's pretty darn easy now, by comparison, eh?

Hmmm.

>
>>>> - unlike the chief engineer at
>>>> your local NBC affiliate, who is merely a professional in his field
>>>> :)
>>>
>>>He probably doesn't have a license and probably never built a
>>>transmitter.
>>
>>Is that a requirement for an Amateur license? Wasn't on my test....
>
>Then why does it matter?

I don't know, Jim - you brought it up!

>
>>>> You know, everyone seems to be holding this event up as a great
>>>> accomplishment for Amateur Radio.
>>>
>>>It points out that the tests aren't that hard. Which some of us have
>>>been saying for years.
>>
>>Agreed.
>
>>>> And I applaud the little girl's
>>>> dedication to memorizing the material and passing all of the required
>>>> tests. That took a lot of effort on her part.
>>>>
>>>> But it is a clear indication that the testing procedure is far too
>>>> easy - IMHO. It can be memorized, which removes any requirement to
>>>> comprehend the material. Do you believe that a 7-year old can
>>>> comprehend the theories of complex numbers as they relate to impedance
>>>> in a resonant circuit?
>>>
>>>I'm sure some can.
>>
>>Sure, Jim.
>
>There are plenty of older hams who can't do it either. Would you take their
>licenses away?

Of course not. That would be silly.

>>
>>The whole point of putting that on the test was to encourage people to
>>learn technical material, not memory walk through it.
>
>Hasn't worked, has it? It's just a hoop most hams have to jump through, isn't
>it?
>
>>>>Bull.
>
>Horse.

Fully agreed - the animal is irrelavant, it's still poop....

>>>
>>>Have you ever been around really bright children whose talents are
>>>recognized and supported, Leo? They're capable of far more than
>>>many adults give them credit for.
>>>
>>>Complex numbers are simply a way of dealing with a pair of related
>>>electrical quantities. There's no need to have a detailed
>>>understanding of that whole
>>>field of math just to do some LCR calculations.
>>
>>Agreed - and any idiot can learn to plug numbers into a formula.
>
>Why such a nasty tone? "Idiots"?

Not nasty at all - any idiot can plug numbers into a formula. It
takes education to understand the root concepts. Like when you took
your Masters....

>
>>The idea was to learn the root concepts and theories!
>>
>Hasn't worked, has it?

It has in the commercial world!

>
>>>And there is *no* requirement that *any* ham understand complex
>>>numbers.
>>
>>There is, if he really wants to figure out why his 50 ohm antenna has
>>an SWR of 2.6 to 1......
>
>Not at all.

How so? That's where the rubber meets the road, so to speak.....

>
>And why would a 50 ohm antenna have such a high SWR if it's 50 ohms?

Do the math!

>>
>>>> >>A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>>>> >>professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>>>> >>US?
>>>> >
>>>> >No, except that some radiotelegraphy test elements were credited
>>>> >because they were essentially the same in both services.
>>>> >
>>>> >The problem has always been that the commercial (not professional - in
>>the USA
>>>> >that means something very specific) licenses did not test for knowledge

>>of
>>>> >amateur regs or operating practices. So a commercial licensee was not
>>>> >qualified to operate an amateur station based on the commercial license
>>test
>>>> >alone.
>>>> >And that's still the case.
>>>> >
>>>> >>With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>>>> >>who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>>>> >>qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>>>> >>when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>>>> >>arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>>>> >
>>>> >No. It's a bad arrangement. Unless the Canadian professional tests
>>include
>>>> >the amateur rules and operating practices, your government is derelict in
>>>> > its duty to the ARS. That's a plain and simple fact.
>>>>
>>>> IC disagrees. But I'll ask them to take your opinion under advisement
>>>> :)
>>>
>>>Wrong is wrong. But the IC are professionals, aren't they?
>>
>>Yep - professional regulators. Them who makes the rules!
>
>PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!

No - Professionals In Government.

>
>>>> Personally I'd think, for example, that the guy who sits in a control
>>>> tower accurately vectoring planes all over our busy airspace is far
>>>> better equipped to carry on a two-way conversation on 2-meters than
>>>> the average amateur who passed a relatively simple test!
>>>
>>>Maybe. But there's no requirement that he have any sort of radio
>>>operator's license. He doesn't need to know how the radios work.
>>>Complex numbers?
>>
>>They aren'r required - you just told me that....
>
>Exactly. Nor band edges, or power limits, etc.

All of which can easily be looked up. And memorized. By children.

>>
>>>> He could
>>>> learn all of the operating procedures that he needs by reading a
>>>> couple of sections of the RAC study guide....a couple of nights would
>>>> be all it would take. And, in a real emergency, that's the guy that I
>>>> would want to see on the radio, coordinating things!

>>>
>>>maybe - if he knows the environment.
>>>
>>>> Not the guy with
>>>> the mag mount 2-meter antenna on his callsigned baseball cap at the
>>>> local hamfest.....(I swear he goes to every hamfest in the world -
>>>> you've seen him at yours, haven't you? :))
>>>
>>>No. I'm too busy looking at rigs and parts.
>>
>>Look up - he's there, along with the guys who look like the local
>>homeless shelter burnt down!
>
>Gee, you sure have a high opinion of your fellow hams.

Well, not all of them :) These folks may be your fellow hams, but
they certainly aren't mine!

I find their appearance, behaviour and odor inappropriate for the ARS.

(Oh My God! I'm beginning to sound like that other guy!!!
AAAAAHHHHHH!)

>>
>>>> >For the USA to make the
>>>> >same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were
>>changed.
>>>> >Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be possible
>>
>>>> >for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the
>>amateur-radio-related
>>>> >questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an
>>amateur
>>>> >radio station.
>>>>
>>>> ...unless they can find a 7-year old to elmer them, that is. That is
>>>> some prettty tough material to master! LOL!
>>>
>>>Would you talk that way to a 7 year old, Leo?
>>
>>Why not?
>>
>How much time *do* you spend with children?

Every day!

I encourage my kids to work hard to accomplish whatever goals they
wish to achieve. What I do not do, however, is coerce them into
believing that they have accomplished something fantastic when, in
reality, they really only memorized their way through in place of
doing any real hard work.

Guess I won't be getting a job on the Editorial Committee at the ARRL
any time soon.....oh well!

>
>>>btw, when I was in EE school, I wound up elmering my faculty advisor.
>>>He was a
>>>PhD EE but didn't know much about radio, because radio is only a small
>>>part of EE. He knew *his* part of EE backwards and forwards, but
>>>needed *me* to help
>>>him figure out ham radio. I was glad to help, of course.
>>
>>Yep, you're quite the guy alright!
>
>Glad you figured that out.

You bet - I've had you figured out for quite some time now, my friend!
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2244. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 20:24:52 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <95ia20pjb7k6vv79umb1deagnb0esoagv8@4ax.com>
Source record: 87020

On Sat, 07 Feb 2004 18:57:45 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:

>> >snip
>
>> A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>> professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>> US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>> who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>> qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>> when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>> arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>
>There is no such mechanism available in the United States. A U.S.
>citizen licensed in Canada may not use his Canadian license when
>operating from the U.S.

That's not quite what I said, Dave. If a Canadian with a Commercial
licence obtains an Amateur licence vis this program, that Amateur
licence is covered under the existing reciprocity agreement - it is a
standard Amateur licence.

Your point is interesting, however - one need only be a resident of
Canada to qualify for an amateur license - not a citizen. If a US
citizen living in Canada obtains a Canadian amateur license, how would
that be illegal to use in the US?

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

2245. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 20:39:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Qp6dnYqbPaVw0bjdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87021

N2EY wrote:
> In article <kpmdnR8--baOL77dRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Ms Jackson is free to expose
>>herself under appropriate circumstances. If she wants to do a dance
>>routine and have Justin Timberlake tear off part of her outfit. That is
>>also okay - tho she might want to use a less weird presentation.
>>
>> There are appropriate television venues for that, such as HBO, Cinemax,
>
>
>>etc. Late night TV kind of stuff.
>>
>> But not on the super bowl halftime show. Not on Teletubbies or Barney
>>or Blues Clues or fishing shows. Those just aren't the places for that
>>sort of thing. Even my favorite, the History channel, has some shows
>>that deal with sex and show nudity.
>
>
> I gotta get cable...

Even then, it isn't smarmy stuff. It's mostly educational, with an
erotic undertone. It's the sort of thing that even if a youngster were
to watch it, they wouldn't be affected negatively
>
>>They put them on late at night when
>>the kids are in bed, and any viewing is strictly voluntary. No one harmed.
>
>
> I agree 100%, Mike, but I'd put it this way:
>
> The big problem isn't the content but whether it's expected or not when the
> viewer tunes in. Shows like "Sex in the City" and "Coupling" pretty much
> tell you what to expect by the name of the show. Other shows have warnings,
> ratings and writeups in the program guides.

Good point.

> The problem with the "wardrobe malfunction" was that nobody expected it except
> Ms. Jackson. Yet she will not incur any fine or penalty. That's just wrong.

I'll bet she doesn't get on Prime-time TV without a tape delay, tho'!

>>Everything in it's time and place, and the superbowl isn't the time or
>>place IMO.
>
>
> Agreed - particularly without any warning.
>
> Some may say this whole thing ahs nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
> the exact opposite is true. The big problem with that "wardrobe malfunction"
> was its unexpected nature. Since amateur radio is unscheduled, crosses time
> zones and no licensee owns a frequency, the standards of all amateur on-air
> activity have to be "G-rated".

Agreed! Why some people have a problem understanding that is beyond me.
Everything in moderation and in it's time and place. If Janet wants to
go around with parts hanging out of her clothes, she is welcome to.
(IMO) As long as as it is in the proper place. Otherwise, keep it clean.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2246. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 20:50:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PpSdnZGIMY0T0rjdRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87022

N2EY wrote:

> In article <102822lgmdsgg0f@corp.supernews.com>, "Harold Burton"
> <hwburton@cableone.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>>news:40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com...
>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>>>>violence is OK?
>>>>
>>>
>>>Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids, but
>>>would
>>>sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....
>>>
>>>
>>>>Is that really what we want to teach our children?
>>>>
>>>
>>>I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
>>>school.
>>
>>
>>When you get right down to it, except for a few shameful and widely
>>publicized exceptions, todays kids suffer from too little rather than too
>>much physical punishment.
>
>
> I disagree! Beating children simply means the beater can't think of
> a better way to deal with the kid.
>
> It also teaches the kid at a very primeval level that violence is a
> legitimate method of getting what you want from others.

And the argument is null anyway. If beating your kid worked, you would
only have to do it once or twice.

In fact, I was recently enlightened to the fact that (I hope this
doesn't invoke Godwin's law!) Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin, and Adolf
Hitler have one thing in common. They recieved regular beatings as children.

>>Worst form of abuse for todays kids is to let'em grow
>>up with no self control or discipline. That was true in earlier generations,
>>too.
>
>
> I agree 100%, except that I'd call it "neglect" rather than "abuse". And in
> some cases neglect is worse because it tells the kid he's not worth bothering
> with.

And discipline doesn't have to be beatings! Sit a kid on the couch for a
couple hours with no entertainment, and they'll come around. Sounds
simple and a little stupid, but it works. I got "wailed" on occasion as
a kid, and while it hurt, once it was over, big deal. All it taught me
was it was a good idea to not get caught, and if I could delay the
punishment until the punisher cooled down, I wasn't as likely to get
hit. That last part is telling in itself.
>
>>Look at Bill Clinton and, for that matter, the younger days of our current
>>President.
>
>
> Not just the younger days, either.
>
>
>>Sometimes they grow out of it and sometimes they don't.
>
>
> Exactly!

And sometimes, despite getting beat, they still turn out bad. Kind of
makes you wonder what does work! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2247. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 20:54:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207155448.25517.00004162@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87023

In article <40253872.ACFC300B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> Actually, Mike, I don't disagree with you at all - what she did was
>> quite inappropriate for the venue. But it ain't really that big a
>> deal....
>
>If it is a big deal for a segment of the population, it is a big deal
>for the network, the FCC and MTV.

If we accept "It ain't that big a deal", we'll get more and more of it. Oh
wait, that's how we got where we are now.
>
>> Read the article that I referenced, if you have time - it presents an
>> interesting perspective on what tends to constitute "obscenity". Sex
>> bad, violence good - you know. And, as always, Jack Nicholson's
>> comment is priceless :)

There is no reason for us to look to show business personnel for role models.
But too many of us do.
>
>I've not read or heard anything about obsenity being the issue. The
>halftime show was quite inappropriate. Everyone is making the noise
>about Janet Jackson but the lyrics used by P. Diddy, Nelly and Kid Rock
>were offensive. Kid Rock's defacing of the American Flag and his use of
>it as a poncho were offensive.

I say those things were obscene. Far more so than what Ms. Jackson did.
>
>> Example - I watched a bit of "Full Metal Jacket" on TBS a while back.
>> While all of the profanity and sexual references had been 'sanitized',
>> most of the gore and violence remained (it was funny, though, to see
>> Sgt. Hartman saying "Darn" and "Heck" and such, even though his lips
>> clearly had other intentions...).
>>
>> Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>> violence is OK? Is that really what we want to teach our children?

It's what the media wants to teach us.
>
>Songs about the use of women as sexual objects, about multiple casual
>sexual partners, about the glorification of drug use, drinking and
>criminal behavior in a public performance on prime-time TV are among the
>things I'd rather children didn't see or hear because they cater to the

>lowest, base side of humanity.
>
I agree 100%.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"I'm tired of all this sex on the television - I mean, I keep falling off!" -
Monty Python

2248. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:04:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402552D8.12308D68@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87024

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40232748.C8F2698B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Ding Dong Schoolmaster
> brandishing his Ruler k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40219EA0.3F50F6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <snarly
> >> k8mn@earthlink.net aka "Mr. Warmth"> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <40215EEF.3F9E310F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Mental or physical age? :-)
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>At which age did you pass an amateur radio license exam, Leonard?
> >> >>
> >> >> Never tried, snarly dave.
> >> >>
> >> >Well, there you have it.
> >>
> >> Have what? I don't have any amateur license. Got several others.
> >>
> >In the context of this newsgroup, that means just what?
>
> Yup. You need to UPGRADE your neurons.
>
> Hint: You made a general statement. I gave you a specific answer.
>
> You didn't like the answer. You never do. TS. :-)

You'd better re-read it, Leona. A question reading "at which age did
you pass an amateur radio license exam?" is not a general statement. It
is a specific question. Your answer included "Got several others".

That has zip to do with an amateur radio exam. You seem to have
straight lined.

> >> Snarly dave, I don't care about your amateur wonderfulness and
> >> vindictiveness and bigotry to non-amateurs. I'm a pro, like it or no.
> >
> >If you don't care, why are you still haunting a newsgroup dealing with
> >amateur radio?
>
> Boooooo! I haunt you! :-)

Uhhhhh, I'm not a newsgroup.

> Snarly dave, I said I don't care about YOUR amateur wonderfulness.

Be fair, Leonidas, you don't care about anyone's amateur wonderfulness.
It is quite apparent from your posts of these eight or so years.

> YOURS, snarly dave. You are NOT U.S. amateur radio. [thank
> the Lord...the League membership drive would be in hell if so...]

Oh, but I'm very much a part of U.S. amateur radio and I've been part of
amateur radio in five other countries. You aren't part of amateur radio
anywhere on the planet. You aren't a part of the ARRL. Your
connections to amateur radio are simply that you've commented to the FCC
about the service in which you do not participate and that you post
here.

> >It is clear that you are not a radio amateur and that
> >you are not, after all these years, "getting into amateur radio".
>
> Snarly dave, it isn't in your power to demand "motivations" since
> you are NOT a moderator in here, a judge, a jury, and certainly
> not an executioner (although I'm sure you would relish the task
> and with a side of fries to go with that).

I demanded nothing, Windy. I made a statement. Your response isn't
required, much less demanded.

> I've been trying to argue the elimination of the morse code test
> for ANY U.S. radio license.

Based on what--your years of experience, exposure, knowledge of?
What's it to ya, bub?

> Problem is, some of you and your ilk (ilk are similar to huns but
> are not, unfortunately, a vanishing species) DEMAND "motivation"
> and some kind of perverse "unquestioning love of a service" that
> is supposed to be a fun, recreational activity about radio. As a
> result you spend hours and waste Internet bandwidth insulting all
> those who do not agree with your wonderfulness, etc.

Unquestioning love? You haven't demonstrated interest enough to obtain
the most basic license available. Waste of internet bandwidth? My

total newsgroup posts over eight years wouldn't equal more than a couple of weeks of your insulting output. Quit wasting bandwidth *snicker*, Leonard.

> >Haunt
> >some radio professionals, using the endearing manner you've displayed
> >here and see how long they put up with your condesent.
>
> It's "condescension," not "condesent" or even 'condiment' although
> it must spice up your life on here.

I'll defer to you as the expert condescendent here.

> I've worked with professionals in radio and electronics a long time
> and they don't come across with the kind of stuff you and the
> gunnery nurse and other "proud SERVICE members" do.

You've likely kept some of your insulting behavior in check when around them then.

> >I worked professionally in radio and electronics.
>
> Of course you did. In the "foreign service," right? :-)

That's right, though it is "Foreign Service"; and in broadcasting and in the military and in industrial electronic component sales.

> [NBC likes the term "fleecing of America" and that might apply? :-)]

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >A number of us here have done so or do so.
>
> Yes. And? :-)

...and did you have trouble connecting the earlier sentence with the one below?

> >What sets you apart is that you are a non-amateur who
> >seems to get his jollies taking potshots at radio amateurs.
>
> Only CERTAIN amateurs...such as those pretending to be radio gods
> and the like. Look in a mirror to meet one.

The facts would prove that untrue. Terms like "Hum Radio", "beeping", "Church of St. Hiram" would indicate otherwise. As to the radio god thing, you have, in the past, said that I was a god, then that I wasn't a god, then that I was a god, then that I wasn't a god. Why don't the

several of you inhabiting the tired old body of Leonard H. Anderson come
to some sort of concensus?

> The salient point should be that I am still here!

Well, it is A salient point but I wouldn't call it THE salient point.
I prefer to think of it as an unpleasant reality.

> There have been many
> others participating in here that did not possess amateur licenses.

I can think of only a couple. Did they all have multiple personalities?

> Most, nearly all in fact, quit, dropped out, probably in irritation at the
> self-important personal wonderfulness expressed by those definitely
> NOT representative-of-the-amateur-community-but-insisted-they-
> ARE-amateur-radio. :-)

The more likely scenario is that either decided that they really weren't
interested in amateur radio or they have become radio amateurs. You're
the rare exception who can't seem to make up his mind :-) :-)

> You can't handle persistence by others who oppose your viewpoints.

Really? I've been responding to your posts since 1996. When will it be
determined that I can't handle you?

> All you can do is attempt insult and demeaning of those persons
> instead of addressing the subjects.

I've done both. Insulting you and demeaning you aren't hard, take
little time (compared to the body of work you've undertaken over the
past eight years) and are richly rewarding. You are to amateur radio
what a chainsaw is to surfing.

> QED most of today's mail package.

I sent no packages in the mail today.

> With all those many years of amateur radio experience you could have
> been doing great things for U.S. amateur radio...instead of trying to
> "get" certain personalities on this newsgroup. It's counterproductive
> and wastes bandwidth and others' time.

For a "PROFESSIONAL IN COMMUNICATIONS" you don't know much. There is no
wasted bandwidth. It is either there or not there. Beside that, I pay
for my access. Don't you? I've done my share for the DXing community
within amateur radio. What have you done for amateur radio in, oh,
let's say the past eight years of posting here?

> >> You do NOT get to choose anything about what anyone is "supposed"
> >> to say, to reply to, or anydamnthingelse. You keep thinking you do
> >> every time you put on the SS uniform with the monocle. Try keeping
> >> the armband off, it's so 40-ish.
> >

> >Get it straight, Len. This is an open newsgroup dealing with amateur
> >radio. You are in no way involved with amateur radio. I am free to
> >choose to respond to anything posted here and shall do so as the spirit
> >moves me.
>
> Get it straight, snarly dave. This is an open newsgroup, without any
> moderator, accessible by anyone.

Gee, I believe I said as much.

> If you get honked by anyone with an opposing view, you can't fall back
> on insults and pejoratives and nastygrams against the person instead
> of the subject. THAT DOESN'T ALWAYS WORK. [obviously not...:-)]

It wasn't worked very well for you, Leona. Is that what you meant by
"obviously not"?

> Try not to "threaten" anyone. That only makes you look more like the
> Waffen SS officer you seem to emulate.

Is a Waffen SS officer a part of that Prussian thing you've brought up
or is this now the "real deal" Nazi stuff? What threat has been
directed your way, Windy?

> Remember something which the gunnery nurse must have forgotten:
> Do as the spirit moves you, NOT as the spirits move you.

You seem to become less rational each day.

> If something doesn't work, stubbornness isn't a cure. You are doing
> it WRONG when no results come. CHANGE.

Wow! You're a guy who could use some material from your own play book.

> >> Shave the head and learn to smile. That will make you more like
> >> Colonel Klink. Lose several pounds too.
> >
> >As a last resort, you can always go to your strength and bring in the
> >Nazi images.
>
> Nein, Herr Robust, Wehrmacht, perhaps the military of Prussia of old,
> not the "nazis." Das ist der "image" presented.

The Waffen SS is part of the military of the Prussia of old?

> "That seemed to write itself." Remember that braggadoccio? :-)

Something from your Ouija Board?

> >Let's see. Amateur radio newsgroup. I'm a radio amateur.
>
> Congratulations. I'll bet you have a nice license certificate suitable for
> framing.

I'll bet you don't.

> >Now, back to
> >the question: What does your comment have to do with Larry's amateur
> >radio license and of concern is his job to you?
>
> Back to your official position as Ding Dong Schoolmaster: Whoinheck
> appointed you anything that you can DEMAND answers? :-)

I find it quite amusing that a question from someone becomes a "DEMAND"
in your mind.

> Quit shaking that ruler around. You can't slap anyone's wrist for
> writing anything in here. Try to realize that you are POWERLESS
> in that regard.

Yes, master. I am POWERLESS. I am under your complete control.

> >It seems to be karma
> >that forces you to live up to the N2EY profile of your likely actions.
>
> TAFKA Reverend Jim has his own problems and those are not your
> concern.

How would you know?

> He's just another newsgroupie but with a bad case of
> thinking he has to comment on everyone's postings all the time. :-)

Ummmm, isn't that what you do here?

> >Actually, old boy, you have quite the attitude toward radio amateurs.
>
> ONLY to CERTAIN ones. Tag, you're IT. :-)

Only certain folks, like those involved in "Hum Radio" and those who are
ARRL members? Only those who support morse code testing? Only those
who disagree with you on the issue of a minimum age for the amateur
radio in which you are not a participant?

> The best man at my wedding is still a radio amateur. The best work
> manager I ever had is still a radio amateur...

...and in all this time, you STILL aren't licensed. That must be a
pretty bitter pill.

> now moved to mid-
> California where my wife and I were overnight guests. I don't have any
> "attitude" towards the group (or "community" as some wish to lump it),
> just CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

The group of individuals grows ever larger.

> >You're insulting, rude and immature.
>
> Self-professed gods seem to get that impression! TS. :-)

I've never made such a profession. The only person who has done so
(you), has seen fit to reverse himself a number of times. :-(

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, "some things seem to write themselves," don't they?

A lot of your stuff seems to write itself.

> >If you're waiting for radio
> >amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely
> >going to be disappointed.
>
> Oh, my, judging all others by the things YOU do? :-)

Er, I don't believe I've ever expected radio amateurs to be impressed by
my professional credentials.

> Poor baby, haven't you realized that I am retired?

Oh, I've realized it, Len. Nobody but a person with lots of empty time
on his hands could produce your r.r.a.p. output.

> I don't HAVE to
> "impress anyone."

Lucky for you that it's so. It hasn't prevented you from trying though.

> I did what I did. Now I don't have to take any
> BS* from anyone on how "important" THEY are.

If, by important, you mean that they hold amateur radio licenses and you
don't, I'm afraid you're wrong. You do have to take it, and often.

> Neither am I
> "impressed" by complex radios or electronic systems, having been
> around many such things, some far more complex than any product
> of Ten-Tec. If you have one and are amazed by it, be my guest.
> Just quit making out How Good You Are Because You Have One.

wHat GaVE yOu ThE idEA THat i bEliEVe ThAT I tHiNK i'M gOOd BeCAusE I
"hAvE onE"? It's more like: "I have one and it's good". You aren't
impressed with it because 1) you don't have one and 2)you don't have a
license to use one.

> I got into the whole big entire world of radio because it was very
> interesting, a fun job despite some obvious challenges in some
> technological areas. It also paid well if a good job was done. I got
> paid reasonably well. As TAFKA Rev. Jim once quoted: "It ain't
> braggin' if ya done it." I did it.

But if someone else did anything, you are quite ready to prove the
validity of the N2EY profile of your likely actions. When it comes to
amateur radio, you didn't do it.

> >It wasn't a casual, throwaway mention and your newsgroup statements of
> >the past are here for a long, long time.

> Like I've said many times, feel free to cut and paste everything I ever
> wrote from Google archives.

Your permission isn't required. I've quoted some of your material from
time to time. So have others.

> Get your own newsgroup if you like.

I'm quite content here, thanks. I am, after all, a radio amateur.

> Will that cure your vindictiveness? I doubt it. You will be angry
> anyway. It's your personality.

Thus sayeth, the original Grumpy Old Man.

> >I haven't changed my mind about you, Len.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, stubborn as they come (you should be sitting in front
> of your orion when that happens).
>
> You will NOT ever retract anything you've said, you will rationalize the
> beejums out of what you said in order to make you look good to
> yourself. Few give a darn. Feel self-triumphant as much as you want.
> It's a free country. Except in this newsgroup where one MUST have
> an amateur callsign officially bestowed on their cub scout uniforms
> or claim they have one while remaining anomalous. :-)

I'll happily retract anything which I feel is in error. What statements
of your have you retracted, old boy?

> >You're a victim of your own inertia and braggadocio.
>
> Nope. Just a Fatal Attraction to balloon-popping of the self-important,
> the self-grandiose, the self-proclaimed god-gurus of hum radio. :-)
>
> That's so much fun! :-)

I'm sure it is, Walter. Give my regards to the rest of the Mitty clan.

> >To twist a phrase: If you haven't done it, it
> >is most certainly bragging. You haven't obtained a license and aren't
> >likely to do so.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, snarly dave. Still at it. You never learn.
>
> I have obtained licenses (note the plural) in radio. Amateur hasn't
> been one of them. That includes station as well as operator.

None of the "plural" has anything to do with amateur radio. You are to
amateur radio what a butter churn is to house painting.

> I may still get a hum license. I may not. Why is that a concern?

Gee, I dunno, Mister "Extra right out of the box", poster of eight years
worth of inexperienced views on how amateur radio should be regulated.

> I'm still a citizen of the United States of America with all the rights
> thereof. No self-important, self-officious SOB* is going to take
> those rights away from me. At least one other SOB* tried but
> failed (miserably).

Let's see. You have the right to be heard by your government. Check.
You have the right to post here. Check. I'm sorry, I can't find the
rights addressing freedom from disagreement, derision or laughter.
Maybe you can post them in your free time.

> Amateur radio is supposed to be a fun recreational activity involving
> radio and the radio arts.

You'll have to take my word for it, Leonard. It is all of those things
and more.

> From the actions of a few who do NOT
> adequately represent the "amateur community," it seems to be a
> vindictive group of ego-honed Cassius Clay imitators who assume
> the invisible mantle of gods of radio. They should get better tailors
> and see what happened to Muhammed Ali in later life.

Any radio amateur is part of the amateur radio community. You are not a
part of that community. You can't even decide who is a god or not a god
within that community. I'll give you a hint. It would likely not be
someone from outside the community.

I checked up on Muhammed Ali. Like you, he never became a radio
amateur.
Unlike you, he never tried to tell radio amateurs what was good for
them.

> A few in
> that category think that amateur radio is a "service" like the military
> and assume rank and insignia demanding respect (and salutes).
> Those should be arrested for impersonating officers. :-)

What's the penalty for impersonating a radio amateur?

> The ARRL does not adequately represent the "amateur community"
> either since their published numbers indicate a decided member-
> ship less than a quarter of all licensed U.S. amateurs. They like to
> think they control everything but they don't.

You tell 'em, Len. YOU CONTROL everything in amateur radio *snicker*.

> The more-public access
> granted by the Internet has shown the FCC that the ARRL is just a
> special interest group and not really that representative.

You are to the ARRL what you are to amateur radio, not a participant.

> >Consider yourself stuffed.
>
> It's after supper and I am adequately filled, thank you for your concern.

> My wife is a good cook, we have a newly remodeled kitchen, a
> comfortable income and life, yet she scolds me for playing with
> the seven-year-olds in radio expertise in a newsgroup. She's right.
> :-)

I'll bet she says that when you play with the seven-year-olds in the neighborhood too. :-) :-)

It must be nice having the only wife who is a good cook, the only folks with a remodeled kitchen (what was wrong the old one?), the only one with a comfortable income and comfortable life. The rest of us are envious, I'm sure. Tell us about your ham shack, won't you?

Dave K8MN

2249. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:09:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4025541A.9C1A9775@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87025

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4022ED6C.55B1405B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Entertain us with your credentials once again, won't you, Len.
>
> How can I do it "again" when you didn't like it the first time?

I don't remember the first time. I remember many of the other times
though.

> Tell the stage manager to change the lights or maybe change
> the flats.

That isn't likely to improve your story.

> >After more than seven
> >years of posting your diatribes in an amateur radio newsgroup, you're no
> >closer to obtaining even the most basic no-code amateur radio license.
>
> Was never my intent to GET a ham license any class.

Your boast of getting an "Extra right out of the box" was an empty one?
Your description of several decades of interest in amateur radio was a
falsehood?

> After seven years you are no closer to understanding that.

The difficulty I'm having understanding it probably has something to do
with the discrepancy in your story.

> You
> desperately need to UPGRADE your neuron count! Download
> some more from Ten-Tec. You can do it.

Nope, Ten-Tec has no neuron upgrade page. They do have one for firmware
upgrades. You do understand what firmware is, don't you?

Dave K8MN

2250. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:12:59 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <veka20luiccufj5bsq1u3s3ufmjpl247jp@4ax.com>
Source record: 87026

On 07 Feb 2004 06:57:52 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <2ai520tsgorvo8q5193da00siulc519v2n@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 05 Feb 2004 20:00:23 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>>>>snip
>>
>>> Poor baby. Your imagination giving you poor pictures again?
>>>
>>> Develop them. I suggest Kodak D-76.
>>
>>Now THAT brought back memories - rolling 620 Verichrome Pan film into
>>the developing tank under that @#$%^ dark green safelight....mixing
>>the developer and getting it to exactly 68 degrees F.......another
>>hobby, another time - long ago.
>>
>>D-76 is good for B&W film only, though. These discussions are far too
>>colourful for anything less than Ektachrome.....definitely Kodak
>>moments, though!
>
> You had a safelight? I was so poor I had to catch fireflies and keep
> them in an old jelly jar for a safelight. Only had the red-orange fire-
> flies in my growing-up town, no green. :-)

My flies all died, so I bought the light. It was so dim, it took
about 10 minutes before you could vaguely see anything at all in the
darkroom. Finally gave up and learned to load the tank by
feel....still remember the bright light (caused by static electricity,
I suppose) when removing the tape at the end of the 620 film, securing
it to the backing paper......looked pretty cool in the dark!

>
> I'll omit mentions of Microdol, forced development to extend Super-
> XX film speed, Promicrol film developer or FR monobaths, the lovely
> odor of acetic acid stop-bath, DuPont Varigam filters, bulk-load 5-
> roll-packs of 35mm and double changing bags, SLRs and the
> ability to hold depth-of-field as you wanted it while composing the
> picture in the pentaprism viewfinder. Those have nothing to do with
> amateur radio policy discussions about Janet Jackson's breast
> or her sister Michael.

Or Kim's callsign. :)

>
> I still have the old developing trays and print dryer, long since
> converted to etching trays for PCBs and a heater for the trays to
> use the last, loaded ferric chloride etchant in the jug.

> All my photography has gone digital and "processing" done in the
> computer.

Same here - never did get in to colour developing using the old
chemicals anyway - too buggy. Photoshop is much better, and a lot
easier to clean up!

>
> All but one of the PCTAs in here buy ready-made rigs, don't
> make their own. The holdout PCTA "designs his own ham
> equipment" such as the Elecraft K2 kit he made. :-) All are
> "advancing the state of the amateur art" and showing "the unique
> ability of the amateur to extend good will" (as stated in FCC's
> 47 C.F.R. 97.1). :-)
>
> How a boot dat, ey? :-)

Len, I tink you got dat right fer sure, eh? :)

>
> LHA / WMD

2251. KE4TEW, Riley's buddy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:18:22 UTC
From: mick <drunkfiredcop@hiccup.net>
Message-ID: <HxcVb.15802$8a5.578@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 87027
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.dx

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
retest? Looks like corruption to me.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

2252. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:23:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <44ka20tto43sk2tadkdo7b7thal6k0bt04@4ax.com>
Source record: 87028

On 07 Feb 2004 06:57:36 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On Fri, 06 Feb 2004 05:34:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>wrote:
>>
>>>Len Five Decades Over 21 but not acting a day over eleven wrote:
>>
>>>If you're waiting for radio
>>>amateurs to be impressed by your professional credentials, you're likely
>>>going to be disappointed.
>>
>>I must admit, I've taken a shot or three at Len over exactly the same
>>issue - no Amateur callsign = no valid opinion on Amateur issues.
>
> No problem to me. :-) Somebody shoots at me in the newsgroup
> and I shoot back...which bothers the hokey heck out some. :-)

Me too - which is how our original - um - exchage of opinions got
started in the first place. Water under the bridge.....
>
>snip

> ...consider also benevolent, grandfatherly VEs over here, such
> as the ones "passing" the written exams of two six year olds about
> three years (?) or so ago. :-)

Yup, we have them too - and there is a big fanfare when anyone under
the age of 16 tests for a license. Which makes sense - we are trying
to encourage young kids to get interested in the hobby, so that it
doesn't die out.

Doesn't mean that we should make the testing process so easy as to be
meaningless, though! Or deify kids who manage to memorize their way
to the top.....

>snip
>
> Actually, I'm not absolutely interested in "being qualified" by a
> pretty certificate (suitable for framing) from our FCC. I got
> really and truly qualified to do that a half century ago, operating
> HF transmitters having RF power outputs of 1 to 40 KW. The
> operating word ought to be "authorized," not qualified. Our FCC
> exists to regulate U.S. civil radio and interstate communications

> (NTIA oversees military and government agency communications)
> and their use of licenses is as a regulatory tool.

Agreed - I see the Amateur license as an authorization, not
qualification. A license to learn, per se....not proof that the
learning has been completed.

>
> Besides, my 'first phone got changed to a General Radiotelephone
> (Commercial) license some time ago. Watch this space since the
> resident gunnery nurse is going to come in on that with six-guns
> blazing, cussing up a storm but getting only misfires and overcast.
> :-) heh heh heh.
>
> Over 40 years ago I joined a grass-roots campaign for a young
> senator from Massachusetts wanting to become President of the
> USA. J.F.K. was Catholic but I had no desire to become Catholic.
> Neither did I want any political position, favor, or anything else as a
> result of such voluntary work on his behalf. Kennedy won by a
> narrow margin. It was a "cause" that was just personal, nothing else
> to justify it.
>
> Some of the anal-retentive olde-tyme hammes in here DEMAND a
> justification for action, all but invoking a death penalty if one doesn't
> live up to their demands. Good grief, those are Charley Browns that
> Sparky never drew...except the maybe beagle dreaming of being a
> WW1 fighter ace in his Sopwith Camel. They dream of Being In
> Charge, of being some kind of "ace" in radio through their mighty
> macho morsemanship. [that kind of "ace" is not spelled with a C or E but
> with two Ss...:-)] Maybe its some kind of "radio testosterone"?
> Most of the time those MMMs just try to use a humiliation ploy with the
> incessant "I've got a license and you ain't, nyah, nyah, nyah." Geez,
> its only a HOBBY license but you would think they got promoted to
> Chief of Staff of Amateur Signals with some kind of field grade rank
> (colonel to general, complete with flag on front car bumper)... :-)
>
> My only objective overall is to be one of many advocating the elimination
> of the morse code test for a license. That's it. But, there's another
> element that may be at work with some of the MMMs: If the morse
> code test is eliminated, they will lose bragging rights to their fabled
> rank, their status as guru radio operator gods in amateurism. That is
> extremely hard on their personal self-esteem and they get all steamed
> over such perceived blows to their boilers. They elevated themselves
> (without "bootstrap" circuit) to lofty positions and had most of their
> pedestals yanked away. They lost federal support for their mental
> hernias. They are but mortal and their works are not that mighty after
> all (to paraphrase Tenneyson). Nobody cares to admire their deeds
> and doings to standards and practices of 70 years ago, a time when
> they did not exist.
>
> As far as I'm concerned, by all objective measure, there's just no need

> for any government to require a morse code test for any amateur radio
> license. There's no ITU requirement to "obey." Not since July of last
> year. The IARU agrees, despite the spin of the ARRL trying to indicate
> otherwise. The ARRL doesn't agree. PCTAs don't, indeed can't agree
> since the loss of the code test as a requirement would be an ego
> blow equivalent to mass destruction.
>
> The familiar argument heard in here is to the effect that "ONLY
> amateurs can discuss, direct, or implement rules and regulations
> of and about amateurs." That's a base falsity. The United States
> Constitution, in its First Amendment, grants the right of ALL U.S.
> citizens to petition our government for the redress of grievances.
> We have a number of similar rights which don't discriminate in the
> favor of elitist, special interest groups. Our FCC was created by an
> Act of our Congress in 1934. In all the time since then (almost 70
> years) there has been absolutely NO law or condition that any
> Commissioner or staff member hold any amateur radio license in
> order to make, change, or enforce amateur radio regulations. None.
> No such law exists...except in the imaginary posse commitatus
> fantasy of a small group of would-be tyrants of opinion...some of them
> in here parading around in the false patriotism of "honor and respect
> and tradition for 'the service.'" BS...a food group already processed
> through by male bovines.
>
> All of the MMMs who parrot their false patriotism and elitism are
> really only trying to elevate themselves to lofty but imaginary positions
> of glory and gradeur that don't exist. Not a good role model for
> enhancing any interest in a fun, recreational activity involving radio.
> But, it satisfies them no end for, in their imaginary ego world, they
> are absolute champions of whatever they have done. All others are
> non-existant.
>
> Actually, in such an environment, there is no possibility of rational,
> civilized discussion. Except for one little thing.
>
> This is (so far) an open, public newsgroup, unmoderated. There are no
> guards checking credentials at any door, there are only the self-styled
> Waffen SS equivalents roaming about, snarling about "qualifications."
>
> Interesting place, this newsgroup. Kraft-Ebbing could have had a
> second edition to cover it for the psychiatric professionals. Some get
> oriongasms even... :-)

I suspect that Masters and Johnson would have found inspiration here
too..... :)

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo
>

>

2253. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:30:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402558E3.F25D836F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87029

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4022EC2F.55D9A333@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Ding Dong Schoolmaster
> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >It should be apparent to you, Leonard. They're discussing matters
> >dealing with amateur radio.
>
> Yes, Janet Jackson's breast, U.S. foreign policy, the local
> weather, national societal morals to name just four common
> "amateur radio" subjects.
>
> :-)

There's your problem! In the post to which you responded, amateur radio
was indeed under discussion.

> >You've delivered bushels of sermons here
> >but you have zip to do with amateur radio.
>
> And snarly dave has delivered tonnes of diatribes against individuals
> for having the temerity to disagree with a radio god such as He!

Again, Leona, my total posts in eight years would equal about two weeks
of your newsgroup output. Have the several of you reached a concensus
yet as to whether I'm a radio god?

> >Instead, you entertain us
> >with tales of how the commercials do things and of your military
> >exploits of fifty years back.
>
> You don't seem very entertained? Shall I strap on my Haney plates?

Which ones--the decorative light switch plates by Anne Haney, the
photographic plates from the R.J. Haney Heritage Park, or "The Optimist"
plates by Jill Haney? No matter, strap 'em on. It'll spiff up your
act.

> "Military exploits?" I don't think I've ever exploited anyone while
> serving my country in the U.S. Army.

Oh, I'll bet you're just being modest.

> Okay, maybe a couple gals in Red Bank, New Jersey, but that was
> long ago, probably before you got diapers.

I shudder to think what particular acts in which you and the girls from Red Bank were involved, which required diapers.

> >Your claims of being here only to engage in civil debate on morse
> >testing elimination ring very hollow.
>
> The Ding Dong Schoolmaster done ring his chimes!
>
> Snarly dave, don't they have any rest homes in your neck of the woods?
> You could go out there and berate some Alzheimer's patient about
> losing their memory and not getting a ham license.

Izzat your problem, that you suffer from Alzheimer's and that you've lost your memory and forgot to go for that Extra you wrote of? I don't know of any local non-hams posting here.

> Better yet, accost an Orthodox Jew and start lecturing them about ham.

What an utterly strange thing for you to write.

Dave K8MN

2254. F4ASKs favorite ham-radio activity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:30:25 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <d0d74d88104429e51dd20872156a9ca8@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 87030

http://www.davidbeckham7.org

2255. Boonton Power meter manual

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:38:25 UTC
From: ddarby1@cfl.rr.com
Message-ID: <5541ee2f.0402071338.7507fbb2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87031

Does anyone know of a place to find a cal/repair manual for a
70's-vintage Boonton 42C Microwattmeter?
Thanks,
Don

2256. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:46:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40255C9F.5A4CC21B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87032

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40232FD0.F492989E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40227DF3.1C5E590D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <confused in the
> >> east...and north...and south k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>,
> >> >n2ey@aol.com
> >> >> >(N2EY)
> >> >> >> writes:

> >> The FDA grades ham.
> >>
> >...leaving you to handle the degrading.
>
> I only degrade the biodegradeable amateurs in here.

We're each biodegradable, Leonard.

> You know, the Few, the Overly-Proud, the (white) Men of the
> Amateur Copse waving in the breeze of their own unoriginality
> bravely holding to the standards and practices of 1930s
> amateurisms but bragging they are state of the art by buying
> the latest radio toy designed by someone else and built by
> someone else and thinking they are potential Nobel laureates
> for doing so.

A few questions (DEMANDS) of you, Leona:

What constitutes "Overly-Proud" and why is the term capitalized?

Do you consider yourself to be of a racial group other than white?

Do you know of anyone who has indicated that hethinks of himself as a Nobel laureate because he bought a radio transceiver which is unequalled in amateur radio equipment?

> You biodegradeables get your jollies not by operating them radio
> toys so much as acting like you are radio gods in here and
> snarling degredations at others who don't have your lofty
> opinions. Worse yet, you aren't even original in your perjoratives.

You're biodegradable, Len. Your definition of "radio god" seems to be "one who is not in agreement with the views of Leonard H. Anderson". How do you determine from reading lines of typed characters, when someone is snarling? Are you snarling when you post here? Do you hold "lofty" opinions? How do you determine when the opinions of others are "lofty"?

> >> Didn't you forget my claim that I was going to invent anti-gravity?
> >
> >Haven't heard of that one. Don't worry too much though. It can't make
> >you look any more foolish than your "Extra right out of the box" claim.
>
> Said that once before. You can find it in Google (you were going to
> cut and paste everything I ever wrote before in here...that will be
> included).

I never wrote that I intended bringing back all of your material. Most of it wasn't that good the first time.

> I'm still working on anti-gravity. Something is holding me down, though.

So you said earlier. Your purloined lines weren't very funny the first time.

> >> Now sit down in front of your orion, snarly dave. Amaze yourself.
> >
> >I do that quite frequently, Leonid.
>
> Herr Robust, you need to get some radio technology EDUCATION.

...and YOU'RE JUST THE GUY to give it to me, I'll bet.

(much of your crap snipped because it was, well, crap)

> Success is yours ahead. Just not at the rate
> you are going.

Amateur radio success has been mine for over 40 years now. Would you like to ruminate on your liklihood of joining the fun on the ham bands, given the rate you are going?

Dave K8MN

2257. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 21:54:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 87033

In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >Here's your options:
>> >
>> >We currently have essentially a 6 license system in place (even though
>> >several licenses are no longer issued). To go from that system
>> >to the one proposed by ARRL leaves three options as I see it:
>> >
>> >1. The one-time free upgrade process as put forth by ARRL which takes
>> >nothing away from anyone
>>
>> Hold on a sec.
>>
>> Right now there are about 105,000 Extras. And we have a few slices of
>> choice kHz on 4 HF bands. In my experience, QRM in these subbands is
>usually
>> less than elsewhere in the same band because relatively few US hams have
>access
>> to them.
>>
>> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have access
>to
>> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So giving
>them
>> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>
>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.

If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
is there?

>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>operating in the Extra only segments.

Then just leave 'em be!

>> Same situation for Generals.
>> elsewhere in the same band
>>
>> >and immediately gets everyone into the
>> >new 3 license system,
>>
>> But nobody says why that is such a big priority, when it wasn't 4 years

>> ago.
>
>I suspect the FCC four years ago (5 years ago now) expected change
>over time. You are free to voice your own thoughts on need or not.

They've gotten change over time, too.
>
>> >or
>> >
>> >2. Go to the new system but "grandfather" those on current but no
>> >longer to be issued license classes which takes nothing from anyone but
>> >presents a dual system of licenses, rules and regulations which would
>> >likly exist for decades until those with licenses no longer being issued
>> >as new ended up SK or otherwise dropped from our ranks
>>
>> or upgraded! Have you forgotten that any of the closed off classes can
>> upgrade with the required tests? The fact that so few Advanceds have
>> upgraded in almost 4 years is quite interesting, don't you think? Number
>> of Advanceds is down by only about 16%, and that includes both upgrades
>> and expirations.
>
>Repeat my comment above about the unlikly QRM from former
>advanced being in Extra segments...if freely upgraded.

Then what's the problem?
>
>> > or,
>> >
>> >3. Implement the ARRL 3 licnense system and downgrade some
>> >folks to new Novice (i.e. the Techs) or General (i.e the Advanced).
>> >This last scenario takes away privileges and we all know how well
>> >that went down in the late 60's Incentive Licensing implementation.
>>
>> Or
>>
>> 4. Do something else.
>
>I identified the ONLY three options on a general basis. You propose
>something else but do not specify what that is. Either there is
>nothing else as an option and you know it or, there is another
>option but you don't wish for anyone to know what it is.
>The ball is in your court. Only three options exist unless you can provide
>a real 4th option.

OK, do this:

Leave General, Advanced and Extra privs alone.

"NewNovices" get privileges to be described elsewhere.

Existing Novice privileges change to those for "NewNovices"

Below 30 MHz, existing Tech Pluses get the same privs as "NewNovices".

Above 30 MHz, existing Techs and Tech Pluses continue to have what they have now. (everything)

If it decided to eliminate Element 1 for the "NewNovice", then Techs would get "NewNovice" privileges below 30 MHz.

Simple, easy and no giveaways.

>> > To me the answer is clear...and, I suspect so is it also to ARRL which
>> >is why the proposal includes free upgrades.
>>
>> Why should FCC allow free upgrades today, when they said no in 1999? What
>has
>> changed?
>
>I don't care. In the end the FCC will decide. There's no need for me
>to explain or even understand why the FCC might allow it.

That's good - won;t have to argue against it as much.
>
>> >> >Rather, it is just one of
>> >> >the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until
>better
>> >> >consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>> >> >Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>> >> >band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC
>official's
>> >> >desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC
>official,
>> >> >but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not
>longer,
>> >> >is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>> >>
>> >> I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good
>or
>> >> bad
>> >> idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from
>initial
>> >> release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?
>> >>
>> >> More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really
>such
>> >> a
>> >> burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass
>Element
>> >> 3,
>> >> in order to get the next higher grade of license?
>> >
>> >See options 2 and 3 above.
>> >
>> The rules for the 6 license classes are already in place. So what's the

>> problem?
>
>Which requires enforcement authorities to keep tabs on 6
>different sets of spectrum authority.

>You can disagree that it isn't
>significant, but I'd bet it IS an issue in the FCC and other
>government mindsets.

Suppose we do my Option 4.

FCC has to keep track of four privsets below 30 MHz and 2 above.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2258. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:11:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40256290.509F9F7E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87034

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4023329A.6601D3DF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <charm school dropout
> from the foreign service k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40219DA6.35D67934@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss Congeniality
> >> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <4021622A.74C88B88@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Miss
> >Construance>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:

> >> >> >Others have misconstrued the term "GETTING INTO" amateur radio as
> >> >> >meaning the several decades of interest preceeding the several years of
> >> >> >newsgroup posts just before the three-year-old claim of getting "an
> >> >> >Extra right out of the box".
> >> >>
> >> >> Go for it, big daddy dave. Ain't no cats on your hot tin roof.
> >> >
> >> >I did go for it, Len--forty years ago, within a year of my first
> >> >exposure to amateur radio.
> >>
> >> ...and you are still undeveloped.
> >
> >That's rich! You've sat on your duff for almost an equivalent period
> >and are still writing about "getting into amateur radio". Thanks for the
> >laughs, Leonard.
>
> Thanks for the laffs, snarly dave, but Don Rickles doesn't have
> to worry about you stealing his act.

...not as long as you're around, don Wrinkles.

> You have the moronic insult of "insult humor" down pat, but grade
> ZERO on the humor part. Work on that.

You wouldn't know humor if it smacked you in the forehead--Oh wait, it
DID!

> Hello? Are you alive? I said "interested in radio," non-compost-
> mentat-intellect.* ALL of it, not just amateur activities.

You might have written that at some time. You also wrote of your
decades-long interest in *amateur* radio.

> I got into
> a lot of the rest of the world of amateur radio,

Let's get this straight. You got into the rest of the world of amateur
radio? When was this?

> ...lots more than you
> you ever did while engaged in the Fleecing of America as a
> "foreign service" member.

Well, you've managed to live up to the profile yet again.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> >Nope. Nothing about your obtaining an amateur radio license here.
> >>
> >> Oh? Is this a requirement to be in the electronics industry?
> >
> >Was that under discussion? I could have sworn that amateur radio was
> >the topic in which you decided to submit your PROFESSIONAL credentials.
>
> Nooooo. You got it WRONG again, herr robust.
>
> I've submitted my professional credentials to professional organizations
> and got the jobs. Unlike some in here bragging of their "human
> resources" fantastic grades and abilities and then going out and
> becoming bus drivers. I'm still getting the professional jobs but the
> work isn't as intense as before now that I don't keep regular hours.
> It's fun, challenging work. You ought to try that sometime...a heckuva
> lot better than spending "foreign service" time fleecing America in
> some backwater African country.

You simply can't help it.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> Strange, isn't it, not one single personnel person (that's "human
> >> resources" profession to bus drivers) said anything about needing
> >> any amateur radio license to work in electronics or aerospace.
> >
> >You must want alt.jobs.wanted.aerospace.
>
> Nooooo. I can get all kinds of jobs involving electronics and even
> radio. I don't care to. I've had a full career as an electronics
> design engineer. My income isn't all from the U.S. Treasury as a
> "foreign service key person." [did you change the locks often
> while a key person?]

"Key Officers of Foreign Service Posts", Len. You took a rap on the
snout in that one, huh?

> >> Where is "here," snarly dave?
> >
> >Right there.
>
> Where is "there," snarly dave? Illustrate your point. :-)

Right here.

> >That is incorrect, Leona. You have your facts scrambled. I'll be happy
> >to quote the post if you're having trouble remembering.
>
> What are you going to state as a "location" next, elsewhere? :-)
>
> Feel free to cut and paste every single post, word for word, from
> Google to illustrate whatever blunted point you think you have.

Oh, it won't be a blunted point, Leonard. It'll be quite direct and to
the point.

> All you will do is annoy all the other readers, the regular
> newsgroupies.

I think a goodly number of them are entertained, Leonard.

All you will do is demonstrate that you have ZERO
> originality, ZERO creativity, are nothing but a bundle of overly-
> proud puffery, vindictive almost to the gunnery nurse's standards.

Ahh, the plaintive cry from the bottom of the Extra box.

> You really ought to TRY to get close to the subjects in this
> newsgroup, not just being an exhibitionist for over-the-top raging
> vindictiveness.

You decide to give someone a tweak, Leonard and a tweak will likely come
your way. You tweak enough folks and lots of tweaks will come in
return.

> >I understand that. There is an amateur license available which requires
> >no morse test. It requires a pretty straightforward written test. You

> >haven't tackled it.
>
> Explain WHY that is some kind of "requirement."

Okay. The FCC will not permit you to operate under Part 97 without it.

> This is a newsgroup with open access, no moderator, straight-
> forward (except for some PCTAs bent over backwards to get back
> to the 1930s). No license of any kind required here. Not even
> poetic license.

Oh, you misunderstood. No FCC license exam is required for newsgroup access. You do have to understand though, that newsgroups are not amateur radio.

> You have NO concept of the discussion over the retention or
> elimination of the morse code test.

Why, certainly I do.

> All you can think of is an
> unyielding spit-de-corpse adherence to the very same rules you
> had to follow long ago in order to get that treasured and adored
> federal merit badge.

The rules under which I received my Novice, General, Advanced and Extra license are no longer the rules of today. Yep, I treasure and adore my federal merit badge. You don't have one, do you?

> Your insistance on all of present day to
> Get The Morse Test or even Get A Ham License makes you a
> prime believer worthy of the Waffen SS.

The Waffen SS? You mean that arm of the old Prussian military? You don't have to obtain an amateur radio license though doing so would take some of the egg off your mug after that "Extra right out of the box" brag you issued. Obtaining even the most basic amateur radio license might provide you with a bit of credibility in your quest to mold amateur radio licensing to your way of thinking.

Do not think! Follow
> orders! Yap! Yap! Bark! Bark!

> All that for a radio HOBBY... :-)

You mean the hobby which has licensing requirements unmet by you? Yeah, all that.

Dave K8MN

2259. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:14:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402071414.69419d83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87035

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402040333.7045cdae@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Billy:
> >>
> >> Point taken, and I offer all appropriate apologies to Miss Clauson.
> >> However, her achievement, while a fairly notable one ***for a child,***
> >> is no longer noteworthy for anyone over the age of, say, 10 years,
> >> and certainly a meaningless one for an adult.
> > >
> > >Larrah, at what age did you pass the Extra exam elements?
> >
> > Billy:
> >
> > I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
> > Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
> > old at the time. My figuring may be a bit off, as I'm somewhat bleary-eyed
> > due to it being past my bedtime.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

It would appear that the young lady beat you to Extra by a couple of decades.

She is a superior amateur to you.

2260. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:15:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402071415.3c933f94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87036

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040207095504.12631.00004760@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402061925.73fdf12e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >. . . Move over ya newbies, ALLYA, the OF has logged in . .
>
> Hans hasn't played the game yet, tho.

Nor has W0EX.

2261. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:27:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40256638.F14CB6C7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87037

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40232C4F.88A4B174@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <4022584B.BA773B99@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <emineminent
> >scientist
> >> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <402167E5.7C98E0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Maybe it slipped your mind that the definition did not come from
> >> >Ten-Tec, old boy.
> >>
> >> Noooo...I provided the definition based on the whole rest of the
> >> electronics industry.
> >
> >You provided? Your statement seems at odds with the other definitions
> >in existence.
>
> Poor baby. You've never programmed... erased and
> re-burned an EPROM...You don't know what "microcode"
> for a minicomputer is... and
> haven't programmed a single CPU
> You haven't had an associate membership in the ACM...
> ...in front of a Microchip PIC Assembler Development Program
> and you would be LOST, even for the "entry-level" PIC, the 16F84.
> You wouldn't know any details of the PIC 16F71...
> You don't know the difference between Assembler and Interpreter
> and Compiler programs, haven't done squat about learning any of
> that, or using them in any sort of designed-by-self application, yet
> you have the puerile perfidy to accuse working electronics
> engineers of "not knowing something."

Yada, yada, yada. You can't rant and froth but you can't hide (your
lack of knowledge of the term "firmware").

> All you can do is BEEP, little fella, and walk around stuffy and
> like the south end of a mule going north bray a bunch of nonsense

> you don't know about. You talk only bullstuff BLUFF, herr robust.

You must not know any more about mules, Phineas T. Bluster than you do of amateur radio. The braying end of a mule is the north end when the mule's direction is the same. Mule stuff comes from mules and bull stuff comes from bulls. I can't BEEP here, Leonard, 'cuz you wouldn't be able to comprehend. I'll stick with typing for your benefit.

> >I'll take that as your only way of conceding a point.
>
> Noooooo. Snarly dave, you just can't take anything.
>
> Your idea of "concession" in opinions is to CONCEDE to your
> nonsense BLUFF at knowing anything about electronics-radio
> hardware and theory.

The bluff in this case is yours. You don't have a firm grasp on the topic of firmware.

> >I'll bet it is, especially when you have no material. You'll have to
> >fall back on your usual, the tap dancing routine.
>
> Had a pair of Haney Plates once...but you have NO idea what
> those are, either, do you?

R.J Haney, Jill Haney? Be specific.

> Snarly dave, to make amends, I'd like to buy you a bier...except
> I know you wouldn't take that lying down...

Someone buy you a Stephen Wright book or something?

Dave K8MN

2262. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:29:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402566CB.C1276851@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87038

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40232862.B1D42573@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue."
> >
> >--Leonard H. Anderson, 5 Feb. 2004
>
> Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue.
>
> Leonard H. Anderson, 6 February 2004
>
> Laminate that and put it in your wallet, Herr Robust.

I believe I will. I'll title it: An Absolute Falsehood by Leonard H.
Anderson.

Dave K8MN

2263. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:38:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <402568F3.4000201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87039

N2EY wrote:

>In article <40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>>Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>>>violence is OK?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids,
>>
>>
>
>"Robert Casey, you bold brazen article, how dare you talk like that!"
>
>
>
>>but would sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....
>>
>>
>
>In my experience, such things would make them violent. In fact almost
>anything could make an IHM nun violent. Bunch of nutcases, actually.
>
I had anotehr species of nuns in my school. "Sisters of Mercy" IIRC,
but there
was no mercy if you forgot your homework.....

>
>
On the first or second day of 1st grade, the nun teacher had to leave our
classroom for a few minutes. Of course some of us were talking and making
noise, as small kids will. When she got back, she freaked out. Made the
kids line up at her desk and punish each one in turn. Must have been 20
minutes
it took to do all 30 something kids.

Also on the first day, it was time for lunch, as the nun announced it. So
I get out my sandwitch and started eating in my desk. Nun freaks.
How would I know that the school had another room for eating lunch?
Have heard that teachers nowadays are taught to anticipate kids not
knowing such things when they start school....

2264. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:39:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4025692D.E400B384@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87040

Leo wrote:
>
> On Sat, 07 Feb 2004 18:57:45 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
>
> >> >snip
> >
> >> A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
> >> professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
> >> US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
> >> who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
> >> qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
> >> when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
> >> arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
> >
> >There is no such mechanism available in the United States. A U.S.
> >citizen licensed in Canada may not use his Canadian license when
> >operating from the U.S.
>
> That's not quite what I said, Dave. If a Canadian with a Commercial
> licence obtains an Amateur licence vis this program, that Amateur
> licence is covered under the existing reciprocity agreement - it is a
> standard Amateur licence.

A Canadian with a valid Canadian amateur radio license may use the
license in the U.S. under reciprocal agreement, no matter if he receives
it by passing the exam or receives it by virtue of his professional
standing.
The only means by which someone may obtain a U.S. amateur license is by
passing the exam.

> Your point is interesting, however - one need only be a resident of
> Canada to qualify for an amateur license - not a citizen. If a US
> citizen living in Canada obtains a Canadian amateur license, how would
> that be illegal to use in the US?

...because that individual then falls under U.S., not Canadian law.

Dave K8MN

2265. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:44:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40256A55.117F8CA1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87041

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:

>
> And the argument is null anyway. If beating your kid worked, you would
> only have to do it once or twice.

You're on a slippery slope, Mike. If TALKING to your child did any
good, you'd only have to do it a couple of time, right? I can hear my
mother's voice now: "How many times to I have to tell you?"

> In fact, I was recently enlightened to the fact that (I hope this
> doesn't invoke Godwin's law!) Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin, and Adolf
> Hitler have one thing in common. They recieved regular beatings as children.

So the secret seems to be, beat your children on an irregular basis and
they won't grow up to be tyrants and ogres. It'd be interesting to find
that Jeffrey Dahmer was never spanked and that his parents tried to
reason with him.

Dave K8MN

2266. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:49:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40256B81.8010603@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87042

>
>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids, but
>>>would
>>>sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Is that really what we want to teach our children?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
>>>school.
>>>
>>>
>>When you get right down to it, except for a few shameful and widely
>>publicized exceptions, todays kids suffer from too little rather than too
>>much physical punishment.
>>
>>
>
>I disagree! Beating children simply means the beater can't think of
>a better way to deal with the kid.
>
>It also teaches the kid at a very primeval level that violence is a
>legitimate method of getting what you want from others.
>
It also delivered a message that people in authority are likely to abuse
their positions
and cannot be trusted. As the teachers often punished kids that didn't
misbehave
as the ones that did. Throw in it being the Vietnam era and .....

Sometimes teachers try to "teach respect" with violence. Well, if "fear and
hatred" = "respect" then it worked.... But I don't think respect does
equal
that.

We also had male nuns, called "brothers". CFX was their callsign, stood
for -something-something-Xavier. One of them was an ex marine drill
seargent,

and thought nothing beating on a kid 20 minutes non-stop. Another was from the Navy, and also could beat on a kid even longer.

Not suprizing that some kids tried to burn the school down. No real damage, something like a wastepaper basket on fire. We always hoped it was the real thing whenever they did a fire drill (after the fire dept made them not pre-announce that there'd be a drill today).

>
>
>

2267. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 22:56:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40256D01.2010206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87043

>
>
>>
>
>
> I'll bet she doesn't get on Prime-time TV without a tape delay, tho'!
>
If I ran CBS or ABC or NBC or WB or UPN for that matter, I'd pass
every live rock singer thru a tape delay. Or any other likely loose
cannon.

And I bet CBS has ordered a delay to pass future live performances thru.
That should make the FCC a little happier. So a director in the control
booth can dump something inappropriate before it goes over the air.

2268. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-07 23:09:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <n9qdnaAXybuO7bjdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87044

Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>> I'll bet she doesn't get on Prime-time TV without a tape delay, tho'!
>>
> If I ran CBS or ABC or NBC or WB or UPN for that matter, I'd pass
> every live rock singer thru a tape delay. Or any other likely loose
> cannon.
> And I bet CBS has ordered a delay to pass future live performances thru.
> That should make the FCC a little happier. So a director in the control
> booth can dump something inappropriate before it goes over the air.

I would sugest that they keep a tape of "Heidi" running to interject
over any offending portion that needs bleeped out.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2269. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 00:54:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ZvGdnS-KnYleFbjdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87045

Dave Heil wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>> And the argument is null anyway. If beating your kid worked, you would
>>only have to do it once or twice.
>
>
> You're on a slippery slope, Mike. If TALKING to your child did any
> good, you'd only have to do it a couple of time, right? I can hear my
> mother's voice now: "How many times to I have to tell you?"

Ahh, but talking DOESN'T work! You can't always reason with a child.
You have to deprive them of something that they value for a little
while. Then you give it back to them until the next time they misbehave.
I'm not advocating talk, and I'm not advocating beatings, I'm advocating
something I've found that works.

>>In fact, I was recently enlightened to the fact that (I hope this
>>doesn't invoke Godwin's law!) Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin, and Adolf
>>Hitler have one thing in common. They recieved regular beatings as children.
>
>
> So the secret seems to be, beat your children on an irregular basis and
> they won't grow up to be tyrants and ogres. It'd be interesting to find
> that Jeffrey Dahmer was never spanked and that his parents tried to
> reason with him.

Read:

http://www.crimelibrary.com/serial_killers/notorious/dahmer/naked1.html

for an interesting if horrible accounting of Jeffrey Dahmer.

Indeed, he was not raised in an abusive environment. But it is unfair
to attibute anything to a pathological serial killer's upbringing
compared to a normal person. But there is a difference between Dahmer
and the nasties I mentioned above. Many people call them all madmen, but
there is a huge difference between Dahmer and the others.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2270. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 00:55:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040207195501.12501.00006056@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87046

In article <n9qdnaAXybuO7bjdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Robert Casey wrote:

>>> I'll bet she doesn't get on Prime-time TV without a tape delay, tho'!
>>>
>> If I ran CBS or ABC or NBC or WB or UPN for that matter, I'd pass
>> every live rock singer thru a tape delay. Or any other likely loose
>> cannon.
>> And I bet CBS has ordered a delay to pass future live performances thru.
>> That should make the FCC a little happier. So a director in the control
>> booth can dump something inappropriate before it goes over the air.
>
>I would sugest that they keep a tape of "Heidi" running to interject
>over any offending portion that needs bleeped out.

As long as it's Heidi Klum

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2271. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 03:13:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402071913.631c0f20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87047

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040207095504.12631.00004760@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402061925.73fdf12e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >. . . Move over ya newbies, ALLYA, the OF has logged in . .
>
> Hans hasn't played the game yet, tho.

C'mon Hans . . .

> >
> >b. 05Mar37
> >
> >Novice ticket, wn3yik some time or another in the 1953-54 timeframe.
> >16-17 years old. Novice WAS on 80. Most memorable Q: Wire blew down
> >overnite. I "inductively coupled" my sleeping brother to the ARC-5
> >output and worked a guy in Pittsburgh mid-morning.
> >
> >General 10 months later. Give or take. First Q as a General was G5ZK.
> >On 80 of course.
> >
> >Extra whenever it was in the late '60s when ya had to pass the stupid
> >test or get booted outta the dx hot slices. 30-31 years old?
> >
> >w3rv
> >CP 30 circa 1955
> >DXCC mixed #10k & DXCC Phone
> >WAZ
> >5BDXCC #142/'72
> >
> Also known as the Big Barracuda....
>
> bwaahaahaaa....

CHOMP!

We have another OF RRAPer recently MIA, Dick Carroll wï¿½ex. I called
him with the Bell thing a couple weeks ago to find out what's up, got
his answering machine, left my number but have not heard from him. I
think Dick predates me in ham radio.

For a great bio of a *real* OF go to QRZ.com and punch in W3EAN. I got
my first taste of ham radio during a '40s civil defense drill when I
was assigned to him as his Cub Scout message runner while he was
mobiling.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2272. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 05:50:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4025CE2D.DA51BF80@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87048

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >>N2EY wrote:
> >
> >
> >> And the argument is null anyway. If beating your kid worked, you would
> >>only have to do it once or twice.
> >
> >
> > You're on a slippery slope, Mike. If TALKING to your child did any
> > good, you'd only have to do it a couple of time, right? I can hear my
> > mother's voice now: "How many times to I have to tell you?"
>
> Ahh, but talking DOESN'T work! You can't always reason with a child.

Take my word, my folks never attempted reason when we were younger. My
sister and I were issued edicts in no uncertain terms. If we argued or
talked back, we could expect some time in a corner or in our rooms or
were grounded.

> You have to deprive them of something that they value for a little
> while. Then you give it back to them until the next time they misbehave.
> I'm not advocating talk, and I'm not advocating beatings, I'm advocating
> something I've found that works.

My dad called it "giving us a little more leash". He retracted some
leash when we demonstrated that we couldn't handle the extra freedom.

> >>In fact, I was recently enlightened to the fact that (I hope this
> >>doesn't invoke Godwin's law!) Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin, and Adolf
> >>Hitler have one thing in common. They recieved regular beatings as children.
> >
> >
> > So the secret seems to be, beat your children on an irregular basis and
> > they won't grow up to be tyrants and ogres. It'd be interesting to find
> > that Jeffrey Dahmer was never spanked and that his parents tried to
> > reason with him.
>
> Read:
>
> http://www.crimelibrary.com/serial_killers/notorious/dahmer/naked1.html

>
> for an interesting if horrible accounting of Jeffrey Dahmer.
>
> Indeed, he was not raised in an abusive environment. But it is unfair
> to attibute anything to a pathological serial killer's upbringing
> compared to a normal person. But there is a difference between Dahmer
> and the nasties I mentioned above. Many people call them all madmen, but
> there is a huge difference between Dahmer and the others.

I'll check out the link.

Dave K8MN

2273. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 06:31:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040208013137.00545.00004211@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87049

In article <ng67205t934b071v5apesetrm0065pa8re@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>
>An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
>the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>
>
>http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Ar
ticle_Type1&call_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
>

Leo:

I don't even have to bother to read it. I'm guessing it says that all of us
hyper-conservative, redneck UhmurriKans are so backwardly non-progressive
in our morality that we're shocked and outraged by the little act put on
during Super Bowl XXXVIII by Jackson and Timberlake. Yada, yada,
yada.

I'm no prude, but I know obscenity when I see it, and that was obscene --
the whole half-time show, not just the Jackson thing. If it were being
shown after 11 PM or on a cable channel, that would be a different
matter, but this was shown on a major network during Prime Time, and
during a high-profile sporting event with a maxxed-out audience, including
young children. If there was anything that was designed to bring our
culture "...one step closer to extinction," this was it. Fortunately, the
negative reaction, while not understood by our ever-so-liberal neighbors
to the North, had the effect of at least getting Janet Jackson booted from
the Grammys, and forced CBS to change the Grammys from a real-time
"live" broadcast to a delayed broadcast, so that any other such
shennanigans can be edited out. Unfortunately, all the dumbed-down
New-Age pop-culture idiots out there will probably buy Janet's new
CD in record numbers, and that was her intention from the beginning.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2274. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 13:35:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FWqVb.700$t16.821682@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87050

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040208013137.00545.00004211@mb-m02.aol.com...
> Fortunately, the
> negative reaction, while not understood by our ever-so-liberal neighbors
> to the North, had the effect of at least getting Janet Jackson booted from
> the Grammys, and forced CBS to change the Grammys from a real-time
> "live" broadcast to a delayed broadcast, so that any other such
> shennanigans can be edited out. Unfortunately, all the dumbed-down
> New-Age pop-culture idiots out there will probably buy Janet's new
> CD in record numbers, and that was her intention from the beginning.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Most of us northerners are also conservatives. Liberals are generally more
noisy than conservatives so get noticed more.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2275. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 14:24:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402080624.3a8568af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86951

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040208013137.00545.00004211@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <ng67205t934b071v5apesetrm0065pa8re@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
> >the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
> >
> >
> >http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Ar
> ticle_Type1&call_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
> >
>
> Leo:
>
> I don't even have to bother to read it. I'm guessing it says that all of us
> hyper-conservative, redneck UhmurriKans are so backwardly non-progressive
> in our morality that we're shocked and outraged by the little act put on
> during Super Bowl XXXVIII by Jackson and Timberlake. Yada, yada,
> yada.
>
> I'm no prude, but I know obscenity when I see it, and that was obscene --
> the whole half-time show, not just the Jackson thing. If it were being
> shown after 11 PM or on a cable channel, that would be a different
> matter, but this was shown on a major network during Prime Time, and
> during a high-profile sporting event with a maxxed-out audience, including
> young children. If there was anything that was designed to bring our
> culture "...one step closer to extinction," this was it. Fortunately, the
> negative reaction, while not understood by our ever-so-liberal neighbors
> to the North, had the effect of at least getting Janet Jackson booted from
> the Grammys, and forced CBS to change the Grammys from a real-time
> "live" broadcast to a delayed broadcast, so that any other such
> shennanigans can be edited out. Unfortunately, all the dumbed-down
> New-Age pop-culture idiots out there will probably buy Janet's new
> CD in record numbers, and that was her intention from the beginning.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

If there hadn't been a "wardrobe malfunction," we'd all be talking
about Kid Rock's use of the flag for a poncho. There's probably a
couple hundred thousand veterans that want to kick his butt. But
Janet trumped him and no one cares about his crime. Had Justin been a
couple of years younger, Janet could join her brother in pedophile

jail.

2276. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 14:27:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402080627.7268fd86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86952

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402071913.631c0f20@posting.google.com>...

> For a great bio of a *real* OF go to QRZ.com and punch in W3EAN. I got
> my first taste of ham radio during a '40s civil defense drill when I
> was assigned to him as his Cub Scout message runner while he was
> mobiling.
>
> w3rv

That's a tall order for a Cub Scout. I hope the speed limits were a
lot lower in the 40's.

2277. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 14:54:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208095449.06226.00002817@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 86953

In article <d22b54c3.0402071913.631c0f20@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>For a great bio of a *real* OF go to QRZ.com and punch in W3EAN. I got
>my first taste of ham radio during a '40s civil defense drill when I
>was assigned to him as his Cub Scout message runner while he was
>mobiling.

Oyez, quite a chap, that one! Next to him we're all babies...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2278. Poor Dimmy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 15:59:43 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <Y_sVb.26893$qK3.24934@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86954
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
retest? Looks like corruption to me.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

2279. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 16:03:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <19nc205asd1sggbu7rrfatgravcukhcfdg@4ax.com>
Source record: 86955

On Sat, 07 Feb 2004 22:39:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>> On Sat, 07 Feb 2004 18:57:45 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Leo wrote:
>>
>> >> >snip
>> >
>> >> A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
>> >> professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
>> >> US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
>> >> who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
>> >> qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
>> >> when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
>> >> arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
>> >
>> >There is no such mechanism available in the United States. A U.S.
>> >citizen licensed in Canada may not use his Canadian license when
>> >operating from the U.S.
>>
>> That's not quite what I said, Dave. If a Canadian with a Commercial
>> licence obtains an Amateur licence vis this program, that Amateur
>> licence is covered under the existing reciprocity agreement - it is a
>> standard Amateur licence.
>
>A Canadian with a valid Canadian amateur radio license may use the
>license in the U.S. under reciprocal agreement, no matter if he receives
>it by passing the exam or receives it by virtue of his professional
>standing.
>The only means by which someone may obtain a U.S. amateur license is by
>passing the exam.
>
>> Your point is interesting, however - one need only be a resident of
>> Canada to qualify for an amateur license - not a citizen. If a US
>> citizen living in Canada obtains a Canadian amateur license, how would
>> that be illegal to use in the US?
>
>...because that individual then falls under U.S., not Canadian law.

I think you're right, Dave - the text of the US reciprocal agreement
refers to the country of citizenship of the foreign amateur, not the

country of residence. Our reciprocal agreement simply requires a US license, and makes no mention of the citizenship of the amateur.

Wonder why it's called a reciprocal agreement when it isn't quite reciprocal? :)

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

2280. Asshole N4CND loses wife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 16:10:07 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <R8tVb.26928$qK3.15478@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 86956
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

http://profiles.yahoo.com/dr_oris

2281. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 16:23:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <sinc201n236hh8v48noihbgrloac0bve4c@4ax.com>
Source record: 86957

On 08 Feb 2004 06:31:37 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <ng67205t934b071v5apesetrm0065pa8re@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>
>>An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
>>the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>>
>>
>>http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Ar
>ticle_Type1&call_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
>>
>
>Leo:
>
>I don't even have to bother to read it. I'm guessing it says that all of us
>hyper-conservative, redneck UhmurriKans are so backwardly non-progressive
>in our morality that we're shocked and outraged by the little act put on
>during Super Bowl XXXVIII by Jackson and Timberlake. Yada, yada,
>yada.

Not really - it was more of an editorial on the rather odd perception
that any reference to sex is bad, yet violence is perfectly OK.

It's worth a read, Larry - it does present an interesting perspective!

>
>I'm no prude, but I know obscenity when I see it, and that was obscene --
>the whole half-time show, not just the Jackson thing. If it were being
>shown after 11 PM or on a cable channel, that would be a different
>matter, but this was shown on a major network during Prime Time, and
>during a high-profile sporting event with a maxxed-out audience, including
>young children. If there was anything that was designed to bring our
>culture "...one step closer to extinction," this was it. Fortunately, the
>negative reaction, while not understood by our ever-so-liberal neighbors
>to the North

Um, you really should read the article before you draw the wrong
conclusions here, Larry. Our society ain't that much different than
yours, we just have this fundamental belief here that graphic violence
is far more objectionable than sex....an odd concept, for sure.... :)

Liberal? Hey, I voted Conservative.... :)

>, had the effect of at least getting Janet Jackson booted from
>the Grammys, and forced CBS to change the Grammys from a real-time
>"live" broadcast to a delayed broadcast, so that any other such
>shennanigans can be edited out. Unfortunately, all the dumbed-down
>New-Age pop-culture idiots out there will probably buy Janet's new
>CD in record numbers, and that was her intention from the beginning.

Yup, I have no doubt that you are absolutely correct here - I'm
certain this was done to market Ms. Jackson's CDs all right, and it
didn't happen by accident either. Shock has become a valuable selling
tool in the entertainment business. And, also no arguement that it was
entirely inappropriate for the Super Bowl (I'd go as far as saying
that the whole #$%^ halftime show should be scrapped, so that footcall
fans like you and I can watch the game without unnecessary
interruption....).
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

2282. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 16:57:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40266A84.157575F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86958

Leo wrote:
>
> On Sat, 07 Feb 2004 22:39:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> On Sat, 07 Feb 2004 18:57:45 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Leo wrote:
> >>
> >> >> >snip
> >> >
> >> >> A question - was a similar arrangement for the recognition of
> >> >> professional credentials in the Amateur service ever in place in the
> >> >> US? With the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the US, someone
> >> >> who has obtained their Amateur licence based on their Professional
> >> >> qualifications automatically gains full Amateur operating privileges
> >> >> when travelling in the US. One would think it logical for this
> >> >> arrangement to be bidirectional, n'est pas?
> >> >
> >> >There is no such mechanism available in the United States. A U.S.
> >> >citizen licensed in Canada may not use his Canadian license when
> >> >operating from the U.S.
> >>
> >> That's not quite what I said, Dave. If a Canadian with a Commercial
> >> licence obtains an Amateur licence vis this program, that Amateur
> >> licence is covered under the existing reciprocity agreement - it is a
> >> standard Amateur licence.
> >
> >A Canadian with a valid Canadian amateur radio license may use the
> >license in the U.S. under reciprocal agreement, no matter if he receives
> >it by passing the exam or receives it by virtue of his professional
> >standing.
> >The only means by which someone may obtain a U.S. amateur license is by
> >passing the exam.
> >
> >> Your point is interesting, however - one need only be a resident of
> >> Canada to qualify for an amateur license - not a citizen. If a US
> >> citizen living in Canada obtains a Canadian amateur license, how would
> >> that be illegal to use in the US?
> >
> >...because that individual then falls under U.S., not Canadian law.

>
> I think you're right, Dave - the text of the US reciprocal agreement
> refers to the country of citizenship of the foreign amateur, not the
> country of residence. Our reciprocal agreement simply requires a US
> license, and makes no mention of the citizenship of the amateur.

> Wonder why it's called a reciprocal agreement when it isn't quite
> reciprocal? :)

That's an easy one: Canada's radio amateurs may operate in the United States without passing a U.S. license exam. U.S. radio amateurs may operate in Canada without passing a Canadian license exam.

During my second assignment to Helsinki (three years), the Finns wanted me to pass a Finnish exam and use an OH2--- callsign because it was their belief that reciprocal operation was intended only for short duration.
They kindly backed off when I pointed out that no such thing was outlined in their regs. I was OH2/K8MN for that entire period. ITU recommendations changed between my first tour in Finland and my second. For the first, I was K8MN/OH2. One eastern european amateur began giving me hell over the air in the 1980's for not using "OH2/K8MN" after those recommendations came out. I told him that I couldn't very well use a call other than the one issued on my Finnish license.

Dave K8MN

2283. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 17:31:22 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <l4sc20paffg83im2fdbg3qctrgitffnaj7@4ax.com>
Source record: 86959

On Sun, 08 Feb 2004 16:57:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>>
>snip

>> I think you're right, Dave - the text of the US reciprocal agreement
>> refers to the country of citizenship of the foreign amateur, not the
>> country of residence. Our reciprocal agreement simply requires a US
>> license, and makes no mention of the citizenship of the amateur.
>
>> Wonder why it's called a reciprocal agreement when it isn't quite
>> reciprocal? :)
>
>That's an easy one: Canada's radio amateurs may operate in the United
>States without passing a U.S. license exam. U.S. radio amateurs may
>operate in Canada without passing a Canadian license exam.

That part makes sense - it's the citizenship wording with respect to
the license holder on one side of the agreement which doesn't exist on
the other side that puzzles me.

>
>During my second assignment to Helsinki (three years), the Finns wanted
>me to pass a Finnish exam and use an OH2--- callsign because it was
>their belief that reciprocal operation was intended only for short
>duration.
>They kindly backed off when I pointed out that no such thing was
>outlined in their regs. I was OH2/K8MN for that entire period. ITU
>recommendations changed between my first tour in Finland and my second.
>For the first, I was K8MN/OH2. One eastern european amateur began
>giving me hell over the air in the 1980's for not using "OH2/K8MN" after
>those recommendations came out. I told him that I couldn't very well
>use a call other than the one issued on my Finnish license.

Now that would have been an interesting place to work Europe from.
You were lucky to have had that opportunity, Dave - I wouldn't mind
trying that!

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

2284. Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:21:54 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948987DE984DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 86960

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in news:l4sc20paffg83im2fdbg3qctrgitffnaj7@4ax.com:

> On Sun, 08 Feb 2004 16:57:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
>>Leo wrote:
>>>
>>snip
>
>>> I think you're right, Dave - the text of the US reciprocal agreement
>>> refers to the country of citizenship of the foreign amateur, not the
>>> country of residence. Our reciprocal agreement simply requires a US
>>> license, and makes no mention of the citizenship of the amateur.
>>
>>> Wonder why it's called a reciprocal agreement when it isn't quite
>>> reciprocal? :)
>>
>>That's an easy one: Canada's radio amateurs may operate in the United
>>States without passing a U.S. license exam. U.S. radio amateurs may
>>operate in Canada without passing a Canadian license exam.
>
> That part makes sense - it's the citizenship wording with respect to
> the license holder on one side of the agreement which doesn't exist on
> the other side that puzzles me.
>
>>
>>During my second assignment to Helsinki (three years), the Finns wanted
>>me to pass a Finnish exam and use an OH2--- callsign because it was
>>their belief that reciprocal operation was intended only for short
>>duration. They kindly backed off when I pointed out that no such thing
>>was outlined in their regs. I was OH2/K8MN for that entire period. ITU
>>recommendations changed between my first tour in Finland and my second.
>>For the first, I was K8MN/OH2. One eastern european amateur began
>>giving me hell over the air in the 1980's for not using "OH2/K8MN" after
>>those recommendations came out. I told him that I couldn't very well
>>use a call other than the one issued on my Finnish license.
>
> Now that would have been an interesting place to work Europe from.
> You were lucky to have had that opportunity, Dave - I wouldn't mind
> trying that!
>
>>
>>Dave K8MN

>
> 73, Leo
>
>
Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to be both a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an American (or a Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada using my US call.

The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American with a US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for only 2 months within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No WARC bands or 40m for Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian call could operate indefinitely in the US, even living here permanently, under the terms of their Canadian licence (not to exceed Extra).

2285. Re: New game on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134921.05539.00004181@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86962

In article <20040208095449.06226.00002817@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <d22b54c3.0402071913.631c0f20@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>For a great bio of a *real* OF go to QRZ.com and punch in W3EAN. I got
>>my first taste of ham radio during a '40s civil defense drill when I
>>was assigned to him as his Cub Scout message runner while he was
>>mobiling.
>
>Oyez, quite a chap, that one! Next to him we're all babies...

Seven-year-old Amateur Extras? :-)

LHA / WMD

2286. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134921.05539.00004180@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86968

In article <19nc205asd1sggbu7rrfatgravcukhcfdg@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Wonder why it's called a reciprocal agreement when it isn't quite
>reciprocal? :)

Perhaps because so many America-firsters want to be "one
over everyone else?" :-)

LHA / WMD

2287. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134922.05539.00004182@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86971

In article <44ka20tto43sk2tadkdo7b7thal6k0bt04@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>> Interesting place, this newsgroup. Kraft-Ebbing could have had a
>> second edition to cover it for the psychiatric professionals. Some get
>> oriongasms even... :-)
>
>I suspect that Masters and Johnson would have found inspiration here
>too..... :)

"Psychopathia Sexualis" by Kraft-Ebbing is still my first choice.

One Extra in here has continually fantasized an improbable life off-
keyboard for years, details varying implausibly as he continues.
Another has oriongasms thinking that no one could possibly under-
stand his expensive radio wondertoy. Another one just writes and
writes and writes every day, every day, every day, on everything
anyone posts, endlessly. Another one has a maternal fixation on
all the "little children" and becomes horrified, hiding head in sand
when confronted with reality outside of league boundaries. Another
one dreams of going back to the Pacific and shooting bears. Still
another went off the deep end long ago in the amateur murine core.
All the American licensed hams hum fascination over a single bared
breast on television, expressing puritan outrage over moral indecency
affecting their fellow seven-year-old Extras.

Morse code does indeed get through when everything else does!

It's a Deep-End City in here. Most fascinating. They don't realize
they are doing what they do when they do it.

This is much better than a post-graduate course in psychology! :-)

LHA / WMD

2288. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134923.05539.00004184@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86964

In article <40253EE8.508B214F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> What does that say about your vaunted federal merit badge?
>
>It says that a mere child is one up on you. She has the badge. You
>don't.

I'm not a SEVEN YEAR OLD Extra.

If you think that a SEVEN YEAR OLD has anything "up" on me,
I'd say you have the mentality of a seven year old.

Now go out to the sandbox and play with your "fellow Extras" in
the First Grade. That's a nice boy. Behave or Mama Dee will
spank you for being naughty.

LHA / WMD

2289. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134923.05539.00004183@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86973

>Oh, but I'm very much a part of U.S. amateur radio and I've been part of
>amateur radio in five other countries. You aren't part of amateur radio
>anywhere on the planet. You aren't a part of the ARRL. Your
>connections to amateur radio are simply that you've commented to the FCC
>about the service in which you do not participate and that you post
>here.

Oh, my, another tyrant ranting away.

The FCC is "not a part of amateur radio," merely the regulation of
every civil radio service in the United States.

The First Amendment gives me a number of rights. Exclusion from
discussing those with anyone or my government is NOT under your
control. Not at any time, herr tyrant.

There are mechanisms in the U.S. Constitution for removing the
rights of citizens. Those are called "amendments." Do you think
you could ever, with or without force, make such an amenedment?

Why do you keep trying to be a tyrant?

Is that due to some mental illness? If so, get help fast.

Now be a good boy and go our and play in the radio sandbox with
your other "fellow hams." I hear the seven-year-old extra is nice.

Sieg heil...gruss gott.

LHA / WMD

2290. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134924.05539.00004185@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86975

In article <op7Vb.575$t16.635978@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Exactly. Which is why I killfiled him and so see only what others may >choose to quote from him. Thank goodness!!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, hiding from truth, freedom, and independence.

Perverse mental activity. Ostrich syndrome.

Hide head in sand and all you can hear is the drumbeats of the league making you tap in time to only their loud music, the rhythm of olde-time hamme radio as it was. It shields you from realization that there are others out there who do not agree with you. It is safe, secure, warm, comforting, makes you feel very superior to shut out all other independent thought.

Tyrants love the ostrich syndrome. Plays right into their rule.

LHA / WMD

2291. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134925.05539.00004186@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86976

In article <20040207095504.12631.00004761@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <P0VUb.500$t16.508574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>Len has made no effort that anyone can see to get an
>>amateur license.
>
>Len does not want an amateur radio license.

Incorrect. I have no pressing need to get one.

>>He appears to want to make changes without being a member
>>of the affected group.
>
>He wants amateur radio as we know it to disappear.

That's partly true. TAFKA Rv.Jim wants U.S. amateur radio to
remain in the standards and practices of the 1930s. He wants
to keep a Living Museum of Archaic Radio Skills.

He loves the idea of Seven Year Old Amateur Extras, his
"fellows" as he said in another post.

>What he wants is a multiband high power version of cb.

Highly incorrect. Shame!

Removal of the morse code test will not be The End Of The
Amateur World, simply the dismay of olde-tyme hammes who
can no longer use morsemanship for one-upmanship on fellow
ham children.

> Or nothing at all.

Highly incorrect again.

>He also appears to enjoy insulting and berating anyone who is
>not in complete agree with his opinions.

Highly incorrect again.

The hidebound, stubborn olde-tyme hammes who appear in here
get replies "that seem to write themselves."

>There's a complete
>description of his behavior around someplace - he proves its
>correctness with each of his posts...

Poor baby. Can't get your love and affection on the newsgroup?
Cure it by doing character assassination of the most [expletive
deleted] kind, insult and demean all those who desire freedom
and independent thought.

>>It's rather like complaining about your congressman
>>when you don't bother to vote.
>
>His hobby is wasting time. Your time.

Tyrants WILL consider defense of the First Amendment as "a waste
of time." They always do.

You waste time with character assassination. Not very Catholic.

LHA / WMD

2292. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134929.05539.00004188@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86977

In article <P0VUb.500$t16.508574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>At least they have to take the initiative to request it and that would make >all the difference. Len has made no effort that anyone can see to get an >amateur license. He appears to want to make changes without being a member >of the affected group. It's rather like complaining about your congressman >when you don't bother to vote.

Mama Dee, as a doting parent to errant children, why don't you demand abrogation of the First Amendment?

Strike all that nonsense about citizens petitioning their government unless they are a PART of govrnment!

Nobody will be allowed to have ANY grievances about anything they are not IN!

That's the AMATEUR WAY!

Anyone not a League member is just a Problem! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Ya gotta love all this Amateur Democracy in action stuff!

LHA / WMD

2293. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134929.05539.00004187@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86980

In article <20040206221357.01692.00000479@mb-m18.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (Mr. Inexhaustible who does not meet exhaust emission standards N2EY) writes:

>In article <rm9820htq9qdcqad62kf46p5vbuhhtfvh2@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 6 Feb 2004 15:18:39 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:<vcb720pnvip3c9quf08jer86bvkn45i6g3@4ax.com>...
>>>> On 06 Feb 2004 14:54:40 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >In article <u737205ku7gql164vavdhaqgvdtf83br1s@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@noway.com>
>>>> >writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> in Canada, as we grant full Amateur license privileges upon
>>>> >>request to persons with appropriate Professional license
>>>> >>qualifications.

<snip>

>>>> And, if you make a few mistakes along the way, or if it takes a week
>>>> to get it running, so what?
>>>
>>>Depends on the mistake.
>>
>>Well, other than operating out of band, there ain't much that a
>>"sorry" wouldn't cover!
>
>So when somebody decides to run ten or twenty times the legal power,
>a "sorry" is supposed to cover it? Or when somebody uses ham radio
>for commercial purposes, or music, etc.. a "sorry" is supposed to cover it?
>
>Sorry, that's not good enough.

Are you considering capital punishment as the only cure for not
zealously following the standards and practices of the 1930s as
the league constantly reminds you?

Perhaps you wish excommunication from talking about a hobby
concerning communication?

What are you hinting at, mighty warrior of purity against [expletive
deleteds] ?

>>>> You're experimenting, and that's what
>>>> amateur radio is all about.
>
>>>Then why have any ham radio tests or licenses at all? You're arguing
>>>for the end of all testing for a ham license, Leo.
>>
>>Not at all -
>
>Yes, you are. If a "sorry" can cover most violations, there's no need for
>most of the tests.

...except the morse code test MUST be there, forever and ever. :-)

>>I'm suggesting that (many of) the radio skills acquired
>>in the acquisition of a commercial license are directly applicable to
>>the Amateur service. Transferrable skills.
>
>Maybe. But most of what a ham needs to know is not covered by a
>commercial license test.

No problem. The amateur tests don't require any rules and regs
required by commercial broadcasters. Isn't that even enough?

>>>> Now, make a couple of mistakes and knock WNEP-TV off the air for a
>>>> couple of minutes - you might be an unemployed professional!
>>>
>>>Which acts as an incentive to know what you're doing.
>>
>>Yup!
>
>>>Does WNEP-TV change frequency, or have to listen first before
>>>transmitting?
>>
>>That is a pretty simple skill - I'm sure the broadcast engineers could
>>figure it out rather quickly :)
>
>I don't think so. They're used to doing all the talking and none of the
>listening.

Commercial broadcasters are required by LAW and the terms of
their license to STAY on their allocated frequencies.

Commercial carrier services on HF are usually allocated several
frequencies to use on HF. A QSY is NOT any technical hurdle
requiring years of experience to learn, to take tests for, or any
of that nonsense. Did that a half century ago. No problem.

>>>> >>and the Pros have made a career of it
>
>>>> >All that means is that they get paid. There are some ladies and
>gentlemen
>>>> >on the streets of most major cities who make a "profession" out of
>>something

>>>> >most people do as amateurs. (Some say it's the oldest profession).
>>>>
>>>> Politicians? :)
>>>
>>>Some say politicians are a subset of the oldest profession. ;-)
>>
>>Fully agreed! :)
>
>So we should listen to those professionals?

If you don't want to listen to law-making, law-enforcing professionals,
you are free to listen to Bubba 24/7 in your cell. No problem.

Your choice.

>>>> >Those people must be qualified to give advice on the subject of their
>>>> >profession,
>>>> >don't you think? ;-) We should revere what they say and do, and not
>>>> >question their knowledge and opinions on the subject, right? ;-) ;-)
>They
>>>> >must be better at it than us unpaid amateurs because they get paid to
>>>> >do it, right? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>>>
>>>> I'll take your word for it, having no personal experience with the
>>>> profession that you are referring to. If you say they're good, Jim,
>>>> then they're good! :)
>>>
>>>I wouldn't know - I'm only an amateur in that field too.
>>>
>>>> Generally speaking, though, professionals are more knowledgable than
>>>> lay people because they are involved in their field full time, and are
>>>> held to standards of conduct and proficiency set by not only the
>>>> regulators but by their employers.
>>>
>>>Generally speaking. However, commercial radio and amateur radio are
>>>different fields. Being a "professional in radio", by itself, is no
>>>indication of qualification to operate an amateur radio station, and
>>>even less of an
>>>indication of qualification to determine amateur radio policy.
>>
>>Two different concepts.
>
>That's right. Amateur radio and commercial radio are two different concepts.

Right...and in your world, the amateur physics are different along
with the hardware. Yawn...

>>Being a licensed professional in radio implies a knowledge of radio
>>theory and concepts - many of which are tranferrable from one area
>>(commercial) to another (amateur).
>
>Some. Not many.

Of course you KNOW that by experience in commercial HF
communications.

Right.

>>By nature, amateur activities have
>>much greater margins for error than professional ones - they are hobby
>>based, after all!
>
>Then why have licenses at all?

Good question.

Without a license to brag about, there would be fewer hams and a
lot more space to play radio in on HF. Sounds like a good thing.

The sandbox would be more open and free for all the seven year
old extras to play in...

>>Amateur radio policy, on the other hand, is made by legislators, none
>>of whom require any knowledge of radio to carry out the
>>responsibilities of their office.
>
>They need to understand certain concepts of radio in order to do the job.
>Doesn't mean they all do.

Impossible. The glory and majesty of amateur radio cannot possibly
be understood by filthy immoral professionals! Shame on them!

Why, [expletive deleted] and let them [expletive deleted] !

>>>> And, rather than just sounding like
>>>> experts, they are expected to demonstrate their proficiency - that's
>>>> what they get paid for! 'Stay current or move out' is the rule of the
>>>> technically-oriented workplace.
>>>
>>>Current with what? Most TV stations are still broadcasting NTSC
>>>signals, based
>>>on a mode that's at least 50 years old. If you don't care about color,
>>>a 1946
>>>NTSC TV (if you can find one that works) is still usable. Then there's
>>>FM
>>>broadcasting which is about as old and good old MW AM, which goes back
>>>to the
>>>1920s.
>>
>>With equipment that is vastly more complex than what the average
>>amateur is using, though.
>
>So what? They don;t have to buy it with their own money, nor take
> care of it with their own money in their spare time. Amateurs do.
>Makes all the difference in the world.

Right! Amateurs are the most noble, god-fearing, honest folks in
the world, to a man upholders of social morals, the ten
commandments, and all give tithes more than ten percent!

Filthy evil money-grubbing professionals don't have families or bills
or loved ones or any expenses. They probalby drink, smoke, and
cuss, showing indecency at football games and everything!

You ought to work at league headquarters where they built all
their home-designed rigs just like you did.

>>If you get the opportunity, have a look
>>inside a cellular base station sometime - all of the equipment in
>>there is computer controlled
>
>Which means no licensed operators are needed at all.

Blasphemy! Say not those evil words!

All must be licensed, tested, analyzed for proper moral virtue, and
be subject to hellfire and brimstone if they so much as hint at any
unlicenseness!

>Elimination of operators has been a major goal of commercial and
>military radio services for years. One less warm body to pay. Just
>like the railroads eliminated most block operators years ago, and the
>telephone company went to dial equipment, and the airlines went to
>planes that can be flown by two, not three.

Haven't you realized it? It's all a vast conspiracy against morse code!

The only ones who use it are the amateurs (glory be their name,
hosannahs in the highest for those virtuous, noble, standard-bearing
leaders of the state of the art in all radio).

Oh, and the U.S. Army Signal Corps is the third most populous
branch in the Army despite no use of morse code for any military
communications. A larger percentage now than in WW2 when
morse code was still used by the military.

American railroads have more radios (none of them morse mode) now
than ever before, are required to channelize very close together in
order to fit within the allocations. NTIA has the facts and figures.
For wired communications they have high-speed data and some use
encrypted modes for security.

American airline companies have shown the rest of the world how to
run profit-making air carriers, both passenger and cargo. They have
NO need for morse modes over civil land air routes, have never had any
internationally since 1955 and abandoned HF morse CW for SSB and
data modes long ago out of practicality of USE, not for warm body
elimination in aircrew. Upon inspection of professional air carriers,
where the once carried an "extra" aircrew for morse comms, they
STILL carry "extra" aircrew in the same number for other flight duties.

As to practicality in use, which would you think a business would
want for written communications: A "high speed" pair of morse
men capable of 40 WPM or a data/teleprinter circuit useable by anyone
who can read and write running a over a hundred times faster?

If public safety is such a concern at sea, why did SOLAS and the
maritime community devise, adopt GMDSS instead of manual
morsemen "sparkies" doing code on 500 KHz? GMDSS can be
operated by any trained, certified ship's crew, not a specialist in
morse.

>> - nothing even resembling a piece of
>>radio gear to be seen.
>
>Only if you don't know what it looks like ;-)

None of it looks like a K2 or an Orion.

Cell sites operate at the 1 GHz band and higher. "Real hams" don't
go near microwaves. "Gigahertz for gigasquirts" - KH2D

>>The signal out, though, is Hertzian, and as old as the universe....
>
>If it's as old as the universe, it existed before Hertz.

It isn't "real radio" if above 30 MHz. - CW (Conventional Wisdom) of the
olde-tyme mighty macho morsemen.

<snip>

>>Sure, but according to IC, that isn't a concern!
>
>IC is just wrong.

Tsk, tsk, next thing you will be accusing Industry Canada of having
Weapons of Mass Destruction!

>>>> >And are professional licensees allowed to build their own transmitters
>>and put
>>>> >them
>>>> >on the air without any certification?
>>>>
>>>> Nope - this is what the Amateur bands are for (type approval not
>>>> required, unlike the commercial frequencies).
>>>
>>>Then the "pros" aren't necessarily qualified in that area, either.
>>>>
>>>> In fact, there are precious few Amateurs left who could do that, Jim,
>>>> even though our bands permit it.
>>>
>>>I can, and have.
>>
>>I know - but they just ain't making them like you anymore!
>

>Yes, they are. There are plenty of hams like me around, building,
>operating, using Morse code....That sort of thing really bothers
>some people.

Only when they want to force their Lifestyle on everyone else.

They won't let things be. They must Convert the heathen NCTAs.

They get all hot and bothered when everyone else doesn't worship
and adore the things they do (obviously superior things according
to them).

>>>Canada may be different. But I don't live there.
>>
>>Same, actually. 100 questions, 60 correct gets you a basic license.
>
>60% passing? At least here it's ~74%.

Yah, here we go with the Territorial Imperative nonsense again...

>>>You seem to be arguing that such licenses aren't really needed
>>>anymore.
>>
>>No - I'm arguing that they are becoming meaningless - simple memory
>>work that a child can do.
>
>If they're meaningless they aren't needed.

Right...SEVEN YEAR OLD EXTRAS IN THE USA.

Wow, certified, stamped, authorized, qualified infantile behavior, legal
to run 1+ KW transmitters without parental supervision!

>Has the licensing of young children caused any problems for the ARS?
>Are they making a mess of the bands?

The mentally-seven-year-olds seem to be doing just fine. Every
so often they appear in the "Riley notices."

>btw, Canada used to have an age requirement of 15 for any class of
>amateur license. Would you have them put that requirement back?
>
>The USA never had an age requirement for a ham license, but at
>least one frequent poster here petitioned the FCC to add an age requirement
>of 14 years. Fortunately the FCC did not do so.

Right. FREEDOM for seven-year-old Extras!

You show them!

>>>> >>Too easy, I'd say,
>>>> >
>>>> >The FCC disagrees.
>>>>
>>>> Unfortunately.

>>>
>>>They're PROFESSIONALS, Leo! They have to "keep current or move out",
>>>right?
>>>It's their JOB to know what's needed, right? Who are we poor dumb old
>>>broken
>>>down amateurs to question them? ;-)
>>
>>They are regulators and politicians, actually....
>
>They're still PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO. Who are you or I to question them? ;-)

I thought SEVEN-YEAR-OLD EXTRAS ranking any radio professional
as cute. You apparently support that in all things?

>>>Must not question the professionals. Their egos can't take it.
>>
>>Well, I'm sure that if you asked a holder of a first class radio
>>license who has worked in the field for years a radio theory question,
>>they'd probably get it right! :)
>
>I've seen them get it wrong. Some don't even know what firmware is.

Right. You tell them mighty professional...you don't what "firmware"
really is! (downloadable software from Ten-Tec).

>>>How often does the average employee at WNEP have to demonstrate
>>>knowledge
>>>of calculation of squares, logs and complex numbers?
>>
>>The receptionist - never. The hands-on technical people - rarely -
>>but they would need it to complete their formal education in radio
>>theory, I'd reckon.
>
>Is formal education necessary for the license?

Are you going to brush the ivy leaves from your BS again? :-)

You didn't get your mighty morse Extra with a BS and MS, did
you? :-)

>>>> Rote memorization was what my point was about, though - and I'm sure
>>>> that was the case.
>>>
>>>How do you know for sure?
>>
>>I don't - but I'd say the odds are pretty heavily in my favour. :)
>
>They are - but you wrote as if there were no other possibility.

My, my, Leo writes an indefenite and TAFKA Rv. Jim says its
an absolute! Gotta love the double-degreed word misunderstanding.

>>>> Ever talk to a 7-year old kid, Jim?
>>>
>>>At least daily.
>>
>>Listen often too?
>>
>At least daily.

Keep those SEVEN-YEAR-OLD EXTRA CLASS skills honed sharp!

>>>Much of what's on the test (band edges, regs) is pure memory stuff.
>>
>>Thought the Extra was more theoretical than regulation based?
>
>None of them are heavy on theory. Not anymore.

Sigh...maybe "Now You're Talking" will be replaced by Mother Goose?

>>But you're not 7!
>
>I'm not 13 either.

Right. You are 49 going on 94.

Seven year old Extras now have ALL the rights your Extra license has.

There's no legal requirement for parental supervision when they run
1+ KW transmitters.

>>>And there is *no* requirement that *any* ham understand complex
>>>numbers.
>>
>>There is, if he really wants to figure out why his 50 ohm antenna has
>>an SWR of 2.6 to 1......
>
>Not at all.
>
>And why would a 50 ohm antenna have such a high SWR if it's 50 ohms?

Right. All Seven-year-old Extras KNOW that stuff!

>>>Wrong is wrong. But the IC are professionals, aren't they?
>>
>>Yep - professional regulators. Them who makes the rules!
>
>PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!

Nooooo. Professionals in LAW. Absolutely NO Commissioner or
staff member of the FCC is required to possess ANY radio operator
license. Read Parts 0 and 1 of Title 47 C.F.R.

You ought to research Industry Canada's organization and charter
some more before tossing sand from your sandbox at them. If you
don't know our FCC then how can you "critique" Industry Canada?
You don't even live in Canada.

>>>> Personally I'd think, for example, that the guy who sits in a control
>>>> tower accurately vectoring planes all over our busy airspace is far
>>>> better equipped to carry on a two-way conversation on 2-meters than
>>>> the average amateur who passed a relatively simple test!
>>>
>>>Maybe. But there's no requirement that he have any sort of radio
>>>operator's license. He doesn't need to know how the radios work.
>>>Complex numbers?
>>
>>They aren'r required - you just told me that....
>
>Exactly. Nor band edges, or power limits, etc.

Tested morse code ability MUST be there for HF. Always. It
transcends any theory of radio.

>>>No. I'm too busy looking at rigs and parts.
>>
>>Look up - he's there, along with the guys who look like the local
>>homeless shelter burnt down!
>
>Gee, you sure have a high opinion of your fellow hams.

How about those "fellow" seven year olds?

>>>> >For the USA to make the
>>>> >same mistake would be a very bad thing, unless the GROL tests were
>>changed.
>>>> >Even then it would be questionable, because it would probably be
>possible
>>
>>>> >for someone to pass the Commercial exam but get all the
>>amateur-radio-related
>>>> >questions wrong. Such a person is simply not qualified to operate an
>>amateur
>>>> >radio station.
>>>>
>>>> ...unless they can find a 7-year old to elmer them, that is. That is
>>>> some prettty tough material to master! LOL!
>>>
>>>Would you talk that way to a 7 year old, Leo?
>>
>>Why not?
>>
>How much time *do* you spend with children?

That's important now that SEVEN YEAR OLDS can be EXTRAS!

LHA / WMD

2294. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134930.05539.00004190@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86965

In article <4022ED6C.55B1405B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>After more than seven
>years of posting your diatribes in an amateur radio newsgroup, you're no
>closer to obtaining even the most basic no-code amateur radio license.

There's NO test required to access or post to newsgroups.

Why should I get an amateur radio license to operate a computer?

I've been operating computers since the 1970s...about two decades
after I first transmitted on HF with a 1 KW transmitter.

You've had too many oriongasms. Stop it or you will grow more
blind.

LHA / WMD

2295. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134930.05539.00004189@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86970

In article <402405EE.4010601@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Len, just get the dammed license. It's more fun to operate then to
>whine.....

You mean WHINE about non-amateur subjects like sex and
contemporary social-sexual morality?

Was I doing that without an amateur radio license?!? :-)

Good heavens, call Riley, call Powell, excommunicate me from
the Catholic Church!

Yes, you're right...an amateur radio license is required in order to
talk about Super Bowl halftimes and "indecent exposure."

That's a very important amateur radio policy topic.

You should make Janet Jackson take a morse code test!

That would cure her of her "indecency!"

[there's never been a case of indecent exposure on the HF ham bands!]

LHA / WMD

2296. Re: New Article: A BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134931.05539.00004191@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86978

In article <402558E3.F25D836F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <superior sandbox operator k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <4022EC2F.55D9A333@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Ding Dong
>Schoolmaster
>> k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >It should be apparent to you, Leonard. They're discussing matters
>> >dealing with amateur radio.
>>
>> Yes, Janet Jackson's breast, U.S. foreign policy, the local
>> weather, national societal morals to name just four common
>> "amateur radio" subjects.
>>
>> :-)
>
>There's your problem! In the post to which you responded, amateur radio
>was indeed under discussion.

I didn't see any mention of Janet Jackson's breast in the question pool.

It's not in Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R.

You ought to petition the FCC to put that in, mighty macho morseman of fortysomething in amateur radio.

At least write the VEC QPC and DEMAND (in your own unique way) that the U.S. amateur test include questions on anatomy, sex, and morals!

Do the right thing for the future!

All the kiddies are counting on you, especially your fellow seven-year-old Extras.

LHA / WMD

2297. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134932.05539.00004192@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86972

In article <1e4e3692.0402051522.1d36e348@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> > > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very
>same
>> > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
>> > > >
>> > > > Why is it NOW a problem?
>> > >
>> > > Why?
>> >
>> > Why, Jim?
>>
>> Why, Jim?
>
>Jim, don't you know why you say the things you say?

Lack of an answer must be due to endorphin overload or lack
of oxygen from the running. Maybe just lack of oxygen from his
rareified heights of code superiority.

Or maybe solder fumes from building a kit to add to his
collection of all home-built and designed ham rigs.

LHA / WMD

2298. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134933.05539.00004195@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86961

In article <40256638.F14CB6C7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Had a pair of Haney Plates once...but you have NO idea what
>> those are, either, do you?
>
>R.J Haney, Jill Haney? Be specific.

There's only one kind of Haney Plates. Invented by Carol Haney's
dad.

You sure don't know much about gypsies! :-)

Do a time-step and let's see how you hold your marks.

LHA / WMD

2299. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134933.05539.00004194@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86963

In article <1e4e3692.0402070826.7766445f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>You're right - MUST have been an imposter. Since the same
>disincentive has been in place since 1912, I can't imagine TAFKA Rev.
>Jim flubbing up like that. Not in a million years.
>
>Whoever forged that post had to have been a complete moron.
>
>My apologies to TAFKA Rev. Jim.

Right! And to his dad, Franz Tafka!

[expletive deleted]

[humor deleted]

[reason, fact, and common sense deleted...]

[morse code testing deleted!] :-)

LHA / WMD

2300. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134933.05539.00004193@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86981

In article <40255C9F.5A4CC21B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <robust oberst auf das sandbox k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40232FD0.F492989E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <40227DF3.1C5E590D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <confused in the
>> >> east...and north...and south k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <402165F0.4B6AE2D4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> trying to go for the jugular but getting only a juggler writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> In article <20040201211559.21232.00003983@mb-m13.aol.com>,
>> >n2ey@aol.com
>> >> >> >(N2EY)
>> >> >> >> writes:
>
>> >> The FDA grades ham.
>> >>
>> >...leaving you to handle the degrading.
>>
>> I only degrade the biodegradeable amateurs in here.
>
>We're each biodegradable, Leonard.

No, I don't think so. You got the formaldehyde before assuming room temperature.

Dr. Frankenstein would be proud...he created a Ham Monster!

"...it's Alive! It's Alive!...it beeped morse code!"

[from an unpublished Mary Shelley manuscript] :-)

>(much of your crap snipped because it was, well, crap)

Right, straight talk from a Newington Charm School dropout.

See 97.1 (e), something about "good will" and "uniqueness."

What next? Shouts of "Drop and give me twenty, maggot?"

The gunnery nurse have a cue-so with you or something?

>Amateur radio success has been mine for over 40 years now.

Wonderful.

Any time soon you will be ready to be a true professional. With another forty years of radio theory study, that is...

Keep up the good work.

Temper fry!

LHA / WMD

2301. Re: Totally ticked.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134934.05539.00004196@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86979

In article <veka20luiccufj5bsq1u3s3ufmjpl247jp@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>> ... Those have nothing to do with
>> amateur radio policy discussions about Janet Jackson's breast
>> or her sister Michael.
>
>Or Kim's callsign. :)

I spoke hastily. Seems that Mr. Casey says something about "taking
a test" in order to talk about Janet Jackson's "unveiling" of an organ.

Such vital amateur radio policy matters must be studied in great
deal in order to wrathfully declare any [expletive deleteds] about it.

Grab the tongs, slide the paper into the fixer, flick off the
safelight and open the door. Something has developed!

Everything is negative. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Not enough exposure.

This group needs a mass oriongasm! :-)

LHA / WMD

2302. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134935.05539.00004197@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86966

In article <40232CBF.A4D30418@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >Do you have a callsign, Len?
>>
>> Several. :-)
>
>Wrong answer, Pops. :-)

RIGHT answer, popless.

Now go back to your orion, sit down in front of it and amaze yourself.

Have an oriongasm. Enjoy.

LHA / WMD

2303. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134936.05539.00004199@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86967

In article <a6SdnajbWqDWX7_dRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> All that snarling and you ain't got either a name or a callsign.
>
>Got both and the license certificate to prove it.

"Prove" to whom, anonymous one?

You have neither name nor callsign.

You don't even have artificial intelligence.

You aren't impressing anyone.

LHA / WMD

2304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134936.05539.00004198@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86974

In article <20040205215433.01019.00000323@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <jsednZJ4fq2vJLzdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>>Kid Rock comes out in a desecrated US Flag with a
>>hole cut in the middle. Pretty
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>>despicable!
>
>I agree 100%.
>
>When the halftime show started I changed the channel. Flipped back at one
point
>and saw "Kid", flipped back to something else. Missed JJ - no big loss.
>
>Note that the flap over her "wardrobe malfunction" has deflected attention
from
>that flag desecration.
>
>>Is this what the
>>superbowl is about? I can only assume that the NFL approves of this kind
>>of disrespectful behavior, and if we watch the trash they spew, we do as
>>well!

You must have missed the Official Oath of Allegiance to the ARRL
given by Dave Sumner at the beginning.

>I think it's evidence of a basic law of entertainment physics: "conservation
of
>goodstuff".

Did you want BOTH of them exposed? :-)

>IOW there's only so much good programming. Some years back,
>the superbowl consisted mostly of rather unexciting games but really good
shows
>and commercials. Then the games got better and the shows and commercials
>worse.

Write the FCC and make Riley take away their amateur radio license!

Get tough!

>It's not just the superbowl - most of what's on broadcast TV is JUNK. Pure and
>simple. If some people in the LA area are offended - tough.

Right! Old Monty Python shows from the BBC! The only good stuff!

Forget things like the Hallmark Hall series, all [expletive deleteds].
Forget things like Live From Lincoln Center specials, all [more
expletive deleteds]. Forget things like a good American football game
going very, very close to the end, saved by a 41-yard field goal at the
last minute. That's so much [expletive deleted] nonsense.

>The irony of the situation is that the people who are really responsible won't
>be fined, but the stations who simply carried the network feed will be.

Ah, for the days of Big Bill Allen and angry letters to newspapers!

Write your Division Manager and complain!

Tell them not to feed the SuperBowl to the NTS!

Make all the teams and officials take morse code tests!

Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.

LHA / WMD

2305. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:49:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208134937.05539.00004200@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 86969

In article <402566CB.C1276851@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <"he's just here to snarl at non-amateurs" k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40232862.B1D42573@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue."
>> >
>> >--Leonard H. Anderson, 5 Feb. 2004
>>
>> Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue.
>>
>> Leonard H. Anderson, 6 February 2004
>>
>> Laminate that and put it in your wallet, Herr Robust.
>
>I believe I will. I'll title it: An Absolute Falsehood by Leonard H.
>Anderson.

Gotta love it!

Snarly dave is "just in here to talk about amateur radio."

:-)

All he can do is spit and shout about non-amateurs.

It must be that definition in 97.1, something about "amateur's
good will" or something.

Goodwill Industries will never have to worry about competition...:-)

LHA / WMD

2306. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 18:53:12 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208135312.01692.00000498@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 86982

In article <19nc205asd1sggbu7rrfatgravcukhcfdg@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Wonder why it's called a reciprocal agreement when it isn't quite
>reciprocal? :)

Perhaps because so many America-firsters want to be "one
over everyone else?" :-)

LHA / WMD

2307. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 19:35:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40268F92.D26F3ACF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86983

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40253EE8.508B214F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> What does that say about your vaunted federal merit badge?
> > >
> > >It says that a mere child is one up on you. She has the badge. You
> > >don't.
> >
> > I'm not a SEVEN YEAR OLD Extra.

Precisely. You're not ANY kind of Extra or any kind of radio amateur.

> If you think that a SEVEN YEAR OLD has anything "up" on me,
> I'd say you have the mentality of a seven year old.

The facts are there: A seven-year-old has an Amateur Extra. You do
not.

> Now go out to the sandbox and play with your "fellow Extras" in
> the First Grade. That's a nice boy. Behave or Mama Dee will
> spank you for being naughty.

Aren't you the guy whose wife is scolding him for playing with
seven-year-olds?

Dave K8MN

2308. Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 19:40:55 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 86984

Hi, Len,

after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did not find anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but nothing about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one very important thing.

What impact will Broadband over Powerlines, or PLC, have on the Amateur Radio Policy.

Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I will take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and the Moderator of this Newsgroup. Please take my apology for the poor quoting habits, I am not jet skilled enough in this magic art.

Please don't cite me impatient, but may I await your reply soon? Today?

Best regards
Helmut

2309. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 19:46:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4026922A.C21CBE5F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86985

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >Oh, but I'm very much a part of U.S. amateur radio and I've been part of
> >amateur radio in five other countries. You aren't part of amateur radio
> >anywhere on the planet. You aren't a part of the ARRL. Your
> >connections to amateur radio are simply that you've commented to the FCC
> >about the service in which you do not participate and that you post
> >here.
>
> Oh, my, another tyrant ranting away.

Tyrant? For pointing out facts? Go over that paragraph again.
Anything there you'd like to dispute?

> The FCC is "not a part of amateur radio," merely the regulation of
> every civil radio service in the United States.

1. The FCC regulates amateur radio. FCC staffers are paid to do so.
So at least some individuals at the FCC are involved in amateur
radio.

2. I am a radio amateur. Thus I am involved in amateur radio.

3. You are not a radio amateur and you are not employed by the FCC.
You have nothing to do with amateur radio.

> The First Amendment gives me a number of rights. Exclusion from
> discussing those with anyone or my government is NOT under your
> control. Not at any time, herr tyrant.

When was it that you were excluded? You "discussed" (albeit one-way,
from you to the FCC) with your government. Now, force the FCC to listen
or act on your views. Maybe you can claim that your First Amendment
Rights were abridged.

> There are mechanisms in the U.S. Constitution for removing the
> rights of citizens. Those are called "amendments." Do you think
> you could ever, with or without force, make such an amenedment?

I have no desire to make an "amenedment", you "synchophant". Why are
you so "beligerent", "Atila"?

> Why do you keep trying to be a tyrant?

I'm not. I'm waiting for a group decision from you on whether or not
I've achieved radio god status.

> Is that due to some mental illness? If so, get help fast.

You keep accusing others of mental illness. Ask you wife what it means when you begin to believe that others are crazy.

> Now be a good boy and go our and play in the radio sandbox with
> your other "fellow hams." I hear the seven-year-old extra is nice.

We're pretty near the gist of things. There are ninety-five-old hams. There are twelve-year-old hams. There are folks in their thirties, forties, fifties, sixties and seventies who are hams. Those of us in the (amateur) radio sandbox play together pretty well. You aren't one of those hams and you don't play well with others. You can sit alone in your sandbox.

Dave K8MN

2310. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 19:49:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402692C3.2E722676@earthlink.net>
Source record: 86986

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <op7Vb.575$t16.635978@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Exactly. Which is why I killfiled him and so see only what others may
> >choose to quote from him. Thank goodness!!
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, hiding from truth, freedom, and independence.
>
> Perverse mental activity. Ostrich syndrome.

You provide truth, freedom and independence? Maybe I'm missing
something in your posts.

> Hide head in sand and all you can hear is the drumbeats of the league
> making you tap in time to only their loud music, the rhythm of olde-
> time hamme radio as it was. It shields you from realization that there
> are others out there who do not agree with you. It is safe, secure,
> warm, comforting, makes you feel very superior to shut out all other
> independent thought.

Dee has built a privacy hedge around her cozy home so she doesn't have
to view the ugly landfill. You are the landfill.

> Tyrants love the ostrich syndrome. Plays right into their rule.

Yeah, I hear Saddam Hussein was quite the Ostrich man.

Dave K8MN

2311. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 20:19:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208151954.21457.00003866@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 86987

In article <20040208013137.00545.00004211@mb-m02.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <ng67205t934b071v5apesetrm0065pa8re@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>
>>An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
>>the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>>
>>
>>http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Ar
>ticle_Type1&call_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
>>
>
>Leo:
>
>I don't even have to bother to read it. I'm guessing it says that all of us
>hyper-conservative, redneck UhmurriKans are so backwardly non-progressive
>in our morality that we're shocked and outraged by the little act put on
>during Super Bowl XXXVIII by Jackson and Timberlake. Yada, yada,
>yada.

No, it's not like that at all, Larry. You should read it, because it's a perfect
example of a bunch of good facts connected by a bit of muddle-headed illogic.

>
>I'm no prude, but I know obscenity when I see it, and that was obscene --
>the whole half-time show, not just the Jackson thing.

I didn't watch past the part where the psuedo-cheerleader-dancers took off their outfits. I flicked back briefly and saw some no-talent wearing the American flag like a poncho, and tuned away.

>If it were being
>shown after 11 PM or on a cable channel, that would be a different
>matter, but this was shown on a major network during Prime Time, and
>during a high-profile sporting event with a maxxed-out audience, including
>young children.

It's even simpler than that: It was aired with no warning of the content, so that those who would be offended could not make an informed choice. That's what's really offensive - and a point totally missed by the above article.

>If there was anything that was designed to bring our
>culture "...one step closer to extinction," this was it. Fortunately, the
>negative reaction, while not understood by our ever-so-liberal neighbors
>to the North, had the effect of at least getting Janet Jackson booted from
>the Grammys, and forced CBS to change the Grammys from a real-time
>"live" broadcast to a delayed broadcast, so that any other such
>shennanigans can be edited out. Unfortunately, all the dumbed-down
>New-Age pop-culture idiots out there will probably buy Janet's new
>CD in record numbers, and that was her intention from the beginning.

The article fails to note the difference between movies (which are rated)
and live TV (which isn't).

73 de Jim, N2EY

2312. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 20:35:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402081235.41faa2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86988

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040206070742.29815.00003137@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <20040205221714.06226.00002732@mb-m19.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >I was born Oct 31, 1952. I got my Novice ticket July 21, 1981. I passed
> >Extra Feb, 7, 1983. I reckon that made me 30 years, 4 months, 7 days
> >old at the time.
>
> What a great new game! I'll play:

Born: 18 Sept 55

Novice: Dated 27 October 72 (I forget when it arrived)
17 years, 1 month, 1 week, 2 days

Extra: Tested 17 December 79 in Long Beach, CA. License dated 11
February 1980 (ex-wife's birthday...ain't that a hoot?)
25 years, 4 months, 3 weeks, 3 days

73

Steve, K4YZ

2313. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 20:38:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402081238.f514e83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86989

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402071415.3c933f94@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040207095504.12631.00004760@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0402061925.73fdf12e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> > >. . . Move over ya newbies, ALLYA, the OF has logged in . .
> >
> > Hans hasn't played the game yet, tho.
>
> Nor has W0EX.

Nor has Le.....ooops, forgot...NO LICENSE!

BBBWWWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

2314. Re: We Need a BANDWIDTH-BASED Frequency Plan - NOT Mode-Based.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 20:47:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402081247.55e129bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86990

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402566CB.C1276851@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <40232862.B1D42573@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue."
> > >
> > >--Leonard H. Anderson, 5 Feb. 2004
> >
> > Snarly dave, I'm just trying to discuss the morse code test issue.
> >
> > Leonard H. Anderson, 6 February 2004
> >
> > Laminate that and put it in your wallet, Herr Robust.
>
> I believe I will. I'll title it: An Absolute Falsehood by Leonard H.
> Anderson.

"How To Be A Competent Pathological Liar" by Leonard H. Anderson.

I can't imagine what goes on in the mind of a person who
seemingly finds so much satisfaction in being so readily identified
with Jon Lovitz' character on Saturday Night Live.

Sheeesh...Let my kids grow up to be ANYTHING but "professional
engineers" of THIS caliber!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2315. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 21:31:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402081331.6ea23651@posting.google.com>
Source record: 86991

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040208095449.06226.00002817@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402071913.631c0f20@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >For a great bio of a *real* OF go to QRZ.com and punch in W3EAN. I got
> >my first taste of ham radio during a '40s civil defense drill when I
> >was assigned to him as his Cub Scout message runner while he was
> >mobiling.
>
> Oyez, quite a chap, that one! Next to him we're all babies...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

No, we're all hams. Save for one who has an interest in ham radio.

2316. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 21:50:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KNCdnUDFC_9lLbvdRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86992

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> I don't even have to bother to read it. I'm guessing it says that all of us
> hyper-conservative, redneck UhmurriKans are so backwardly non-progressive
> in our morality that we're shocked and outraged by the little act put on
> during Super Bowl XXXVIII by Jackson and Timberlake. Yada, yada,
> yada.
>
> I'm no prude, but I know obscenity when I see it, and that was obscene --
> the whole half-time show, not just the Jackson thing. If it were being
> shown after 11 PM or on a cable channel, that would be a different
> matter, but this was shown on a major network during Prime Time, and
> during a high-profile sporting event with a maxxed-out audience, including
> young children. If there was anything that was designed to bring our
> culture "...one step closer to extinction," this was it. Fortunately, the
> negative reaction, while not understood by our ever-so-liberal neighbors
> to the North, had the effect of at least getting Janet Jackson booted from
> the Grammys, and forced CBS to change the Grammys from a real-time
> "live" broadcast to a delayed broadcast, so that any other such
> shennanigans can be edited out. Unfortunately, all the dumbed-down
> New-Age pop-culture idiots out there will probably buy Janet's new
> CD in record numbers, and that was her intention from the beginning.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Jackson and that other idot singing with her keep trying to convince
everyone it was accidental that her breast was exposed. She wore nipple
decoration because she meant for her breast to be exposed. What a lovely
upstanding example that Jackson family is....NOT!!!
And the other moron wearing the flag with a hole in it as a cape
screaming his junk they attempt to call music was just a bad.

2317. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 21:54:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KNCdnUPFC_9LLLvdRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86993

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> You don't even have artificial intelligence.

No I don't, that is what you have only someone forgot to program it.
>
> You aren't impressing anyone.

Of all the people in the world I couldn't care less if I impress, you're it.

2318. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 21:56:12 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KNCdnULFC__-L7vdRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 86994

Helmut wrote:

> Hi, Len,
>
> after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did not find
> anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but nothing
> about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one very
> important thing.

Please don't expect Lennyboy to ever have anything useful to say, that
would be too much of a strain on the poor old man.

2319. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 22:17:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <i29d201otn1lj79nfgf912tfu1dhuu6p5s@4ax.com>
Source record: 86995

On 08 Feb 2004 20:19:54 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <20040208013137.00545.00004211@mb-m02.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>In article <ng67205t934b071v5apesetrm0065pa8re@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>
>>>An article in today's Toronto Star, which covers our amusement with
>>>the Janet Jackson issue pretty well! Double standards abound......
>>>
>>>
>>>http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Ar
>>ticle_Type1&call_pageid=971358637177&c=Article&cid=1076022610517
>>>
>>
>>Leo:
>>
>>I don't even have to bother to read it. I'm guessing it says that all of us
>>hyper-conservative, redneck UhmurriKans are so backwardly non-progressive
>>in our morality that we're shocked and outraged by the little act put on
>>during Super Bowl XXXVIII by Jackson and Timberlake. Yada, yada,
>>yada.
>
>No, it's not like that at all, Larry. You should read it, because it's a
>perfect
>example of a bunch of good facts connected by a bit of muddle-headed
>illogic.

It was pretty accurate and intelligently written, actually! But I
assume from your statement that it didn't agree with your own
viewpoint, as it too is "wrong".

I take it you're not a Robbie Burns fan:

"Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as others see us!"

The experience would do you a world of good, Jim.... :)

>snip
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2320. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 22:49:39 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <72zVb.255754$na.417263@attbi_s04>
Source record: 86996

> Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.
>
> LHA / WMD

Good one Len ..... have to remember it ....

God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2321. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-08 23:52:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 86997

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
[snip]

> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
access
> >to
> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
giving
> >them
> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.

Jim,

I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.

Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> >
> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>
> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> is there?

They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
> >83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> >don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> >increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> >operating in the Extra only segments.
>
> Then just leave 'em be!

That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
is unacceptable.

The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
limits.

After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward

to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.

YM will, of course V ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

2322. N8WWM live-in a felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 00:03:04 UTC
From: "Burke N. Hare" <postmaster@bogg.dynu.com>
Message-ID: <4MWJM7XI38025.7873842593@bogg.dynu.com>
Source record: 86998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Annoyed by this ridiculous header? Want to get rid of it and make full use of this remailer:
Low latency, 24x7, high-bandwidth, reliable remailer - always at the top of the charts.
Full 'from' headers - with NO disclaimer. The only such remailer, bar one.
No namby-pamby filtering of robust speech - say whatever you want.
No restrictions on posting: send as many posts as you want to any newsgroup.
The perfect remailer for maintaining an identity in a newsgroup.

It's easy - just send your public key to config@bogg.dynu.com.

You can load it automatically to my keyring by sending the message in this format:

Create
subject: randomgibberish [make sure it's random to avoid duplication]
your public key

Sign your messages with the key, and get all the benefits of the remailer.
~~~
~~~

2323. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 00:25:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <pckd201oro8uoes7c1nfsvjm30kflmepst@4ax.com>
Source record: 86999

On 8 Feb 2004 18:21:54 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>snip
>>
>Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to be both
>a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an American (or a
>Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada using my US call.
>
>The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American with a
>US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for only 2 months
>within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No WARC bands or 40m for
>Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian call could operate
>indefinitely in the US, even living here permanently, under the terms of
>their Canadian licence (not to exceed Extra).

Not sure if they have changed, Alun - just discovered them when I
bacame a ham a couple of years ago! The link to the RAC page with
info on the current reciprocal agreement is:

http://www.rac.ca/regulatory/rcip.htm

and IC RIC-3, which contains the details on the various agreements, US
and other, is at:

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/$FILE/ric3.pdf

From what I read in these documents, one need only possess a US
licence to gain full Canadian privileges appropriate to the licence
class. For countries other than the US, CEPT and IARP permits are
acceptable.

Hope that helps!

73, Leo

2324. Re: N8WWM live-in a felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 00:32:07 UTC
From: WA3MOJ@none.com
Message-ID: <20040208193207.506$QP@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87000
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
WA3MOJ@none.com wrote:
> WA3MOJ@none.com wrote:
> > Steve Parks wrote it <duke@hen.com> wrote:
> > > Burke N. Hare <postmaster@bogg.dynu.com> wrote in
> > > news:4MWJM7XI38025.7873842593@bogg.dynu.com:
> > >
> > > Fat Doglass you are not concerned with legal
> > > > and lawful compliance. Your squeeze Crisco cathy is a felon. You
> > > > were busted by the fcc. Fat homely hypocrite.
> > >
> > > Nice Post Steve Parks.
> > >
> > Who's that?
> >
> He doesn't use remailers.
>
X-No-Archive removed

--
Build your own amp.
http://electronickits.com/kit/plans/cbradio/cbradio.htm
```

2325. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 01:21:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208202149.12501.00006087@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87051

In article <40256B81.8010603@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>>Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids, but
>>>>would sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....

>>>>>Is that really what we want to teach our children?

>>>>I wouldn't want to subject kids to the crap I had to endure in said
>>>>school.

>>>When you get right down to it, except for a few shameful and widely
>>>publicized exceptions, todays kids suffer from too little rather than too
>>>much physical punishment.

>>I disagree! Beating children simply means the beater can't think of
>>a better way to deal with the kid.

>>It also teaches the kid at a very primeval level that violence is a
>>legitimate method of getting what you want from others.

>It also delivered a message that people in authority are likely to abuse
>their positions and cannot be trusted.

WOW - good point, Robert!

>As the teachers often punished kids that didn't misbehave
>as the ones that did.

IHM nuns were big on punishing the whole class.

>Throw in it being the Vietnam era and .....

Bingo.
>
>Sometimes teachers try to "teach respect" with violence. Well, if "fear and
>hatred" = "respect" then it worked.... But I don't think respect does
>equal that.

>We also had male nuns, called "brothers". CFX was their callsign, stood
>for -something-something-Xavier. One of them was an ex marine drill
>seargent,
>and thought nothing beating on a kid 20 minutes non-stop. Another was from
>the Navy, and also could beat on a kid even longer.

We didn't have those until high school. None of them were as sadistic as nuns.
>
>Not suprizing that some kids tried to burn the school down. No
>real damage, something like a wastepaper basket on fire. We

>always hoped it was the real thing whenever they did a fire drill
>(after the fire dept made them not pre-announce that there'd be a
>drill today).

We were told that if someone attacked the school or a "religious person" they'd burn in hell. And would probably have other consequences, like having their arm fall off when they tried to raise it to hit a nun. Nobody ever tried to find out if such things were true...

All that's changed now. Catholic schools are now more like private academies, and most of the teachers are lay people because nuns and brothers are too few.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2326. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 01:21:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208202151.12501.00006088@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87053

In article <4025CE2D.DA51BF80@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>ike Coslo wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> > Mike Coslo wrote:
>> >
>> >>N2EY wrote:

>> >> And the argument is null anyway. If beating your kid worked, you
>> >> would only have to do it once or twice.

>> > You're on a slippery slope, Mike. If TALKING to your child did any
>> > good, you'd only have to do it a couple of time, right? I can hear my
>> > mother's voice now: "How many times to I have to tell you?"
>>
>> Ahh, but talking DOESN'T work! You can't always reason with a
>> child.
>
>Take my word, my folks never attempted reason when we were younger.

Yup. In many cases it's counterproductive. For example, if you want a kid
to go to bed at 7 and he wants to go to bed at 8, and you spend half an hour
or even half a minute after 7 trying to reason with him, he's "won", because
his bedtime wasn't 7.

> My
>sister and I were issued edicts in no uncertain terms. If we argued or
>talked back, we could expect some time in a corner or in our rooms or
>were grounded.

Which today is called "time out" and which works very well if done right.
>
>> You have to deprive them of something that they value for a little
>> while. Then you give it back to them until the next time they misbehave.
>> I'm not advocating talk, and I'm not advocating beatings, I'm advocating
>> something I've found that works.

Bingo. And for most kids, what they value most are freedom and attention.
Deprive them of either or both, and the message gets through.
>
>My dad called it "giving us a little more leash". He retracted some
>leash when we demonstrated that we couldn't handle the extra freedom.
>

And the lesson was that the *kid's* behavior is what caused it.

>> >>In fact, I was recently enlightened to the fact that (I hope this
>> >>doesn't invoke Godwin's law!) Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin, and Adolf
>> >>Hitler have one thing in common. They recieved regular beatings as
>> >>children.

>> > So the secret seems to be, beat your children on an irregular basis and
>> > they won't grow up to be tyrants and ogres. It'd be interesting to find
>> > that Jeffrey Dahmer was never spanked and that his parents tried to
>> > reason with him.
>>
>> Read:
>>
>> http://www.crimelibrary.com/serial_killers/notorious/dahmer/naked1.html
>>
>> for an interesting if horrible accounting of Jeffrey Dahmer.
>>
>> Indeed, he was not raised in an abusive environment. But it is
>> unfair
>> to attibute anything to a pathological serial killer's upbringing
>> compared to a normal person. But there is a difference between Dahmer
>> and the nasties I mentioned above. Many people call them all madmen, but
>> there is a huge difference between Dahmer and the others.
>
>I'll check out the link.
>
Me too.

I would point out that *most* kids, beaten or not, will not grow up to be
serial killers. But the legacy of violence plays out in other ways.

And there's even a connection to amateur radio policy in all this:

Dave's dad's analogy of "leash" is very accurate. FCC gives its licensees a lot
of "leash" (freedom) in exchange for proper behavior. Violate that agreement,
and the "leash" is shortened. As in the cases of licenses not renewed for
"character" issues (meaning the licensee was convicted of serious crimes
that were not violations of the license itself). The kid who talked back or got
into a fight at school might find he wasn't allowed to watch TV, even though
the offense had nothing to do with TV. Same principle with FCC licenses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2327. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 01:21:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208202152.12501.00006089@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87054

In article <Qp6dnYqbPaVw0bjdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <kpmdnR8--baOL77dRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Ms Jackson is free to expose
>>>herself under appropriate circumstances. If she wants to do a dance
>>>routine and have Justin Timberlake tear off part of her outfit. That is
>>>also okay - tho she might want to use a less weird presentation.
>>>
>>> There are appropriate television venues for that, such as HBO, Cinemax,

>>>etc. Late night TV kind of stuff.

>>> But not on the super bowl halftime show. Not on Teletubbies or Barney
>>>or Blues Clues or fishing shows. Those just aren't the places for that
>>>sort of thing. Even my favorite, the History channel, has some shows
>>>that deal with sex and show nudity.

>> I gotta get cable...

> Even then, it isn't smarmy stuff.

Dang.

>It's mostly educational, with an
>erotic undertone. It's the sort of thing that even if a youngster were
>to watch it, they wouldn't be affected negatively

Doesn't matter. The point is whether or not the audience knows what to expect.

Last night, the local PBS station showed "Catch-22". More than a little nudity,
sex and violence. But they showed it at 10 PM, with content warnings. Anybody
who might be offended knew *ahead of time* to avoid it. No such warning or
rating on the superbowl.

That's the point that the Toronto Star article completely misses.

>>>They put them on late at night when
>>>the kids are in bed, and any viewing is strictly voluntary. No one harmed.
>>
>> I agree 100%, Mike, but I'd put it this way:
>>
>> The big problem isn't the content but whether it's expected or not when the
>> viewer tunes in. Shows like "Sex in the City" and "Coupling" pretty much

>> tell you what to expect by the name of the show. Other shows have warnings,
>> ratings and writeups in the program guides.
>
> Good point.
>
>> The problem with the "wardrobe malfunction" was that nobody expected it
>> except
>> Ms. Jackson. Yet she will not incur any fine or penalty. That's just wrong.
>
> I'll bet she doesn't get on Prime-time TV without a tape delay, tho'!

So what? She got what she wanted - publicity. A week before the superbowl, who
was even talking about her?
>
>>>Everything in it's time and place, and the superbowl isn't the time or
>>>place IMO.

>> Agreed - particularly without any warning.
>>
>> Some may say this whole thing ahs nothing to do with amateur radio policy,
>>but
>> the exact opposite is true. The big problem with that "wardrobe
>> malfunction"
>> was its unexpected nature. Since amateur radio is unscheduled, crosses
>> time
>> zones and no licensee owns a frequency, the standards of all amateur on-air
>> activity have to be "G-rated".
>
>Agreed! Why some people have a problem understanding that is beyond me.

Me too.

>Everything in moderation

Anything worth doing is worth overdoing

>and in it's time and place. If Janet wants to
>go around with parts hanging out of her clothes, she is welcome to.
>(IMO) As long as as it is in the proper place. Otherwise, keep it clean.
>
Agreed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2328. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 01:21:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208202154.12501.00006090@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87052

In article <402568F3.4000201@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>In article <40240390.9040703@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>>Where did society get the mistaken impression that sex is bad, but
>>>>violence is OK?

>>>Nuns in Catholic grammar school routinely used violence on the kids,

>>"Robert Casey, you bold brazen article, how dare you talk like that!"

>>>but would sure be upset about anything vaguely about sex....

>>In my experience, such things would make them violent. In fact almost
>>anything could make an IHM nun violent. Bunch of nutcases, actually.
>>
>I had anotehr species of nuns in my school. "Sisters of Mercy" IIRC,
>but there was no mercy if you forgot your homework.....

Oyez, they had it down to an art. Grab a bit of a kid's hair and dribble his
head on the slate blackboard was one trick.

I remember one nun who busted an 18 inch wooden ruler beating a kid,
so he had to go to a specific store after school and buy another with his own
money, (they cost about a quarter) and then bring it back the next day so she
could finish beating him with it.
>
>On the first or second day of 1st grade, the nun teacher had to leave our
>classroom for a few minutes. Of course some of us were talking and making
>noise, as small kids will. When she got back, she freaked out. Made the
>kids line up at her desk and punish each one in turn. Must have been 20
>minutes it took to do all 30 something kids.

Only 30 kids in your first grade class? There were 70 (seventy) in mine.

IHM nuns preferred group punishment - keep the whole class after school or such
for the misdeeds of a few. The theory was that the innocent would beat the &^%
out of the offenders after school. Which happened sometimes.
>
>Also on the first day, it was time for lunch, as the nun announced it. So
>I get out my sandwitch and started eating in my desk. Nun freaks.
>How would I know that the school had another room for eating lunch?

Oh man...

>Have heard that teachers nowadays are taught to anticipate kids not
>knowing such things when they start school....

Oh yes, but it's usually not needed, because nowadays most kids have
at least been to kndergarten, and most have been in preschool and day
care since diaper time. So they're more used to the whole concept of school.

But back in those days it was common for a kid to have never set foot in a
school or classroom until the first day of forst grade. I still remember other
kids being terrified. I wasn't - I'd gone to public school kindergarten.

Then I learned how different catholic school was...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2329. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 01:21:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87055

In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>[snip]
>
>> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>access
>> >to
>> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>giving
>> >them
>> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>
>Jim,
>
>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.

Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>
>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.

You're the one willing to share with "a few"....

And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
in the **WRITTEN** test requirements. Yet now I see that same person
supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
tests...

>> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.

>> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>> is there?
>
>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?

Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>>
>> >83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just

>> >don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>> >increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>> >operating in the Extra only segments.
>>
>> Then just leave 'em be!
>
>That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>is unacceptable.

Why?
>
>The FCC wants to simplify -

Says who?

I recall that FCC **REJECTED** the ARRL proposal to free-upgrade Tech Pluses
and Novices to General back in 1998-99. And even though ARRL proposed keeping
the Advanced open, FCC rejected that too.

In fact it was *FCC's* idea to keep the Novice and Advanced as closed-off
license classes, rather than handing out free upgrades.

What has changed in the four years since then that now requires handing out
over 82,000 free passes to Extra, and over 322,000 free passes to General?

>the ARRL wants to create a viable
>entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power limits.

And that part is a good idea! In fact, it's almost identical to what I proposed
here more than 2 years ago. Except I'd require 5 wpm code...

But that doesn't explain the need for over 400,000 free upgrades.

Of course if the Novice is reopened with new HF privs, Tech Pluses should get
those same privs. And if the code test isn't required for "NewNovices", then
Techs should get those same HF privs.
>
>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>comments on the subject on eHam.net

I'll ask again for a link to those comments.

>I (personally, not as NCI)
>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>
Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.

Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and the
new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.

So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes take place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.

I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...

Or maybe someone can repost them here...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2330. Re: New Year's Eve Record Set

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 01:54:14 UTC
From: noname <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a90b24e1077062d989716@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 87056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3FF8B915.5030902@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
> M. Boker wrote:
>
> >Initial assessments from monitoring groups and other observers
> > indicates a record number of pirates, unlicensed broadcasters,
> >& intruders took to the airwaves New Year's Eve and New Year's
> >Day across the U.S.
> >
> >
> Today with the Internet with the World Wide Web, it seems pointless to
> bother with pirate broadcasting. If I had a message I wanted heard (or
> read) I'd set up a web page. If I wanted people to hear my garage band's
> music, I could upload the mp3s to that web page. The web page would
> be available 24/7 world wide. A pirate station will only have a very
> limited
> range and time period, and most people interested in your material would
> miss it.
>
> Add the fact that the pirate station is rather illegal, the web page would
> be the media of choice.

There's something magical about getting on the air for real though. I
can recall jumping at the chance to run a college radio station when I
was younger even though I wasn't a student there. Why did outsiders run
it? Because the students didn't care.

Some friends and I spent three years broadcasting from there. The
experiences could never be duplicated.

Here's a small sampling:

The night security let in the beasts. We kept the studios locked but
they could see us through the studio windows. Grrrr!

The night I managed to lock myself out of the studio as a record was
just ending. Took me a good 4 hours to find a security guy who had a
key.

Having to bring the tools and soldering irons to repair the ancient
Dukane mixing board we had to deal with. Oh, and smelling that telltale
odor that we just smoked something else in the board.

Reverb was created by tuning a portable radio to the same frequency and
placing it at the back of the room on low to medium volume.

Play it backwards? All you needed was a thread spool and a pencil sub.

Doing phase crossovers by messing with the inputs to the preamps.

Digging through the record vault and finding rare old gems, dusting em' off and playing em'.

It was too much fun. Hey, I was all of 21 at the time and it was a hell of alot better than rolling around on the streets.

2331. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 02:16:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <53qd20989dq5nrgq6m97vj7iqfk2kvnubj@4ax.com>
Source record: 87057

On 09 Feb 2004 01:21:52 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>snip
>
>Last night, the local PBS station showed "Catch-22". More than a little nudity,
>sex and violence. But they showed it at 10 PM, with content warnings. Anybody
>who might be offended knew *ahead of time* to avoid it. No such warning or
>rating on the superbowl.
>
>That's the point that the Toronto Star article completely misses.

Jim, my friend, if you had cared to read past the title you may have
noted the other far more important points that the article was
actually making.....

However, if you feel so passionately about this subject and believe
that the material presented was erroneous, please feel free to write
to the Editor at the following address:

lettertoed@thestar.ca

I'm certain that they would publish your perspective on this issue in
the "Letters to the Editor" column.

Or, you could just continue to complain here, in this little
group.......and continue to prove Benford's Law.

Your choice.

73, Leo

2332. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 02:42:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gMGdndgTku8MbrvdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87058

Leo wrote:

> It was pretty accurate and intelligently written, actually! But I
> assume from your statement that it didn't agree with your own
> viewpoint, as it too is "wrong".

I consider the points it makes accurate enough, but it makes glaring errors too.

The biggest one is the comparison between violence and sex. In it's own context, I agree, there is a weirdness about how some of us accept violence, but not sex.

But that ain't the argument.

If she were to become topless as an accident, I'd wager that the event would be a momentary thing to talk about around the water cooler. "That's the hazard of live TV" would be what people would say. "Poor Janet! She must have been mortified!", would be another.

But since the whole thing was planned, and they lied about it afterward, it changes the whole thing around. THAT has no place in a halftime show.

Fact is, the shows have deteriorated in content over the last several years, and a large portion of the audience doesn't like the emerging format. They (we) are complaining, and they (we) have a right to. It really isn't about sex versus violence. I no more want to see trashy, sexually oriented "entertainment" during the superbowl halftime than I want to see people being stabbed or hurt during it, or to have Peter Popoff come out and do faith healing and ask for donations.

And that is why I think the article is way off base.

> I take it you're not a Robbie Burns fan:
>
> "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see oursel's as others see us!"

Sigh.....

2333. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 02:46:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GOmdnXcvuZcZabvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87059

N2EY wrote:

> All that's changed now. Catholic schools are now more like private academies,
> and most of the teachers are lay people because nuns and brothers are too few.

Well DUH, Jim! Since we don't let them beat the kids any more, what fun
is it for them now? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2334. Re: janet jackson to get ham license "K6TIT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 02:54:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4026F665.6030301@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87060

>
>
>
>I remember one nun who busted an 18 inch wooden ruler beating a kid,
>so he had to go to a specific store after school and buy another with his own
>money, (they cost about a quarter) and then bring it back the next day so she
>could finish beating him with it.
>
One of the male nuns was going to hit my hand with the blackboard
pointer. I was
to hold out my hand, but I pulled it away by instinct to avoid getting
hit. He broke it
on the floor. He just let it go at that, as I think he may have thought
he went a hair
too far with this stuff. Not that he dialed it back much.... No he didn't
make me buy another pointer.

>
>
>Oh yes, but it's usually not needed, because nowadays most kids have
>at least been to kndergarten, and most have been in preschool and day
>care since diaper time. So they're more used to the whole concept of school.
>
>But back in those days it was common for a kid to have never set foot in a
>school or classroom until the first day of first grade. I still remember other
>kids being terrified. I wasn't - I'd gone to public school kindergarten.
>
>Then I learned how different catholic school was...
>
I never finished kindergarden myself. Got thrown out of it in 2 weeks.
Was likely
partly that my mom had told me to not do anything a stranger tells me
to. Teacher
was a stranger..... I didn't know what the hell was going on with this
strange
place I got dumped off at one day.

>
>
>
>
>
In later grades (2 to 4 or so) I got placed in the "poor reader" group.
Because
I'd always be losing my place in the reader when it was my turn to read the

next paragraph out of the reading book. Well, who can keep track of this while
several slow kids are slogging thru their paragraphs. I'd get bored and read the
rest of teh story and finish it. And then not know where everyone else is in it.
Teachers never figured this out.

They did have some good stuff. There was this thing called "SRA". Was a box
of about a hundred different short stories and articles. Color coded for level
of difficulty. You'd pull one of your current level and you'd read it and answer
the questions on the back of it by yourself. Pass 5 of these little tests and you
step up one level. Was an open book sort of test where you were allowed and encouraged
to look at the story again as you did the questions. There were about 20 levels.

2335. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 02:57:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5aOdncGrVq2_arvdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87061

N2EY wrote:

> I would point out that *most* kids, beaten or not, will not grow up to be
> serial killers. But the legacy of violence plays out in other ways.

Very true! There have been children that have been abused that turn out fine, and those with tranquil lives that turn out terrible. What the discipline or lack of it will do is bring out latent problems.

The really whacked ones will be that way regardless.

2336. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 03:16:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87062

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

> Jim,
>
> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.

So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
that other Extra's take.

> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.

as are your motives.

>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>>
>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>is there?
>
>
> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
>>
>>Then just leave 'em be!
>
>
> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> is unacceptable.

Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?

> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> limits.

On what relevant statements do you base this?

> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.

As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test requirements, how do you support your rationale?

Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously the answer is yes.

Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified to operate at the level to which they will be advanced?

Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2337. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 03:32:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <g42dnSs0rOOiYrvdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87063

N2EY wrote:

> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>
>>Sohl"
>>
>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>
>>
>>[snip]
>>
>>
>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>>
>>access
>>
>>to
>>
>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>>
>>giving
>>
>>them
>>
>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>
>>Jim,
>>
>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>
>
> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>
>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>
>

> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>
> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements. Yet now I see that same person
> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
> tests...

Technically he's right Jim. He isn't supporting any reduction in the
writtens. He's supporting not having to take a test *at all*. There is a
difference, you know!

>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>
>
>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>>is there?
>>
>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
>
> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>
>>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
>>>
>>>Then just leave 'em be!
>>
>>That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>>is unacceptable.
>
>
> Why?
>
>>The FCC wants to simplify -
>
>
> Says who?
>
> I recall that FCC **REJECTED** the ARRL proposal to free-upgrade Tech Pluses
> and Novices to General back in 1998-99. And even though ARRL proposed keeping
> the Advanced open, FCC rejected that too.
>
> In fact it was *FCC's* idea to keep the Novice and Advanced as closed-off
> license classes, rather than handing out free upgrades.
>
> What has changed in the four years since then that now requires handing out
> over 82,000 free passes to Extra, and over 322,000 free passes to General?
>

>
>>the ARRL wants to create a viable
>>entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power limits.
>
>
> And that part is a good idea! In fact, it's almost identical to what I proposed
> here more than 2 years ago. Except I'd require 5 wpm code...
>
> But that doesn't explain the need for over 400,000 free upgrades.
>
> Of course if the Novice is reopened with new HF privs, Tech Pluses should get
> those same privs. And if the code test isn't required for "NewNovices", then
> Techs should get those same HF privs.
>
>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>>comments on the subject on eHam.net
>
>
> I'll ask again for a link to those comments.

I think that when you scratch the surface of most people that support
reductions in the Morse code testing, you will find that they also
support reduction or elimination of the rest of the testing regimen.
There are exceptions, but they prove the rule IMO.

>
>>I (personally, not as NCI)
>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>>
>
> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.

By golly, that's a lot more high level hams!

> Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
> there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and the
> new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
> they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
>
> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes take
> place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.

Yup!

> I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...

Me too! I want to see if he can convince me of something I'd said I'd
never support!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2338. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 04:54:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 87064

In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>
>> Jim,
>>
>> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.

Only a few?

Fun fact:

When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras, that
is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The more the
merrier - IF they pass the tests.

>So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
>that other Extra's take.

Exactly.

>> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>
> as are your motives.

As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in *our*
sandbox.

>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.

>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>>is there?
>>
>> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?

>>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
>>>
>>>Then just leave 'em be!

>> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>> is unacceptable.
>

> Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?

Good question.
>
>> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
>> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
>> limits.
>
>On what relevant statements do you base this?
>
>> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
>> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>
> As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test
>requirements, how do you support your rationale?
>
> Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously the
>answer is yes.
>
> Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified to
>operate at the level to which they will be advanced?
>
> Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
>come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
>
That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General upgrade.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2339. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 05:20:21 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948A35B9C32Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87065

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
news:pckd201oro8uoes7c1nfsvjm30kflmepst@4ax.com:

> On 8 Feb 2004 18:21:54 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
>>snip
>>>
>>Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to be
>>both a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an American (or
>>a Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada using my US call.
>>
>>The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American
>>with a US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for only
>>2 months within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No WARC
>>bands or 40m for Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian call
>>could operate indefinitely in the US, even living here permanently,
>>under the terms of their Canadian licence (not to exceed Extra).
>
> Not sure if they have changed, Alun - just discovered them when I
> bacame a ham a couple of years ago! The link to the RAC page with
> info on the current reciprocal agreement is:
>
> http://www.rac.ca/regulatory/rcip.htm
>
> and IC RIC-3, which contains the details on the various agreements, US
> and other, is at:
>
> http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/$FI
> LE/ric3.pdf
>
> From what I read in these documents, one need only possess a US
> licence to gain full Canadian privileges appropriate to the licence
> class. For countries other than the US, CEPT and IARP permits are
> acceptable.
>
> Hope that helps!
>
> 73, Leo

I will have a look at those documents, but it would appear to be a change.
I was told by Industry Canada that they would not enforce the citizenship
requirement anyway under the old rules, but I didn't feel very secure to
rely on that!

73, Alun

2340. Re: Can I get my old WN6 call back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 06:10:00 UTC
From: Sofa Slug <sofaslug_SPAMNOT@arts.ucla.edu>
Message-ID: <c0787qnrg1@daisy.noc.ucla.edu>
Source record: 87066

Thanks to Larry and everyone else who responded... I will certainly "Czech" it out :)

-S

> Sofa:
>
> Just plug the old call sign into QRZ.com, and see if it is available. If so,
> you can request it as a Vanity Call Sign. You can find the details on how to
> do that right on that site, or you can Czech out ARRL.org.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2341. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 06:12:11 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948AC24DE453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87067

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
news:pckd201oro8uoes7c1nfsvjm30kflmepst@4ax.com:

> On 8 Feb 2004 18:21:54 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
>>snip
>>>
>>Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to be
>>both a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an American (or
>>a Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada using my US call.
>>
>>The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American
>>with a US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for only
>>2 months within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No WARC
>>bands or 40m for Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian call
>>could operate indefinitely in the US, even living here permanently,
>>under the terms of their Canadian licence (not to exceed Extra).
>
> Not sure if they have changed, Alun - just discovered them when I
> bacame a ham a couple of years ago! The link to the RAC page with
> info on the current reciprocal agreement is:
>
> http://www.rac.ca/regulatory/rcip.htm
>
> and IC RIC-3, which contains the details on the various agreements, US
> and other, is at:
>
> http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/$FI
> LE/ric3.pdf
>
> From what I read in these documents, one need only possess a US
> licence to gain full Canadian privileges appropriate to the licence
> class. For countries other than the US, CEPT and IARP permits are
> acceptable.
>
> Hope that helps!
>
> 73, Leo

The first page talks about 'Americans operating in Canada', but I am not an
American, just someone with a US licence! That is the problem.

Reading further, RIC-2 limits operation under the bilateral agreement to US
citizens who are US residents, just as the previous rules did.

However, in RIC-3 it says that operating in Canada is possible under CEPT.

I cannot use my US licence under CEPT, as the CEPT letter that the FCC publish says that it is only valid for US citizens (I've no idea why, as the CEPT treaty does not mention citizenship anywhere).

However, if I got my UK licence re-activated it would automatically be valid in Canada under CEPT. Someone who wasn't British would still be able to do that, although I am actually a British citizen. I often go across the border to Windsor when I visit Detroit, but I have never operated on the Canadian side. It seems if I did so it would have to be as VE3/G8VUK, after first getting my UK licence back.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2342. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 08:58:11 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c07i32$53c$03$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87068

Hi all, on this thread,

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> Jim,
> >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> Only a few?
> Fun fact:
> When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras,
that
> is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The more
the
> merrier - IF they pass the tests.

You all are on the wrong numbers, as you might recall, that the airwaves wont stop ath the borders of your country. There are already hundrets of thousands HAMS worldwide in "Your Sandbox". Dont you think that beeing a ham requires only some simple testing? It requires GLOBAL THINKING of open minded persons. All what I could read here on this matter is everything else than OPEN MINDED and not a bit of GLOBAL HAM THINKING.

> >So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
> >that other Extra's take.
>
> Exactly.
>
> >> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> >
> > as are your motives.
>
> As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in *our*
> sandbox.

What is "your sandbox"? Where can I make a test to access 40m above 7.100 ? Where can I do the test for usage of 146 - 148 MHz? This is your sandbox, I assume. But all the other Ham frequencies are also the sandbox and playground of all the hams in the world. Their numbers are a lot more than just 100k.

>
> >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.

>
> >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> >>>is there?
> >>
> >> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
> >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
> >>>
> >>>Then just leave 'em be!
>
> >> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> >> is unacceptable.
> >
> > Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?
>
> Good question.
> >
> >> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
> >> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> >> limits.
> >
> >On what relevant statements do you base this?
> >
> >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >
> > As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test
> >requirements, how do you support your rationale?
> >
> > Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously the
> >answer is yes.
> >
> > Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified to
> >operate at the level to which they will be advanced?

Thats the usual procedure in most countries of the globe to make a one shot
exam.
> >
> > Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
> >come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
> >
> That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General upgrade.

Effective after Aug. 15, 2003, this kind of upgrade from non-HF to HF- Hams
has occured after the WRC03 throughout the world. This has been of greatest

benefit to ham radio after its developement. Now as there is young blood on the bands, it will keep the ITU from knibbling on the bands.

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2343. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 12:25:38 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <nmue20hobrk1d2gsk72lvu2pe2h7nj3bqj@4ax.com>
Source record: 87069

On 9 Feb 2004 06:12:11 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
>news:pckd201oro8uoes7c1nfsvjm30kflmepst@4ax.com:
>
>> On 8 Feb 2004 18:21:54 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>>
>>>snip
>>>>
>>>Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to be
>>>both a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an American (or
>>>a Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada using my US call.

>>>
>>>The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American
>>>with a US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for only
>>>2 months within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No WARC
>>>bands or 40m for Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian call
>>>could operate indefinitely in the US, even living here permanently,
>>>under the terms of their Canadian licence (not to exceed Extra).
>>
>> Not sure if they have changed, Alun - just discovered them when I
>> bacame a ham a couple of years ago! The link to the RAC page with
>> info on the current reciprocal agreement is:
>>
>> http://www.rac.ca/regulatory/rcip.htm
>>
>> and IC RIC-3, which contains the details on the various agreements, US
>> and other, is at:
>>
>> http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/$FI
>> LE/ric3.pdf
>>
>> From what I read in these documents, one need only possess a US
>> licence to gain full Canadian privileges appropriate to the licence
>> class. For countries other than the US, CEPT and IARP permits are
>> acceptable.
>>
>> Hope that helps!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>The first page talks about 'Americans operating in Canada', but I am not an
>American, just someone with a US licence! That is the problem.
>

>Reading further, RIC-2 limits operation under the bilateral agreement to US
>citizens who are US residents, just as the previous rules did.

You're right - I missed that completely. I should have looked it up
RIC-2 as well, I suppose!

>
>However, in RIC-3 it says that operating in Canada is possible under CEPT.
>
>I cannot use my US licence under CEPT, as the CEPT letter that the FCC
>publish says that it is only valid for US citizens (I've no idea why, as
>the CEPT treaty does not mention citizenship anywhere).
>
>However, if I got my UK licence re-activated it would automatically be
>valid in Canada under CEPT. Someone who wasn't British would still be able
>to do that, although I am actually a British citizen. I often go across the
>border to Windsor when I visit Detroit, but I have never operated on the
>Canadian side. It seems if I did so it would have to be as VE3/G8VUK, after
>first getting my UK licence back.

Which seems like a pretty cumbersome process - I wonder why the
citizenship rules were placed in the US/Canada agreement? One would
think that the licence would be sufficient to prove competence, and
residency to prove QTH...

>
>73 de Alun, N3KIP

73, Leo

2344. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 12:46:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40278119.268BD35@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87070

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> > In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> [snip]
>
> > >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
> access
> > >to
> > >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
> giving
> > >them
> > >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>
> Jim,
>
> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.

That's awfully big of you, Carl.

> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.

Ah, but it IS his sandbox. It is also MY sandbox and, through a
lowering of the qualifications for obtaining an Extra class license, it
happens to be your sandbox.

> > >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >
> > If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> > is there?
>
> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?

Why should anyone obtain an upgrade without testing?

> > >83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> > >don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> > >increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> > >operating in the Extra only segments.
> >
> > Then just leave 'em be!

>
> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> is unacceptable.

How so and to whom?

> The FCC wants to simplify -

Really?

> the ARRL wants to create a viable
> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> limits.
>
> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.

So a "gimme" for tens of thousands is what makes sense to you, huh?
You've often written of morse tests as hoops and hazing, preventing
"otherwise qualified" people from entering amateur radio. You vowed that
you'd never support a watering down of written tests. Now you are
supporting a freebie for these thousands of "otherwise qualified"
individuals. "Otherwise qualified" must mean those people who can't
pass a required examination.

> YM will, of course V ...

I don't know about mileage, but my views certainly differs from yours.

Dave K8MN

2345. Re: Sorry! 8411

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 13:05:25 UTC
From: WA3MOJ@none.com
Message-ID: <20040209080525.171$PO@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87071

The spam bots say thank you for the food.

test@test.com wrote:
> Sorry sir!
> I'm a student now.I have a studying about Spam Mail issuse
> case.Therefore I need more and more spam mail for this study.
>
> s1@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s2@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s3@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s4@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s5@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s6@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s7@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s8@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s9@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s10@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s11@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s12@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s13@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s14@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s15@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s16@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s17@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s18@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s19@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s20@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s21@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s22@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s23@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s24@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s25@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s26@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s27@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s28@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s29@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s30@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s31@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s32@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s33@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s34@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s35@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s36@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s37@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw

> s38@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s39@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s40@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s41@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s42@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s43@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s44@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s45@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s46@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s47@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s48@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s49@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw
> s50@spam.mis.stu.edu.tw

--
Build your own amp.
http://electronickits.com/kit/plans/cbradio/cbradio.htm

2346. Re: ORDERS TO AKC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 14:14:45 UTC
From: WA3MOJ@none.com
Message-ID: <20040209091445.207$iE@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

N8WWM - aka- markiezaqueen@ikillclowns.com (AKC SLAPS PACETRONICS HARD!)
wrote:
> Lancer <lancer@rock..com> wrote in message
> news:<mphb209l4212qqcq45lmc94snkvrgfs0p8@4ax.com>...
> > On 7 Feb 2004 00:16:29 -0800, keyklownslappa@yahoo.com (PACETRONIC
> > SLAPPA!) wrote:
> >
> > >Rat out 20 auctions daily...And keep track of them by auction number.
> > >Report all 20 daily in this NG. Let the dick eaters know we mean it.
> > >
> > >Someone take on Yahoo and keep pounding. We WILL win.
> > >
> > >"20 auctions a day keeps fagboys at bay"
> >
> > Ok, where is your list of 20 from yesterday, and the 20 from today.
> > Or were you just talking out your ass again?
>
> I was talking to see which of the cum eating gay slut crack addicted
> cumholes in here would pry their hands off the pipe long enouh to run
> their gay whore lips. You win, cock muncher.
>
What is wrong with you Doug? All of your posts contain gay references.

--
No Code Techs are really just CBer's in drag.

2347. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 14:33:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402090633.3f2b1d3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87073

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c07i32$53c$03$1@news.t-online.com>...
> Hi all, on this thread,

Hello!
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> Jim,
> > >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> > Only a few?
> > Fun fact:
> > When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras,
> that
> > is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The more
> the
> > merrier - IF they pass the tests.
>
> You all are on the wrong numbers, as you might recall, that the airwaves
> wont stop ath the borders of your country.

The "others" I wrote of above are other US Amateur Extra licensees.

> There are already hundrets of
> thousands HAMS worldwide in "Your Sandbox".

It's not my sandbox. It's our sandbox. And all who can pass the
required
tests are welcome! Not just "a few".

> Dont you think that beeing a ham
> requires only some simple testing?

Yes! The tests for a US license are very simple, yet some people want
them
to be even more simple. I don't think that's a good idea.

> It requires GLOBAL THINKING of open
> minded persons. All what I could read here on this matter is everything else
> than OPEN MINDED and not a bit of GLOBAL HAM THINKING.

Most of what is discussed here is amateur radio policy in the USA.
That's simply a result of it being US based and in English.

> > >So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
> > >that other Extra's take.
> >
> > Exactly.
> >
> > >> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> > >
> > > as are your motives.
> >
> > As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in *our*
> > sandbox.
>
> What is "your sandbox"?

I don't have one!

> Where can I make a test to access 40m above 7.100 ?

Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.

The reason hams in Regions 1 and 3 don't have 7.100-7.300 is that
their
governments wanted that spectrum for shortwave broacasting in 1938.
It's
not the fault of hams or governments in Region 2.

> Where can I do the test for usage of 146 - 148 MHz?

Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.

> This is your sandbox, I
> assume.

Not mine. Ours.

> But all the other Ham frequencies are also the sandbox and
> playground of all the hams in the world. Their numbers are a lot more than
> just 100k.

And they're all welcome. But how many of them are actually using, say,
7.000 to 7.025?
>
> > >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >
> > >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> > >>>is there?
> > >>
> > >> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> > >> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >
> > >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> > >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> > >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> > >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.

> > >>>
> > >>>Then just leave 'em be!
>
> > >> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> > >> is unacceptable.
> > >
> > > Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?
> >
> > Good question.
> > >
> > >> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
> > >> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> > >> limits.
> > >
> > >On what relevant statements do you base this?
> > >
> > >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> > >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> > >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> > >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> > >
> > > As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test
> > >requirements, how do you support your rationale?
> > >
> > > Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously the
> > >answer is yes.
> > >
> > > Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified to
> > >operate at the level to which they will be advanced?
>
> Thats the usual procedure in most countries of the globe to make a one shot
> exam.

That's not the case in the USA. We have several classes of license,
with a very
easy and simple exam for the limited-privileges licenses and a more
advanced exam for the full-privileges license. By the standards of
most of the rest of
the world, the USA exams are very easy.

What is being discussed in this thread is a proposal that would give
more privileges to many with limited-privileges license *without* any
more tests.
I think that's a bad idea.
> > >
> > > Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
> > >come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
> > >
> > That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General upgrade.
>
> Effective after Aug. 15, 2003, this kind of upgrade from non-HF to HF- Hams

> has occured after the WRC03 throughout the world.

Are you talking about the code test? We're talking about the *written*
tests.

> This has been of greatest
> benefit to ham radio after its developement. Now as there is young blood on
> the bands, it will keep the ITU from knibbling on the bands.

How much difference has it really made?

How many countries have changed their rules?

How many new hams have gotten on the air since those changes?

How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
period of time before the changes?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2348. Re: N8WWM A hero to all honest men

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:00:37 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <63c6b2f77ac6636921678eb07343a3d2@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87074
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 9 Feb 2004 01:22:51 -0800, markiezaqueen@ikillclowns.com (AKC SLAPS PACETRONICS HARD!) wrote:

>Burke N. Hare <postmaster@bogg.dynu.com> hid behind anonyminity
>because he KNOWS what I would do to him, and faggotedly mewled like
>the cum hole he is in
>news:4MWJM7XI38025.7873842593@bogg.dynu.com:
>
>Fat Doglass you are not concerned with legal
>and lawful compliance. Your squeeze Crisco cathy is a felon. You
>were busted by the fcc. Fat homely hypocrite.
>
>
>None of the 3 statements you made are true:
>
>1.My wife is not and has not been an accountant, ever. I appreciate
>the fact that your cum hole fag ass needs SOMETHING to try out on me,
>or rather people close to me. You cum eaters are in such pain from the
>AKC that anything that even would suggest some negative information is
>going to be used. Bravo. HARDEEHARRHARRHARR! LIFE IS GOOD FOR ME! You
>have blanks in your six shooter. In fact, you are a moron for taking a
>6 shooter to a session of playing the dozens. Keep it up though. I am
>hiding a terrible bunch of secrets...My parents never got divorced, I
>aint never been to jail, and the biggest darkest one...I aint never
>sucked a dick, like you do daily. Ding! Thanks for playing.
>
>2. I have never been busted by the FCC for anything. You need to read
>up a bit, cumhole. You faggot asses are the slutboys who worry about
>the FCC, not me. HARDEEHARRHARRHARR! LIFE IS GOOD FOR ME!
>
>3. My height/weight are pretty proportionate. Ask someone who knows
>me. There are several on here. I am not homely, in fact I am quite
>appealing to women. I have my original teeth, I don't smell like a
>pigs ass, and my mind is 100% functional (unlike you in all cases
>there). There is no hypocrisy involved at all here. You cumhole faggot
>ass punks can't take the AKC whuppin' your ass over and over. You
>search in vain or in fake/erroneous information for ANYTHING you can
>find to disparge us, to no avail. The hypocrisy is from your faggot
>cumhole mouth, and it shows in your fear of stepping out and saying
>the shit you say publicly. Notice that I don't hide a friggin' thing.
>HARDEEHARRHARRHARR! LIFE IS GOOD FOR ME!
>
>4. http://www.geocities.com/keyklownslappa/index.html?1075823179430

>A new page will go up with a similar QSL card each time one of your
>asshole buddies goes down. It will be often. All you faggots do is
>reinforce the idea that you are cowardly cum sucking cock sucker boys,
>so we will beat you even harder now. HARDEEHARRHARRHARR! LIFE IS GOOD
>FOR ME!
>
>
>Call me anything you want, say anything you want. Whoopie fukkin doo.
>Your slut cumhole faggot ass aint got the balls to do anything else
>but hide behind a keyboard. Your whole existence in the communications
>world depends on your ability to hide. So, fuck you, asswipe...DING!
>Thanks for playing. Next contestant?? HARDEEHARRHARRHARR! LIFE IS GOOD
>FOR ME!
>
>Care to do anything else?
>
>PS Your ole lady and rover...heheheh

2349. Re: DAVEMADE, BILLS 2 WAY next in the AKC rat-out pipeline!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:01:29 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <43487b62d5868dec667a76c305ca4333@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 09 Feb 2004 07:42:30 -0600, Duke Of Windsor <duke@hen.com>
wrote:

>WA3MOJ@none.com wrote in news:20040209072110.106$dz@newsreader.com:
>
>> N8WWM (AKC SLAPS PACETRONICS HARD!) wrote:
>>> WA3MOJ@none.com wrote in message
>>> news:<20040208205930.974$Fb@newsreader.com>...
>>> > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>>> > > BELIEVE it.
>>> > >
>>> > > PACETRONICS went down.
>>> > >
>>> > > More will soon.
>>> > >
>>> > > The goal is a world without KEYCLOWNS.
>>> > >
>>> > > It CAN happen.
>>> > >
>>> > I've always heard good things about Bills 2 way for CB gear.
>>>
>>> Who gives a shit...he deserves it for amps.
>>>
>> Find another hobby you repeater jamming, felony living freak!
>
>
>Easy Moped, Curt will have to spank you agin.

2350. Re: CoaxLengthPolice declares jihad on truckers dicks with his lips

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:02:03 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <fec1f826a0a24e021d6b268a47dec350@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87076
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 9 Feb 2004 01:53:18 -0800, markiezaqueen@ikillclowns.com (AKC SLAPS PACETRONICS HARD!) wrote:

>coaxlengthpolice@aol.com (CoaxLengthPolice) wrote in message news:<20040208185447.22897.00001763@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> And my lips spent their entire weekend wrapped around penises! All too
>> fucking funny to look at my jizz encrusted lips! Did
>> they make a difference at the truckstop? Yep. Do they feel better after using
>> them on 75 truck drivers this weekend? OH YEAH!!!
>
>"Section 2.815(b) of the Commission's Rules prohibits the marketing
>of External Radio Frequency Power Amplifiers (or amplifier kits)
>capable of operation on any frequency or frequencies between 24 and 35
>MHz."

2351. Re: A good site for illegal fags like you

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:02:43 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <a70c8055bad5b0fb8f5c35e2d62ac9f5@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87077
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 9 Feb 2004 01:45:11 -0800, markiezaqueen@ikillclowns.com (AKC SLAPS PACETRONICS HARD!) wrote:

>coaxlengthpolice@aol.com (CoaxLengthPolice) wrote in message news:<20040208200039.17130.00001724@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> http://www.bills2way.com/equip/10meter.html
>
>
>He will be ratted out for the amps and export rigs. Watch. He is going down!

2352. Re: Cry On Your Ass Juice Stained Pillow, Steve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:03:20 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <c431bd9548829853ac8c6d1d72ba0665@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 9 Feb 2004 06:35:27 GMT, Steve Parks <moparholic@hotmail.com>
wrote:

>like the fag baby you are.
>
>
>

2353. Re: N8WWM live-in a felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:04:15 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <7db536322098f2288487d1e3b88639fc@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 08 Feb 2004 22:07:41 -0600, Duke Of Windsor <duke@hen.com>
wrote:

>WA3MOJ@none.com wrote in news:20040208192401.298$fU@newsreader.com:
>
>> Steve Parks wrote it <duke@hen.com> wrote:
>>> Burke N. Hare <postmaster@bogg.dynu.com> wrote in
>>> news:4MWJM7XI38025.7873842593@bogg.dynu.com:
>>>
>>> Fat Doglass you are not concerned with legal
>>> > and lawful compliance. Your squeeze Crisco cathy is a felon. You were
>>> > busted by the fcc. Fat homely hypocrite.
>>>
>>> Nice Post Steve Parks.
>>>
>> Who's that?
>>
>
>You

2354. Re: Cranus the Anus hides from the truth, proving his faggotness.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:06:21 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <773c272a984cd28798e9fa11ab3018ab@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87080
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 8 Feb 2004 08:59:55 -0800, keyklownslappa@yahoo.com (PACETRONIC SLAPPA!) wrote:

>Come on faggotboy, speak up. I will throw in a bonus if you do. I will
>let you lick out my toilet bowl.
>
>Asslicker and doggie dick deep throater Cranus the Anus, who can't do
>anything about the AKC, says this...
>
>> > >
>> > > Sorry, but amplifiers are not illegal. Only certain uses of amplifiers
>> > > are illegal. Don't you know anything? You been around DouGay and
>> > > Georgie-girl too long!
>> BTW, it is not illegal to discuss amplifiers. It is not illegal to
>> possess amplifiers. It > may < (depending on the particular
>> circumstances) be illegal to use amplifiers. However, ALL amplifiers
>> are not illegal, which is what you try to make us believe. You're
>> wrong; same as you were wrong about "ALL 10 meter radios are illegal".
>
>The FCC says THIS:
>
>"Section 2.815(b) of the Commission's Rules prohibits the marketing
>of External Radio Frequency Power Amplifiers (or amplifier kits)
>capable of operation on any frequency or frequencies between 24 and 35
>MHz."
>
>This quote is from the letter sent to your faggot shithunk asswipes at
>Pacetronics, who we brought down by providing necessary data to
>various government agencies.
>
>Since we know cranus the cum eating anus aint any part of the law...I
>would GUESS that the legally constituted LAW of this country is not
>the liar here.
>
>If you are a cum eating faggot keyclown who WISHES your heroine was
>right, you may delusionally believe differently.
>
>It is OK to have any belief you wish...

2355. Re: ChukkeeSukkee, pussyboy admitted faggot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:07:27 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <0ac56ab1c2d83bd87b8c881a9f208320@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87081
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 7 Feb 2004 11:56:42 -0800, keyklownslappa@yahoo.com (PACETRONIC SLAPPA!) wrote:

>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html

2356. Re: Cranus the anus LIES, while seeking human sperm to eat

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 15:08:19 UTC
From: redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com>
Message-ID: <04bcab9ceffc1d148162c15efca1dc73@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 7 Feb 2004 00:02:12 -0800, keyklownslappa@yahoo.com (PACETRONIC SLAPPA!) wrote:

>Proof that cranus the cum eating anus is a lying piece of shit:
>
>"Section 2.815(b) of the Commission's Rules prohibits the marketing
>of External Radio Frequency Power Amplifiers (or amplifier kits)
>capable of operation on any frequency or frequencies between 24 and 35
>MHz."
>
>This taken from the text of the FCC citation given to Pacetronics.
>
>What else is necessary to show Cranus the Anus is a lying shit hunk
>with sperm on his cum soaked face?
>
>He is just a stupid ass nut washing gay faggot praying to make it not
>be so by repetition of a lie!

2357. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 16:57:02 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>
Source record: 87083

On Sun, 08 Feb 2004 21:42:25 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> It was pretty accurate and intelligently written, actually! But I
>> assume from your statement that it didn't agree with your own
>> viewpoint, as it too is "wrong".
>
> I consider the points it makes accurate enough, but it makes glaring
>errors too.
>
> The biggest one is the comparison between violence and sex. In it's own
>context, I agree, there is a weirdness about how some of us accept
>violence, but not sex.
>
> But that ain't the argument.
>
> If she were to become topless as an accident, I'd wager that the event
>would be a momentary thing to talk about around the water cooler.
>"That's the hazard of live TV" would be what people would say. "Poor
>Janet! She must have been mortified!", would be another.
>
> But since the whole thing was planned, and they lied about it
>afterward, it changes the whole thing around. THAT has no place in a
>halftime show.

Agreed. But it just ain't that big a deal. And to listen to people
like Spike Lee deriding the incident as possibly the worst thing that
has ever happened in the entertainment biz is absolutely imbecilic,
given the content of some of his own productions. But. these guys
know where the money comes from and how to stay on the right side of
public opinion.

Personally, I'd consider Kid Rock's treatment of the flag far more
disrespectful and tasteless - yet that got hardly any press at all. Or
the lyrics to some of the award-winning rap music - plenty of hate in
there....and racism, and violence, and immorality. But, they give
performers like Eminem big awards and big bucks to spread their
sinister messages of hate and apathy to our kids - and get big-time
upset over a televised breast, as if that would cause irreprable harm
to their young psyches and moral character. That's just stupid.

>
> Fact is, the shows have deteriorated in content over the last several

>years, and a large portion of the audience doesn't like the emerging
>format. They (we) are complaining, and they (we) have a right to. It
>really isn't about sex versus violence. I no more want to see trashy,
>sexually oriented "entertainment" during the superbowl halftime than I
>want to see people being stabbed or hurt during it, or to have Peter
>Popoff come out and do faith healing and ask for donations.

I'd prefer that they drop the entire halftime big talent show
entirely. Remember when the SuperBowl was all about the game? We can
thank our media friends for trying to jazz it up to appeal to the
largest number of viewers possible, in an effort to boost advertizing
revenues.

Now, because of this incident, broadcasters are installing tape delay
equipment to ensure that inappropriate things are not aired. This is
not being done for the benefit of the public good, mind you - it is
being done so as to placate the advertizers, so that they don't end up
on the wrong side of public opinion and lose market share - and keep
those big bucks coming in.....

Even the FCC has ruled that profanity is OK on broadcast services. Is
this not more repugnant than a breast? Hmmmm. Nice value system.

Where was the outcry a few years ago when Bono let loose a string of
expletives on the Grammys? That was at least an order of magnitude
worse than a televised breast, and a lot harder to explain to the
kids....where were the 7-second tape delays and prophesies of the end
of his career? But hey, there were no nasty body parts involved, so
that was OK.....

>
> And that is why I think the article is way off base.

Not sure that I agree, Mike - the point was, the breast thing was just
not that big a deal. There are far worse things that society should
be concerned about - one need only look to the movies, video games or
even network TV to see that although sex has been somewhat removed
from our kids view, an incredible amount of graphic violence is pumped
out at them on a daily basis. That ain't good - and the impact on
society is well documented. All too frequently. With tragic results.

>
>
>> I take it you're not a Robbie Burns fan:
>>
>> "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
>> To see oursel's as others see us!"
>
> Sigh.....

'Tis true, though - however difficult it may be.

73, Leo

2358. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 16:58:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209115844.22081.00003972@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87084

In article <4026F665.6030301@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>One of the male nuns was going to hit my hand with the blackboard
>pointer. I was
>to hold out my hand, but I pulled it away by instinct to avoid getting
>hit. He broke it
>on the floor. He just let it go at that, as I think he may have thought
>he went a hair
>too far with this stuff. Not that he dialed it back much.... No he didn't
>make me buy another pointer.

Typical. Parochial school did more to create millions of excatholics....

>>Oh yes, but it's usually not needed, because nowadays most kids have
>>at least been to kndergarten, and most have been in preschool and day
>>care since diaper time. So they're more used to the whole concept of school.
>>
>>But back in those days it was common for a kid to have never set foot in a
>>school or classroom until the first day of first grade. I still remember
>>other
>>kids being terrified. I wasn't - I'd gone to public school kindergarten.
>>
>>Then I learned how different catholic school was...
>>
>I never finished kindergarden myself. Got thrown out of it in 2 weeks.
> Was likely
>partly that my mom had told me to not do anything a stranger tells me
>to. Teacher
>was a stranger..... I didn't know what the hell was going on with this
>strange
>place I got dumped off at one day.
>
HAW!!

>In later grades (2 to 4 or so) I got placed in the "poor reader" group.
> Because
>I'd always be losing my place in the reader when it was my turn to read the
>next paragraph out of the reading book. Well, who can keep track of
>this while
>several slow kids are slogging thru their paragraphs. I'd get bored and
>read the
>rest of teh story and finish it. And then not know where everyone else
>is in it. Teachers never figured this out.

Had several nuns whose idea of "teaching" was to simply have a kid read from the textbook. At any moment, Sister Mary Elephant would call out another kid's name and if the kid didn't pick up on the very next word, he'd get a beating. We became quite good at following along and daydreaming at the same time.
>
>They did have some good stuff. There was this thing called "SRA". Was
>a box
>of about a hundred different short stories and articles. Color coded
>for level
>of difficulty. You'd pull one of your current level and you'd read it
>and answer
>the questions on the back of it by yourself. Pass 5 of these little
>tests and you
>step up one level. Was an open book sort of test where you were allowed
>and encouraged
>to look at the story again as you did the questions. There were about
>20 levels.
>
I remember that! By 5th grade they'd run out of levels for me. I'd do 3 or 4 in the time it took most of the rest of the kids to do one. And since you could look back and check you answers, it was a cinch.

--

Another trick was that you never wanted your folks to find out when you got beaten at school, because they'd give you more of the same at home, and a lecture about how those blessed nuns had sacrificed their lives to teach you ungrateful kids, etc. Well, we never asked 'em to.

Those were the bad old days.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2359. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 17:22:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>
Source record: 87085

On 08 Feb 2004 18:49:36 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>snip
>
> Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.

....That line still makes me laugh every time I read it!

I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
better than voice. Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded. From the experimenting
(read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
on it.....

Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
lazy - like me) :)

I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
there must have been similar narrowband technologies used by the
military which predated it - any idea what they were?

>
> LHA / WMD
>

73, Leo

2360. Re: Asshole N4CND loses wife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 17:25:22 UTC
From: edo <nobody@cryptorebels.net>
Message-ID: <16006dd8edb7b90aae5afca0c95d0dfa@cryptorebels.net>
Source record: 87086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

In article <R8tVb.26928$qK3.15478@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote:
>
>
> http://profiles.yahoo.com/dr_oris

Poor WHORASS, I guess his hag of a wife got fed up with him
sexually abusing Shelby and Michelle........

2361. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 17:32:42 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c08g7k$f4$04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87087

Hi, Jim,

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:c2356669.0402090633.3f2b1d3a@posting.google.com...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c07i32$53c$03$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > Hi all, on this thread,
>
> Hello!
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > news:20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > > In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >> Jim,
> > > >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> > > > Only a few?
> > > > Fun fact:
> > > > When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras,
> > that
> > > > is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The
more
> > the
> > > > merrier - IF they pass the tests.
> >
> > You all are on the wrong numbers, as you might recall, that the airwaves
> > wont stop ath the borders of your country.
>
> The "others" I wrote of above are other US Amateur Extra licensees.

HF-Bands are not only for EXTRA licensed hams from the US, and the
expression "SANDBOX" means the whole spectrum accessible for radio amateurs
all over the world. In the process of restructuring after WRC03 zillion of
hams will be able to enter this spectrum. Most of them did not pass the "US
GOLD CARD EXTRA" tests. They are given full HF privileges by the
authorities. This will also occur in the United States in the near future.
Do you realy think, your authority will step back from their voting at
WRC03? Do you think they want to loose their face towards those other
countries they were partnering at the WRC03?

They all are your fellow hams. Your friends, buddies, pals, or fellas. Why
don't you try to do the same, as the rest of the worlds hams are doing to

their hamfriends, stepping up now into the heaven of ham radio? Welcome them, elmer them, if you think they are not skilled enough, and give them the feeling of beeing welcome in your part of the spectrum. Exept in the US and a few other countries, you can tell the license class from the callsign. From all the others around the globe you cannot tell, if they've got their HF-privileges after the WRC without passing a test. What will your reaction be? "Go home, this is MY PARTof the spectrum"? There will be poor operational skills around for a while. Just recall YOUR first months of HF-operation. No master ever fell out of the blue sky, they all had to take their lesson and do her homework and practice.

Beeing a ham worldwide includes to be:
CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the pleasure of others.
LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in the United States is represented nationally and internationally.

PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient station and operation above reproach.

FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.

BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to family, job, school or community.

PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and community.

--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928. Nowadays there has to be added: global thinking

> Most of what is discussed here is amateur radio policy in the USA.

> That's simply a result of it being US based and in English.

And concerning this newsgroup as to be US-based and written in english language is not protecting you of beeing a ham. Act like, speak like and write like it is to the honor of amateur radio.

> > > >So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
> > > >that other Extra's take.

I've heard the same song across the bands after they dropped the CW-test to 5wpm. Did it help anything? Your authority ignored it. Do you think they did change their habit to please 10 percent of the american hams?

> > >
> > > Exactly.
> > >
> > > >> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.

> > > >
> > > > as are your motives.
> > >
> > > As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in
our
> > > sandbox.
> >
> > What is "your sandbox"?
>
> I don't have one!
>
> > Where can I make a test to access 40m above 7.100 ?
>
> Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
>
> The reason hams in Regions 1 and 3 don't have 7.100-7.300 is that
> their
> governments wanted that spectrum for shortwave broacasting in 1938.
> It's not the fault of hams or governments in Region 2.

You are right on this. It will get regulated after 2007 when the 40m
allocation will be 7000 - 7200 exclusive for all hams worldwide. This was
also concluded in Geneva.

> > Where can I do the test for usage of 146 - 148 MHz?
>
> Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
>
> > This is your sandbox, I
> > assume.
>
> Not mine. Ours.
>
> > But all the other Ham frequencies are also the sandbox and
> > playground of all the hams in the world. Their numbers are a lot more
than
> > just 100k.
>
> And they're all welcome. But how many of them are actually using, say,
> 7.000 to 7.025?
> >
> > > >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >
> > > >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> > > >>>is there?
> > > >>
> > > >> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> > > >> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >
> > > >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> > > >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable

> > > >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> > > >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>Then just leave 'em be!
> >
> > > >> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> > > >> is unacceptable.
> > > >
> > > > Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?
> > >
> > > Good question.
> > > >
> > > >> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
> > > >> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> > > >> limits.
> > > >
> > > >On what relevant statements do you base this?
> > > >
> > > >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> > > >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> > > >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> > > >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> > > >
> > > > As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test
> > > >requirements, how do you support your rationale?
> > > >
> > > > Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously
the
> > > >answer is yes.
> > > >
> > > > Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified
to
> > > >operate at the level to which they will be advanced?
> >
> > Thats the usual procedure in most countries of the globe to make a one
shot
> > exam.
>
>
> That's not the case in the USA. We have several classes of license,
> with a very easy and simple exam for the limited-privileges licenses and a
more
> advanced exam for the full-privileges license. By the standards of
> most of the rest of the world, the USA exams are very easy.
>
> What is being discussed in this thread is a proposal that would give
> more privileges to many with limited-privileges license *without* any
> more tests. I think that's a bad idea.

> > > >
> > > > Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
> > > >come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
> > > >
> > > That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General
upgrade.
> >
> > Effective after Aug. 15, 2003, this kind of upgrade from non-HF to HF-
Hams
> > has occured after the WRC03 throughout the world.
>
> Are you talking about the code test? We're talking about the *written*
> tests.
>
> > This has been of greatest
> > benefit to ham radio after its developement. Now as there is young blood
on
> > the bands, it will keep the ITU from knibbling on the bands.
>
> How much difference has it really made?
>
> How many countries have changed their rules?
>
> How many new hams have gotten on the air since those changes?
>
> How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
> period of time before the changes?

Jim, it is not the difference in numbers, it is just the fact, that it
happend. Give yourself the cream upon the cake and think positive about the
new situation. Showing anger and agressiv language against those beeing a
"victim" of the restructuring process doesn't bring any good to the ham
family. Not in your country, and not around the world. And where we cannot
do anything against it, it's not worth to argue about it. It is NOT
negotiable.

Here in Europe, we even did'nt have the time to try negotiating. The
authorities of the various countries just signed the bill and thats it. Your
FCC should do the same. This would save you all here on this thread a lot of
nerves.
>

God bless, stay calm, and have a nice week

73 de OE8SOQ

Helmut

ps: meet me on echolink node # 107658 if you would like to talk.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2362. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 17:55:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209125503.22081.00003973@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87088

In article <53qd20989dq5nrgq6m97vj7iqfk2kvnubj@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 09 Feb 2004 01:21:52 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>snip
>>
>>Last night, the local PBS station showed "Catch-22". More than a little
>nudity,
>>sex and violence. But they showed it at 10 PM, with content warnings.
>Anybody
>>who might be offended knew *ahead of time* to avoid it. No such warning or
>>rating on the superbowl.
>>
>>That's the point that the Toronto Star article completely misses.
>
>Jim, my friend, if you had cared to read past the title you may have
>noted the other far more important points that the article was
>actually making.....

I read the whole article. The author missed the most important point of the
whole wardrobe malfunction. Muddle-headed thinking on his part. Just my
opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2363. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 17:55:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209125505.22081.00003974@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87089

In article <g42dnSs0rOOiYrvdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>>
>>>Sohl"
>>>
>>>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>
>>>[snip]
>>>
>>>
>>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>>>
>>>access
>>>
>>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>>>
>>>giving
>>>
>>>>>them
>>>>
>>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>>
>>>Jim,
>>>
>>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>>
>>
>> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>>

>>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>>
>>
>> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>>
>> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements. Yet now I see that same person
>> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
>> tests...
>
> Technically he's right Jim. He isn't supporting any reduction in the
>writtens. He's supporting not having to take a test *at all*. There is a
>difference, you know!

No there isn't.

Eliminating something is the same as reducing it to zero. The free upgrades
simply reduce the testing required for the upgrade to zero. Still a reduction.
>
>>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>>
>>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>>>is there?
>>>
>>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>>>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>>
>> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>>
>>>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>>>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>>>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>>>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
>>>>
>>>>Then just leave 'em be!
>>>
>>>That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>>>is unacceptable.
>>
>> Why?
>>
>>>The FCC wants to simplify -
>>
>> Says who?
>>
>> I recall that FCC **REJECTED** the ARRL proposal to free-upgrade Tech
>Pluses
>> and Novices to General back in 1998-99. And even though ARRL proposed
>keeping
>> the Advanced open, FCC rejected that too.
>>

>> In fact it was *FCC's* idea to keep the Novice and Advanced as closed-off
>> license classes, rather than handing out free upgrades.
>>
>> What has changed in the four years since then that now requires handing out
>> over 82,000 free passes to Extra, and over 322,000 free passes to General?
>>
>>
>>>the ARRL wants to create a viable
>>>entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power limits.
>>
>>
>> And that part is a good idea! In fact, it's almost identical to what I
>proposed
>> here more than 2 years ago. Except I'd require 5 wpm code...
>>
>> But that doesn't explain the need for over 400,000 free upgrades.
>>
>> Of course if the Novice is reopened with new HF privs, Tech Pluses should
>get
>> those same privs. And if the code test isn't required for "NewNovices",
>then
>> Techs should get those same HF privs.
>>
>>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>>>comments on the subject on eHam.net
>>
>>
>> I'll ask again for a link to those comments.

Please?
>
>
> I think that when you scratch the surface of most people that support
>reductions in the Morse code testing, you will find that they also
>support reduction or elimination of the rest of the testing regimen.
>There are exceptions, but they prove the rule IMO.

I disagree! I think many if not most anticodetest folks just want the code test
to go away. Frankly, I'm surprised that Carl has changed his tune so
completely.

>>>I (personally, not as NCI)
>>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>>
>> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
>> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
>
> By golly, that's a lot more high level hams!

Bingo.
>
>> Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
>> there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and
>the
>> new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
>> they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
>>
>> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes
>take
>> place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>
> Yup!
>
>> I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...
>
>Me too! I want to see if he can convince me of something I'd said I'd
>never support!

I can see some possibilities:

- Free upgrading Techs would mean a lot more hams with HF, which is a big
arguing point against BPL

- Possible recruiting tool for ARRL ("look what we got you!")

- Less work for VECs (NCVEC is always complaining - see their comments.)

- (the big one): The ARRL proposal dumps Element 1 for all but Extra.
Supporting it gets Carl and NCI most of what they want in the codetest area.
And maybe the FCC will dump Element 1 for Extra too....

I'd really like to see the link. Looked around eham but can't find the comments
mentioned.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2364. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 17:55:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209125506.22081.00003975@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87090

In article <40278119.268BD35@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> > In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>> Sohl"
>> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >
>> [snip]
>>
>> > >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>> access
>> > >to
>> > >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>> giving
>> > >them
>> > >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>
>> Jim,
>>
>> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>
>That's awfully big of you, Carl.

I haven't heard Carl on the lowest 25 of 80, 40, 20 or 15. Have you, Dave?
>
>> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>
>Ah, but it IS his sandbox. It is also MY sandbox and, through a
>lowering of the qualifications for obtaining an Extra class license, it
>happens to be your sandbox.

It's *our* sandbox.
>
>> > >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>> >
>> > If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>> > is there?
>>
>> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>

>Why should anyone obtain an upgrade without testing?

That's what I keep asking!

>> > >83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>> > >don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>> > >increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>> > >operating in the Extra only segments.
>> >
>> > Then just leave 'em be!
>>
>> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>> is unacceptable.
>
>How so and to whom?
>
>> The FCC wants to simplify -
>
>Really?
>
>> the ARRL wants to create a viable
>> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
>> limits.
>>
>> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
>> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>
>So a "gimme" for tens of thousands is what makes sense to you, huh?
>You've often written of morse tests as hoops and hazing, preventing
>"otherwise qualified" people from entering amateur radio. You vowed that
>you'd never support a watering down of written tests. Now you are
>supporting a freebie for these thousands of "otherwise qualified"
>individuals. "Otherwise qualified" must mean those people who can't
>pass a required examination.

Required *WRITTEN* examination.

Note also that Carl has repeatedly said here that the current license structure
was just about right except for the code test and the need to beef up the Tech
written because it allows full power on "meat cooking frequencies" (great
catchphrase, btw). All of which made sense if you agree with the anticodetest
arguments. Now, for some reason, there's some sort of *need* to hand out lotsa
freebies. But no one will say why.

>> YM will, of course V ...
>
>I don't know about mileage, but my views certainly differs from yours.
>
Having met W1RFI and chauffered him around Philly a few weeks back, I'd really
like to read his reasoning on the ARRL proposal. 'Specially if he won over

Carl. Heck, he might win me over!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2365. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 19:18:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4027DD15.5060605@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87091

N2EY wrote:

>In article <4026F665.6030301@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>One of the male nuns was going to hit my hand with the blackboard
>>pointer. I was
>>to hold out my hand, but I pulled it away by instinct to avoid getting
>>hit. He broke it
>>on the floor. He just let it go at that, as I think he may have thought
>>he went a hair
>>too far with this stuff. Not that he dialed it back much.... No he didn't
>>make me buy another pointer.
>>
>>
>
>Typical. Parochial school did more to create millions of excatholics....
>
There may have been this side effect that, after school I split the
joint as fast as I
could. Never saw any molestation (don't know if my particular school
had any of that,
but I wasn't at any risk of that).

Then there were the yearly school plays. You had two choices: be in it,
or buy a
50 cent ticket to the play. It was a no brainer: I paid the 50 cents
rather than have
to memorize lines and acts and spending more time at the school.

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Had several nuns whose idea of "teaching" was to simply have a kid read from
>the textbook. At any moment, Sister Mary Elephant would call out another kid's
>name and if the kid didn't pick up on the very next word, he'd get a beating.
>We became quite good at following along and daydreaming at the same time.
>
That's how history class got done. And memorizing names and dates.
Good for playing
"Jeopardy" but otherwise meaningless. It seemed that kings in Europe

would get bored
sitting around their castles and decide to have wars for fun every so
often. Football not
having been developed yet....

>
>
>>They did have some good stuff. There was this thing called "SRA".
>>
>>
>>
>I remember that! By 5th grade they'd run out of levels for me. I'd do 3 or 4 in
>the time it took most of the rest of the kids to do one. And since you could
>look back and check you answers, it was a cinch.
>
"What was Mr Honey Bunny's wife's name?" I had a bad memory, but being
able to
go back and look made it easy.

There were a few kids whose mother tongue was probably not English, and had
difficulty. I though that they were just brain damaged or something, as
I had no
concept that there were other languages than English until I was about
ten. Never
heard anything other than English in real life or on radio or TV...

>
>--
>
>Another trick was that you never wanted your folks to find out when you got
>beaten at school, because they'd give you more of the same at home, and a
>lecture about how those blessed nuns had sacrificed their lives to teach you
>ungrateful kids, etc. Well, we never asked 'em to.
>
Didn't have that problem. Actually, my parents might have sued if they
knew, but
I didn't know that at the time.

Some nuns may have been teenage girls afraid of sex....

>
>
>

2366. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 21:13:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4027F7F8.4060909@psu.edu>
Source record: 87093

Dave Heil wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>
>>Sohl"
>>
>>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>
>>
>>[snip]
>>
>>
>>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>>>>
>>access
>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>>>>
>>giving
>>
>>>>them
>>>>
>>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>>>
>>Jim,
>>
>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>
>
> That's awfully big of you, Carl.
>
>
>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>
>
> Ah, but it IS his sandbox. It is also MY sandbox and, through a
> lowering of the qualifications for obtaining an Extra class license, it
> happens to be your sandbox.

>
>
>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>>>
>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>>is there?
>>
>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
>
> Why should anyone obtain an upgrade without testing?
>
>
>>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
>>>
>>>Then just leave 'em be!
>>
>>That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>>is unacceptable.
>
>
> How so and to whom?
>
>
>>The FCC wants to simplify -
>
>
> Really?
>
>
>>the ARRL wants to create a viable
>>entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
>>limits.
>>
>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>>comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>
>
> So a "gimme" for tens of thousands is what makes sense to you, huh?
> You've often written of morse tests as hoops and hazing, preventing
> "otherwise qualified" people from entering amateur radio.

The Morse code was keeping tens of thousands of otherwise *unqualified*
people out too!

> You vowed that
> you'd never support a watering down of written tests. Now you are
> supporting a freebie for these thousands of "otherwise qualified"
> individuals. "Otherwise qualified" must mean those people who can't
> pass a required examination.

I'm "otherwise qualified" to be a neurosurgeon!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2367. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 21:16:20 UTC
From: af1q@netzero.com
Message-ID: <6884c75d.0402091316.230de5c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87092

I think the ARRL is doing a super job of taking care of its own cash cow. Ham Radio as we know it is changing in the interest of progress with no considration for the hobby. I bet if everyone who subscribes to QST was to cancel their subscriptions,in other words, BOY COTT the ARRL, their trend of thought would take a sudden change of direction. Who cares about manufactures who pay for glossy pages of advertisment in QST. After all didn't we all used to make our own radios once.
It seems as though the reciepe is to dismantle the hobby of amateur radio and ARRL is trying to hang on to what ever will keep them going as money making tax free organization.
Ask your self, what has the ARRL ever done for you personally or for anyone you know, I bet the answer is zero, nada.
I am glad that I have at least had the past 47 or so years of amateur radio.
That is how I feel and I just want to voice my personal opinion even though I am going to get bashed for it. Jim AF1Q

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message news:<c2356669.0402090633.3f2b1d3a@posting.google.com>...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c07i32$53c$03$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > Hi all, on this thread,
>
> Hello!
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > news:20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > > In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >> Jim,
> > > >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> > > > Only a few?
> > > > Fun fact:
> > > > When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras,
> that
> > > > is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The more
> the
> > > > merrier - IF they pass the tests.
> > >
> > > You all are on the wrong numbers, as you might recall, that the airwaves
> > > wont stop ath the borders of your country.

>
> The "others" I wrote of above are other US Amateur Extra licensees.
>
> > There are already hundrets of
> > thousands HAMS worldwide in "Your Sandbox".
>
> It's not my sandbox. It's our sandbox. And all who can pass the
> required
> tests are welcome! Not just "a few".
>
> > Dont you think that beeing a ham
> > requires only some simple testing?
>
> Yes! The tests for a US license are very simple, yet some people want
> them
> to be even more simple. I don't think that's a good idea.
>
> > It requires GLOBAL THINKING of open
> > minded persons. All what I could read here on this matter is everything else
> > than OPEN MINDED and not a bit of GLOBAL HAM THINKING.
>
> Most of what is discussed here is amateur radio policy in the USA.
> That's simply a result of it being US based and in English.
>
> > > >So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
> > > >that other Extra's take.
> > >
> > > Exactly.
> > >
> > > >> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> > > >
> > > > as are your motives.
> > >
> > > As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in *our*
> > > sandbox.
> >
> > What is "your sandbox"?
>
> I don't have one!
>
> > Where can I make a test to access 40m above 7.100 ?
>
> Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
>
> The reason hams in Regions 1 and 3 don't have 7.100-7.300 is that
> their
> governments wanted that spectrum for shortwave broacasting in 1938.
> It's
> not the fault of hams or governments in Region 2.
>

> > Where can I do the test for usage of 146 - 148 MHz?
>
> Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
>
> > This is your sandbox, I
> > assume.
>
> Not mine. Ours.
>
> > But all the other Ham frequencies are also the sandbox and
> > playground of all the hams in the world. Their numbers are a lot more than
> > just 100k.
>
> And they're all welcome. But how many of them are actually using, say,
> 7.000 to 7.025?
> >
> > > >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>
> > > >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> > > >>>is there?
> > > >>
> > > >> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> > > >> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
> > > >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> > > >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> > > >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> > > >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>Then just leave 'em be!
>
> > > >> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> > > >> is unacceptable.
> > > >
> > > > Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?
> > >
> > > Good question.
> > > >
> > > >> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
> > > >> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> > > >> limits.
> > > >
> > > >On what relevant statements do you base this?
> > > >
> > > >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> > > >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> > > >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> > > >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> > > >
> > > > As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test

> > > >requirements, how do you support your rationale?
> > > >
> > > > Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously the
> > > >answer is yes.
> > > >
> > > > Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified to
> > > >operate at the level to which they will be advanced?
> >
> > Thats the usual procedure in most countries of the globe to make a one shot
> > exam.
>
>
> That's not the case in the USA. We have several classes of license,
> with a very
> easy and simple exam for the limited-privileges licenses and a more
> advanced exam for the full-privileges license. By the standards of
> most of the rest of
> the world, the USA exams are very easy.
>
> What is being discussed in this thread is a proposal that would give
> more privileges to many with limited-privileges license *without* any
> more tests.
> I think that's a bad idea.
> > > >
> > > > Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
> > > >come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
> > > >
> > > That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General upgrade.
> >
> > Effective after Aug. 15, 2003, this kind of upgrade from non-HF to HF- Hams
> > has occured after the WRC03 throughout the world.
>
> Are you talking about the code test? We're talking about the *written*
> tests.
>
> > This has been of greatest
> > benefit to ham radio after its developement. Now as there is young blood on
> > the bands, it will keep the ITU from knibbling on the bands.
>
> How much difference has it really made?
>
> How many countries have changed their rules?
>
> How many new hams have gotten on the air since those changes?
>
> How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
> period of time before the changes?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2368. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 21:52:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402091352.724e9333@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87094

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>...

> Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I will
> take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and the
> Moderator of this Newsgroup.

THIS is PRECIOUS! =)

WTG for the National Lampoonistic twist, whoever...!

Steve, K4YZ

2369. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 21:55:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402091355.1dac1621@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87095

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402081331.6ea23651@posting.google.com>...

> No, we're all hams. Save for one who has an interest in ham radio.

Hey Brain...y'aint talking about Lennie, are you?

Just last week he adamantly stated he had NO interest in Amateur
Radio beyond antagonizing this NG over the Code issue, which he
himself can't seem to stay focused on...

Steve, K4YZ

2370. Re: If Ham Radio Were Invented Today (reprise)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 21:59:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402091359.1a069d3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87096

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040208134933.05539.00004193@mb-m16.aol.com>...

After having commited himself in public with the assertion "I am
only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue, Leonard H.
Anderson embarrassed his family name with the following:

> In article <40255C9F.5A4CC21B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <robust oberst auf das
> sandbox k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

> No, I don't think so. You got the formaldehyde before assuming
> room temperature.

> Dr. Frankenstein would be proud...he created a Ham Monster!

> "...it's Alive! It's Alive!...it beeped morse code!"

> [from an unpublished Mary Shelley manuscript] :-)

> >(much of your crap snipped because it was, well, crap)
>
> Right, straight talk from a Newington Charm School dropout.
>
> See 97.1 (e), something about "good will" and "uniqueness."
>
> What next? Shouts of "Drop and give me twenty, maggot?"
>
> The gunnery nurse have a cue-so with you or something?

> >Amateur radio success has been mine for over 40 years now.
>
> Wonderful.
>
> Any time soon you will be ready to be a true professional. With
> another forty years of radio theory study, that is...
>
> Keep up the good work.
>
> Temper fry!

Not that we're surprised.

Leonard H. Anderson is a known pathological liar with a penchant
for overstated accomplishments in radio communication and blatant lies
about the character of his military service.

Just another day on RRAP for him.

Steve, K4YZ

2371. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 23:11:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402091511.5dda845@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87097

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>...
> On Sun, 08 Feb 2004 21:42:25 -0500, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>
> >Leo wrote:
> >
> >> It was pretty accurate and intelligently written, actually! But I
> >> assume from your statement that it didn't agree with your own
> >> viewpoint, as it too is "wrong".
> >
> > I consider the points it makes accurate enough, but it makes glaring
> >errors too.
> >
> > The biggest one is the comparison between violence and sex. In it's own
> >context, I agree, there is a weirdness about how some of us accept
> >violence, but not sex.
> >
> > But that ain't the argument.
> >
> > If she were to become topless as an accident, I'd wager that the event
> >would be a momentary thing to talk about around the water cooler.
> >"That's the hazard of live TV" would be what people would say. "Poor
> >Janet! She must have been mortified!", would be another.
> >
> > But since the whole thing was planned, and they lied about it
> >afterward, it changes the whole thing around. THAT has no place in a
> >halftime show.
>
> Agreed. But it just ain't that big a deal.

Not to you. To other people it *is* a big deal. Not just the incident
itself,
but the incident as a symbol of how goofy the whole system is.

> And to listen to people
> like Spike Lee deriding the incident as possibly the worst thing that
> has ever happened in the entertainment biz is absolutely imbecilic,
> given the content of some of his own productions. But. these guys
> know where the money comes from and how to stay on the right side of
> public opinion.

Exactly! They're all playing the game to their best advantage.

> Personally, I'd consider Kid Rock's treatment of the flag far more
> disrespectful and tasteless - yet that got hardly any press at all.

Agreed. To my way of thinking it was downright obscene. And the
producers
must have known about it beforehand.

> Or
> the lyrics to some of the award-winning rap music - plenty of hate in
> there....and racism, and violence, and immorality. But, they give
> performers like Eminem big awards and big bucks to spread their
> sinister messages of hate and apathy to our kids - and get big-time
> upset over a televised breast, as if that would cause irreprable harm
> to their young psyches and moral character. That's just stupid.

Who gives out those awards? Think about it - most of the showbiz
awards,
be they Grammys, Emmys, Oscars, GGs, Tonys or whatever, are given out
based on voting by industry insiders, not the general public or even a
subset (such as the viewing/moviegoing public). Kid Rock has never,
and now
will never, get a penny from me. Yet there's little I can do to stop
him
from getting awards for acting like a treasonous idiot.

> > Fact is, the shows have deteriorated in content over the last several
> >years, and a large portion of the audience doesn't like the emerging
> >format. They (we) are complaining, and they (we) have a right to. It
> >really isn't about sex versus violence. I no more want to see trashy,
> >sexually oriented "entertainment" during the superbowl halftime than I
> >want to see people being stabbed or hurt during it, or to have Peter
> >Popoff come out and do faith healing and ask for donations.
>
> I'd prefer that they drop the entire halftime big talent show
> entirely.

Agreed! Maybe they should run all the commercials at halftime - most
of them were far better than what little I saw of the show!

> Remember when the SuperBowl was all about the game?

When was that? This year's game was the best I've seen in a long long
time.
The game itself, that is.

> We can
> thank our media friends for trying to jazz it up to appeal to the
> largest number of viewers possible, in an effort to boost advertizing
> revenues.

That's why it's called show *business*. And make no mistake -
professional athletics is nothing more than a form of show business.

> Now, because of this incident, broadcasters are installing tape delay
> equipment to ensure that inappropriate things are not aired.

Aw 'cmon, they have it already.

> This is
> not being done for the benefit of the public good, mind you - it is
> being done so as to placate the advertizers, so that they don't end up
> on the wrong side of public opinion and lose market share - and keep
> those big bucks coming in.....

"What's good for General Bullmoose...."
>
> Even the FCC has ruled that profanity is OK on broadcast services.

When did they do that?

> Is this not more repugnant than a breast?

Depends on whose.

> Hmmmm. Nice value system.
>
> Where was the outcry a few years ago when Bono let loose a string of
> expletives on the Grammys?

That was a few months ago. And there *was* an outcry - to the extent
that
The Congress is considering a bill to ban certain words on broadcast
TV and
radio. The list is almost identical to George Carlin's list. Of course
the
words are actually part of the bill....

> That was at least an order of magnitude
> worse than a televised breast, and a lot harder to explain to the
> kids....where were the 7-second tape delays and prophesies of the end
> of his career? But hey, there were no nasty body parts involved, so
> that was OK.....

Tell it to the FCC.

> > And that is why I think the article is way off base.
>
> Not sure that I agree, Mike - the point was, the breast thing was just
> not that big a deal.
There are far worse things that society should
> be concerned about - one need only look to the movies, video games or
> even network TV to see that although sex has been somewhat removed
> from our kids view, an incredible amount of graphic violence is pumped
> out at them on a daily basis. That ain't good - and the impact on
> society is well documented. All too frequently. With tragic results.

And the broadcasters have the same excuse they've used for years:
People *want* that stuff, because they vote with their channel

changers. It's all about
ratings, and if a show gets ratings, there's more of the same. Lots
more.

Last night ABC aired "Pearl Harbor", which I found to be a much better
film
than the reviews would lead one to expect. It was quite violent, but
the
violence served a purpose and in telling the story. And the violence
had real consequences to real people. Definitely not something you'd
want young kids to see. That's a different thing than the 'cartoon'
violence of many shows. (Any really good war film [Das Boot, Saving
Private Ryan] also turns out to be an
effective anti-war film, simply by being accurate). The danger isn't
the violence, it's not taking the violence seriously.

> >> I take it you're not a Robbie Burns fan:
> >>
> >> "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
> >> To see oursel's as others see us!"
> >
> > Sigh.....

You're wrong about that.

> 'Tis true, though - however difficult it may be.
>
Let me hold this mirror up for ya, Leo......

Just because I disagree with some of your opinions doesn't make me
"wrong".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2372. Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 23:18:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402091518.7f42d818@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87098

For many years now the sane and the reasonable in this forum have dodged Lennie the Liar's labelling of the Code Tested among us as "morsemen", "mighty morsemen", etc etc. If for no other reason than because HE uses it to try an belittle us.

But I have to ask myself...WHY...?!?! =)

I have a skill that precious few have (certainly one LENNIE doesn't have!). It took a certain amount of work, determination and concentration to "get it right", and everytime I use it, it's just a bit different than the last time, but thrilling and fulfilling nonetheless....Almost like an artist putting brush to canvas.

When the guys on 14.195 are still yelling "YOU'RE FIVE NINE IN DETROIT BUT I MISSED YOUR CALLSIGN AND HANDLE...", I have a "rare one" in the log and am moving on to the next challenge.

When the gang on the SSB traffic net is fighting QRN from hell, I have QSL'ed the traffic and am on my second cup of coffee.

Where the guys on phone pass up a "CQ" in a foreign tounge or heavy accent, I answer and make a friend.

I've helped relay messages home for my Brother Marines and other services that meant keeping that "personal touch alive. Yes, cellphones and Internet have driven that need to almost zero, but the "basic traffic handlers" have still proven thier worth in the 21st century.

I've made friends in other countries that I wouldn't have otherwise made due to LACK of technology in those parts of the world, and on at least a couple of occassions my travels led me to their doorstep.

Who could ask for any better justification for embracing Morse skills than making a friend?

Well, I know that's an rhetorical question and the pundits and antagonists (especially our resident pathological liar, social barfly and NON-licensee, Lennie H. Anderson) will now "have at it" and tell me how it violates some right of theirs...Oh well...

I have something Lennie can't ever have...WON'T ever have, and will never understand...self-inflicted ignorance is his own undoing.

So sign me...proudly at that...

Steve Robeson, K4YZ
Mighty Morseman

2373. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-09 23:25:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402091525.1d2d2bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87099

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>...

> I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
> better than voice.

Much better than any form of analog voice.

> Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
> tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded.

Exactly.

> From the experimenting
> (read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
> months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
> get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
> appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
> with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.

The soundcard is only part of the system. The decoder is quite smart,
in that
it stores and examines the received data and does a "best fit"
decoder. You can read all about it at several websites.

But it's important to realize what constitutes "poor conditions".
Against purely amplitude noise it's quite robust. But against phase
noise of various
types it is not robust at all. All depends on the situation.

> Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
> on it.....

What rig is it?
>
> Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.

Not really. You will find times when the PSK-31 signal is clearly
audible in the speaker, well above the background amplitude noise, but
the decoder cannot make sense of it because the phase distortion is
too bad.

> And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
> lazy - like me) :)

It was meant as a replacement for conventional RTTY - as a "keyboard
to keyboard" mode. For example, the speed was chosen to be about what
average conversational keyboarding hams use.

btw, the code used in PSK-31 uses shorter symbols for the most common characters and longer ones for the least common. Just like Morse code, which is where the designers got the idea.
>
> I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -

Yup - G3PLX, and a number of folks who helped him by testing it out on the air and others who have developed software packages. A local ham of my acquaintance (one of those longtime 20 wpm 1x2 Extras with multiple EE degrees - we share two alma maters, btw) was one of the team who helped test it out.

PSK-31 is another great tool in the toolbox, but not a replacement for good old Morse Code.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2374. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 00:46:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <402829F7.1080505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87100

>
>
>
> So sign me...proudly at that...
>
>Steve Robeson, K4YZ
>Mighty Morseman
>
Bring back the code only license.....

>
>

2375. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 00:55:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209195503.08626.00003046@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87251

In article <5c01b95b.0402091355.1dac1621@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>y'aint talking about Lennie, are you?
>
> Just last week he adamantly stated he had NO interest in Amateur
>Radio beyond antagonizing this NG over the Code issue, which he
>himself can't seem to stay focused on...
>
Steve,

Since Mr. Anderson has made his purpose here quite clear, why do you continue to bother with him? All that does is reinforce his behavior. You've raised kids - you obviously know that rewarding behavior is a good way to get more of it. And often the "reward" is simply giving your attention.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2376. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 01:03:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <nkag20hecb5qnqlbqc4v5re0hpsp77f0vu@4ax.com>
Source record: 87252

On 9 Feb 2004 15:25:04 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>...
>
>> I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
>> better than voice.
>
>Much better than any form of analog voice.
>
>> Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
>> tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded.
>
>Exactly.
>
>> From the experimenting
>> (read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
>> months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
>> get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
>> appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
>> with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
>
>The soundcard is only part of the system. The decoder is quite smart,
>in that
>it stores and examines the received data and does a "best fit"
>decoder. You can read all about it at several websites.

Good point - I've compared it to RTTY from the decoding standpoint -
RTTY seems to be much more prone to losing characters or dropping out
entirely when the signal is weak or noise is high.

>
>But it's important to realize what constitutes "poor conditions".
>Against purely amplitude noise it's quite robust. But against phase
>noise of various
>types it is not robust at all. All depends on the situation.

>
>> Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
>> on it.....
>
>What rig is it?

Heath SB-400. The Pride of 1964 :)

With a narrowband signal like this, it doesn't take much drift! I'm seeing a frequency decrease of up to 15 Hz, beginning a few seconds after keying. B+ to the VFO appears to be well regulated - maybe not tight enough though. Might have to replace the 0A2 with a few zeners - haven't tried that yet....

>>
>> Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
>
>Not really. You will find times when the PSK-31 signal is clearly
>audible in the speaker, well above the background amplitude noise, but
>the decoder cannot make sense of it because the phase distortion is
>too bad.

Haven't experienced that yet - at least when I see that, I'll know what is causing it!

>
>> And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
>> lazy - like me) :)
>
>It was meant as a replacement for conventional RTTY - as a "keyboard
>to keyboard" mode. For example, the speed was chosen to be about what
>*average* conversational keyboarding hams use.
>
>btw, the code used in PSK-31 uses shorter symbols for the most common
>characters and longer ones for the least common. Just like Morse code,
>which is where the designers got the idea.

Didn't know that - great idea, though!

>>
>> I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
>
>Yup - G3PLX, and a number of folks who helped him by testing it out on
>the air and others who have developed software packages. A local ham
>of my acquaintance (one of those longtime 20 wpm 1x2 Extras with
>multiple EE degrees - we share two alma maters, btw) was one of the
>team who helped test it out.
>
>PSK-31 is another great tool in the toolbox, but not a replacement for
>good old Morse Code.

Haven't formulated an opinion on that one yet - stay tuned!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2377. Re: Nice Link Steveo...IDIOT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 01:08:36 UTC
From: OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam
Message-ID: <oaWVb.8252$Jw4.6339@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87253
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

moparholic@hothamail.com wrote:
> I'd rather drop this shit and spare everyone from this tripe.

That kind of blows it for folks that don't have CB's.

--

Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

2378. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 01:25:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ub-dnZq2c52XrrXdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87254

N2EY wrote:

> In article <g42dnSs0rOOiYrvdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>>>
>>>>Sohl"
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>[snip]
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>>>>
>>>>access
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>to
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>>>>
>>>>giving
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>them

>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>>>
>>>>Jim,
>>>>
>>>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>>>
>>>
>>>Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>>>required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>>>
>>>
>>>You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>>>
>>>And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>>>in the **WRITTEN** test requirements. Yet now I see that same person
>>>supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
>>>tests...
>>
>> Technically he's right Jim. He isn't supporting any reduction in the
>>writtens. He's supporting not having to take a test *at all*. There is a
>>difference, you know!
>
>
> No there isn't.
>
> Eliminating something is the same as reducing it to zero. The free upgrades
> simply reduce the testing required for the upgrade to zero. Still a reduction.

I would have though by now you would have known that such a statement
from me was very tongue in cheek, Jim!

>>>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>>>
>>>>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>>>>>is there?
>>>>
>>>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>>>>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>>>
>>>Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>>>>>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>>>>>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>>>>>>>operating in the Extra only segments.

>>>>>
>>>>>Then just leave 'em be!
>>>>
>>>>That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>>>>is unacceptable.
>>>
>>>Why?
>>>
>>>
>>>>The FCC wants to simplify -
>>>
>>>Says who?
>>>
>>>I recall that FCC **REJECTED** the ARRL proposal to free-upgrade Tech
>>
>>Pluses
>>
>>>and Novices to General back in 1998-99. And even though ARRL proposed
>>
>>keeping
>>
>>>the Advanced open, FCC rejected that too.
>>>
>>>In fact it was *FCC's* idea to keep the Novice and Advanced as closed-off
>>>license classes, rather than handing out free upgrades.
>>>
>>>What has changed in the four years since then that now requires handing out
>>>over 82,000 free passes to Extra, and over 322,000 free passes to General?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>the ARRL wants to create a viable
>>>>entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power limits.
>>>
>>>
>>>And that part is a good idea! In fact, it's almost identical to what I
>>
>>proposed
>>
>>>here more than 2 years ago. Except I'd require 5 wpm code...
>>>
>>>But that doesn't explain the need for over 400,000 free upgrades.
>>>
>>>Of course if the Novice is reopened with new HF privs, Tech Pluses should
>>
>>get
>>
>>>those same privs. And if the code test isn't required for "NewNovices",
>>
>>then

>>
>>>Techs should get those same HF privs.
>>>
>>>
>>>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>>>>comments on the subject on eHam.net
>>>
>>>
>>>I'll ask again for a link to those comments.
>
>
> Please?
>
>>
>> I think that when you scratch the surface of most people that support
>>reductions in the Morse code testing, you will find that they also
>>support reduction or elimination of the rest of the testing regimen.
>>There are exceptions, but they prove the rule IMO.
>
>
> I disagree! I think many if not most anticodetest folks just want the code test
> to go away. Frankly, I'm surprised that Carl has changed his tune so
> completely.

Could be I'm not hanging out with the right no-coders, Jim. The ones I
know, with one or two exceptions, seem to be at least acqueiscing of the
ARRL plan. I think you would agree that their givaway plan fits the bill.

>
>>>>I (personally, not as NCI)
>>>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>>>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>>>
>>>Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
>>>for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
>>
>> By golly, that's a lot more high level hams!
>
>
> Bingo.
>
>>>Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
>>>there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and
>>
>>the
>>
>>>new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
>>>they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
>>>
>>>So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes
>>

>>take
>>
>>>place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>>
>> Yup!
>>
>>
>>>I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...
>>
>>Me too! I want to see if he can convince me of something I'd said I'd
>>never support!
>
>
> I can see some possibilities:
>
> - Free upgrading Techs would mean a lot more hams with HF, which is a big
> arguing point against BPL

If I were arguing *for* BPL, I would denounce that little trick as a
transparent ploy. I think it is bad form to do something that gives the
opposition a foot in the door.

> - Possible recruiting tool for ARRL ("look what we got you!")

Then what will they do for an encore?
>
> - Less work for VECs (NCVEC is always complaining - see their comments.)

NO tests at all would lessen their workload.

> - (the big one): The ARRL proposal dumps Element 1 for all but Extra.
> Supporting it gets Carl and NCI most of what they want in the codetest area.
> And maybe the FCC will dump Element 1 for Extra too....

> I'd really like to see the link. Looked around eham but can't find the comments
> mentioned.

Yeah, I've been looking too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2379. Re: Nice Link Steveo...IDIOT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 01:31:00 UTC
From: Steveo-moparholic@hothamail.com
Message-ID: <20040209203100.889$t8@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote:
> moparholic@hothamail.com wrote:
> > I'd rather drop this shit and spare everyone from this tripe.
>
> That kind of blows it for folks that don't have CB's.
>
When you return from snorkeling, us keyclowns will assist you
in buying whatever your budget will allow. It really doesn't
cost much to get started, and you're picking a good time to
do it since the sun spot is on the retreat.

The 11 meter band will get less noisey every year now...

Until you're and old man with a keyclown kill-O-watt, after
that the years seem like months. hehe (happy b day to me)

--
Take out the ham to mail me.

2380. Re: Nice Link Steveo...IDIOT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:09:52 UTC
From: OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam
Message-ID: <Q3XVb.20146$Hf1.19700@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo-moparholic@hothamail.com wrote:
> When you return from snorkeling, us keyclowns will assist you
> in buying whatever your budget will allow. It really doesn't
> cost much to get started, and you're picking a good time to
> do it since the sun spot is on the retreat.

Yeah, but what do I do? Do you guys just talk to folks you don't know?
--

_____
Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

2381. Re: Nice Link Steveo...IDIOT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:33:30 UTC
From: Steveo-moparholic@hothamail.com
Message-ID: <20040209213330.695$Kr@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87257
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote:
> Steveo-moparholic@hothamail.com wrote:
> > When you return from snorkeling, us keyclowns will assist you
> > in buying whatever your budget will allow. It really doesn't
> > cost much to get started, and you're picking a good time to
> > do it since the sun spot is on the retreat.
>
> Yeah, but what do I do? Do you guys just talk to folks you don't know?
>
Hell I do that almost everyday without the radio, but yes. SSB is not so
different from text Usenet if the right people are conversing.

But just like Usenet, there are some stainley's and geopunk's.

N8's are the fire hydrants that the dogs piss on.

--
Take out the ham to mail me.

2382. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:46:36 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <dkgg201855995os700eh4hi46m5nr9tjbi@4ax.com>
Source record: 87258

On 9 Feb 2004 15:11:08 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>...
>> On Sun, 08 Feb 2004 21:42:25 -0500, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>snip

>
>Just because I disagree with some of your opinions doesn't make me
>"wrong".

Fully agreed, Jim. Similarly, others who disagree with your opinions
(governments, newspapers, or individuals) aren't necessarily 'wrong'
or 'muddle-headed', are they?

You seem to believe that they are.....or so you say, anyway!

Unless you have facts available to prove the errors as you perceive
them, it's just your opinion on the subject that you are putting
forth, not absolute truths. Hence the reference to Benford's Law in
one of my other posts along the same lines as this one....

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2383. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:48:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40284668.72936B7F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87259

Leo wrote:
>
> On 08 Feb 2004 18:49:36 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> >snip
> >
> > Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.
>
> ....That line still makes me laugh every time I read it!

Me too, especially when I think about it not getting through to Len.

Dave K8MN

2384. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:56:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40284858.F570C1E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87260

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <40278119.268BD35@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >>
> >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >> > In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >> Sohl"
> >> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> [snip]
> >>
> >> > >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
> >> access
> >> > >to
> >> > >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
> >> giving
> >> > >them
> >> > >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
> >>
> >> Jim,
> >>
> >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> >
> >That's awfully big of you, Carl.
>
> I haven't heard Carl on the lowest 25 of 80, 40, 20 or 15. Have you, Dave?

Nary a peep.

> >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >
> >So a "gimme" for tens of thousands is what makes sense to you, huh?
> >You've often written of morse tests as hoops and hazing, preventing
> >"otherwise qualified" people from entering amateur radio. You vowed that
> >you'd never support a watering down of written tests. Now you are
> >supporting a freebie for these thousands of "otherwise qualified"
> >individuals. "Otherwise qualified" must mean those people who can't
> >pass a required examination.

>
> Required *WRITTEN* examination.
>
> Note also that Carl has repeatedly said here that the current license structure
> was just about right except for the code test and the need to beef up the Tech
> written because it allows full power on "meat cooking frequencies" (great
> catchphrase, btw). All of which made sense if you agree with the anticodetest
> arguments. Now, for some reason, there's some sort of *need* to hand out lotsa
> freebies. But no one will say why.

It must be that these folks are all "otherwise qualified".

> >> YM will, of course V ...
> >
> >I don't know about mileage, but my views certainly differs from yours.
> >
> Having met W1RFI and chauffered him around Philly a few weeks back, I'd really
> like to read his reasoning on the ARRL proposal. 'Specially if he won over
> Carl.

I had the pleasure of a lengthy chat with Ed at our state convention a
couple of summers back and I enjoyed the experience.

> Heck, he might win me over!

I enjoyed our chat, but I'm not banking on his ability to win me over on
this one.

Dave K8MN

2385. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:58:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 87261

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >[snip]
> >
> >> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
> >access
> >> >to
> >> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
> >giving
> >> >them
> >> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
> >
> >Jim,
> >
> >I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>
> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
> >
> >Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>
> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....

You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
damned well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...

> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.

I'm not ... I'm supporting the establishment of a reasonable, viable
entry level class with appropriate testing and restrictions.

>Yet now I see that same person
> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
> tests...

As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in a
way
where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are already
authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any knowledge
of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
>
> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>
> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> >> is there?
> >
> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?

Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.

[snip]

> >After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> >comments on the subject on eHam.net
>
> I'll ask again for a link to those comments.

Go to eham.net (or use Google) ... I don't have the URL direct
to Ed's comments handy ...

>
> >I (personally, not as NCI)
> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >
> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.

Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you have
a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)

> Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
> there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and
the
> new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
> they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.

They could make a rules change effective 30 days from publication in the
Federal Register ...

> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes
take
> place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.

Give me a break ... your arguments are just plain lame and your "someone might
get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as I took" is
REALLY showing.

> I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...

Go find them - you know how to google.

36-1/2 :-)
Carl - wk3c

2386. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 02:59:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40284926.C4370CEF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87262

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >>
> >>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >>
> >>Sohl"
> >>
> >>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>>
> >>
> >>[snip]
> >>
> >>
> >>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
> >>>>
> >>access
> >>
> >>>>to
> >>>>
> >>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
> >>>>
> >>giving
> >>
> >>>>them
> >>>>
> >>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
> >>>>
> >>Jim,
> >>
> >>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> >
> >
> > That's awfully big of you, Carl.
> >
> >
> >>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> >
> >
> > Ah, but it IS his sandbox. It is also MY sandbox and, through a

> > lowering of the qualifications for obtaining an Extra class license, it
> > happens to be your sandbox.
> >
> >
> >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >>>
> >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> >>>is there?
> >>
> >>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >
> >
> > Why should anyone obtain an upgrade without testing?
> >
> >
> >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
> >>>
> >>>Then just leave 'em be!
> >>
> >>That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> >>is unacceptable.
> >
> >
> > How so and to whom?
> >
> >
> >>The FCC wants to simplify -
> >
> >
> > Really?
> >
> >
> >>the ARRL wants to create a viable
> >>entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> >>limits.
> >>
> >>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> >>comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> >>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >
> >
> > So a "gimme" for tens of thousands is what makes sense to you, huh?
> > You've often written of morse tests as hoops and hazing, preventing
> > "otherwise qualified" people from entering amateur radio.
>

> The Morse code was keeping tens of thousands of otherwise *unqualified*
> people out too!

That was Carl's litany some years back and why I trotted it out for use
in this instance.

> > You vowed that
> > you'd never support a watering down of written tests. Now you are
> > supporting a freebie for these thousands of "otherwise qualified"
> > individuals. "Otherwise qualified" must mean those people who can't
> > pass a required examination.
>
> I'm "otherwise qualified" to be a neurosurgeon!

...and this one was pointed out to Carl and others here by me some years
back.

The idea of a "gimme" for tens of thousands makes no more sense than
Carl's reversal on his vowed support for tougher written exams.

Dave K8MN

2387. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 03:06:27 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <3dig20taca1976llij7enspvnuimdev5mf@4ax.com>
Source record: 87263

On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 02:58:14 -0000, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:

>snip

>.... twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
>damned well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...

Hmmm - I think I've had that done to a few of my posts a time or two
as well!

The best defense is still a good offense, I guess..... :)

>snip
>36-1/2 :-)
>Carl - wk3c

73, Leo

2388. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:07:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rOYVb.1431$t16.1160750@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87264

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0402091518.7f42d818@posting.google.com...
> For many years now the sane and the reasonable in this forum have
> dodged Lennie the Liar's labelling of the Code Tested among us as
> "morsemen", "mighty morsemen", etc etc. If for no other reason than
> because HE uses it to try an belittle us.
>
> But I have to ask myself...WHY...?!?! =)
>
> I have a skill that precious few have (certainly one LENNIE
> doesn't have!). It took a certain amount of work, determination and
> concentration to "get it right", and everytime I use it, it's just a
> bit different than the last time, but thrilling and fulfilling
> nonetheless....Almost like an artist putting brush to canvas.
>
> When the guys on 14.195 are still yelling "YOU'RE FIVE NINE IN
> DETROIT BUT I MISSED YOUR CALLSIGN AND HANDLE...", I have a "rare one"
> in the log and am moving on to the next challenge.
>
> When the gang on the SSB traffic net is fighting QRN from hell, I
> have QSL'ed the traffic and am on my second cup of coffee.
>
> Where the guys on phone pass up a "CQ" in a foreign tounge or
> heavy accent, I answer and make a friend.
>
> I've helped relay messages home for my Brother Marines and other
> services that meant keeping that "personal touch alive. Yes,
> cellphones and Internet have driven that need to almost zero, but the
> "basic traffic handlers" have still proven thier worth in the 21st
> century.
>
> I've made friends in other countries that I wouldn't have
> otherwise made due to LACK of technology in those parts of the world,
> and on at least a couple of occassions my travels led me to their
> doorstep.
>
> Who could ask for any better justification for embracing Morse
> skills than making a friend?
>
> Well, I know that's an rhetorical question and the pundits and
> antagonists (especially our resident pathological liar, social barfly
> and NON-licensee, Lennie H. Anderson) will now "have at it" and tell
> me how it violates some right of theirs...Oh well...
>

> I have something Lennie can't ever have...WON'T ever have, and
> will never understand...self-inflicted ignorance is his own undoing.
>
> So sign me...proudly at that...
>
> Steve Robeson, K4YZ
> Mighty Morseman

Very nice article. At the moment I am only a little Morseman but perhaps someday I too will be a Mighty Morseman.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2389. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:10:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OQYVb.1432$t16.1161686@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87265

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0402091525.1d2d2bd@posting.google.com...
> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>...
>
> > I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
> > better than voice.
>
> Much better than any form of analog voice.
>
> > Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
> > tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded.
>
> Exactly.
>
> > From the experimenting
> > (read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
> > months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
> > get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
> > appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
> > with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
>
> The soundcard is only part of the system. The decoder is quite smart,
> in that
> it stores and examines the received data and does a "best fit"
> decoder. You can read all about it at several websites.
>
> But it's important to realize what constitutes "poor conditions".
> Against purely amplitude noise it's quite robust. But against phase
> noise of various
> types it is not robust at all. All depends on the situation.
>
> > Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
> > on it.....
>
> What rig is it?
> >
> > Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
>
> Not really. You will find times when the PSK-31 signal is clearly
> audible in the speaker, well above the background amplitude noise, but
> the decoder cannot make sense of it because the phase distortion is
> too bad.
>

> > And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
> > lazy - like me) :)
>
> It was meant as a replacement for conventional RTTY - as a "keyboard
> to keyboard" mode. For example, the speed was chosen to be about what
> *average* conversational keyboarding hams use.
>
> btw, the code used in PSK-31 uses shorter symbols for the most common
> characters and longer ones for the least common. Just like Morse code,
> which is where the designers got the idea.
> >
> > I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
>
> Yup - G3PLX, and a number of folks who helped him by testing it out on
> the air and others who have developed software packages. A local ham
> of my acquaintance (one of those longtime 20 wpm 1x2 Extras with
> multiple EE degrees - we share two alma maters, btw) was one of the
> team who helped test it out.
>
> PSK-31 is another great tool in the toolbox, but not a replacement for
> good old Morse Code.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

As I tell my students EVERY mode has its advantages and disadvantages. Each has its place in the scheme of things. If they have not tried out the modes within their financial reach, they have shortchanged their "toolbox."

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2390. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:13:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DTYVb.1458$t16.1162462@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87266

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:nkag20hecb5qnqlbqc4v5re0hpsp77f0vu@4ax.com...
> On 9 Feb 2004 15:25:04 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
> >> better than voice.
> >
> >Much better than any form of analog voice.
> >
> >> Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
> >> tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded.
> >
> >Exactly.
> >
> >> From the experimenting
> >> (read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
> >> months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
> >> get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
> >> appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
> >> with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
> >
> >The soundcard is only part of the system. The decoder is quite smart,
> >in that
> >it stores and examines the received data and does a "best fit"
> >decoder. You can read all about it at several websites.
>
> Good point - I've compared it to RTTY from the decoding standpoint -
> RTTY seems to be much more prone to losing characters or dropping out
> entirely when the signal is weak or noise is high.
>
> >
> >But it's important to realize what constitutes "poor conditions".
> >Against purely amplitude noise it's quite robust. But against phase
> >noise of various
> >types it is not robust at all. All depends on the situation.
>
> >
> >> Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
> >> on it.....
> >
> >What rig is it?

>
> Heath SB-400. The Pride of 1964 :)
>
> With a narrowband signal like this, it doesn't take much drift! I'm
> seeing a frequency decrease of up to 15 Hz, beginning a few seconds
> after keying. B+ to the VFO appears to be well regulated - maybe not
> tight enough though. Might have to replace the 0A2 with a few zeners
> - haven't tried that yet....
>
> >>
> >> Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
> >
> >Not really. You will find times when the PSK-31 signal is clearly
> >audible in the speaker, well above the background amplitude noise, but
> >the decoder cannot make sense of it because the phase distortion is
> >too bad.
>
> Haven't experienced that yet - at least when I see that, I'll know
> what is causing it!
>
> >
> >> And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
> >> lazy - like me) :)
> >
> >It was meant as a replacement for conventional RTTY - as a "keyboard
> >to keyboard" mode. For example, the speed was chosen to be about what
> >*average* conversational keyboarding hams use.
> >
> >btw, the code used in PSK-31 uses shorter symbols for the most common
> >characters and longer ones for the least common. Just like Morse code,
> >which is where the designers got the idea.
>
> Didn't know that - great idea, though!
>
> >>
> >> I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
> >
> >Yup - G3PLX, and a number of folks who helped him by testing it out on
> >the air and others who have developed software packages. A local ham
> >of my acquaintance (one of those longtime 20 wpm 1x2 Extras with
> >multiple EE degrees - we share two alma maters, btw) was one of the
> >team who helped test it out.
> >
> >PSK-31 is another great tool in the toolbox, but not a replacement for
> >good old Morse Code.
>
> Haven't formulated an opinion on that one yet - stay tuned!
>
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY

>
> 73, Leo
>

Just to add to information, I heard a couple of hams talking shortly after the major solar flares of this past fall were finally over. They had commented on the fact that the distortion on PSK31 was so bad that they had had to switch to Morse.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2391. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:55:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209235509.01019.00000374@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87267

In article <20040209115844.22081.00003972@mb-m17.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>Another trick was that you never wanted your folks to find out when you got
>beaten at school, because they'd give you more of the same at home, and a
>lecture about how those blessed nuns had sacrificed their lives to teach you
>ungrateful kids, etc. Well, we never asked 'em to.
>
>Those were the bad old days.

As far as the American federal government is concerned, it does not
discriminate against the religious beliefs of any radio amateur.

Unless your parochial school taught amateur radio theory or
standards and practices, such is hardly a fitting subject of a
newsgroup concerning amateur radio policy.

Is it now a requirement that ALL U.S. radio amateurs practice
Catholicsm in addition to love, adoration, and respect for morse
code? Especially in early schooling?

[expletive deleted]

[morse code testing deleted]

[more expletives! :-)]

LHA / WMD

2392. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate call deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:55:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209235510.01019.00000375@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87269

In article <20040208202152.12501.00006089@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>and in it's time and place. If Janet wants to
>>go around with parts hanging out of her clothes, she is welcome to.
>>(IMO) As long as as it is in the proper place. Otherwise, keep it clean.
>>
>Agreed!

You two ought to write, wire, data transmit to the VEC QPC all of
your charges of immorality and tell the QPC to make them part
and parcel of every written test element!

This is a vital and important part of amateur radio policy!!!

Glad you brought it up.

I will be looking forward to seeing what the QPC comes up with in
that important amateur radio knowledge-morality area on multiple-
choice answers on the U.S. written tests.

Morality must be STRICT and punishment as severe in U.S. amateur
radio!

"No kids, lids, space cadets, or nudity while beeping CW."

LHA / WMD

2393. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:55:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209235511.01019.00000376@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87270

In article <c08g7k$f4$04$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>> How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
>> period of time before the changes?
>
>Jim, it is not the difference in numbers, it is just the fact, that it
>happend. Give yourself the cream upon the cake and think positive about the
>new situation. Showing anger and agressiv language against those beeing a
>"victim" of the restructuring process doesn't bring any good to the ham
>family. Not in your country, and not around the world. And where we cannot
>do anything against it, it's not worth to argue about it. It is NOT
>negotiable.

Helmut, what you say is true but the verbose regulars in this newsgroup
are adamant "America-firsters," that is, what the Americans do is "best"
and therefore that is good for the rest of the world.

The IARU came out with the opinion years ago that morse code testing
should be eliminated from an ITU requirement. The ARRL, a supposed
leader of American amateur radio (with membership less than 25% of
all American amateur licensees) was against it. They aren't really for
eliminating any of it and remain in a middle position, neither for nor
against it. ARRL tries to please too many, therefore there is no real
consensus possible. It reduces to a simple phrasing for American
radio amateurs: All must do as was done in the old days by the old-
timers...because the old-timers imagine they are "the best."

It is a sad situation for the entire world in my estimation, a stubborn
opinion that belongs better in times of two centuries ago. As an
American who loves his country and has done so longer than most
other Americans in here, I am ashamed of their "radio-backwoodsman"
attitudes. Such reflects poorly on us, yet so many remain stubbornly
resolute in an America-first belief, a parochial attitude centering
around themselves with little regard to this nation or the world.

Fortunately for the rest of the radio world (much larger than amateurism)
the USA's negotiations on that rest of the radio world activity is better
and more liberal, willing to listen to other points of view. In here there
is NO other view allowed if it displeases the old-time regulars.

LHA / WMD

2394. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:55:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209235513.01019.00000378@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87268

In article <72zVb.255754$na.417263@attbi_s04>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>> Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Good one Len ..... have to remember it ....

Credit Brian Burke with the phrase. He had that truism right,
worthy of repeating. :-)

LHA / WMD

2395. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:55:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209235513.01019.00000377@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87272

In article <laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>> Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.
>
>....That line still makes me laugh every time I read it!

It is absolutely, positively, 100% true. Brian Burke's phrase should
go into the textbooks. :-)

>I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
>better than voice. Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
>tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded. From the experimenting
>(read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
>months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
>get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
>appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
>with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
>Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
>on it.....
>
>Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
>And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
>lazy - like me) :)
>
>I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
>there must have been similar narrowband technologies used by the
>military which predated it - any idea what they were?

PSK31 was designed/innovated by Peter Martinez, G3PLX, in the
UK, then air-tested by several over much of Yurp. Years ago.

There's a whole heaping lot of techniques/systems used by the
militaries (of the world, actually) on sending data/teleprinter over
both wire and radio circuits. Too many to recount in here. Few of
the militaries or the governments or the commercial carriers bother
with narrowband-specific communication circuits since they have
needs to send much data quickly. The advance in Information
Theory and Coding (generic other than morse code or character
codes) have applied themselves to other things besides comm
applications: Single-error correction, double-error detection for
computer memory applications to real-time analysis of seismic
effects on building structures. Real-time Fourier Analysis has
been at the heart of that and includes mundane things like the
little audio bargraph displays on home music systems (usually
combined with "equalizer" settings of same).

The "MIT Redbook" by Peterson and Weldon is a thick text chock full of all sorts of data coding schemes, error correction of same, plus ways other than Forward Error Correction to send data best without extra bits (something alluded to in Shannon's seminal 1948 paper that became familiarly known as "Shannon's Law").

The VLF Alert messages in the USN submarine fleet is not a subject of discussion. Those are digital, encrypted, and have some other features to work through all kinds of RF interference. The militaries/governments/commercial carriers generally confine themselves to rather standard medium- to high-throughput systems for radio circuits without going into complicated schemes. The various "TOR" modes are very close to those. Add to that the ALE or Automatic Link Establishment interrogation-response on auto-measurement of signal quality and that is the broad picture of what goes on by non-amateur communications HF to VHF. Note: Some of the details of everyday encryption are in the grey area of talk and I won't go into that due to prohibitions of U.S. law. If any such appear on the Internet, it has been cleared for public viewing, not classified.

A wide example of medium- to high-rate data communications allied to the basics of PSK31 is the common data modem used with personal computers. It can, with a good POTS line (Plain Old Telephone System), send 56K data rate material over a 3 KHz bandwidth. There are, literally, millions of those modems in existance; 152 million personal computers were sold worldwide in 2003 alone according to a story in LA Times Business section for 9 Feb 04.

The standard data modem with PCs uses a combination of amplitude and phase modulation of a carrier tone plus some rudimentary digital state re-arrangments to get a rate increase far above conventional single-mode modulations yet it does not violate Shannon's Law. Many who can only grasp the single-mode concepts keep trying to say "it isn't possible!" yet the possible is happening 24/7 worldwide by the millions. The generality of such dramatic rate versus bandwidth can be applied anywhere. PSK31 was one of those, cleverly arranged by Martinez to fit into a bandwidth equal to a morse code spectral space and perform just a bit better at an average throughouput of about 30 WPM. The PSK31 system is a complex one yet quite easy to implement with the aid of a (now) common personal computer. The PC isn't absolutely necessary since a dedicated terminal or radio modem can be built in a smaller package...but still needs a keyboard, display-printer to complete the data terminal.

What is astounding, in a world of technological plenty, that there are so many radio-backwoodsmen demanding that all revert to village blacksmith or horse & buggy driver or other primitiveness in a hobby activity to fulfill some mythical "requirement of knowing 'basics'" in order to be "as good as them!" Their "knowledge" of data comms is relegated to the memorizing-of-manufacturer's-advertisements-descriptions for "technical familiarity"...if a description says that a system operates at a low data rate, they cannot envision the possible

scaling to a high data rate...and vice-versa, very high data rate scaled down to slower speed and narrower bandwidth.

The first commercial telegraph circuit opened in 1844. Queen Victoria's coronation was about 1847 and she reigned into the 1900s beginning while radio was first demonstrated as a communications means in 1896. Among the PCTAs there is a terrible radio "victorianism" both in technology and morality...the chronology and subsequent utterances of those PCTAs is too coincident to overlook!

In this arena of PCTA radio-backwoodsmen (who can manually fell giant redwoods in their fantasies), there can be NO talk of what any radio service is doing other than what is blessed and codified by the league. [see numerous utterances of the resident gunnery nurse]

"Shannon?" Who's he? He didn't have a DXCC, hasn't worked a DX contest, isn't a dues-paying league member. Claude Elwood is "SK" bless his joyful soul, but he did establish the relationships, the framework on getting the highest data (of any kind, not just teleprinter) through any given bandwidth on any communication circuit. No village smithy anvils needed to bang out wireline morse on a solid-state radio and pretend to be "advancing the state of the radio art." :-)

[expletive deleted]

[morse testing deleted]

[more expletives!...:-)]

LHA / WMD

2396. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 04:55:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040209235514.01019.00000379@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87271

In article <anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Now, because of this incident, broadcasters are installing tape delay
>equipment to ensure that inappropriate things are not aired. This is
>not being done for the benefit of the public good, mind you - it is
>being done so as to placate the advertizers, so that they don't end up
>on the wrong side of public opinion and lose market share - and keep
>those big bucks coming in.....

Broadcasters have used various kinds of "tape delay" since 1956
and before.

The most common has been the magnetic tape delay of a few
seconds for the audio. One example was the first Apollo mission
around the moon (but not landing) during Christmas holiday; VOA
did not use any delay but the network broadcasters had about a
3 second (approximately) delay of the same feed from NASA.
[no, it wasn't in case an astronaut bared a breast on audio...:-)]

Television broadcasters are considering longer combined audio-
video delay for minutes, not just seconds, to avoid the "shock
video" that upsets so many. This will usually mean another
person on constant monitoring in real-time on live shows to do
real-time "evaluation" of morality, etc., in order to cut out the
"offensive" material. [especially so for seven-year-old extras and
outraged bus driver veterans of the desk wars]

Considering that ALL network corporate income comes from
advertising time sales in U.S. broadcasting (PBS calls it
"sponsorship" in lovely spin while trying to be high-faluting and
lofty, even when carrying artsy, refined humor from Python shows),
the networks are VERY cognizant of advertising/marketing opinion.
"Public opinion" is, and always has been, secondary except for
who watches the shows paid for by advertising sales.

Now, in truth, NONE of the above nor anything in this thread has
not the remotest relationship to amaeur radio policy. :-) The
entire thread has none. Of no matter, it is considered vital and
important that all must be licensed amateur radio service men in
order to discuss female-specific anatomy and morals required for
their seven-year-old peer group. Sigh.

LHA / WMD

2397. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 05:29:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <2vqg20lea5dh39otm7tmtauk8lqmjhdorm@4ax.com>
Source record: 87273

On 10 Feb 2004 04:55:13 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>> Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.
>>
>>....That line still makes me laugh every time I read it!
>
> It is absolutely, positively, 100% true. Brian Burke's phrase should
> go into the textbooks. :-)
>
>>I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
>>better than voice. Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
>>tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded. From the experimenting
>>(read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
>>months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
>>get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
>>appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
>>with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
>>Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
>>on it.....
>>
>>Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
>>And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
>>lazy - like me) :)
>>
>>I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
>>there must have been similar narrowband technologies used by the
>>military which predated it - any idea what they were?
>
> PSK31 was designed/innovated by Peter Martinez, G3PLX, in the
> UK, then air-tested by several over much of Yurp. Years ago.
>
> There's a whole heaping lot of techniques/systems used by the
> militaries (of the world, actually) on sending data/teleprinter over
> both wire and radio circuits. Too many to recount in here. Few of
> the militaries or the governments or the commercial carriers bother
> with narrowband-specific communication circuits since they have
> needs to send much data quickly. The advance in Information
> Theory and Coding (generic other than morse code or character
> codes) have applied themselves to other things besides comm
> applications: Single-error correction, double-error detection for
> computer memory applications to real-time analysis of seismic

> effects on building structures. Real-time Fourier Analysis has
> been at the heart of that and includes mundane things like the
> little audio bargraph displays on home music systems (usually
> combined with "equalizer" settings of same).
>
> The "MIT Redbook" by Peterson and Weldon is a thick text
> chock full of all sorts of data coding schemes, error correction of
> same, plus ways other than Forward Error Correction to send data
> best without extra bits (something alluded to in Shannon's seminal
> 1948 paper that became familiarly known as "Shannon's Law").
>
> The VLF Alert messages in the USN submarine fleet is not a
> subject of discussion. Those are digital, encrypted, and have some
> other features to work through all kinds of RF interference. The
> militaries/governments/commercial carriers generally confine them-
> selves to rather standard medium- to high-throughput systems for
> radio circuits without going into complicated schemes. The various
> "TOR" modes are very close to those. Add to that the ALE or
> Automatic Link Establishment interrogation-response on auto-
> measurement of signal quality and that is the broad picture of what
> goes on by non-amateur communications HF to VHF. Note: Some
> of the details of everyday encryption are in the grey area of talk and
> I won't go into that due to prohibitions of U.S. law. If any such appear
> on the Internet, it has been cleared for public viewing, not classified.
>
> A wide example of medium- to high-rate data communications allied
> to the basics of PSK31 is the common data modem used with
> personal computers. It can, with a good POTS line (Plain Old Telephone
> System), send 56K data rate material over a 3 KHz bandwidth. There
> are, literally, millions of those modems in existance; 152 million
> personal computers were sold worldwide in 2003 alone according to a
> story in LA Times Business section for 9 Feb 04.
>
> The standard data modem with PCs uses a combination of amplitude
> and phase modulation of a carrier tone plus some rudimentary digital
> state re-arrangments to get a rate increase far above conventional
> single-mode modulations yet it does not violate Shannon's Law. Many
> who can only grasp the single-mode concepts keep trying to say "it
> isn't possible!" yet the possible is happening 24/7 worldwide by the
> millions. The generality of such dramatic rate versus bandwidth can
> be applied anywhere. PSK31 was one of those, cleverly arranged
> by Martinez to fit into a bandwidth equal to a morse code spectral
> space and perform just a bit better at an average throughouput of
> about 30 WPM. The PSK31 system is a complex one yet quite
> easy to implement with the aid of a (now) common personal
> computer. The PC isn't absolutely necessary since a dedicated
> terminal or radio modem can be built in a smaller package...but
> still needs a keyboard, display-printer to complete the data terminal.
>
> What is astounding, in a world of technological plenty, that there are

> so many radio-backwoodsmen demanding that all revert to village
> blacksmith or horse & buggy driver or other primitiveness in a hobby
> activity to fulfill some mythical "requirement of knowing 'basics'" in
> order to be "as good as them!" Their "knowledge" of data comms is
> relegated to the memorizing-of-manufacturer's-advertisements-
> descriptions for "technical familiarity"...if a description says that a
> system operates at a low data rate, they cannot envision the possible
> scaling to a high data rate...and vice-versa, very high data rate scaled
> down to slower speed and narrower bandwidth.
>
> The first commercial telegraph circuit opened in 1844. Queen
> Victoria's coronation was about 1847 and she reigned into the 1900s
> beginning while radio was first demonstrated as a communications
> means in 1896. Among the PCTAs there is a terrible radio
> "victorianism" both in technology and morality...the chronology and
> subsequent utterances of those PCTAs is too coincident to overlook!
>
> In this arena of PCTA radio-backwoodsmen (who can manually fell
> giant redwoods in their fantasies), there can be NO talk of what
> any radio service is doing other than what is blessed and codified by
> the league. [see numerous utterances of the resident gunnery nurse]
>
> "Shannon?" Who's he? He didn't have a DXCC, hasn't worked a DX
> contest, isn't a dues-paying league member. Claude Elwood is "SK"
> bless his joyful soul, but he did establish the relationships, the
> framework on getting the highest data (of any kind, not just teleprinter)
> through any given bandwidth on any communication circuit. No village
> smithy anvils needed to bang out wireline morse on a solid-state
> radio and pretend to be "advancing the state of the radio art." :-)
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> [morse testing deleted]
>
> [more expletives!...:-)]
>
> LHA / WMD

Excellent answer - thanks very much!

73, Leo

2398. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 06:36:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210013625.00545.00004251@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87275

In article <c2356669.0402091511.5dda845@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>You're wrong about that.
>
>> 'Tis true, though - however difficult it may be.
>>
>Let me hold this mirror up for ya, Leo......
>
>Just because I disagree with some of your opinions doesn't make me
>"wrong".

But...everyone who disagrees with YOUR opinions are "wrong!"

Gotta love the double standards of the Extras in here... :-)

LHA / WMD

2399. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 06:36:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210013626.00545.00004252@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87274

In article <rOYVb.1431$t16.1160750@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

> At the moment I am only a little Morseman but perhaps
>someday I too will be a Mighty Morseman.

In CW nobody can hear your gender... :-)

LHA / WMD

2400. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 10:01:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87276

In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> >> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>> >Sohl"
>> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >[snip]
>> >
>> >> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>> >access
>> >> >to
>> >> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>> >giving
>> >> >them
>> >> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>> >
>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>>
>> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>> >
>> >Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>>
>> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>
>You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
>to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know

[expletive deleted]

> well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...

I'm not squirming or stretching, Carl. Just pointing out some facts. And I
don't
know what you intended to mean - I just know what you actually wrote. Frankly,

I was very surprised that you support free upgrades without *written* testing
for over 400,000 US hams

>> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
>
>I'm not ...

Let's get this clear right now.

ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade to
General with no additional testing.

They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra
with no additional testing.

Do you support those free upgrades or not?

If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction in
the written test requirements for those licenses.

Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction, but it's
still a reduction. And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small
matter.

>I'm supporting the establishment of a reasonable, viable
>entry level class with appropriate testing and restrictions.

That's a completely different issue. And I support the "NewNovice" concept as
well. In fact I proposed it here more than two years ago.
>
>>Yet now I see that same person
>> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
>> tests...
>
>As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
>tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in a
>way
>where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are already
>authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any knowledge
>of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.

Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech written is
adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not simply dump
the General question pools into the Extra, and use the current Tech pool for
General?
>>
>> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>>
>> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>> >> is there?
>> >
>> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't

>> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>>
>> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>
>Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
>(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
>
How do you know what FCC wants?

>[snip]
>
>> >After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>> >comments on the subject on eHam.net
>>
>> I'll ask again for a link to those comments.
>
>Go to eham.net (or use Google) ..

I did. No luck.

>I don't have the URL direct to Ed's comments handy ...
>
So there's a wonderful set of arguments out there, but you can't/won't
point us to them.....That's not how you sell something, Carl.

>> >I (personally, not as NCI)
>> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>> >
>> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
>> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
>
>Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you have
>a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)

I don;t have any hangups about the tests. I'm all for them.

If the difference isn't so great, why require the General test at all?
>
>> Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
>> there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and
>> the
>> new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
>> they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
>
>They could make a rules change effective 30 days from publication in the
>Federal Register ...
>
Sure - but they don't. Look at the 2000 restructuring - announced in late
December 1999, made effective April 15, 2000. More than 3-1/2 months
- over 100 days - of prep time.

>> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes
>> take
>> place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>
>Give me a break ...

What do you mean? That's exactly what a lot of people will do.

Those with no license or an existing Novice will have an incentive
to get a Tech before the rules change and ride the free upgrade
bus to General. Those with Tech will have a *disincentive* to
actually take (or study for) the General. Same for Advanceds
and the Extra.

>your arguments are just plain lame

How? Do you think people won't do this?

>and your "someone might
>get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as I took"
>is REALLY showing.

Nobody today can even take the tests I took. You couldn't pass the tests I
took,
Carl.

The tests I took are not the issue. Free upgrades and reduction in written test
requirements are the issue.
>
>> I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...
>
>Go find them - you know how to google.

I'll look again but it's quite telling that you are being very unhelpful when
asked for assistance
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2401. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 10:54:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100254.587267ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87277

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<402829F7.1080505@ix.netcom.com>...

> Bring back the code only license.....

Why, Robert?

WHERE have you seen me or ANYone else in this forum suggest that
Morse Code is the ONLY mode we want to operate?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2402. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 10:56:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100256.7aaf0279@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87278

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040210013626.00545.00004252@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <rOYVb.1431$t16.1160750@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> > At the moment I am only a little Morseman but perhaps
> >someday I too will be a Mighty Morseman.
>
> In CW nobody can hear your gender.

Why would anyone have to, Lennie? In CW, all I am concerned with
is how well that person manipulates a Bug, key, paddle, etc. Of
course there are those who use keyboards, but not everyone can be A
Mighty Morseman.

ESPECIALLY you.

Steve, K4YZ

2403. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:01:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100301.15b275b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87279

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040210013625.00545.00004251@mb-m02.aol.com>

> Gotta love the double standards of the Extras in here...

The only "double standard in here" belongs to a certain
unlicensed, untruthful, unmitigated pathological liar named LEONARD H.
ANDERSON.

Ooooops! That would be YOU! =)

Steve, K4YZ

2404. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:06:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100306.5dc0790e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87280

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040209235514.01019.00000379@mb-m25.aol.com>...

> Now, in truth, NONE of the above nor anything in this thread has
> not the remotest relationship to amaeur radio policy.

A TYPO! A TYPO! Geeze! Lennie must be SEETHING with anger!
(Based on HIS "Rules of Engagement", of course!

> The entire thread has none. Of no matter, it is considered vital and
> important that all must be licensed amateur radio service men in
> order to discuss female-specific anatomy and morals required for
> their seven-year-old peer group. Sigh.

Nope...In this thread you are perfectly welcome, Sir Putzman.
This is one thread that you MIGHT have some practical experience from
which to base an INFORMED opinion about.

I DOUBT it, but in THIS case I will give you the BENEFIT of the
doubt!

Steve, K4YZ

2405. Re: New game on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:10:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100310.6a7210c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87281

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040208134921.05539.00004181@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <20040208095449.06226.00002817@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> >Oyez, quite a chap, that one! Next to him we're all babies...
>
> Seven-year-old Amateur Extras?

Lennie, was there a reason you started a thread with the same
name rather than keep the same thread intact?

Steve, K4YZ

2406. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:17:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100317.29bd7fc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87282

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203150349.21232.00004012@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> In article <20040202200502.07984.00000419@mb-m22.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> >But we're not going back to those days, so other methods must be used. One
> >solution is to make the question pool so large and varied that it's easier for
> >99% of prospective hams to just learn the material rather than memorize or
> >word-associate their way to a passing grade.
>
> USA amateur radio regulations require only a MINIMUM of 10 for every
> written test element question. There is NO maximum.
>
> Anyone who wants a "tougher" test that all but the eidetic could not
> memorize ought to bug the VEC Question Pool Committee. They
> decide on how big the question pool is, not the FCC.

And unless the FCC closes the pools, it's of little use.

Also, too many of those "questions" and thier distractors are
just re-wordings of the same question...Still makes it easier to
"eliminate" the wrong answers rather than KNOW the correct one.

> I've been repeating the above for quite a while...but it seems that
> "new ideas" have a difficult time catching on...

You also repeated "I'm going to get an Extra Lite out of the box"
several times, but obvioulsy THAT "new idea" didn't catch on, even in
your OWN camp, Lennie.

Of course WE never expected you to keep your word...

Ya Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

2407. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:19:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100319.fa76d91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87283

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040203195239.15923.00003573@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <AICdnQxpB8lRfYLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

> > Just like the difficulties I had with learning Morse, a person that has
>
> >trouble with drawing should just work hard at it!
>
> Do you have...(SNIP)

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"
Leonard H. Anderson.

Yet one more validation of the assertion that Lennie is a liar.

Thanks, Lennie...In this ONE endeavour you always prevail.

Steve, K4YZ

2408. Re: My Idea For A New License Structure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:22:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402100322.58e2e82f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87284

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040207015750.06226.00002777@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402051521.6fac4012@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >TAFKA Rev. Jim, has the cat got your tongue?
>
> It's sleeping on his bug.
>
> Don't wake the dead.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"
Leonard H. Anderson.

It's so heartwarming to see Lennie the Liar and his Brain cuddled
up in newsgroup agitation....father and son.

Steve, K4YZ

2409. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 11:44:10 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0ag69$sa4$06$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87285

Len and the group,

reading here since a few weeks, i do agree with the sight of view from your standpoint.

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag news:20040209235511.01019.00000376@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <c08g7k$f4$04$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
> writes:
>
> >> How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
> >> period of time before the changes?
> >
> >Jim, it is not the difference in numbers, it is just the fact, that it
> >happend. Give yourself the cream upon the cake and think positive about the
> >new situation. Showing anger and agressiv language against those beeing a
> >"victim" of the restructuring process doesn't bring any good to the ham
> >family. Not in your country, and not around the world. And where we cannot
> >do anything against it, it's not worth to argue about it. It is NOT
> >negotiable.
>
> Helmut, what you say is true but the verbose regulars in this newsgroup
> are adamant "America-firsters," that is, what the Americans do is "best"
> and therefore that is good for the rest of the world.

There is nothing wrong to be patriotic. But beeing patriotic does not mean, whats good for my countrie must be good for any other one. Amateur Radio is a global "institution". The rules for AR are set by an international entity.
>
> The IARU came out with the opinion years ago that morse code testing
> should be eliminated from an ITU requirement. The ARRL, a supposed
> leader of American amateur radio (with membership less than 25% of
> all American amateur licensees) was against it. They aren't really for
> eliminating any of it and remain in a middle position, neither for nor
> against it. ARRL tries to please too many, therefore there is no real
> consensus possible. It reduces to a simple phrasing for American
> radio amateurs: All must do as was done in the old days by the old-
> timers...because the old-timers imagine they are "the best."

Are this oldtime-hams still use spark gap TX? Thats what they should do when argueing this way. The Americans never would have reached the moon, thinking

this "old days" way.

>
> It is a sad situation for the entire world in my estimation, a stubborn
> opinion that belongs better in times of two centuries ago. As an
> American who loves his country and has done so longer than most
> other Americans in here, I am ashamed of their "radio-backwoodsman"
> attitudes. Such reflects poorly on us, yet so many remain stubbornly
> resolute in an America-first belief, a parochial attitude centering
> around themselves with little regard to this nation or the world.
>
> Fortunately for the rest of the radio world (much larger than
amateurism)
> the USA's negotiations on that rest of the radio world activity is
better
> and more liberal, willing to listen to other points of view. In here
there
> is NO other view allowed if it displeases the old-time regulars.

What makes me frightened is, theat there is no will to change ones way of thinking into a global range. The kind of "this is my fence, I dont care whats outside" mentality is not a hams mentality. It reminds me of the mentality of the ancient "southstates and yankee" disputes in the OLD US. It must be the genes, keeping fellow hams from going the right, the ham way.

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

>
> LHA / WMD

2410. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 12:27:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402100427.19cbaac7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87286

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns948AC24DE453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>...
> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
> news:pckd201oro8uoes7c1nfsvjm30kflmepst@4ax.com:
>
> > On 8 Feb 2004 18:21:54 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
> >
> >>snip
> >>>
> >>Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to be
> >>both a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an American (or
> >>a Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada using my US call.
> >>
> >>The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American
> >>with a US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for only
> >>2 months within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No WARC
> >>bands or 40m for Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian call
> >>could operate indefinitely in the US, even living here permanently,
> >>under the terms of their Canadian licence (not to exceed Extra).
> >
> > Not sure if they have changed, Alun - just discovered them when I
> > bacame a ham a couple of years ago! The link to the RAC page with
> > info on the current reciprocal agreement is:
> >
> > http://www.rac.ca/regulatory/rcip.htm
> >
> > and IC RIC-3, which contains the details on the various agreements, US
> > and other, is at:
> >
> > http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/$FI
> > LE/ric3.pdf
> >
> > From what I read in these documents, one need only possess a US
> > licence to gain full Canadian privileges appropriate to the licence
> > class. For countries other than the US, CEPT and IARP permits are
> > acceptable.
> >
> > Hope that helps!
> >
> > 73, Leo
>
> The first page talks about 'Americans operating in Canada', but I am not an
> American, just someone with a US licence! That is the problem.
>

> Reading further, RIC-2 limits operation under the bilateral agreement to US
> citizens who are US residents, just as the previous rules did.
>
> However, in RIC-3 it says that operating in Canada is possible under CEPT.
>
> I cannot use my US licence under CEPT, as the CEPT letter that the FCC
> publish says that it is only valid for US citizens (I've no idea why, as
> the CEPT treaty does not mention citizenship anywhere).
>
> However, if I got my UK licence re-activated it would automatically be
> valid in Canada under CEPT. Someone who wasn't British would still be able
> to do that, although I am actually a British citizen. I often go across the
> border to Windsor when I visit Detroit, but I have never operated on the
> Canadian side. It seems if I did so it would have to be as VE3/G8VUK, after
> first getting my UK licence back.

AND you'd be able to run ssb below 7.100. Fancy that. Huge burden relieved. Move.

> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

w3rv

2411. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 14:46:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4028EEE0.80104@psu.edu>
Source record: 87287

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
>
>>In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>>
>>>Sohl"
>>>
>>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>
>>>[snip]
>>>
>>>
>>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>>>>>
>>>access
>>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
>>>>>
>>>giving
>>>
>>>>them
>>>>
>>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>>>>
>>>Jim,
>>>
>>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>>
>>Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>>required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>>
>>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>>
```

>>You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>
>
> You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
> to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
> damned well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...
>
>
>>And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>>in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
>
>
> I'm not ... I'm supporting the establishment of a reasonable, viable
> entry level class with appropriate testing and restrictions.

Speaking of spin!

>
>>Yet now I see that same person
>>supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
>>tests...
>
>
> As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
> tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in a
> way where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are already
> authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any knowledge
> of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.

More spin.

Mistake number one is that this doesn't "make things right".

Mistake number two is assuming that this will be a one shot deal.

What is the rationale for the return to more stringent requirements
after the mass upgrade? That will be looked at as a clear disincentive
to adding new hams after the "upgrade" process.

>>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>>>>
>>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>>>>is there?
>>>
>>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>>>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>>
>>Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>
>
> Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
> (or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.

How are you going to counter the argument that the requirements are
suddenly increased after "making things right"?

If a person that that takes the Technician test today is qualified to
be on HF, then they are equally as qualified the day after things are
"made right".

The only way that this can even remotely be "fair" would be to make the
post restructuring test requirements for the entry level license much
easier.

But you'll never support that will you?

>
>>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>>>comments on the subject on eHam.net
>>
>>I'll ask again for a link to those comments.
>
>
> Go to eham.net (or use Google) ... I don't have the URL direct
> to Ed's comments handy ...

I've used both, and haven't found the comments.

>>>I (personally, not as NCI)
>>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>>>
>>
>>Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
>>for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
>
>
> Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you have
> a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
>
>
>>Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
>>there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and
>
> the
>
>>new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
>>they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
>
>
> They could make a rules change effective 30 days from publication in the
> Federal Register ...
>
>
>>So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes
>

> take
>
>>place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>
>
> Give me a break ... your arguments are just plain lame and your "someone
> might get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as
>I took" is REALLY showing.

Sorry, Carl! The arguments aren't lame.

>>I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...
>
>
> Go find them - you know how to google.

Give us a break here Carl! Both of us have tried, and they seem to be
hidden in there. Perhaps they were removed?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2412. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 14:52:42 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <4arh20pn9ibl6of397hckdu7athrvie501@4ax.com>
Source record: 87288

On 9 Feb 2004 15:11:08 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>...
>snip
>>
>> Agreed. But it just ain't that big a deal.
>
>Not to you. To other people it *is* a big deal. Not just the incident
>itself,
>but the incident as a symbol of how goofy the whole system is.

Goofy is right.

Just found this article on Fox News this morning, regarding a class
action suit that has been filed in Tennessee over the Janet Jackson
'exposure':

http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,110630,00.html

The lawsuit claims that:

"As a direct and proximate result of the broadcast of the acts,
[Carlin] and millions of others saw the acts and were caused to suffer
outrage, anger, embarrassment and serious injury."

Serious injury? Millions injured? From a TV picture of a breast? (that
ain't no ordinary breast, it's a WMD...) One can only speculate on
the nature of that one - the suit doesn't specify what kind of injury
was caused.

Hmmm - still think the Star article missed the target?

Nope, no irrational reaction there, eh? <8^0

>snip
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2413. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 17:39:57 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948B80C21E6B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87289

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0402100427.19cbaac7@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns948AC24DE453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>...
>> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
>> news:pckd201oro8uoes7c1nfsvjm30kflmepst@4ax.com:
>>
>> > On 8 Feb 2004 18:21:54 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >>snip
>> >>>
>> >>Have the Canadian rules changed? The last time I read it you had to
>> >>be both a US citizen and a US resident to qualify. I'm not an
>> >>American (or a Canadian either) so I couldn't operate in Canada
>> >>using my US call.
>> >>
>> >>The rules I read were certainly not reciprocal, though. An American
>> >>with a US call and residing in the US could operate in Canada for
>> >>only 2 months within the terms of the nearest Canadian licence (No
>> >>WARC bands or 40m for Generals!), whereas a Canadian with a Canadian
>> >>call could operate indefinitely in the US, even living here
>> >>permanently, under the terms of their Canadian licence (not to
>> >>exceed Extra).
>> >
>> > Not sure if they have changed, Alun - just discovered them when I
>> > bacame a ham a couple of years ago! The link to the RAC page with
>> > info on the current reciprocal agreement is:
>> >
>> > http://www.rac.ca/regulatory/rcip.htm
>> >
>> > and IC RIC-3, which contains the details on the various agreements,
>> > US and other, is at:
>> >
>> > http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric3.pdf/
>> > $FI LE/ric3.pdf
>> >
>> > From what I read in these documents, one need only possess a US
>> > licence to gain full Canadian privileges appropriate to the licence
>> > class. For countries other than the US, CEPT and IARP permits are
>> > acceptable.
>> >
>> > Hope that helps!
>> >

>> > 73, Leo
>>
>> The first page talks about 'Americans operating in Canada', but I am
>> not an American, just someone with a US licence! That is the problem.
>>
>> Reading further, RIC-2 limits operation under the bilateral agreement
>> to US citizens who are US residents, just as the previous rules did.
>>
>> However, in RIC-3 it says that operating in Canada is possible under
>> CEPT.
>>
>> I cannot use my US licence under CEPT, as the CEPT letter that the FCC
>> publish says that it is only valid for US citizens (I've no idea why,
>> as the CEPT treaty does not mention citizenship anywhere).
>>
>> However, if I got my UK licence re-activated it would automatically be
>> valid in Canada under CEPT. Someone who wasn't British would still be
>> able to do that, although I am actually a British citizen. I often go
>> across the border to Windsor when I visit Detroit, but I have never
>> operated on the Canadian side. It seems if I did so it would have to
>> be as VE3/G8VUK, after first getting my UK licence back.
>
> AND you'd be able to run ssb below 7.100. Fancy that. Huge burden
> relieved. Move.
>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> w3rv
>

Anyone would try to think you were trying to get rid of me, LOL!

2414. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 17:52:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402100952.7e377dfc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87290

af1q@netzero.com (James F. Aguiar) wrote in message
news:<6884c75d.0402091316.230de5c5@posting.google.com>...
> I think the ARRL is doing a super job of taking care of its own cash
> cow.

Do you think all of the work done at ARRL Hq could be done by unpaid
volunteers?

> Ham Radio as we know it is changing in the interest of progress
> with no considration for the hobby.

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

> I bet if everyone who subscribes
> to QST was to cancel their subscriptions,in other words, BOY COTT the
> ARRL, their trend of thought would take a sudden change of direction.

Of course it would. But why should the members do that? What issue
would make
all of the members decide to drop out?

> Who cares about manufactures who pay for glossy pages of advertisment
> in QST.

I care about one or two of them.

> After all didn't we all used to make our own radios once.

Some of us still do.

Is all of your ham gear home made?

> It seems as though the reciepe is to dismantle the hobby of amateur
> radio and ARRL is trying to hang on to what ever will keep them going
> as money making tax free organization.

What, exactly, is ARRL doing that you disagree with? Please be
specific.

> Ask your self, what has the ARRL ever done for you personally or for
> anyone you know, I bet the answer is zero, nada.

You lose!

Here are some things ARRL has done for me:

- Excellent publications that helped me learn radio theory and
practice
- W1AW code practice helped me improve code skills

- ARRL-sponsored contests, awards and nets are a lot of fun and build
skills as well.
- PRB-1
- Fight against BPL
- Best ham magazine ever printed (QST)
- Representation in Washington and internationally, as well as
information.

> I am glad that I have at least had the past 47 or so years of amateur
> radio.

Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.

I've been a ham for 36+ years, too.

> That is how I feel and I just want to voice my personal opinion even
> though I am going to get bashed for it.

No bashing, just some questions. You may *feel* the ARRL does nothing
for you, but the reality is quite different.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0402090633.3f2b1d3a@posting.google.com>...
> > "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c07i32$53c$03$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > > Hi all, on this thread,
> >
> > Hello!
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > > news:20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > > > In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > > > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > > >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > >> Jim,
> > > > >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> > > > > Only a few?
> > > > > Fun fact:
> > > > > When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras,
> that
> > > > > is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The more
> the
> > > > > merrier - IF they pass the tests.
> > > >
> > > > You all are on the wrong numbers, as you might recall, that the airwaves
> > > > wont stop ath the borders of your country.

> >
> > The "others" I wrote of above are other US Amateur Extra licensees.
> >
> > > There are already hundrets of
> > > thousands HAMS worldwide in "Your Sandbox".
> >
> > It's not my sandbox. It's our sandbox. And all who can pass the
> > required
> > tests are welcome! Not just "a few".
> >
> > > Dont you think that beeing a ham
> > > requires only some simple testing?
> >
> > Yes! The tests for a US license are very simple, yet some people want
> > them
> > to be even more simple. I don't think that's a good idea.
> >
> > > It requires GLOBAL THINKING of open
> > > minded persons. All what I could read here on this matter is everything else
> > > than OPEN MINDED and not a bit of GLOBAL HAM THINKING.
> >
> > Most of what is discussed here is amateur radio policy in the USA.
> > That's simply a result of it being US based and in English.
> >
> > > > >So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the test
> > > > >that other Extra's take.
> > > >
> > > > Exactly.
> > > >
> > > > >> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> > > > >
> > > > > as are your motives.
> > > >
> > > > As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in *our*
> > > > sandbox.
> > >
> > > What is "your sandbox"?
> >
> > I don't have one!
> >
> > > Where can I make a test to access 40m above 7.100 ?
> >
> > Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
> >
> > The reason hams in Regions 1 and 3 don't have 7.100-7.300 is that
> > their
> > governments wanted that spectrum for shortwave broacasting in 1938.
> > It's
> > not the fault of hams or governments in Region 2.
> >

> > > Where can I do the test for usage of 146 - 148 MHz?
> >
> > Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
> >
> > > This is your sandbox, I
> > > assume.
> >
> > Not mine. Ours.
> >
> > > But all the other Ham frequencies are also the sandbox and
> > > playground of all the hams in the world. Their numbers are a lot more than
> > > just 100k.
> >
> > And they're all welcome. But how many of them are actually using, say,
> > 7.000 to 7.025?
> > >
> > > > >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >
> > > > > >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> > > > > >>>is there?
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> > > > > >> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >
> > > > > >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
> > > > > >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
> > > > > >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
> > > > > >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
> > > > > >>>
> > > > > >>>Then just leave 'em be!
> >
> > > > > >> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
> > > > > >> is unacceptable.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?
> > > > >
> > > > > Good question.
> > > > >
> > > > > >> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
> > > > > >> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
> > > > > >> limits.
> > > > >
> > > > > >On what relevant statements do you base this?
> > > > >
> > > > > >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> > > > > >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
> > > > > >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> > > > > >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> > > > >
> > > > > As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test

> > > > >requirements, how do you support your rationale?
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously the
> > > > >answer is yes.
> > > > >
> > > > > Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified to
> > > > >operate at the level to which they will be advanced?
> > >
> > > Thats the usual procedure in most countries of the globe to make a one shot
> > > exam.
> >
> > That's not the case in the USA. We have several classes of license,
> > with a very
> > easy and simple exam for the limited-privileges licenses and a more
> > advanced exam for the full-privileges license. By the standards of
> > most of the rest of
> > the world, the USA exams are very easy.
> >
> > What is being discussed in this thread is a proposal that would give
> > more privileges to many with limited-privileges license *without* any
> > more tests.
> > I think that's a bad idea.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
> > > > > >come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General upgrade.
> > > >
> > > > Effective after Aug. 15, 2003, this kind of upgrade from non-HF to HF- Hams
> > > > has occured after the WRC03 throughout the world.
> >
> > Are you talking about the code test? We're talking about the *written*
> > tests.
> >
> > > This has been of greatest
> > > benefit to ham radio after its developement. Now as there is young blood on
> > > the bands, it will keep the ITU from knibbling on the bands.
> >
> > How much difference has it really made?
> >
> > How many countries have changed their rules?
> >
> > How many new hams have gotten on the air since those changes?
> >
> > How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
> > period of time before the changes?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

2415. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 17:54:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402100954.31c0733b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87291

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402091518.7f42d818@posting.google.com>...
> For many years now the sane and the reasonable in this forum have
> dodged Lennie the Liar's labelling of the Code Tested among us as
> "morsemen", "mighty morsemen", etc etc. If for no other reason than
> because HE uses it to try an belittle us.
>
> But I have to ask myself...WHY...?!?! =)
>
To annoy and insult you, Steve. Isn't that clear after all these years?

Ask yourself why you bother to pay attention to him.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2416. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 18:02:48 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>
Source record: 87292

On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>snip
>
>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.

Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
is still going strong there.....

>
>snip

>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 18:14:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402101014.77fe51f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87293

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<nkag20hecb5qnqlbqc4v5re0hpsp77f0vu@4ax.com>...
> On 9 Feb 2004 15:25:04 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<laff20d9vauh4dl22v41rucqnkrgne3qrg@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> I understand that Morse is good for getting through poor conditions
> >> better than voice.
> >
> >Much better than any form of analog voice.
> >
> >> Makes sense, it is narrowband and binary (well,
> >> tri-state if you count the spaces...) encoded.
> >
> >Exactly.
> >
> >> From the experimenting
> >> (read: fooling around) that I have been doing over the past couple of
> >> months, I have been repeatedly amazed with the ability of BPSK-31 to
> >> get clean copy through pretty bad conditions. Even DX signals that
> >> appear as weak vestiges on the waterfall display can be easily decoded
> >> with near 100% accuracy, using just a PC sound card as an interface.
> >
> >The soundcard is only part of the system. The decoder is quite smart,
> >in that
> >it stores and examines the received data and does a "best fit"
> >decoder. You can read all about it at several websites.
>
> Good point - I've compared it to RTTY from the decoding standpoint -
> RTTY seems to be much more prone to losing characters or dropping out
> entirely when the signal is weak or noise is high.

Part of that is the modulation method used and part is the encoding.
There's a good explanation of the varicode philosophy and the PSK31
modulation method on a number of websites.

btw, PSK31 in BPSK mode works at around 45-50 wpm. The speed depends
on the exact text sent because the length of each character varies,
but the average character is 6 to 7 bits long.

>
> >But it's important to realize what constitutes "poor conditions".
> >Against purely amplitude noise it's quite robust. But against phase
> >noise of various
> >types it is not robust at all. All depends on the situation.

>
> >> Frequency stability of my old Heath TX is a problem, but I'm working
> >> on it.....
> >
> >What rig is it?
>
> Heath SB-400. The Pride of 1964 :)

Amazing how well a 40 year old box full of glowbottles is still
useful, huh?
15 Hz stability from a one-tube Hartley is pretty decent.
>
> With a narrowband signal like this, it doesn't take much drift! I'm
> seeing a frequency decrease of up to 15 Hz, beginning a few seconds
> after keying. B+ to the VFO appears to be well regulated - maybe not
> tight enough though. Might have to replace the 0A2 with a few zeners
> - haven't tried that yet....

First try replacing the 0A2 regulator and 6AU6A oscillator tubes -
different
ones may have slightly different characteristics.

But the real problem may be that the heater voltage is changing when
transmitting, rather than the B+. Another possibility is that heat
from the
6146s and power supply may be causing a bit of drift, because PSK31 is
a very
high duty cycle mode and a lot of heat gets dissipated on transmit.

One cure to consider is to build an external VFO, either LC or
synthetic, to do the job. The SB-400 LMO tunes 5.0 to 5.5 MHz, and it
tunes "backwards" (5.5 MHz on the VFO is the low end of the band
selected). Such a VFO could be mounted
externally to eliminate any changes to the rig itself.

I copied the heterodyne scheme of the Heath SB-series for the
Southgate Type 6 transceivers, btw. Found some Heath filters at the
1978 Rochester hamfest and
built a rig around them. Now it's on "standby" duty since the Type 7
entered service about 10 years ago.
>
> >> Now there's something that will get through when nothing else will.
> >
> >Not really. You will find times when the PSK-31 signal is clearly
> >audible in the speaker, well above the background amplitude noise, but
> >the decoder cannot make sense of it because the phase distortion is
> >too bad.
>
> Haven't experienced that yet - at least when I see that, I'll know
> what is causing it!

Exactly.
>
> >> And, it types itself out, too. (that's a real boon for the perennially
> >> lazy - like me) :)
> >
> >It was meant as a replacement for conventional RTTY - as a "keyboard
> >to keyboard" mode. For example, the speed was chosen to be about what
> >*average* conversational keyboarding hams use.
> >
> >btw, the code used in PSK-31 uses shorter symbols for the most common
> >characters and longer ones for the least common. Just like Morse code,
> >which is where the designers got the idea.
>
> Didn't know that - great idea, though!

Yup. Even the use of 00 for a character space was derived from Morse.

> >> I believe that BPSK-31 was created within the amateur community -
> >
> >Yup - G3PLX, and a number of folks who helped him by testing it out on
> >the air and others who have developed software packages. A local ham
> >of my acquaintance (one of those longtime 20 wpm 1x2 Extras with
> >multiple EE degrees - we share two alma maters, btw) was one of the
> >team who helped test it out.
> >
> >PSK-31 is another great tool in the toolbox, but not a replacement for
> >good old Morse Code.
>
> Haven't formulated an opinion on that one yet - stay tuned!
>
Consider that it takes a lot more hardware to implement PSK31, and
that
the requirements of that hardware are much more stringent than what is
required to implement Morse code.

Consider also that Morse code, as used by hams, is an aural mode, but
doesn't
require talking. Thus it can be used in a number of situations where
other
modes can't. For example, it's not safe to drive and work PSK-31, but
mobile
Morse operation is safely enjoyed by many hams. Using voice is often
out of
the question when it is of prime importance not to disturb other
family members.

And when cost, size, weight and battery power considerations are
paramount, Morse code equipment is the natural choice. Check out the
new KX1 at

http://www.elecraft.com

for an example of what can be done with modern Morse code radio
equipment.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2418. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 19:26:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402101126.6c15dd96@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87294

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4028EEE0.80104@psu.edu>...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >
> >>In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >>>
> >>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >>>
> >>>Sohl"
> >>>
> >>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>[snip]
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
> >>>>>
> >>>access
> >>>
> >>>>>to
> >>>>>
> >>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level. So
> >>>>>
> >>>giving
> >>>
> >>>>>them
> >>>>>
> >>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
> >>>>>
> >>>Jim,
> >>>
> >>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> >>
> >>Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
> >>required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
> >>
> >>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> >>

> >>You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
> >
> >
> > You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
> > to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
> > damned well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...
> >
> >
> >>And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
> >>in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
> >
> >
> > I'm not ... I'm supporting the establishment of a reasonable, viable
> > entry level class with appropriate testing and restrictions.
>
> Speaking of spin!

By whom? ;-)

As I see it, the ARRL proposal has five distinct parts:

1) A revised entry level license (I call it the "NewNovice" to
differentiate it from existing license classes). This new class would
have different requirements *and* different privileges than the
current entry-level license (Technician). It would essentially be a
reworking of the old Novice license and would require a new question
pool.

2) Putting most of the Tech test stuff into a new revised General test
(because there won't be any more Tech test).

3) Removal of the code test requirement from all but the Extra.

4) Upgrading all existing Techs and Tech Pluses to General

5) Upgrading all existing Advanceds to Extra.

I think 1) and 2) are a very good ideas

> >>Yet now I see that same person
> >>supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
> >>tests...

> > As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
> > tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in a
> > way where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are already
> > authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any knowledge
> > of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
>
> More spin.
>
> Mistake number one is that this doesn't "make things right".
>

> Mistake number two is assuming that this will be a one shot deal.

It will be, because after it's done there won't be any more Techs or
Tech Pluses. Or Advanceds. They'll all be Generals or Extras. No new
ones to be
issued.
>
> What is the rationale for the return to more stringent requirements
> after the mass upgrade?

Bingo!

Ham A got his General by passing the Tech and riding the free upgrade
bus.

Ham B has to pass the "NewNovice" (which is easier than the Tech) but
also
the revised General (which is harder than the existing General).

Explain to Ham B why she has to meet higher requirements than Ham A
for the same privileges. (I wanna be there when that is explained!)

> That will be looked at as a clear disincentive
> to adding new hams after the "upgrade" process.

Exactly.

> >>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >>>>
> >>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> >>>>is there?
> >>>
> >>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >>>sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >>
> >>Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
> >
> >
> > Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
> > (or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
>
> How are you going to counter the argument that the requirements are
> suddenly increased after "making things right"?

bwaahaahaa
>
> If a person that that takes the Technician test today is qualified to
> be on HF, then they are equally as qualified the day after things are
> "made right".

No more Tech tests will be offered after the Great Giveaway.
>
> The only way that this can even remotely be "fair" would be to make the

> post restructuring test requirements for the entry level license much
> easier.

That's part of the plan.
>
> But you'll never support that will you?

The privileges of the entry level license will be changed to match the
reduced written exam requirements.

> >>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
> >>>comments on the subject on eHam.net
> >>
> >>I'll ask again for a link to those comments.
> >
> >
> > Go to eham.net (or use Google) ... I don't have the URL direct
> > to Ed's comments handy ...
>
> I've used both, and haven't found the comments.
>
Nor I. So I emailed W1RFI and got a nice reply. I don't agree with his
logic but it was good to hear from him. No, I won't repost private
email here.
>
> >>>I (personally, not as NCI)
> >>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >>
> >>Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
> >>for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
> >
> > Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you have
> > a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)

More spin...

> >
> >>Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen overnight -
> >>there's always a time delay between when a rules change is announced and
> >
> > the
> >
> >>new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal tomorrow,
> >>they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
> >
> >
> > They could make a rules change effective 30 days from publication in the
> > Federal Register ...
> >
> >
> >>So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the changes

> >
> > take
> >
> >>place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
> >
> >
> > Give me a break ... your arguments are just plain lame and your "someone
> > might get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as
> >I took" is REALLY showing.
>
>
> Sorry, Carl! The arguments aren't lame.

Exactly.
>
> >>I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...
> >
> >
> > Go find them - you know how to google.
>
> Give us a break here Carl! Both of us have tried, and they seem to be
> hidden in there. Perhaps they were removed?
>
I doubt they were removed, but perhaps I will paraphrase them in a
future post.

But as of now, Carl has not made a convincing case for free upgrades.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2419. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 19:29:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402101129.443b0be6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87295

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<4arh20pn9ibl6of397hckdu7athrvie501@4ax.com>...
> On 9 Feb 2004 15:11:08 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>...
> >snip
> >>
> >> Agreed. But it just ain't that big a deal.
> >
> >Not to you. To other people it *is* a big deal. Not just the incident
> >itself,
> >but the incident as a symbol of how goofy the whole system is.
>
> Goofy is right.
>
> Just found this article on Fox News this morning, regarding a class
> action suit that has been filed in Tennessee over the Janet Jackson
> 'exposure':
>
> http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,110630,00.html
>
> The lawsuit claims that:
>
> "As a direct and proximate result of the broadcast of the acts,
> [Carlin] and millions of others saw the acts and were caused to suffer
> outrage, anger, embarrassment and serious injury."

That lawsuit has already been dropped. Basically someone getting their
15 minutes of fame.

It is absolutely surreal that the plaintiff's name is Carlin.

> Serious injury? Millions injured? From a TV picture of a breast? (that
> ain't no ordinary breast, it's a WMD...) One can only speculate on
> the nature of that one - the suit doesn't specify what kind of injury
> was caused.

Whiplash?
>
> Hmmm - still think the Star article missed the target?

Yes.
>
> Nope, no irrational reaction there, eh? <8^0

There certainly was - in the Star article...

But I think "Kid Rock" was far worse.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2420. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 19:31:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402101131.37f8be01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87296

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40253C6F.2D2714D4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40215E2A.C8F57755@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:

> Young Don Newell was the crucifer one Sunday at St. Andrew's Episcopal
> Church in Oak Hill. After the processional and after my father had
> begun the service, Don fished a tiny crystal radio from his cassock,
> stuffed the earphone into his ear and attached a wire with an alligator
> clip to the cross. As the service ended, my dad whispered to him, "I'd
> like a word after church".

Yeah, I'll bet there was a "word or two"!

> > You brought back a lot of hilarious memories of "electronerd
> > educations" gone awry David. Gawd we had fun . . !
>
> The best I've ever heard was deliverd at the Dayton banquet one year by
> Jean Shepherd.

I'd love to read it if his talk has been archived somewhere. I'll bet
that if some Shepherd-type individual went out and compiled tales
about all the goofy stunts and missteps kid hams got into back when in
a book it would sell.

> Well, in my case it was a one-time Christmas deal--the one BIG present
> and that was second-hand from Allied's big, used equipment list. The
> receiver I saved for was also from the same list.

I wonder if there are any Allied employees left from the days when
they were in the ham biz.

> More newspaper
> deliveries, an after-school job at the local hobby shop several days
> each week and the writing of a sports column for the local newspaper
> provided coaxial cable and connectors, a key, antenna wire and the
> like.

My first store-bought rcvr was a new Hallicrafters S-40B. Which I
bought from Sears & Roebuck believe it or not. At the time Sears sold
the S-38, the S-40, and a couple higher-end Hallicrafters rcvrs. I
think one of 'em was the SX-71. The S-40 catalog price was $119.95.
But I had an aunt who lived in Chicago and worked for Sears so I was
able to get her employee's 10% discount. A whole twelve bucks. I was
as interested in SWLing as much as I was into becoming a Novice so I

spent more time chasing SW BC "rare ones" than I did tuning the W1AW code practice sessions. Eventually though, maybe a year after I got the rcvr I had 7.5 wpm down cold and was close to 10 wpm so I trundled off downtown, took the test and put the S-40 to the real task.

> Some of that money was also spent on a big U.S. call area map and
> some (sorry, no choice of color) QSL cards from WRL.

Now yer really rubbing it in . . . The Globe King, the King of the Hill . . ! I understand that Leo is now 93 and is still at it at.

> > > ...and ran the W3KT outgoing QSL forwarding service for a number of
> > > years.
> >
> > I forgot all about that, tnx.
>
> I used Jesse's outgoing card forwarding service in the days preceeding
> the ARRL's outgoing bureau.

I knew it existed but I wasn't active in that timeframe.

> > Speaking of QSL card handling Joe Arcure W3HNK is in this
> > neighborhood, I gotta look him up.
>
> Joe used to be a regular at the DX hospitality suites at Dayton. I
> haven't seen him in a number of years.

He recently retired from Sun Oil and has tapered back from his former volume of QSL work. I haven't done an eyball with him for probably 40 years. It's time to dig him up for a lunch.

> All of this nostalgia has me fired up to grab my collection of the West
> Coast DX Bulletin to re-read some of Cass's gems.

I subscribed to one or another of the dx bulletins but I forget which one it was. I don't remember a "Cass". I had a big asset in the dx spots game, I was geographically right in the middle of the FRC 2m "spots network". I left the rcvr on 24/7, when I heard it light up I knew there was a goodie lurking somewhere, got into the shack pronto, fired up and joined the throng on the freq. Some of the poor dx stations we jumped all over probably wondered what hit 'em.

Then there was the Ham Trader yellow sheets . . I moved a *lotta* gear in and out with those.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2421. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 19:47:06 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948B96509CA83elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87297

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com:

> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>snip
>>
>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>
> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
> is still going strong there.....
>
>>
>>snip
>
>>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 73, Leo
>
>

Ah well, Leo, they still think that the United states is the centre of the universe (or even the center of the universe, HI!). We used to think the same thing about the British Empire, and we were wrong too!

2422. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 20:13:36 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948B9ACD9743Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87298

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0402101126.6c15dd96@posting.google.com:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:<4028EEE0.80104@psu.edu>...
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> >
>> >>In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> >>>
>> >>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> >>>>"Bill
>> >>>
>> >>>Sohl"
>> >>>
>> >>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>>>
>> >>>
>> >>>[snip]
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll
>> >>>>>>have
>> >>>>>
>> >>>access
>> >>>
>> >>>>>to
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level.
>> >>>>>So
>> >>>>>
>> >>>giving
>> >>>
>> >>>>>them
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>Jim,
>> >>>

>> >>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>> >>
>> >>Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>> >>required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>> >>
>> >>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>> >>
>> >>You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>> >
>> >
>> > You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your
>> > attempt to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something
>> > you know damned well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it
>> > ...
>> >
>> >
>> >>And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>> >>in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
>> >
>> >
>> > I'm not ... I'm supporting the establishment of a reasonable, viable
>> > entry level class with appropriate testing and restrictions.
>>
>> Speaking of spin!
>
> By whom? ;-)
>
> As I see it, the ARRL proposal has five distinct parts:
>
> 1) A revised entry level license (I call it the "NewNovice" to
> differentiate it from existing license classes). This new class would
> have different requirements *and* different privileges than the
> current entry-level license (Technician). It would essentially be a
> reworking of the old Novice license and would require a new question
> pool.
>
> 2) Putting most of the Tech test stuff into a new revised General test
> (because there won't be any more Tech test).
>
> 3) Removal of the code test requirement from all but the Extra.
>
> 4) Upgrading all existing Techs and Tech Pluses to General
>
> 5) Upgrading all existing Advanceds to Extra.
>
> I think 1) and 2) are a very good ideas
>
>> >>Yet now I see that same person
>> >>supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take
>> >>*written* tests...

>
>> > As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General
>> > written tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make
>> > things right" in a way where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed
>> > out, those Techs are already authorized 1500W at frequencies that
>> > the FCC and anyone with any knowledge of RF safety knows are more
>> > "risky" than HF.
>>
>> More spin.
>>
>> Mistake number one is that this doesn't "make things right".
>>
>> Mistake number two is assuming that this will be a one shot deal.
>
> It will be, because after it's done there won't be any more Techs or
> Tech Pluses. Or Advanceds. They'll all be Generals or Extras. No new
> ones to be
> issued.
>>
>> What is the rationale for the return to more stringent
>> requirements
>> after the mass upgrade?
>
> Bingo!
>
> Ham A got his General by passing the Tech and riding the free upgrade
> bus.
>
> Ham B has to pass the "NewNovice" (which is easier than the Tech) but
> also
> the revised General (which is harder than the existing General).
>
> Explain to Ham B why she has to meet higher requirements than Ham A
> for the same privileges. (I wanna be there when that is explained!)
>
>> That will be looked at as a clear disincentive to adding new hams
>> after the "upgrade" process.
>
> Exactly.
>
>> >>>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them
>> >>>>upgrades, is there?
>> >>>
>> >>>They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't sent
>> >>>in their license for cancellation - so what?
>> >>
>> >>Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>> >

>> >
>> > Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's (or
>> > my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
>>
>> How are you going to counter the argument that the requirements are
>> suddenly increased after "making things right"?
>
> bwaahaahaa
>>
>> If a person that that takes the Technician test today is
>> qualified to
>> be on HF, then they are equally as qualified the day after things are
>> "made right".
>
> No more Tech tests will be offered after the Great Giveaway.
>>
>> The only way that this can even remotely be "fair" would be to
>> make the
>> post restructuring test requirements for the entry level license much
>> easier.
>
> That's part of the plan.
>>
>> But you'll never support that will you?
>
> The privileges of the entry level license will be changed to match the
> reduced written exam requirements.
>
>> >>>After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>> >>>comments on the subject on eHam.net
>> >>
>> >>I'll ask again for a link to those comments.
>> >
>> >
>> > Go to eham.net (or use Google) ... I don't have the URL direct to
>> > Ed's comments handy ...
>>
>> I've used both, and haven't found the comments.
>>
> Nor I. So I emailed W1RFI and got a nice reply. I don't agree with his
> logic but it was good to hear from him. No, I won't repost private
> email here.
>>
>> >>>I (personally, not as NCI)
>> >>>think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> >>>to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>> >>
>> >>Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test
>> >>requirements for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those
>> >>licensed today.

>> >
>> > Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you
>> > have a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
>
> More spin...
>
>> >
>> >>Here's another thought: Rules changes like that don't happen
>> >>overnight - there's always a time delay between when a rules change
>> >>is announced and
>> >
>> > the
>> >
>> >>new rules take effect. So if FCC simply accepted ARRL's proposal
>> >>tomorrow, they'd probably make it effective a few months hence.
>> >
>> >
>> > They could make a rules change effective 30 days from publication in
>> > the Federal Register ...
>> >
>> >
>> >>So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the
>> >>changes
>> >
>> > take
>> >
>> >>place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>> >
>> >
>> > Give me a break ... your arguments are just plain lame and your
>> > "someone might get privs without taking a test with the same number
>> > of questions as
>> >I took" is REALLY showing.
>>
>>
>> Sorry, Carl! The arguments aren't lame.
>
> Exactly.
>>
>> >>I'd really like to see a link to Ed's arguments...
>> >
>> >
>> > Go find them - you know how to google.
>>
>> Give us a break here Carl! Both of us have tried, and they seem to be
>> hidden in there. Perhaps they were removed?
>>
> I doubt they were removed, but perhaps I will paraphrase them in a
> future post.
>

> But as of now, Carl has not made a convincing case for free upgrades.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I have said as much before, but a real overhaul of licencing will probably require all new grades of licence with all new names and all new test elements. Having read the mail on this proposal, I am convinced that this is the only way to remove the perception of free upgrades. It is only a perception really, as after you change things the same name no longer really means the same thing anyway.

Just for a laugh, let's call the new licences Entry, Average and Superior, just for the sake of this discussion. The Entry licence could have a low power restriction and limit HF operation to a few specific subbands. The Average licence would give everything else, except, say, a short callsign, which would be reserved for the Superior hams, whilst those of us who know we really are superior could keep the calls we have, ROTFL!

Of course, there would have to be rules to determine what class of licence we all end up with. Advanced or Extra would get a Superior licence, Generals would get an Average licence, and Novices would get an Entry licence. There would be, say 18 months notice of this coming into effect, and 12 months experience as a Tech would be required to get an Average licence, Techs licenced for less than 12 months getting an Entry licence (which would give them something like Tech+ privileges anyway, but would probably be a reduction in power). Element 1 would, of course, be abolished next Tuesday!

Have fun replying!

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2423. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 20:32:16 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <9mei20ldli06ri2srk9sj008o6vp28rtmv@4ax.com>
Source record: 87299

On 10 Feb 2004 19:47:06 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@
>4ax.com:
>
>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>snip
>>>
>>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>
>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>> is still going strong there.....
>>
>>>
>>>snip
>>
>>>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>>
>
>Ah well, Leo, they still think that the United states is the centre of the
>universe (or even the center of the universe, HI!). We used to think the
>same thing about the British Empire, and we were wrong too!

Good point - in the grand scheme of things, it's the ITU who is likely
to blame for the continuation of amateur radio on a global scale - the
ARRL is but one fish in the big sea (well, a whale maybe, but it's a
big sea!)

BTW - it looks like you might be back in the British Empire sooner
than you think - I saw somebody trying to show you the door a while
ago in another post hi!) No problem, as your usher noted, there's
some great SSB DX on 7.050 thru 7.100 - might be worth it!

73, Leo

2424. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 20:51:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <d1gi20lpkqlieeec7bbnsvrvsq80jl909u@4ax.com>
Source record: 87300

On 10 Feb 2004 20:13:36 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>snip

>> But as of now, Carl has not made a convincing case for free upgrades.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>I have said as much before, but a real overhaul of licencing will probably
>require all new grades of licence with all new names and all new test
>elements. Having read the mail on this proposal, I am convinced that this
>is the only way to remove the perception of free upgrades. It is only a
>perception really, as after you change things the same name no longer
>really means the same thing anyway.

Precisely. The Extra being issued today bears little resemblance to
the licence of the same name that was issued years ago. Hence the
hostile attutude toward the so-called "Extra-lites".

Renaming and redefining the levels would fix that - although I suspect
that none of the old Extras would ever accept the new category, and
continue to use the old classification as long as they could work a
key - which would by inference make the Superior into the equivalent
of the old Advanced category.......

As an aside - I've been reading through a 1975 copy of the "ARRL
Operating Manual" that I picked up at a hamfest this weekend. Wow -
it was a different world back then in Amateur Radio! Clearly, from
the amount of text dedicated to Morse, message relay, traffic handling
and other such topics, code was king back then! Worth a read, if you
can find one.

>
>Just for a laugh, let's call the new licences Entry, Average and Superior,
>just for the sake of this discussion. The Entry licence could have a low
>power restriction and limit HF operation to a few specific subbands. The
>Average licence would give everything else, except, say, a short callsign,
>which would be reserved for the Superior hams, whilst those of us who know
>we really are superior could keep the calls we have, ROTFL!
>
>Of course, there would have to be rules to determine what class of licence
>we all end up with. Advanced or Extra would get a Superior licence,
>Generals would get an Average licence, and Novices would get an Entry
>licence. There would be, say 18 months notice of this coming into effect,
>and 12 months experience as a Tech would be required to get an Average

>licence, Techs licenced for less than 12 months getting an Entry licence
>(which would give them something like Tech+ privileges anyway, but would
>probably be a reduction in power). Element 1 would, of course, be abolished
>next Tuesday!

That's an interesting idea. I'll bet that you're gonna be told why
it's a bad one soon enough, though - many times, too, I'd reckon.....
:)

>
>Have fun replying!
>
>73 de Alun, N3KIP

73, Leo

2425. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 21:11:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <402948E9.3050806@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87101

Len Over 21 wrote:

>>
>>
>
> As far as the American federal government is concerned, it does not
> discriminate against the religious beliefs of any radio amateur.
>
> Unless your parochial school taught amateur radio theory or
> standards and practices, such is hardly a fitting subject of a
> newsgroup concerning amateur radio policy.
>
> Is it now a requirement that ALL U.S. radio amateurs practice
> Catholicism
>
New award: Worked All Orders of Nuns "WAON".... :-)

2426. My Idea, was Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 21:39:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40294F89.9080406@psu.edu>
Source record: 87102

Alun wrote:

< a litany snipped so I can concentrate on your post!>

> I have said as much before, but a real overhaul of licencing will probably
> require all new grades of licence with all new names and all new test
> elements. Having read the mail on this proposal, I am convinced that this
> is the only way to remove the perception of free upgrades. It is only a
> perception really, as after you change things the same name no longer
> really means the same thing anyway.

A wise man once told me that without proof to the contrary, perception
becomes truth.

> Just for a laugh, let's call the new licences Entry, Average and Superior,
> just for the sake of this discussion. The Entry licence could have a low
> power restriction and limit HF operation to a few specific subbands. The
> Average licence would give everything else, except, say, a short callsign,
> which would be reserved for the Superior hams, whilst those of us who know
> we really are superior could keep the calls we have, ROTFL!
>
> Of course, there would have to be rules to determine what class of licence
> we all end up with. Advanced or Extra would get a Superior licence,
> Generals would get an Average licence, and Novices would get an Entry
> licence. There would be, say 18 months notice of this coming into effect,
> and 12 months experience as a Tech would be required to get an Average
> licence, Techs licenced for less than 12 months getting an Entry licence
> (which would give them something like Tech+ privileges anyway, but would
> probably be a reduction in power). Element 1 would, of course, be abolished
> next Tuesday!
>
> Have fun replying!

My proposal would be to keep Technician, General, and Extra.

Technician would be the entry level license, and would have the same
access as today. This would be the license that allows people to get
their feet wet in Ham radio. VHF and up access allows those that only
want repeater access their hobby, and the 6 meter access gives a taste
of the wide world below.

Tech plus has same privileges as now. Grandfathered in

Testing would be at the same level. Lots of RF safety. No one should
have ANY form of Ham license without being well versed in RF Safety.

General has all the access and privileges as they do now.

Testing would be at the same level, but the tests would have more questions geared towards HF operation. I would add more questions overall (how many here equate more questions with "harder"?)

Advanced has same privileges as now. Grandfathered in.

Extra has all the access and privileges as they do now.

Test would be similar to what is done now, but will cover more of the Electronic area of the hobby.

No code test for any of the licenses.

Novice segments will become part of a band plan for those who want to learn Morse code.

Finally, I would like to address those who wish to "fix" the system.

>>>No proposal fixes the system!!!<<<<<<

Fixing the system would not involve three license classes. Fixing the system would have only one license class, especially since with the end of Morse code testing, there is no reason why the applicant could not study for and take one element that consists of the agreed upon test material.

But that will never go over, so IMO, the only alternative is to make an incremental change in the system that we already have that does not remove privileges, and does not give free upgrades that create more problems tan they solve.

There ya go! The only real changes are to the testing regimen. No one loses, no one gains.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2427. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 21:42:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40295032.3030108@psu.edu>
Source record: 87104

Alun wrote:

> Ah well, Leo, they still think that the United states is the centre of the
> universe (or even the center of the universe, HI!). We used to think the
> same thing about the British Empire, and we were wrong too!

Trolling, eh?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2428. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 21:42:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40295038.615C584@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87103

N2EY wrote:
>
> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<4arh20pn9ibl6of397hckdu7athrvie501@4ax.com>...
> > On 9 Feb 2004 15:11:08 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>...
> > >snip
> > >>
> > >> Agreed. But it just ain't that big a deal.
> > >
> > >Not to you. To other people it *is* a big deal. Not just the incident
> > >itself,
> > >but the incident as a symbol of how goofy the whole system is.
> >
> > Goofy is right.
> >
> > Just found this article on Fox News this morning, regarding a class
> > action suit that has been filed in Tennessee over the Janet Jackson
> > 'exposure':
> >
> > http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,110630,00.html
> >
> > The lawsuit claims that:
> >
> > "As a direct and proximate result of the broadcast of the acts,
> > [Carlin] and millions of others saw the acts and were caused to suffer
> > outrage, anger, embarrassment and serious injury."
>
> That lawsuit has already been dropped. Basically someone getting their
> 15 minutes of fame.
>
> It is absolutely surreal that the plaintiff's name is Carlin.
>
> > Serious injury? Millions injured? From a TV picture of a breast? (that
> > ain't no ordinary breast, it's a WMD...) One can only speculate on
> > the nature of that one - the suit doesn't specify what kind of injury
> > was caused.
>
> Whiplash?
> >
> > Hmmm - still think the Star article missed the target?
>

> Yes.
> >
> > Nope, no irrational reaction there, eh? <8^0
>
> There certainly was - in the Star article...

...and the Carline lawsuit was alreay dropped today.

> But I think "Kid Rock" was far worse.

Don't leave out the crotch grabbing and inappropriate "lyrics" from
P.Diddy and Nelly.

Dave K8MN

2429. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 22:17:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <qkli20dncur8r6u6d88ngqar09e3okesg7@4ax.com>
Source record: 87105

On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 21:42:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<4arh20pn9ibl6of397hckdu7athrvie501@4ax.com>...
>> > On 9 Feb 2004 15:11:08 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>> >
>> > >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<anaf20trnvpl1l286iu7tcnke41qnlp9j9@4ax.com>...
>> > >snip
>> > >>
>> > >> Agreed. But it just ain't that big a deal.
>> > >
>> > >Not to you. To other people it *is* a big deal. Not just the incident
>> > >itself,
>> > >but the incident as a symbol of how goofy the whole system is.
>> >
>> > Goofy is right.
>> >
>> > Just found this article on Fox News this morning, regarding a class
>> > action suit that has been filed in Tennessee over the Janet Jackson
>> > 'exposure':
>> >
>> > http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,110630,00.html
>> >
>> > The lawsuit claims that:
>> >
>> > "As a direct and proximate result of the broadcast of the acts,
>> > [Carlin] and millions of others saw the acts and were caused to suffer
>> > outrage, anger, embarrassment and serious injury."
>>
>> That lawsuit has already been dropped. Basically someone getting their
>> 15 minutes of fame.
>>
>> It is absolutely surreal that the plaintiff's name is Carlin.
>>
>> > Serious injury? Millions injured? From a TV picture of a breast? (that
>> > ain't no ordinary breast, it's a WMD...) One can only speculate on
>> > the nature of that one - the suit doesn't specify what kind of injury
>> > was caused.
>>
>> Whiplash?

>> >
>> > Hmmm - still think the Star article missed the target?
>>
>> Yes.
>> >
>> > Nope, no irrational reaction there, eh? <8^0
>>
>> There certainly was - in the Star article...
>
>...and the Carline lawsuit was alreay dropped today.

....which is disappointing - I was hoping to find out what the
'serious injuries' claimed in the suit were.
>
>> But I think "Kid Rock" was far worse.
>
>Don't leave out the crotch grabbing and inappropriate "lyrics" from
>P.Diddy and Nelly.

Agreed - somehow, this garbage tends to pass as part of the
'performers art' these days....those lyrics glorify gangsterism and
violent behaviour, that ain't good.

>
>Dave K8MN

73, Leo

2430. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 23:23:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <UJdWb.1635$t16.1325673@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87106

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0402100256.7aaf0279@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040210013626.00545.00004252@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> > In article <rOYVb.1431$t16.1160750@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > > At the moment I am only a little Morseman but perhaps
> > >someday I too will be a Mighty Morseman.
> >
> > In CW nobody can hear your gender.
>
> Why would anyone have to, Lennie? In CW, all I am concerned with
> is how well that person manipulates a Bug, key, paddle, etc. Of
> course there are those who use keyboards, but not everyone can be A
> Mighty Morseman.
>
> ESPECIALLY you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Well like too many people, he is putting the emPHAsis on the wrong sylLABle
in the word Morseman. He seems to choose to ignore that the correct suffix
for a group of humans is -man. Instead he chooses to confuse it with the
gender specific version of the word man. Actually the oldest meaning of the
word "man" is human. Females were "women" and males were "wermen."
Overtime, the prefix for the males was dropped and the single word "man" was
used for both the human race and the male of the species. I think we ought
to resurrect the prefix for the males so that the liberals don't continue
this confusion.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2431. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 23:32:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sSdWb.1638$t16.1327427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87107

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >snip
> >
> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>
> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
> is still going strong there.....
>
> >
> >snip
>
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 73, Leo
>

Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2432. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-10 23:41:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <v_dWb.1639$t16.1328749@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87108

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:9mei20ldli06ri2srk9sj008o6vp28rtmv@4ax.com...
> On 10 Feb 2004 19:47:06 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@
> >4ax.com:
> >
> >> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >>
> >>>snip
> >>>
> >>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
> >>
> >> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
> >> is still going strong there.....
> >>
> >>>
> >>>snip
> >>
> >>>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Ah well, Leo, they still think that the United states is the centre of
the
> >universe (or even the center of the universe, HI!). We used to think the
> >same thing about the British Empire, and we were wrong too!
>
> Good point - in the grand scheme of things, it's the ITU who is likely
> to blame for the continuation of amateur radio on a global scale - the
> ARRL is but one fish in the big sea (well, a whale maybe, but it's a
> big sea!)
>
> BTW - it looks like you might be back in the British Empire sooner
> than you think - I saw somebody trying to show you the door a while
> ago in another post hi!) No problem, as your usher noted, there's
> some great SSB DX on 7.050 thru 7.100 - might be worth it!
>
> 73, Leo

As I indicated in another post, early on in amateur radio, it would have
been easy for the ITU to have allocated all the frequencies to commericial

and government interests. The size of the US amateur community was, in those early days, very probably a key element in keeping an allocation for amateurs.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2433. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 00:00:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210190018.29815.00003216@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 87109

In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>snip
>>
>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>
>Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>is still going strong there.....

In large part that's because of US influence at the international level. Also
the IARU, which was founded by guess who?

Except for Japanese 4th class licensees, how many hams are there in the rest of
the planet?

You might want to check out what the rest of the world wanted to do to amateur
radio in the 1920s at the Paris conferences....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2434. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 00:15:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t-CdnfXclJ216bTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87110

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>
>>On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>snip
>>>
>>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>
>>Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>is still going strong there.....
>>
>>
>>>>snip
>>
>>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>73, Leo
>>
>
>
> Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
> after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
> justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
> have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
> frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not
> have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.

Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!

8^)

FWIW, I'm really disapointed in thoes two. 8^(

- Mike KB3EIA -

2435. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 00:45:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210194505.25517.00004239@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87111

In article <Xns948B80C21E6B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Anyone would try to think you were trying to get rid of me, LOL!

Independent thought must be abolished from this group.

It makes the regular natives restless and they might take up
their spears and fight against Abrams tanks...

LHA / WMD

2436. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 00:45:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210194506.25517.00004240@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87112

In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>snip
>>
>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>
>Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>is still going strong there.....

Irrelevant to this group, Leo. ARRL "represents all amateurs." They say
so up front.

W1AW reaches the edges of the known world...a couple provinces of
Canada, as far west as Ohio, down to Atlanta, Georgia. Their concept
of "world."

Every single radio amateur in the USA "owes everything" to Saint Hiram
Percy Maxim who "went to Washington" in 1919 to "restore ham radio"
after WW One. ARRL tells everyone that, forever and ever. Happened
85 years ago when all the seven-year-old amateur extras in here were
young. Clap clap.

LHA / WMD

2437. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 00:45:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210194508.25517.00004241@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87113

In article <c2356669.0402100952.7e377dfc@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>af1q@netzero.com (James F. Aguiar) wrote in message
>news:<6884c75d.0402091316.230de5c5@posting.google.com>...
>> I think the ARRL is doing a super job of taking care of its own cash
>> cow.
>
>Do you think all of the work done at ARRL Hq could be done by unpaid
>volunteers?

According to the ARRL's tax return of 2002 their income was $12 million. That money was going where? :-)

>> Ham Radio as we know it is changing in the interest of progress
>> with no considration for the hobby.
>
>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, inflexibility to understand the reality of now.

If you don't agree with it, you "don't understand it." :-)

>> I bet if everyone who subscribes
>> to QST was to cancel their subscriptions,in other words, BOY COTT the
>> ARRL, their trend of thought would take a sudden change of direction.
>
>Of course it would.

No, it would not. QST sells enough ad space to keep itself going.

However, if the ARRL loses its demographic base to show advertisers, they will not bother buy more ad space.

>But why should the members do that? What issue
>would make all of the members decide to drop out?

Perish the thought. BELIEVERS would still belong...just like the followers of Osama hang onto his very word today...

>> Who cares about manufactures who pay for glossy pages of advertisment
>> in QST.
>
>I care about one or two of them.

Do you care enough to buy the very best? :-)

Or are you still designing your own kits?

>> After all didn't we all used to make our own radios once.
>
>Some of us still do.

"Design them" too! :-)

>> It seems as though the reciepe is to dismantle the hobby of amateur
>> radio and ARRL is trying to hang on to what ever will keep them going
>> as money making tax free organization.
>
>What, exactly, is ARRL doing that you disagree with? Please be
>specific.

TAFKA Rev. Jim's response to Aguiar's reply ought to be something!

>> Ask your self, what has the ARRL ever done for you personally or for
>> anyone you know, I bet the answer is zero, nada.
>
>You lose!
>
>Here are some things ARRL has done for me:
>
> - Excellent publications that helped me learn radio theory and practice

Drexel didn't teach you anyting? :-)

> - W1AW code practice helped me improve code skills

W1AW isn't heard in all the states in the union.

> - ARRL-sponsored contests, awards and nets are a lot of fun and build
>skills as well.

Wow...like no other magazine or organization "sponsored" (gave
awards) other contests...

> - PRB-1

To help fight the evil, money-grubbing, dictatorial home neighborhood
organizations?

> - Fight against BPL

A few OTHER companies and organizations and LOTS of individuals
have voiced their objection to BPL here, PLC overseas. There's over
5000 Comments on NOI 03-104 on the FCC ECFS not from ARRL.

> - Best ham magazine ever printed (QST)

Hardly. RSGB's "Radio Communication" is an English language
monthly with a wider scope of amateur radio interests.

QST NEVER compared to HAM RADIO magazine during HR's 22
years of independent monthly publication. HR was far better, did
not cater to any BoD stuffiness.

> - Representation in Washington and internationally, as well as
>information.

Special Interest Groups abound in DC. All it takes is money to pay
them for their services representing the BoD's opinion.

With the Internet, ALL citizens can now communicate with our
federal government at the speed of enlightenment. We don't have to
be filtered through any organization or SIG having its own agenda.

>> I am glad that I have at least had the past 47 or so years of amateur
>> radio.
>
>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.

You owe EVERYTHING to your ARRL. Start paying up...

>I've been a ham for 36+ years, too.

Sure. Just like the standards and practices of the 1930s. You are
49 going on 94.

>> That is how I feel and I just want to voice my personal opinion even
>> though I am going to get bashed for it.
>
>No bashing, just some questions. You may *feel* the ARRL does nothing
>for you, but the reality is quite different.

ARRL never gave me anything except six issues of QEX that Ed Hare
kindly sent me at league expense...from a stack of unsold issues at Hq.
[the last time I ever received anything from Newington without paying
shipping charges...:-)]

ARRL has wasted my time, the late Vic Clark included.

LHA / WMD

2438. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 00:45:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210194510.25517.00004242@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87114

In article <c0ag69$sa4$06$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>reading here since a few weeks, i do agree with the sight of view from your
>standpoint.

Then you have seen some rather strong personal disagreements held
by some old-timers. :-)

>There is nothing wrong to be patriotic. But beeing patriotic does not mean,
>whats good for my countrie must be good for any other one. Amateur Radio is
>a global "institution". The rules for AR are set by an international entity.

In fairness, most of the "discussion" in here concerns U.S. regulations
for amateur radio. In the past those same regulations have been
strongly influenced by the ARRL, the only surviving amateur member-
ship group (started 1914, five years after the first one, the Radio Club
of America that is still in existance but now mostly a wide-range radio
fraternal-historical organization).

I agree on your statement of patriotism. What is going on in here is
that several demand that all be patriotic in Their way. :-)

Radio amateurs use HF bands due to propagation of radio waves
reaching out around the world on HF. U.S. amateurs seem to forget
that for everything but morse code. Some of those insist that morse
code is a "univesal language" without once considering that
international morse code is derived from the English language
characters. Because their primary language is English, those hams
think that using morse code is "easy for all to use." They don't think
of those many millions around the world who don't have a "western"
alphabetic language as their primary language. Learning a second,
or even third language is difficult. Americans seem to ignore that.
Those of the United Kingdom are more liberal since they are next to
the European nations, one tunnel travel away.

>Are this oldtime-hams still use spark gap TX? Thats what they should do when
>argueing this way.

Only in their minds. Damped oscillation RF generation ("spark") is not
allocated in U.S. radio regulations, any radio service.

Some U.S. amateurs arc and spark and sputter in rage when their
opinions are not met with universal love, respect, and adoration. :-)

Most of those will use expensive, top-of-the-line, ready-built, designed
by others equipment with the first mode of radio, on-off carrier manual

keying. For all intents and purposes they could use spark sets
exactly the same way. :-)

Some call that "advancing the state of the radio art."

>The Americans never would have reached the moon, thinking
>this "old days" way.

Quite true! As perhaps the only one in here who ever worked on any
Apollo program effort, I am familiar with the way NASA engineered
the whole thing. I felt fortunate to greet and shake hands with two
astronauts, John Young and Robert Crippen...myself and hundreds of
others at Rocketdyne in California after the first successful Shuttle
space flight.

What is curious is the self-serving nature of the ARRL in describing
those astronauts who also hold Technician class licenses as "ham-
astronauts." The way the league describes them it is as if they
got to be astronauts "because" they were radio amateurs. Not true.
Obtaining a U.S. amateur radio license was just another requirement
by NASA so that they could provide a small extra service to the
citizens of the USA via amateur radio. It was not at all necessary to
the American space program overall. It is NASA public relations.

>What makes me frightened is, theat there is no will to change ones way of
>thinking into a global range. The kind of "this is my fence, I dont care
>whats outside" mentality is not a hams mentality. It reminds me of the
>mentality of the ancient "southstates and yankee" disputes in the OLD US. It
>must be the genes, keeping fellow hams from going the right, the ham way.

That is human nature. :-) But...those hams who think that way are
still hams and will not tolerate being criticized!

What happened with the USA "incentive program" of multiple classes
of amateur radio licenses is that American hams were put into a very
old position of class distinction, of some "being better" than others
because they had a "higher class" license. One can almost feel the
physical discrimination from such. There is not enough unity, solely
that of some being higher or "more important" than others of "lesser"
class. Those who achieved the "highest" class some time ago want
to assume a royal status and rule over others...they feel themselves
"superior." :-)

That trend to class consciousness is going away, but very slowly.
The American amateur radio regulation restructuring of year 2000
dropped the number of new license classes from six to three. The
tested morse code rate has dropped from the three rates to just one.
To those of old-time incentive plan licensing this was "the end of
their world" and they were outraged, horrified. Too bad. They do not
think of far more citizens who could not see the original class
distinction and turned away from amateur radio activity, not wanting
to be a part of such class distinction.

There are many many more hobbies and recreations available through electronics now. Robotics is a growing interest. Radio-control of aircraft and vehicles is another. Electronics advancement and general communications theory improvements have made the Internet possible. We can now communicate with others of same interests at the speed of light without needing radio and sunspot activity. Internationally. The only barrier is lack of a common language. Morse code was never a common language, only a standardized English representation by law.

LHA / WMD

2439. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:06:17 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com>
Source record: 87115

On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >snip
>> >
>> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>
>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>> is still going strong there.....
>>
>> >
>> >snip
>>
>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>
>Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not
>have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.

Dee,

Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
the war. Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale? Keeping in
mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but
not an overwhelming influence. Foreign stations still boom over here
today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
they can. The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
either.

According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in the US - it was the US Military. The ARRL did a fine job of lobbying the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs - but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful. And, in the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.

In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.

As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to that :o0

Source: http://www.ve4.net/history/part1.txt

Does anyone have any further documentation pertaining to this subject? I know that the Netherlands didn't regain operating privileges until the early 1920s - Alun, old son, what was the history of this over the pond?

>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

73, Leo

2440. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:08:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <m20j20t0fdkks1jvvd9mtcdujlainj6pmi@4ax.com>
Source record: 87116

On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 19:15:37 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>
>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!

No rant intended, Mike. Just looking for facts!

You wouldn't happen to have any on you, would you? :)

>
>8^)
>
>FWIW, I'm really disapointed in thoes two. 8^(
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2441. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:32:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210203200.07155.00000632@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87118

In article <d22b54c3.0402101131.37f8be01@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>I wonder if there are any Allied employees left from the days when
>they were in the ham biz.

Allied Radio is still an electronics parts distributor, was never solely in the "ham biz." Allied is now a division of Hamilton-Avnet and MUCH bigger than it was when they had a single building in Chicago. I'd been there...impressive showroom to a 15 year old, but not that great in 1956 when I was 23.

Newark Electronics is still in the electronics parts distributor biz, also bigger than it was in the 1950s.

There's lots more places to get parts for hum radios now, but the old-style parts of a half century are very, very scarce. :-)

You really ought to get out more...

LHA / WMD

2442. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:32:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210203201.07155.00000634@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87117

In article <t-CdnfXclJ216bTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>> after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>> justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>> have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>> frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not
>> have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.
>
>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!

One ritta mistake: It isn't factual.

LHA / WMD

2443. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:32:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210203201.07155.00000633@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87119

In article <UJdWb.1635$t16.1325673@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Well like too many people, he is putting the emPHAsis on the wrong sylLABle
>in the word Morseman. He seems to choose to ignore that the correct suffix
>for a group of humans is -man. Instead he chooses to confuse it with the
>gender specific version of the word man. Actually the oldest meaning of the
>word "man" is human. Females were "women" and males were "wermen."
>Overtime, the prefix for the males was dropped and the single word "man" was
>used for both the human race and the male of the species. I think we ought
>to resurrect the prefix for the males so that the liberals don't continue
>this confusion.

In CW nobody can HEAR your gender.

In here we can hear you scream... :-)

Get out your nun's habit and brandish the ruler, Mama Dee. Lots of seven-year-old amateur extras in here need "correction." :-)

Be nice to the gunnery nurse or he will call you "scum" and "putz" and make you get down and give you ten! [in the USMC way, of course...]

LHA / WMD

2444. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:32:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210203202.07155.00000636@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87120

In article <sSdWb.1638$t16.1327427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not
>have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.

You were THERE then? :-)

Nooooo Mama Dee, U.S. radio amateurs got tossed off of MF because
they were interfering with broadcasters. That's the REAL radio history.

You need to get an Internet visa and visit some of the Yurp ham
websites to learn their side of things. Those places don't have the
league SPIN operating to selectively edit out things the league
doesn't want you to hear.

Commercial radio did NOT "want all the shortwave frequencies" in
1919, but rather the opposite. Once the commercial radio services
found out about HF "skip" propagaation, they studied it, grabbed it up
some years later through the CCITT, and ran with it for carrier service
in communications. They did right well with it until about 1960, too.

LHA / WMD

2445. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:32:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210203202.07155.00000635@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87122

In article <v_dWb.1639$t16.1328749@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>As I indicated in another post, early on in amateur radio, it would have
>been easy for the ITU to have allocated all the frequencies to commericial
>and government interests. The size of the US amateur community was, in
>those early days, very probably a key element in keeping an allocation for
>amateurs.

There was NO "ITU" before WW2. There was the CCITT.

The size of the US amateur community was, in those early days,
miniscule compared to the broadcasters getting started. Ham radio's
oinks weren't near "numerous" until AFTER WW2.

But, to hear the spin from the league, they and Stl Hiram practically
invented ham radio and saved it from perdition.

Selective editing of the REAL history of all radio doesn't make it
"truth." Except to the devout Believers...

LHA / WMD

2446. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:32:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210203203.07155.00000637@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87121

In article <9mei20ldli06ri2srk9sj008o6vp28rtmv@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>>Ah well, Leo, they still think that the United states is the centre of the
>>universe (or even the center of the universe, HI!). We used to think the
>>same thing about the British Empire, and we were wrong too!
>
>Good point - in the grand scheme of things, it's the ITU who is likely
>to blame for the continuation of amateur radio on a global scale - the
>ARRL is but one fish in the big sea (well, a whale maybe, but it's a
>big sea!)

Whales are all wet.

"Save the whales, collect the entire set!" :-)

>BTW - it looks like you might be back in the British Empire sooner
>than you think - I saw somebody trying to show you the door a while
>ago in another post hi!) No problem, as your usher noted, there's
>some great SSB DX on 7.050 thru 7.100 - might be worth it!

The last time there was any significant increase in HF ham bands
was 1979, 25 years ago.

As far back as 8 years ago, the NTIA's survey of future spectrum
requirements for amateur service indicated that over 1 MHz of
ham band space would be needed...as indicated by a footnote
saying that an ARRL person said that. ARRL has lobbied only for
the "60 meter" band in HF and got all of five CHANNELS. U.S.
league membership dollars at work... :-)

Yurp has a LF band. USA doesn't. Over here there's only the
160 to 190 KHz FREE band (no license required) on LF, sure as
heck no real power required either).

I love all the "effort" expended by the ARRL to get more HF band-
space within borders.

LHA / WMD

2447. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 01:45:55 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <fn0j20dfeur0dm6f3vs5e7anvik9m8le5s@4ax.com>
Source record: 87123

On 11 Feb 2004 00:00:18 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>>snip
>>>
>>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>
>>Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>is still going strong there.....
>
>In large part that's because of US influence at the international level. Also
>the IARU, which was founded by guess who?

Perhaps, but are there specific historical facts which support that
theory?

The ARRL was a founding member of IARU - not the only founding
member....

>
>Except for Japanese 4th class licensees, how many hams are there in the rest of
>the planet?

Well, my trusty EuroCall 2003 CD lists 276,446 callsigns in Europe
alone - even if a couple of guys died, there's probably more than that
now. I don't have figures for Asia, Africa, Oceania or the rest of
the Americas (except that there's around 56,000 or so up here...).

Quite a few, anyway! DX wouldn't be the same without 'em..... ;)

That's a lot of real estate, covering some 150 or so countries, give
or take a few....

>
>You might want to check out what the rest of the world wanted to do to amateur
>radio in the 1920s at the Paris conferences....

Would you have a link handy for that one?

And, did the ARRL actually exert that much influence over the other
members? As there is one IARU zone for each ITU zone, I'd expect that
they would have infinitely more say in the Zone 2 group than the
others...they may have been founders of the IARU in 1925, but they

didn't own it - did they?

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2448. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:00:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040210210007.05539.00004253@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87124

In article <iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>wrote:
>
>>
>>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>> >snip
>>> >
>>> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>>
>>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>> is still going strong there.....
>>>
>>> >
>>> >snip
>>>
>>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>> 73, Leo
>>>
>>
>>Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>>after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>>justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>>have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>>frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not
>>have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.
>
>Dee,
>
>Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
>depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
>the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
>back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
>the war.

About 4,000, from various accounts.

Now, how many amateurs were there in the rest of the world back then?

> Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
>number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale?

Yes.

>Keeping in
>mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but
>not an overwhelming influence.

Was there even an ITU back then?

>Foreign stations still boom over here
>today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
>they can.

That's because of a compromise worked out in 1938.

>The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
>control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
>either.

The point is that the cause of truly "amateur" radio was largely the work
of Americans. In fact, amateur radio was not recognized as a separate
radio service by international treaty until 1927. That recognition was
due in large part to the work of Maxim, Stewart, Warner and others at
the various conferences, including Paris in 1924 and 1925.
>
>According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
>wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
>the US - it was the US Military.

Yep, most notably the Navy.

>he ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
>the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
>but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
>from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful.

I think they would have. Most of the rest of the world had very few if any
amateurs. Many countries could not understand why anyone would want to
pursue radio as an end in itself. Many also wanted total government control
of radio. Very few outside the US thought amateurs needed more than a few small
bands and more than a few watts.

>And, in
>the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
>for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.

Unlikely without the help of the IARU.
>
>In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally
>transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US
>amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.

And there were how many of them?
>
>As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to
>enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to
>that :o0

>Source: http://www.ve4.net/history/part1.txt
>
>Does anyone have any further documentation pertaining to this subject?
>I know that the Netherlands didn't regain operating privileges until
>the early 1920s - Alun, old son, what was the history of this over the
>pond?
>
Start with "200 Meters And Down"

73 de Jim, N2EY

2449. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:04:58 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <pr2j20tlupm30hpaadvrut766paakm1bli@4ax.com>
Source record: 87125

On 10 Feb 2004 10:14:34 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>snip

>> Heath SB-400. The Pride of 1964 :)

Oh yeah - and my basement!

>
>Amazing how well a 40 year old box full of glowbottles is still
>useful, huh?
>15 Hz stability from a one-tube Hartley is pretty decent.
>>
>> With a narrowband signal like this, it doesn't take much drift! I'm
>> seeing a frequency decrease of up to 15 Hz, beginning a few seconds
>> after keying. B+ to the VFO appears to be well regulated - maybe not
>> tight enough though. Might have to replace the 0A2 with a few zeners
>> - haven't tried that yet....
>
>First try replacing the 0A2 regulator and 6AU6A oscillator tubes -
>different
>ones may have slightly different characteristics.

That was one of the things I tried when I rbuilt the TX back in the
summer - ended up with an 0A2WA regulator and a 6136 in the LMO. That
brought it much closer...that and some conductive silver grease in the
bearings of the LMO tuning cap (I didn't even know they made that
stuff till I dug into the Web and discovered that TRW used it when
they built the LMOs for Heath, and it dries out over time.....)

>
>But the real problem may be that the heater voltage is changing when
>transmitting, rather than the B+. Another possibility is that heat
>from the
>6146s and power supply may be causing a bit of drift, because PSK31 is
>a very
>high duty cycle mode and a lot of heat gets dissipated on transmit.

That is very possible - it's also possible that the drift is in one of
the other oscillator sections other than the LMO. Haven't had time to
tear it apart and see yet....one of these days!

>
>snip

Thanks for the info!

>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2450. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:29:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402101829.18e57c7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87126

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402091355.1dac1621@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402081331.6ea23651@posting.google.com>...
>
> > No, we're all hams. Save for one who has an interest in ham radio.
>
> Hey Brain...y'aint talking about Lennie, are you?
>
> Just last week he adamantly stated he had NO interest in Amateur
> Radio beyond antagonizing this NG over the Code issue, which he
> himself can't seem to stay focused on...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

That is an interest.

2451. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:32:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402101832.2f3c1756@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87127

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040209195503.08626.00003046@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0402091355.1dac1621@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >y'aint talking about Lennie, are you?
> >
> > Just last week he adamantly stated he had NO interest in Amateur
> >Radio beyond antagonizing this NG over the Code issue, which he
> >himself can't seem to stay focused on...
> >
> Steve,
>
> Since Mr. Anderson has made his purpose here quite clear, why do
> you continue to bother with him? All that does is reinforce his behavior.
> You've raised kids - you obviously know that rewarding behavior is
> a good way to get more of it. And often the "reward" is simply giving
> your attention.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

TAFKA Rev. Jim, Steve has an obsession. It is not rational.
Compelling, rational arguments will not deter him.

2452. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:36:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87128

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>...
> Hi, Len,
>
> after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did not find
> anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but nothing
> about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one very
> important thing.
>
> What impact will Broadband over Powerlines, or PLC, have on the Amateur
> Radio Policy.
>
> Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I will
> take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and the
> Moderator of this Newsgroup. Please take my apology for the poor quoting
> habits, I am not jet skilled enough in this magic art.
>
> Please don't cite me impatient, but may I await your reply soon? Today?
>
> Best regards
> Helmut
> --

Hi Dave.

2453. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:41:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87129

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402061152.1d2b0928@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402051522.1d36e348@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402040346.47ba943f@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402030512.1c958840@posting.google.com>...
> > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402020358.79bcf254@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > > > > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > > > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > > > > > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Why?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why, Jim?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why, Jim?
> > > >
> > > > Jim, don't you know why you say the things you say?
>
> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?

"We've got a bleeder!"

from: When Harry Met Sally

2454. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 02:57:18 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <1h3j201g68kehgb0nt1qdseic4m4btqhdo@4ax.com>
Source record: 87130

On 11 Feb 2004 02:00:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>>wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>>news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>>>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >snip
>>>> >
>>>> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>>>
>>>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>>> is still going strong there.....
>>>>
>>>> >
>>>> >snip
>>>>
>>>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>> 73, Leo
>>>>
>>>
>>>Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>>>after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>>>justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>>>have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>>>frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would not
>>>have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.
>>
>>Dee,
>>
>>Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
>>depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
>>the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
>>back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
>>the war.
>
>About 4,000, from various accounts.

>
>Now, how many amateurs were there in the rest of the world back then?

Dunno - you tell me!

>
>> Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
>>number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale?
>
>Yes.
>
>>Keeping in
>>mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but
>>not an overwhelming influence.
>
>Was there even an ITU back then?

Founded on 17 May 1865, according to their history page. Just a
couple of weeks after the Civil War ended!

>
>>Foreign stations still boom over here
>>today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
>>they can.
>
>That's because of a compromise worked out in 1938.

Which apparently could not be vetoed by just one country in a global
union :)

>
>>The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
>>control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
>>either.
>
>The point is that the cause of truly "amateur" radio was largely the work
>of Americans. In fact, amateur radio was not recognized as a separate
>radio service by international treaty until 1927. That recognition was
>due in large part to the work of Maxim, Stewart, Warner and others at
>the various conferences, including Paris in 1924 and 1925.
>>
>>According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
>>wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
>>the US - it was the US Military.
>
>Yep, most notably the Navy.
>
>>he ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
>>the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
>>but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
>>from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful.
>

>I think they would have. Most of the rest of the world had very few if any
>amateurs. Many countries could not understand why anyone would want to
>pursue radio as an end in itself. Many also wanted total government control
>of radio. Very few outside the US thought amateurs needed more than a few small
>bands and more than a few watts.
>
>>And, in
>>the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
>>for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>
>Unlikely without the help of the IARU.

That was well after opeating privileges were restored in 1919, though
- the IARU came along in 1925. We had been on the air for six years by
then...

>>
>>In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally
>>transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US
>>amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.
>
>And there were how many of them?

Infinitely more than in the US, until October! :) Point was, our
privileges were restored well before the ARRL was able to get that in
place in the US.

Numbers don't always carry the greatest influence in political
decisions - there is also sovereignty, and little things like that...

>>
>>As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to
>>enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to
>>that :o0
>
>>Source: http://www.ve4.net/history/part1.txt
>>
>>Does anyone have any further documentation pertaining to this subject?
>>I know that the Netherlands didn't regain operating privileges until
>>the early 1920s - Alun, old son, what was the history of this over the
>>pond?
>>
>Start with "200 Meters And Down"

That's mostly US history, though - I was looking more for what other
countries were doing around that time.....
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2455. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 03:25:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5hhWb.1715$t16.1359694@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87131

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> >news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
> >> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >>
> >> >snip
> >> >
> >> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
> >>
> >> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
> >> is still going strong there.....
> >>
> >> >
> >> >snip
> >>
> >> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >>
> >
> >Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
> >after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
> >justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
> >have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
> >frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would
not
> >have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.
>
> Dee,
>
> Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
> depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
> the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
> back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
> the war. Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
> number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale? Keeping in
> mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but
> not an overwhelming influence. Foreign stations still boom over here
> today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say

> they can. The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
> control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
> either.
>

Although records in the early 1900s are sketchy, if you pick periods in time that are documented, the number of US amateurs was roughly equal to the rest of the world combined. This is still true today if one excludes Japan, which has over 1 million licensed users but with an abysmally low activity rate (Japanese licenses are for life, many children are licensed in school programs and never use the licenses, and no renewal is required). While the US would not have been an "overwhelming" influence, it still would have been a major player. How long could amateurs in other countries have been effective against government and commercial interests in the ITU if the US had remained in an "amateur radio black hole?" It is difficult to say of course but there would have been much less strength available to resist the encroachment. Yes one cannot say with absolute certainty which way it would have gone but I do believe that amateur radio would be a lot less common now if the US had not been involved. Also keep in mind that due to our form of government, our civilian population (in this case hams) do have more influence in shaping our governments approach to items like amateur radio than is and was prevalent in a lot of countries.

> According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
> wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
> the US - it was the US Military. The ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
> the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
> but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
> from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful. And, in
> the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
> for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>

I did indeed mean to include military. Sorry about that. In the context of lobbying the US government for keeping amateur frequencies and re-opening them after WWI, I do believe that in the absence of the ARRL another body could have formed (and probably would have) and done the same as the ARRL. But you know what, we would then be having this same discussion of "ZZZZ" organization and the people who today slam the ARRL would be slamming the "ZZZZ." The rest of us would then be defending "ZZZZ". Same game, different names.

> In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally
> transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US
> amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.
>
> As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to
> enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to
> that
>

But would they have had enough clout in subsequent ITU conferences to stave off the commercial and military seekers of the bands. In any disagreement, you don't want the strongest player sitting on the sidelines or playing on the other side.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2456. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 03:30:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DIhWb.1717$t16.1360312@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87132

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:fn0j20dfeur0dm6f3vs5e7anvik9m8le5s@4ax.com...
> On 11 Feb 2004 00:00:18 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo
<nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >Except for Japanese 4th class licensees, how many hams are there in the
rest of
> >the planet?
>
> Well, my trusty EuroCall 2003 CD lists 276,446 callsigns in Europe
> alone - even if a couple of guys died, there's probably more than that
> now. I don't have figures for Asia, Africa, Oceania or the rest of
> the Americas (except that there's around 56,000 or so up here...).
>
> Quite a few, anyway! DX wouldn't be the same without 'em..... ;)
>

Excluding Japan, the last time I checked the Radio Amateur Call book listed
about 600,000+ for the combined rest of the world. Roughly equal to the
number of US Amateurs.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2457. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 03:32:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FnhWb.1718$t16.1360628@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87133

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0402101829.18e57c7a@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402091355.1dac1621@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402081331.6ea23651@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > No, we're all hams. Save for one who has an interest in ham radio.
> >
> > Hey Brain...y'aint talking about Lennie, are you?
> >
> > Just last week he adamantly stated he had NO interest in Amateur
> > Radio beyond antagonizing this NG over the Code issue, which he
> > himself can't seem to stay focused on...
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> That is an interest.

Actually he likes to antagonize over anything he can manage to twist into an
argument.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2458. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 03:41:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <gvhWb.1719$t16.1361971@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87134

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:1h3j201g68kehgb0nt1qdseic4m4btqhdo@4ax.com...
> On 11 Feb 2004 02:00:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com>, Leo
<nomail@noway.com>
> >writes:
> >>Foreign stations still boom over here
> >>today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
> >>they can.
> >
> >That's because of a compromise worked out in 1938.
>
> Which apparently could not be vetoed by just one country in a global
> union :)

That simply illustrates that the rest of the world cared less about amateurs privileges than the US did. It indicates that the various governments wanted these frequencies for themselves as many of the shortwave broadcasters are government entities in their respective countries. That is the other side of the coin. If the US had not been in there from the earliest days supporting amateur frequencies, today's picture could easily be very different.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2459. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 03:44:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2-ydnR3QluaeOLTdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87135

Leo wrote:
> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 19:15:37 -0500, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
>>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!
>
>
> No rant intended, Mike. Just looking for facts!
>
> You wouldn't happen to have any on you, would you? :)

Facts? I have the history I've read.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2460. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 04:20:06 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <i9bj20hb3t12qq51j50tvbegvo52rv0obd@4ax.com>
Source record: 87136

On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 22:44:04 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 19:15:37 -0500, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!
>>
>>
>> No rant intended, Mike. Just looking for facts!
>>
>> You wouldn't happen to have any on you, would you? :)
>
> Facts? I have the history I've read.

I'll have to take that as a 'no' then....

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2461. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 06:07:14 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <4029c5d5$0$99190$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 87137

In <20040203205637.05539.00004128@mb-m16.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <401d2ee5$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>In <20040128115555.12501.00005862@mb-m04.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>>In article <4016b2c4$0$99194$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>>>In <20040126221611.21457.00003651@mb-m10.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>writes:

>>>>>In article <4014174d$0$99189$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>>>>>In <20040124161738.01692.00000193@mb-m18.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>>writes:

>>>>>>>In article <4011630c$0$99191$45beb828@newscene.com>, Paul W. Schleck
>>>>>>><pschleck@novia.net> writes:

>>>>>>>>In <20040122195926.07984.00000145@mb-m22.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>>>>writes:

>>>>>>>>>In article <arZPb.33225$P%1.26072919@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
>>>>D.
>>>>>>>>>Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>I brought this subject up with someone in the League. This exact
>>>>>>>>thread, actually. I was told that the ARRL BoD sincerely believes
>>(take
>>>>>>>>at face value, or not) that failure to upgrade licensees in the FCC R&O
>>>>>>>>for WT 98-143 was not a final "no" answer.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Maybe it wasn't. But are such freebies really a good idea?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It may be a realistic, and pragmatic, idea when considered against the
>>>>>>pros and cons:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cons:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Provides a "free upgrade" to those that haven't explicitly tested for
>>>>>>it.
>>>>
>>>>>That's one. There are others:

>>>>
>>>>>- Allowing a free upgrade
>>
>>>*can be taken as*
>>
>>>>>proof that the material in the test which is not
>>>>>taken is not necessary for the privileges.
>>>>
>>>>To quote from the ARRL's FAQ on their proposal:
>>>>
>>>>http://www.arrl.org/news/restructuring2/faq.html
>>>>
>>>>"The fact is that the examination bar has never been at a uniform height
>>>>over ham radio's nearly 100-year history."
>>
>>>And I say: "So what? The question is whether there is any good reason to
>>>give almost 60% of existing hams a free upgrade to the next license class,
>>>even though the upgrade to that class requires only a written test from a
>>>published pool.
>>>
>>>>Were you also opposed to giving pre-1917 hams a waiver for the 20 WPM
>>>>code test?
>>
>>>No such waiver ever existed. What *was* waived were the 20 wpm receiving and
>>>sending code tests, plus the Extra written test. The person who got the
>>>waiver had to hold at least a General license, too.
>>
>>Now you're being pedantic.

>I'm being *accurate*.

>>I was describing a subset of the waiver
>>given, enough for the purpose of the argument.
>>You described the entire
>>waiver. Both are correct, and neither contradicts my arguments.

>I find it interesting that you mentioned only the code test part of the waiver,
>not
>the written test part. Some folks might think the waiver only applied to the
>code
>tests.
>>
>>>That was long before my time, too. And it affected maybe 2% of the licensed
>>>hams at the time.
>>
>>So you might accept grandfathering, if it occurred at some asymptotic
>>point in the past, and only affected a small minority of hams?

>Depends on the situation. The old Extra waiver only began after there was no
>difference
>among the operating privileges of a General, Conditional, Advanced or Extra

>(1952 or later). IOW it was
>just a title sort of thing - didn't make any difference in practical
>application. And anyone who qualified
>for it was an OT from the very early days (35 years at least). By the time the
>waiver meant anything
>in terms of operating privileges, that gap was over 51 years.

According to W2XOY, the upgrade to Extra given to pre-1917 Hams with a
General or Advanced-class license started in 1951:

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Ham-Radio-History/message/5330

along with the renaming of Class A to Advanced, Class B to General, C to
Conditional, and the introduction of the Novice and Technician.

So there was some short period of time (until the "Giveaway of 1953"),
where this "free upgrade" gave additional phone privileges on 75 and 20
meters for some of those pre-1917 hams. Specifically, those that held a
General class (formerly "Class B") license. That would be *accurate*.

More information on this, just received today, is given below.

>That's a completely different scenario than offering a free *upgrade* to almost
>60% of existing hams,
>plus any that might get ham tickets before the rules change.

>>What
>>percentage would be a threshold? You say that it is wrong to
>>grandfather 60% of all hams, but you might be willing to accept
>>grandfathering of 2% of all hams.

>And I might not. Depends on the situation.

>And the more I think about it, the more I think the old Extra waiver was a bad
>idea, and that there may be
>no scenario that would be worthwhile.

>>What about a proposal that
>>grandfathers some percentage of hams in-between?

>I say no to free upgrades, then.

So nearly all of the previous discussion above is moot because there is
no "free upgrade" scenario that you will support regardless of the
percentage of hams affected, or their status/seniority.

>>What would be your
>>greater objection, grandfathering all of the Techs, or grandfathering
>>all of the Advanced?
>>
>What's the difference? They're both bad ideas.

Prior to your latest reply, I might argue that since the latter would
affect a lower percentage of existing hams, who have held their class of
license since at least April 15th 2000, you might find it more

palatable. However, since you have decided that no such free upgrades are a good idea, the distinction is now a moot point for the purpose of this discussion.

>>Remember that at some time in the future, we may be looking on this
>>grandfathering as occurring at some asymptotic point in the past, as
>>with the pre-1917 waiver above.

>You mean like when the Advanced has been unavailable for 35+ years and their
>numbers are down to about 1% of the ARS total?

Well, yes, that's what I was driving at. You want to wait until then. I want to deal with the matter sooner. At least I got you to explicitly bound your answers tighter than "never" or 0%. And what would you do then?

>>You ask below what is the long-term
>>plan. I say one aspect of the plan is to be able to look back on this
>>grandfathering in the same way that we look upon the pre-1917 waiver.

>We don't look back on it the same way.

>And why was it done?

The Restructuring FAQ at arrl.org omits the mention of waiver of the written test, so it too is incomplete. I dropped a line to N1KB, who is listed as the author of the document, with a request for correction and clarification. He replied to me with pointers to some sources, including Ham-Radio-History group noted above, which dates the origin of the waiver, and "free upgrade," to 1951. W1UED just replied today with an answer as to why. George E. Sterling, W1AE, was the first (and likely only) radio amateur to come up through the ranks at the FCC and be appointed Commissioner. The Amateur Extra license first appeared in the 1920's and lasted through the 1930's, when it was discontinued as a budget-cutting measure. During the 1951 restructuring, which restored the Amateur Extra license, W1AE was an FCC Commissioner:

http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/commish-list.html

As a pre-WWI licensee himself, he thought it would be an appropriate honor to that group of hams if they were given the restored Amateur Extra license, and had the political clout to make it happen. So, the 1951 restructuring gave anyone who was licensed prior to April 1917 and who presently held a General or Advanced-class license, a "free upgrade" to Extra.

The following QST article describes the 1951 Restructuring and FCC Dockets 10073 and 10077:

http://www.arrl.org/members-only/qqnsearch.html?search=1&words=FCC+dockets&year=1951&selpub=QST

(ARRL Members-Only Link)

A photocopy of the full article is available for $3 ($5 for non-members)
postpaid from the ARRL.

That still supports my original assertion that free upgrades given to
existing licensees, based on seniority or status, can be
non-controversial, especially when viewed from the long-term future.

>>
>>>>>- Amateurs who miss the one time upgrade have to take more tests than
>>>>>those who didn't. How do we justify that?
>>>>
>>>>It's called "grandfathering," which is done in more regulatory contexts
>>>>than can possibly be named here. Due to the need for certainty in the
>>>>law, it is nearly always based on hard cutoff dates. Technologies,
>>>>practices, and people change over the very long timeline that laws and
>>>>regulations are required to cover. It is not possible to predict the
>>>>future with certainty, so laws and regulations must change to reflect
>>>>current knowledge. It is also impractical for society to retest,
>>>>recertify, or revalidate every existing entity against current
>>>>requirements.
>>
>>>None of which is proposed.
>>
>>But when considering alternatives, one really has to identify all
>>implicit alternatives, and argue for or against them (avoiding the
>>logical pitfall of false dichotomies, trichotomies, etc.). The status
>>quo, which you have advocated, and might be labeled alternative #4 based
>>on your exchange with Bill Sohl, is one such implicit alternative.

>To put it simply: Just leave the closed-off classes alone, and let them
>go away by attrition.

>This is exactly what was done with the Advanced from the beginning of 1953
>until 1967 - more than 14 years. What problems did it cause?

The Advanced-class was eventually opened back up to new licensees, so we
do not know what the longer-term effects would have been. I see no
realistic likelihood that Advanced will be (or even should be) reopened
in any foreseeable future. The outcome that you propose, which is to
carry them on the books for at least 35 more years or until they
constitute less than 1% of all hams, may introduce further problems than
the previous, and much shorter, 14-year period.

>> I
>>would argue against that, for the reasons I have given previously
>>(streamlining of license classes, streamlining of band plans, reduction
>>of regulatory burden, reduction in confusion for amateurs and the FCC,
>>harmonization with the deletion of S25.5 and with other countries'
>>regulations, etc.).

>All it takes to keep those classes is a few sentences in Part 97.

"A few sentences" in laws or regulations can have non-trivial
implications about the regulatory infrastructure that is necessary to

give them force. An Advanced-class license is one more alternative to program into the licensing computer, one more piece of regulation to be understood and enforced by regulators, and overall, one more class of amateurs to track and incorporate into any regulatory policies and agendas. The implementation of all of that is significantly more than a few sentences.

>>
>>If license classes are consolidated to a smaller number, one alternative
>>is simply to grandfather existing hams, which the ARRL has advocated.

>A more accurate term is "free upgrade", because that's what it is.

>"Grandfather" implies letting a person keep what they already have without
>recertification. That's not what is proposed by the ARRL BoD for Techs and
>Advanceds.

>>One other implicit alternative (say, #5), is to make every Novice,
>>Advanced (and possibly non-Plus, or would that be non-Plussed, Tech)
>>come back in to take written tests to upgrade to the next level, or
>>otherwise lose privileges.

>That's the worst alternative.

Which is why I specifically identify it and dismiss it early.

>>I would argue against that also, for the
>>reasons I have also given previously (it is impractical to retest
>>everyone,

>It could easily be done over time by saying that you either retest before Date
>X
>or you'll be reclassified at a lower license class.

There is a legitimate distinction between "easy" and "straightforward." Anyone with engineering experience surely knows that something could be conceptually simple, but still complex and time-consuming in its actual implementation. Mass re-testing might be straightforward, but would not be easy within FCC and VEC budget/manpower constraints.

Mass re-testing would be a regulatory burden for the FCC, a personal burden on VEC's who would have play de-facto judge and jury for large numbers of existing peers, friends, fellow club members, etc., concerning whether or not they could retain former privileges (what volunteer would want to endure that for very long?), and would go against where the FCC is heading, which is towards less regulation and fewer grand schemes. I might also argue that mass-retesting is sounding very much like a repeat of the scenario played out in the 1960's with Incentive Licensing.

There's a lot of debate in this newsgroup about the Incentive Licensing scheme of the 1960's, who initiated it, what was intended, who supported it, why it failed, who was to blame, etc., but one thing that most can agree on is that it's very easy to start out with good intentions, and

what comes out the exit door of regulatory agencies might be
unrecognizable as something that would give the desired result. Hence
the expression, "The road to hell is paved with good intentions." Mass
re-testing could also be viewed as well-intentioned, but ultimately a
road to hell.

So, it's a good thing that neither of us are arguing in favor of testing
to avoid losing privileges, right?

>>and such existing hams are a large, stable user base such as
>>that in the definition of grandfathering below).

>"Large, stable user base"? We don't really know about that. How many
>of those folks are active? Why have so few Advanceds upgraded to
>Extra?

You are teetering very close to making a non-falsifiable argument here.
You argue here, and in other threads, that Advanced should be left alone
because:

- There are still quite a few of them, who are happy with their present
privileges, who would get a free upgrade unfairly, and crowd the Extra
phone bands.

AND

- There may not be very many of them, active at least, so any upgrade
would not give much benefit, anyway.

You also argue that Novice should be left alone because there aren't
very many of them, but then advocate restructuring that you believe
would bring back its "heyday" with many more licensees in that class,
which of course, should then be left alone.

Which is it? Too many, or too few, to justify elimination? If neither
is a sufficient criteria to argue for or against elimination of a
license class, then that's a non-falsifiable argument.

>>>>The web site for Malvern Instrumentation gives a good definition of
>>>>grandfathering in a technical context:
>>>>
>>>>"Grandfathering is the practice of claiming exemption of older systems
>>>>from validation regulations and requirements on the basis that these
>>>>systems have proved their reliability by adoption for a long period of
>>>>time by a large user base."

>IOW, we allow them to continue doing what they're doing because they've shown
>a lack of problems in the past. But we require more of new systems.
>It *doesn't* say we allow free upgrades.

When you say "we require more of new systems" above, are you referring
to people or license classes? There is a subtle distinction. A group
of people may not want to change, but license classes may need to. A
set of license classes is a ladder, to be climbed as far as the licensee

wishes to develop his skills. It is also a taxonomy, with a specific regulatory purpose. That purpose is to ensure that limited frequency spectrum is being put to the best and highest use via the distribution of privileges over that spectrum. Implicit in this is structuring the license class system to ensure that all amateur radio spectrum (HF, VHF, UHF, Microwave) is not only used, but used well, in ways that fulfill the Basis and Purpose (FCC Part 97.1).

Since technologies, modes, and frequency usage patterns change over time, the taxonomy should change as well, hence the need for periodic restructuring over amateur radio's 100-year lifetime (Though I would argue that not doing the "Giveway of 1953," and staying with the 1951 restructuring until the no-code issue came to a head in the 1980's, would have avoided the backlash that resulted in Incentive Licensing of 1968). But what do you do when license classes change and people do not? It is preferable to not have existing licensees lose privileges. There is no compelling regulatory purpose to having both an Advanced and Extra class license at present (if there ever was). So, given all of that, combining both licenses into one class of license is a way of making existing people fit new license classes without having them lose privileges. Doing this constitutes a form of grandfathering.

>>>>
>>>>Grandfathering in the context of ham radio recognizes that existing hams
>>>>have not only passed the tests in effect at the time, sometimes topics
>>>>not covered presently (Morse code, drawing circuit diagrams, etc.), but
>>>>have also gained experience beyond their initial exam topics. It is a
>>>>fair, and pragmatic, distinction between existing hams and entry-level
>>>>ones. Quoting again from the FAQ document:
>>>>
>>>>"Passing any amateur examination does not magically result in a good
>>>>operator. It's just the key to the kingdom, so to speak. Experience and
>>>>good mentoring create skillful and knowledgeable operators, not the
>>>>relative difficulty or ease of the test."
>>
>>>I disagree with that assessment. YMMV.
>>>>
>>>>You might argue that not every existing ham has obtained the same degree
>>>>of experience, or even a minimum necessary level of experience to be
>>>>given a free upgrade. That would be true, but ultimately would be
>>>>self-limiting, as experience would correlate with participation. An
>>>>inactive ham using no privileges today would be using no more privileges
>>>>if the FCC gave him a free upgrade tomorrow. Free upgrades are not a
>>>>perfect solution, ideal in all cases, but are a good solution overall.
>>
>>>I disagree. What's wrong with simply allowing Techs, Tech Pluses and
>>>Advanceds to upgrade in their own time?
>>
>>>What is the sudden need to eliminate those license classes? The Novice and
>>>Advanced have been closed off to new issues for almost 4 years, and their
>>>numbers have declined. And from 1953 to 1967, no new Advanceds were issued.

>>>Did any of that cause problems?
>>
>>>What's the rush?
>>
>>>Are the written tests too hard?

>Well? The current Extra was recently earned by a bright seven year old - can
>we really say that it's unreasonable to expect others to do what she did for
>the
>same privileges?

As others have pointed out in other threads, the 7-year old Extra is a
statistical outlier, one of a handful in amateur radio history, and not
a typical example. The more typical, and meaningful, example of an
entry-level ham would be one who was high school or college-age. The
greater numbers of these typical entry-level hams would mean that they
would have a more profound impact on the shaping of the future of
amateur radio, anyway.

>>>>>- Decreased reason for more than half of all hams to upgrade by testing.
>>>>
>>>>No proposal is perfect. Weigh this one against the pros.
>>>>
>>>I have. The cons win.
>>
>>>>>>Pros:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Avoids having to wait until the last Advanced class license expires to
>>>>>>refarm the Advanced phone bands.
>>>>
>>>>>Why does that have to be done at all?
>>>>
>>>>So, are you advocating not refarming the Advanced phone bands even
>>>>*after* the last Advanced class license expires? Yeah, that's a
>>>>semantic nit-pick over what you wrote above, but then so is "You mean
>>>>the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?" that you wrote below.
>>
>>>You're avoiding the question.
>>
>>>Why do the Advanced class subbands have to be "refarmed" at all? Who or what
>>>would they be "refarmed" to? What's the longterm plan?
>>>>
>>>>If you do agree that the Advanced phone bands should be refarmed at some
>>>>point in the future, at what point would you have it done? Would you
>>>>leave it to Extras, give it to Generals, or would you otherwise split it
>>>>up in some way?
>>
>>>Why does it need to be done at all? Is the Extra written that hard?

>Why do you avoid these simple questions?

Because sometimes simple questions are loaded with built-in assumptions
(e.g., "Why won't you join me in voting to ban COP-KILLER bullets?" or
even the classic, "Have you stopped beating your wife?"). Furthermore,
you see simplicity where I see complication, and vice-versa.

>>
>>So you would argue that any refarming would be done at some asymptotic
>>point in the far future, indistinguishable at present between "decades"
>>and "never."

>I'm *asking* what the problem is with leaving some things alone.

The question has been asked and answered, though I have given you an
answer you disagree with. Asking the question repeatedly will not
result in a different answer from me. Put away the rhetorical bludgeon.

>>
>>>>
>>>>>>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
>>>>>>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
>>>>>>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
>>>>>>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
>>>>>>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).
>>>>
>>>>>Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?
>>>>
>>>>In this day and age, regulatory agencies seem more eager to simplify
>>>>regulations. Removing regulations that are obsolete, or cover too small
>>>>an intended audience to be justified on a cost basis, is likely a top
>>>>priority for such agencies. Again, what is your timeline for change?
>>>>Decades in the future, or never?
>>
>>>I don't see any reason to "refarm" them at all. Not at this time, anyway.
>>
>>>Note that in 4 years, the number of Advanceds has dropped by only about 16%.
>>
>>>Seems to be a pretty popular license even today.
>>
>Note also that several Advanceds have said they *don't* want an upgrade, free
>or not.
>I don't understand why, but that's what they've said.

>>>It sounds to me like you want all Advanceds to become Extras so that the
>>>Advanced subbands can become General bandspace. That's not part of the ARRL
>>>proposal, though.
>>
>>No, I never said that.

>No, you didn't. That's why I wrote "sounds to me".

My first draft of my reply said, "No I never said nor implied that." I
edited it to achieve economy of words, because even if I somehow implied
that I supported the entire ARRL proposal, adoption of that proposal

would not giving the entire Advanced phone subbands to the Generals.

>>I would combine Advanced and Extra phone bands
>>into just Extra phone bands, and leave the General bands as they are.

>That's the status quo! It's not "refarming" at all.

It still removes one color bar from the frequency allocation charts (for Advanced), so is not strictly a "status quo" solution like you have advocated.

I suppose a definition of refarming is necessary for this context. Even the ITU seems to struggle with the meaning of this word (search for "definition of refarming" on Google). A commonly-accepted definition is:

"Moving one service out to make way for another that would use the spectrum more optimally."

So, really, neither of us are using the word entirely according to this definition. Even if we substitute "class" for "service" above, no General, Advanced, or Extra is being moved out to make way for anyone else under the two alternatives offered in this discussion (mine, and the ARRL's). Even Novice and Tech Plus hams only face a "lose some, but gain a lot more" prospect under the ARRL proposal. You would define refarming as making different license classes within the same service either gain or lose spectrum. I would agree that this would constitute one kind of refarming. I would also assert that the elimination of license classes within a service to simplify spectrum allocation is another kind of refarming.

>>That doesn't mean that I wouldn't support frequency shifting, such as
>>that proposed to make 40 meters a primary amateur allocation, or part of
>>Novice band refarming. Just that I would keep the proportional amounts
>>roughly the same. I realize that the current ARRL proposal splits up
>>the Advanced phone bands, giving proportionally more to the General than
>>the Extra phone bands on 80 and 40 meters, and proportionally less on 15
>>meters (no changes on 20 meters). I do not strongly support that, but
>>even that proposal isn't giving the entire Advanced phone bandwidth to
>>the Generals.

>And if nothing at all is done, the results are almost the same as what you
>propose.

Emphasis on "almost." One of my motivations in this extended discussion is to determine our agreements and disagreements, what are hard-and-fast beliefs, and what might be open to compromise. In case you haven't figured it out, I'm gathering verbage for a draft of my comments on any future NPRM. You seem to be alternating between active opposition to, and fatalistic acceptance of, the possibility that Element 1 will be deleted. Perhaps you want to "go down fighting" on this issue with the ARRL and the FCC. Your ideal-world position of no changes allows me to rebut with the continued complications that it implies. On the other

hand, I too believe that Element 1 being dropped is likely, but I also
believe that changes to license classes and band allocations are still
very much up in the air at this point. Because of this, I will happily
play "what-if" with the various scenarios (as the FCC might do them in
any combination) while also indicating which ones that I favor.

So that there is no further confusion about what I favor, I support
dropping Element 1 (which would merge Technician with Technician-Plus),
giving present Advanced-class licensees a "free upgrade" to Extra, and
keeping General and Extra-class phone bands substantially and
proportionately the same (save for some small shifting/resizing for
Novice-band refarming and making all of 40 meters a primary amateur
radio allocation).

>>
>>>>>>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
>>>>>>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
>>>>>>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
>>>>>>documentation forever.
>>>>
>>>>>If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
>>>>>years, two months and 20 days or so.
>>>>
>>>>If by saying, "If the current rules are left alone..." you really meant
>>>>leaving alone everything *except* the 5 WPM Morse code requirement
>>>>(which would be eliminated for these General and below under the ARRL
>>>>proposal), then, and only then, Technician-class hams will assume the
>>>>HF privileges of Technician-Plus.
>>
>>>Whatever. I don't see why the 5 wpm code test is such a big deal as a
>>>requirement.
>>
>>Does your "Whatever" answer above mean that you support 5 WPM Morse code
>>for all HF license classes, or just for Extra?

>I support a code test for all amateur licenses, period. I think the dropping of
>the
>code test for the Tech back in 1991 was a mistake. I argued and commented
>against it then, and much of what I said would happen has come to pass.

The FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System (EFCS) only goes back to 1992
and your callsign doesn't appear in Google Groups until 1997. Would you
mind elaborating on what you thought would happen, and what you think
has come to pass?

>>If the former, then
>>there is a very real distinction that will continue to exist in the
>>license ladder whether or not it continues to be recorded in the
>>database. If so, then the expiring of Tech-Plus license in 6 years is
>>not a simplification, it is a complication.
>>
>>>>That's still a long time in FCC

>>>>enforcement (and VEC administration) years.
>>
>>>Why? It's been almost 4 years since the last restructuring took effect. Look
>>>at the enforcement letters - Techs without code masquerading as Tech Pluses
>>>isn't a big problem, from what I see.
>>
>>You argue that it's not an enforcement problem because few or none have
>>been caught. I would argue that it is an enforcement problem because it
>>would be very hard to catch someone, especially if confirming who has
>>what privileges requires documentation that is no longer in the FCC
>>database, and might no longer be retained by hams or VEC's. The FCC's
>>limited staff time is probably being aimed at big fish, such as Advanced
>>and Extra-class scofflaws engaging in power and interference violations.

>You might want to read the letters. They're pretty evenly distributed, license
>clas wise, except for Novices.

I have read them. Even if they are evenly distributed in numbers, they
are not evenly distributed according to number of licensees in each
class. If they were, then there would be approximately one Extra-class
violator for every three Tech/Tech-Plus violators, or every 1.5
General-class violators. I stand by my original argument.
Specifically, that the FCC's enforcement agenda is mostly aimed at
high-yield (easier to catch/more serious punishment, aka "big fish")
violations "such as" (i.e., not limited to) power and interference
violations at higher classes of license. Such licensees are being
subject to proportionately more enforcement scrutiny than other classes
of license.

>>>>Even if you argue that FCC
>>>>action on further restructuring will take most of that six years anyway,
>>>>there are still all those Novice and Advanced class licenses that will
>>>>likely exist in the database for decades to come.
>>
>>>It makes sense to grandfather existing Novices to the "NewNovice" (or
>>>whatever
>>>it is called). There are only about 32,000 Novices left now, down from just
>>>under 50,000 after restructuring.
>>
>>>What *is* the problem with Advanceds just staying as they are? Have you not
>>>read from the Advanceds who say they *don't want* to become Extras?
>>
>>Which is as much of an argument as "Have you not read from the hams who
>>say that they *don't want* to have ham radio examinations without Morse
>>code?"

>You keep avoiding the question.

You keep avoiding my answers.

>>>>
>>>>>Why not just give all the existing Techs, Tech Pluses and Novices the

>>>>>"NewNovice" privs, in addition to their existing privileges? The database
>>>>>doesn't need to change at all.
>>>>
>>>>Did you notice that Novices actually lose privileges? See the FAQ
>>>>document above for more details. In particular, power limits are
>>>>lowered from 200 Watts PEP to 100 Watts PEP on HF bands except for 10
>>>>meters, and 50 Watts PEP on 10 meters.
>>
>>>Is that really much of a problem? How many Novices are on the air today
>>>running more than those power levels?
>>
>Well? You know the answer as well as I: "Very few".

The same argument could also apply to Tech/Tech-Plus, as "very few" of
them operate below 30 MHz between 100 and 200 Watts either (though
significantly more might operate between 50 and 100 Watts on 10 meters).
The simplest alternative is to make Tech lose privileges, in the form of
reduced power limits, below 30 MHz in order to have one Novice/Tech set
of privileges on those bands.

Did you change your mind on this issue? According to the following
recent posting of yours:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com

you advocate doing just that. No argument from me, but it does suggest
that you realized the additional complexity of trying to both fold
NewNovice privileges into Technician *and* keep Technician from losing
privileges, so decided against keeping the latter constraint.

>>>> From the FAQ:
>>>>
>>>>"The reason behind the change in Novice power limits is to avoid having
>>>>to examine entry-level applicants about how to evaluate amateur stations
>>>>for RF safety. "
>>>>
>>>>I'm sure that you would argue that Technicians should retain their power
>>>>limits (1500 Watts PEP) on 6 meters and up, and I would agree, but what
>>>>about HF? Should Technicians lose privileges on those bands, by having
>>>>their power limits lowered (from 200 Watts PEP), or should there be
>>>>separate power limits for Novice and Technician on HF? This is starting
>>>>to get more complicated than before.
>>
>>>Not at all! Where an existing ham has greater privs, those privs would be
>>>retained. This has been done with Tech Pluses for almost 4 years now. FCC
>>>proposed it and enacted it, btw. Why can't it be done for existing Novices
>>>and Techs?
>>

But you agree that it would be a better idea to have just one set of
Novice/Tech privileges below 30 MHz even if that means Tech might lose
privileges due to lower power limits on those bands?

>>So, again, as part of your status-quo alternative, you want to keep in
>>place the regulations and bandplans for six classes of license, only
>>five of which will be tracked in the FCC database six years from now.

>Why not? Most of that is just a few lines in Part 97.

>>>The 1998 proposal from ARRL Hq was for Tech Pluses and Novices to get a
>>>freebie
>>>to General - and FCC said no. What has changed that suddenly makes free
>>>upgrades a good idea?
>>
>>The ARRL argues that this is now the second round of restructuring.

>Then why wasn't the BoD ready for it?

They were probably as "ready" for it as they were for the first round of recent restructuring in 1998-2000, or even the multi-year build-up to the 1991 Report and Order for the no-code license. Maybe they want to cross bridges when they feel that they have come to them? Maybe they will act decisively if and only if there is the possibility they will be left behind (such as from other parties submitting competing proposals that are assigned RM numbers)? Maybe their inside-the-FCC spy only now just phoned Newington with the coded message, "Raven is moving on Morris, repeat, Raven is moving on Morris," and they are now busy trying to channel the spirits of Hiram Maxim and Vic Clark for guidance? You tell me.

>>The FCC prefers to revisit things every few years, and do things in
>>manageable chunks.

>Meaning no disrespect, but - how do you know?

Because an interested observer can see that this is how the FCC wants to do business these days, via biennial regulatory reviews. Among other things, it makes Congress happy that the FCC continues to "improve" itself by reviewing regulations every couple of years. The FCC also wants to make sure that it leaves enough for future rounds.

>And if that is, indeed, the case, why not make a few changes now
>(like the "NewNovice") and revisit in a few years?

It is likely that the FCC will move on deletion of Element 1 very shortly, now that S25.5 is being deleted and there are several proposals on the table that have been assigned RM numbers to deal with this event. Your recent poll conducted on this newsgroup has most predicting action on this matter sometime in 2004:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20040110155603.11891.00003578%40mb-m11.aol.com

What is less clear is what other types of reorganization the FCC might choose to adopt at this time. The Novice-band refarming proposal has been on an FCC staffer's desk for about two years now. You might argue that this is a sign that it would be rejected. I might argue instead that the FCC is waiting for wrap-up of all related issues, including S25.5, and to approach Novice-band refarming as part of a periodic

review. If this is a "window of opportunity" that might not come again
in a while, and it is uncertain which proposal items the FCC might
choose, a good strategy would be to put all reasonable proposal items on
the table, especially if they can be argued to be interrelated to one
another as part of an overall, long-term plan.

Your suggestion above, to "make a few changes now" and "revisit in a few
years" might be reasonable *if* we controlled the agenda. We don't, the
FCC does. Because of this, omission of some items now, in a misguided
attempt to dictate what should and shouldn't be done, and in what
timeframe, might cause FCC to later ask, "Why didn't you bring this up
before?" or worse, "What are you trying to hide?"

>>What is driving this second round is the lifting of
>>the S25.5 requirement, the eventual need (in the ARRL's opinion, and
>>mine) to address the shrinking pools of Novice and Advanced class
>>licenses, as well as the fact that there will be no distinction in the
>>FCC database between two classes of licenses with different privileges
>>(Tech and Tech Plus) in the very near future.

>Let's take those one at a time:

>"shrinking pools of Novice and Advanced class licenses"

>If the Novice is reopened to new issues and existing Novices get NewNovice
>privileges as proposed by the BoD, the Novice shrinkage should stop.

>Advanceds are shrinking at a very slow rate (16% in almost 4 years) so there's
>no hurry in dealing with them.

>"there will be no distinction in the FCC database between two classes of
>licenses with different privileges
>(Tech and Tech Plus) in the very near future"

>Part of the proposal is for the code test for all but the Extra to go away, so
>the difference between
>Tech and Tech Plus becomes moot unless someone wants to get an Extra - at which
>time all they
>need do is present their old license or other document for Element 1 credit.

>Or they can just take the code test!

>So that's not an issue either.
>>
>>>>>>>>Rather, it is just one of
>>>>>>>>the unresolved loose ends that was deliberately not tied up until
>>better
>>>>>>>>consensus emerged from the amateur radio community about things like
>>>>>>>>Novice band refarming, etc. The League official noted that the ARRL's
>>>>>>>>band refarming proposal, RM-10413, has been sitting on an FCC
>>official's
>>>>>>>>desk for about two years now (he claims to know the exact FCC official,
>>>>>>>>but did not name him). Because of this, as long a wait, if not longer,

>>>>>>>>is expected on a "final" answer concerning automatic upgrading.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I say we should judge by actions. When FCC thinksa proposal is a good or
>>>>>>>bad
>>>>>>>idea, they act. How long did the whole 98-143 process take, from initial
>>>>>>>release of the NPRM to the new rules in April 2000?

>>>>>>>More important, what would a lack of free upgrades hurt? Is it really
>>>>>>>such a
>>>>>>>burden to require an Advanced to pass Element 4, or a Tech to pass
>>>>>>>Element 3, in order to get the next higher grade of license?

>>>>>>I think the ARRL may be politically shrewder than some would give them
>>>>>>credit.

>>>>>You mean the BoD. I'm the ARRL too, remember?

>>>>Yes, I meant the governance of the ARRL when I used the shorthand "ARRL"
>>>>in the context of offering an opinion on a BoD decision. Only they can
>>>>establish ARRL official policy and petition the FCC in the name of the
>>>>ARRL. Who else did you think I meant?

>>>Those folks are elected and paid for by members like *me*. They supposedly
>>>make those proposals in *my* name and with *my* support.

>>>Well, I don't support everything in that proposal.

>>Welcome to the realities of representative democracy.

>Been there since 1968 with ARRL.

>>Both of us pay
>>dues to the ARRL and elect Directors. They make proposals in both of
>>our names. I don't support everything in that proposal either, but it
>>is an ARRL proposal. You and I are perfectly free to submit comments to
>>the FCC as "ARRL Members," but the ARRL Board of Directors will submit
>>comments to the FCC as "*The* ARRL."

>Which will be done in my case, as was before. The BoD needs to realize,
>however, that the ARRL's position is weakened by proposing things that
>much if not most of the membership opposes.

>>>>>How much of the ARRL proposal in 1998 got enacted?

>>>>You will need more than a rhetorical question to make an argument here.
>>>>Instead, why don't you just come right out and say, for the benefit of
>>>>the audience, which items in the ARRL proposal got enacted, and which
>>>>ones didn't? And, of those that didn't get enacted, which ones you
>>>>think have already been given a final "no" answer?

>>>All right.

>>>Fact is, almost nothing proposed by ARRL Hq in 1998 got enacted. 5 wpm for
>>>General, that's about it. On everything else, FCC either:

>>>- said no: free upgrades, better written tests, Techs on HF CW without a
>>>formal test

>>>- went far beyond what was requested: 5 wpm Extra, Advanced closed off,
>>>written testing reduced dramatically

>>>>>>They can turn to the reformers and say, "See, we're giving you
>>>>>>a both a Novice and General HF-class license that doesn't require Morse
>>>>>>Code." To the old-school (and long-time, dues-paying) members they can
>>>>>>at least imply, "We recognize that the Morse Code tests you took in the
>>>>>>past are valuable, so we are going to reward you with a higher class of
>>>>>>license. Then you will always know that you are better than anyone who
>>>>>>gets a General or Extra class license under the reduced standards in the
>>>>>>future."

>>>>>Avoids the subject of why free upgrades are needed.

>>>>But does address the subject of why they may be politically desirable,
>>>>not only by leading to simplified FCC regulations, but also resulting
>>>>in a more harmonious and productive amateur radio in the future by
>>>>addressing most of the concerns of most factions.

>>>I don't see that at all. Are the written tests so difficult, and the VE test
>>>process so onerous, that free upgrades are the only answer?

>>>>>I say they're not.

>>>>So you've said. I'm sure that you will also say this to your
>>>>representatives within the ARRL and comment on any future FCC NPRM on
>>>>the subject.
>>
>>>Already have. In detail. More to come, too.
>>
>>>>I will, too. For the record, I'm not in complete
>>>>agreement with the ARRL proposal, either. I don't see the regulatory
>>>>justification for the retention of 5 WPM Morse code for Extra,
>>
>>>I do. Morse code is a big part of amateur radio, and having no code test at
>>>all simply denies the reality of that.
>>
>>I'm sure that you will argue in more detail than "Morse code is a big
>>part of ham radio, and having no code test simply denies the reality of
>>that."

>OK, here's some more:

>One of the Basis and Purposes of the ARS is technical education and skill
>development.
>IOW, hams learning about how radio works. Morse skill helps in this area
>because Morse-capable radio equipment can be made using a very wide variety of
>technologies and complexities.

>IOW, the beginner can build a very simple Morse station, and improve it as
>knowledge and skill expand.

>>You may also have to find new arguments beyond those that the
>>FCC rejected in Docket WT 98-143, including yours.
>>
>That was 5 years ago. Things change. And if FCC just dumps Element 1, as they
>may, the Tech and Tech plus can simply merge.

Yes, but if you oppose dumping Element 1, then you oppose merging Tech
and Tech Plus. You assert that there isn't a problem either way. I
disagree. But there is that distinction, and two "what-if" scenarios.

>>>>and I
>>>>remain skeptical that a Novice license (even a restructured one) is
>>>>viable today.
>>
>>>What we have now is a system that tends to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF
>>>amateur radio, and manufactured equipment. And away from HF and homebrewing.
>>>A restructured Novice could change that.
>>
>>Part of arguing for a new Novice license would involve identifying what
>>has not worked with the present Novice license, and what changes would
>>somehow "open the floodgates" with the proposed future one.

>What didn't work was simply this: Getting a Novice required passing two tests
>(code and theory) while getting a Tech after 1991 required passing just one. So
>most new hams went for the Tech because it was perceived to be easier.

>On top of that, the Novice didn't have 2 meters.

All true. But if Element 1 is dropped, and no other changes are made,
then the current Tech becomes what the former Tech-Plus was, with HF
privileges and one exam. Sounds simple to me. Why can't that serve as
an entry-level license? Why try to resurrect the dead-horse of Novice?
Could it be that people are willing to take a harder exam to obtain more
attractive privileges?

>>You argue
>>that most entry-level hams are being funneled to VHF/UHF.

>They are. Look at the privileges. ALL of amateur VHF/UHF vs. four little slices
>of HF.

I don't disagree. That's why I said, "I might also argue..." below
instead of, "I might argue instead..."

>> I might also
>>argue that there are not very many entry-level hams at all, especially
>>younger people, regardless of where they are being funneled.

>Look at

>http://www.ah0a.org

>for numbers of new licenses granted each month.

>In the past 12 months FCC issued 20,256 new amateur licenses. Is that "not very
>many"?

The answer is more complicated than that. Numbers of new amateur licenses sounds great on paper, as it would be about 3% annual growth. However, this does not take into account the number of amateurs leaving from non-renewal, or even how many of them were very active in the first place. Even AH0A touches on this subject at the following link on his site:

http://www.ah0a.org/FCC/Rate.html

Quoting AH0A:

"If the number of new amateurs being added every month (through renewal, upgrade, or as new amateurs) were equal to those expiring, the average time to expiration should remain the same. Assuming that the distribution of the times to expiration was constant over the future 120 months, the expected value would be 60 months.

A number less than 60 months would mean that the class of licensees is decreasing. Looking at the Chart 1. you can see this is the case for Novice, Technician, and Technician Plus licensees.

In Oct 2000, the average life of licenses for the entire Amateur population will drop below 60 months. Within a year the number of U.S. Amateurs will begin to decline."

Has AH0A's prediction come to pass? Well, according to:

http://www.ah0a.org/FCC/Licenses.html

we're not dropping precipitously (yet), but our total numbers have been flat (within a variance of less than half of one percent) for at least the past 6 years.

But let's look at those 20,000 or so new hams again, as I did argue "new" and not "overall." Making the slightly inaccurate, but simplifying, assumption that distribution of those new hams is proportional to that of the entire U.S. population, that would mean 50 new hams being licensed last year in my local community (based on population figures for my Metropolitan Statistical Area, or MSA). Wow! *FIFTY* new amateurs per year! We could certainly make good use of each and every one of them. We have lots of choices available that would welcome new volunteers with open arms:

- Local ARES and RACES organizations (especially with a recent influx of money and training opportunities due to Homeland Security)
- Weather training and spotting
- HF and VHF nets, including informal commute-time repeater nets
- DF Fox Hunts
- Field Day
- USAF MARS (where not only do you have HF privileges as a Technician, but there is an active user community for more advanced digital modes like MT63 and MFSK16)

or just as dues-paying members of local clubs, who can socialize with our experienced members, learn things from club programs, and undertake their own station projects with guidance from our Elmers. Field Day is not the only opportunity to guest operate an HF station if you do not have one of your own. We have even had local club members open their homes and well-equipped HF stations to any and all interested guest operators for special operating activities such as club anniversaries, QSO parties, Veteran's Day, etc.

Oh wait, where did they all go? All of the above activities are starved for new volunteers, and have exhibited flat or negative growth in recent years. I look around at all of the above activities (metaphorically so on the bands) and I see substantially the same people I have seen for the last several years.

So, to answer your question, yes, that is "not very many."

>>The
>>youngest members in most clubs locally are well into their mid-30's.
>>The presence of teenagers has all but evaporated.

>Why do you think that is?

Weeelll, since you asked...

One important feeder for amateur radio, especially those with strong technical and operating skills, and who will persist in it well into adulthood, is college radio clubs. Another is the military.

The ARRL, at least during the timeframe that I was involved in college club leadership (mid to late 1980's), seemed to focus its youth programs at too young an age to make a significant difference. A lot of focus was on getting elementary school-age hams to qualify for Novice tickets, despite the evidence that very few of them were going to stay with us long-term. Individual Field Organization officials were supportive of us (most notably W3ABC and the county EC, whose WB3 call I now can't remember). However, the ARRL as a whole seemed rather indifferent to college clubs, and not very helpful in providing publicity support in the form of PSA's, pamphlets, etc. Their materials seemed to either be aimed at children (Archie comics) or retirees (pursue a hobby with your copious money and spare time!). When I discussed this with one of our late-1970's alumni, who worked at the League for a while after graduation, he agreed, stating that he wanted to update the materials, but was overruled by higher-ups who wanted to persist with traditional styles of recruitment.

League indifference was one issue. Perhaps they expected that we could fend for ourselves. University indifference was another. EE students found faculty either ignorant ("I didn't know there was a ham club on campus") or hostile (One of our members raised his hand in a lecture, in response to the professor asking if anyone was a ham, because the topic of the lecture was SWR, and hams would have a good understanding of it. Later discussion with the professor by that member indicated that he disliked hams in general.) Efforts by some of our MSEE student members

to set up an analog RF design class (intended for upper-class undergraduates who have already taken the introductory electronics, electromagnetics, and modulation methods courses) were stymied by the fact that the only faculty member who was interested in teaching such a class was now retired. He might be able to teach such a course once, but it would not be a well-integrated, and long-term, part of the curriculum.

All of this was unfortunate, because word back from some of our EE graduates who went on to RF engineering careers (one working on microwave measurements at a government laboratory in Maryland, the other working for a certain communications and avionics systems manufacturer in Iowa) was that they found the BSEE curriculum oriented more towards sorting and filtering of students than with actually educating those students and imparting useful information. The oversized curriculum was intended to cover state professional licensing exams and provide a "grand tour" of topics to allow future graduate students to make an informed choice when they later specialized. Both said that they would have been at a significant professional disadvantage if they had not had the hands-on background in RF that amateur radio offered them. Their advice? Sure, pursue the degree, as that is the only way to get into a professional engineering career these days. Just don't expect it to be a climb-the-mountain-and-see-God experience. Take advantage of as many opportunities as you can to get hands-on experience, including co-ops and technical hobbies like amateur radio, because the curriculum alone will not even come close to providing it.

It also saddens me to see a fine, mostly self-supporting, radio club like W3ADO at the U.S. Naval Academy have to defend itself against closure. It was even necessary to (politely) correct command's perceptions, which was something like, "Amateur radio, is that still around?" Though many midshipmen will graduate with engineering degrees, very few officers will serve as professional engineers in the Navy. Rather, they will draw on that expertise to command ships full of highly-qualified technicians working on many advanced technological systems. The radio club, with its well-equipped station and numerous successful projects (enumerated in my letter linked below), offers one of the few opportunities for such officers to gain hands-on experience in RF engineering before joining the fleet, and thus be able to better command that which they better understand.

A letter-writing campaign, in which I participated:

http://sacmarc.novia.net/hypermail/att-0220/01-w3ado.txt

helped save the club, for now. I would like to thank fellow newsgroup participant Larry Roll, K3LT, for joining me in this campaign. However indifferent the League may have been to college clubs in the past, they also wrote in defense of W3ADO.

>>
>>What types of realistic homebrewing are you advocating for "NewNovice"

>>hams beyond 3-transistor OOK transmitters and single-conversion
>>receivers? Please be specific.

>What's wrong with those sorts of rigs for a start? There are also
>lots of good kits out there. And note that the "NewNovice" allows a wide
>variety of modes.

Actually using a CW rig requires at least some proficiency in Morse code. Not only are entry-level hams eschewing that, but so are most experienced hams, if trends and surveys are any indication. Furthermore, the ARRL-proposed NewNovice does not require a Morse code test. Such a CW rig could be built, but would it be used? Even if it is just a base project for learning purposes that would later be extended, what kind of homebrewing agenda, and timeline, would you advocate to get to something that would be practically usable in modes other than CW?

>>What aspects of current communications
>>technology, something that would be used and would not be a trophy or
>>shop-project to be put on a shelf, can be realistically homebrewed via
>>commercially-available (and presently-manufactured) parts by high-school
>>age hams?

>Lots of CW rigs, for a start. I built my first station from junk at age 13.

I left the door wide open for you to suggest lots of other kinds of homebrewing, but you went right back to CW rigs, using examples of what you built over 35 years ago. I can think of a few others that I think entry-level hams should attempt in the present day. For example:

High school students should be able to homebrew:

- Patch cables, control harnesses, and connection terminations from bulk wire and connectors

- Antennas and feed systems, again from bulk materials

- IC-based timer and microcontroller circuits from commonly-available electronic parts

Implicit in the above is learning to make the correct choice of components, both parts and bulk materials, appropriate for the desired performance, specifications, and overall design. These types of projects would be a good opportunity to learn how to use a multimeter and an oscilloscope. Mechanical and fabrication skills, including soldering, would also be developed.

For college students:

- Software-based radios (ever heard of GnuRadio)?

I put this one in the college-age category, because being able to design and implement software-based radios would be helped by sufficient knowledge of Digital Signal Processing (DSP) theory, and much of that

(at least the derivations and proofs) is based on calculus and
differential equations. Proper computer programming education would
occur at this time, also.

>Do you think homebrewing is no longer practical? How about kits? Are
>we to be nothing but appliance operators?

No, I think that homebrewing is practical, I just disagree with what
kinds of homebrewing are desirable. I read your comments in FCC Docket
WT 98-143, did you read mine? They are available in the ECFS. I do
address this issue there.

Kits are now enjoying increased popularity even without changes to
amateur radio licensing, though they no longer have the cost advantage
over commercially-built gear that they did when Heathkit was in its
heyday.

>>When you argue for "NewNovice" privileges, are you supporting it with 5
>>WPM code, or without?

>I support a code test for *all* ham licenses. That probably won't happen, of
>course.
>But it's a good idea.

One simple, nearly status-quo, outcome that the FCC might pursue in
response to the deletion of S25.5 is to drop the 5 WPM code requirement
by eliminating Element 1. If so, then the Tech/Tech-Plus distinction
goes away, and the Novice/Tech HF privileges would be usable by
operators from the numerous ranks of Technician. That might also be
considered a "good idea."

>>What if almost no one wants to sign up for 5 WPM
>>code as an entry-level requirement?

>The ARRL proposal talks about how great the old Novice was in its heyday. 5 wpm
>didn't stop hundreds of thousands of hams then - why should it do so now, when
>we have more and better training methods?

Because we are long past the Novice's heyday, and few want to sign up
for Novice today. Prospective amateurs "vote with their feet" in
seeking out the Technician class license as an entry-level license. One
plausible reason for this is the CW test, as even you alluded to above.
Maintain the CW test, and you continue to funnel amateurs away from
Novice and HF. As noted above, a simpler test is not a panacea, because
people are willing to take a harder test to get more desirable
privileges. Again, what is the necessary ingredient that is missing?
We already have "more and better training methods", we have a pool of
applicants that are willing to take a harder test to get more desirable
privileges, and we even have lots of potential homebrew projects to make
simple CW transmitters and receivers. Why do few people want to sign up
for that nowadays?

Even under the ARRL proposal, the proposed NewNovice license does not impart enough knowledge, nor does it grant enough privileges, to be suitably attractive to make it a viable entry-level license, in my opinion. Especially if it has to be justified strongly enough either to exist as a fourth open class of license, or introduce more free upgrades (such as from Tech/Tech-Plus to General) to keep the number of open classes limited to three.

>The fact is that it's not the code test or the written test or the number of
>license classes
>which is/are the problem. It's things like lack of publicity, antenna
>restrictions, and
>competition from other activities.

All of the above are challenges for amateur radio, but which of the above do we have the most control over, and thus the greatest ability to solve? How would you propose to solve each of them?

I notice you making the "lack of publicity" argument in this newsgroup since at least 2000, and discussing some specifics in later postings. Obviously you and I don't have the budget and manpower to do national campaigns. Only the ARRL is big enough to do that. Have you talked to ARRL officials about this? What are their answers? Even if the ARRL is unmoveable on this issue, we can still make a difference locally. What have you done locally in the past four years to better publicize amateur radio? How did it work out?

>73 de Jim, N2EY

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

2462. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 06:47:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <0ekWb.20368$jH6.11233@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87138

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Don't leave out the crotch grabbing
> and inappropriate "lyrics" from
> P.Diddy and Nelly.

I don't have a lot of time to talk, but simply couldn't ignore this subject. Have you ever heard the phrase, "slinging sh*t?" It's fairly popular with some teenagers today. Anyway, I was flipping through the channels the other day and happened upon the "Soul Train" television show. There was a male singer on stage going through the motions of doing exactly that. As he was singing, he would wipe his hand up the crack of his butt and then flick his hand in the direction of the cheering audience.

He did this several times (six or seven, at least). If he had not repeated it, I wouldn't have believed what I first saw. I have no idea who the singer was, and only stayed on the channel long enough after that to learn the program name, but this has to be an example of entertainment reaching a new low.

Michael Jackson repeatedly grabbing his crotch in front of audiences often filled with young children was the previous low point, in my opinion (especially considering the recent allegations and his admission of sleeping with children).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2463. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 06:56:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211015633.29660.00002865@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87139

In article <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
>> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?
>
>"We've got a bleeder!"
>
>from: When Harry Met Sally

Don't forget the redux on the Oriongasm scene by the other guy... :-)

LHA / WMD

2464. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 06:56:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211015634.29660.00002866@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87141

In article <FnhWb.1718$t16.1360628@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> That is an interest.
>
>Actually he likes to antagonize over anything he can manage to twist into an >argument.

Only to counter the revisionist history of radio as presented by the ARRL. :-)

Please, continue to hide head in the sand and let the league be your Big Brother. They know what is best for ham radio because they say they do.

Hmmm...we are 20 years past "1984." :-)

LHA / WMD

2465. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 06:56:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211015636.29660.00002867@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87140

In article <1h3j201g68kehgb0nt1qdseic4m4btqhdo@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 11 Feb 2004 02:00:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>>>>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> >snip
>>>>> >
>>>>> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>>>>
>>>>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>>>> is still going strong there.....
>>>>>
>>>>> >snip
>>>>>
>>>>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>
>>>>> 73, Leo
>>>>
>>>>Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>>>>after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>>>>justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>>>>have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>>>>frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would
>not
>>>>have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.
>>>
>>>Dee,
>>>
>>>Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
>>>depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
>>>the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
>>>back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
>>>the war.

>>
>>About 4,000, from various accounts.
>>
>>Now, how many amateurs were there in the rest of the world back then?
>
>Dunno - you tell me!
>
>>> Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
>>>number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale?
>>
>>Yes.

Heh. In the renowned historian's view, just three would do it. :-)

Meanwhile, heedless to the Americans, the first witnessed and
documented demonstration of radio as a communications medium
took place in Italy and Russia in 1896.

>>
>>>Keeping in
>>>mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but
>>>not an overwhelming influence.
>>
>>Was there even an ITU back then?

No. The CCITT.

>Founded on 17 May 1865, according to their history page. Just a
>couple of weeks after the Civil War ended!

The American Civil War, that is. :-)

Actually, the old National Bureau of Standards (now a part of NIST)
started up then with the first international conference in Yurp on
weights and measures and the like. That's in the history of NBS
in "Measures for Progress" published by the US Government Printing
Office nearly three decades ago, authored for the NBS.

The CCITT was mainly concerned with international interfacing of
telegrams. Commercial landline telegraphy was then 23 years old
in the USA and spreading rapidly worldwide.

>>>Foreign stations still boom over here
>>>today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
>>>they can.
>>
>>That's because of a compromise worked out in 1938.
>
>Which apparently could not be vetoed by just one country in a global
>union :)

The "40m issue" of SWBCs v. hams hasn't been fully settled in
25 years and won't see the first separation until a couple years

from now.

>>>The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
>>>control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
>>>either.
>>
>>The point is that the cause of truly "amateur" radio was largely the work
>>of Americans. In fact, amateur radio was not recognized as a separate
>>radio service by international treaty until 1927. That recognition was
>>due in large part to the work of Maxim, Stewart, Warner and others at
>>the various conferences, including Paris in 1924 and 1925.
>>>
>>>According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
>>>wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
>>>the US - it was the US Military.
>>
>>Yep, most notably the Navy.
>>
>>>he ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
>>>the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
>>>but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
>>>from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful.
>>
>>I think they would have. Most of the rest of the world had very few if any
>>amateurs. Many countries could not understand why anyone would want to
>>pursue radio as an end in itself. Many also wanted total government control
>>of radio. Very few outside the US thought amateurs needed more than a few
>small
>>bands and more than a few watts.
>>
>>>And, in
>>>the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
>>>for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>>
>>Unlikely without the help of the IARU.
>
>That was well after opeating privileges were restored in 1919, though
>- the IARU came along in 1925. We had been on the air for six years by
>then...
>
>>>In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally
>>>transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US
>>>amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.
>>
>>And there were how many of them?
>
>Infinitely more than in the US, until October! :) Point was, our
>privileges were restored well before the ARRL was able to get that in
>place in the US.
>

>Numbers don't always carry the greatest influence in political
>decisions - there is also sovereignty, and little things like that...
>
>>>
>>>As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to
>>>enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to
>>>that :o0
>>
>>>Source: http://www.ve4.net/history/part1.txt
>>>
>>>Does anyone have any further documentation pertaining to this subject?
>>>I know that the Netherlands didn't regain operating privileges until
>>>the early 1920s - Alun, old son, what was the history of this over the
>>>pond?
>>>
>>Start with "200 Meters And Down"
>
>That's mostly US history, though - I was looking more for what other
>countries were doing around that time.....

Not only that, it is "radio history" somewhat filtered by the ARRL to
emphasize their "importance" even though they were a late-comer
among USA amateur radio organizations. Sigh.

For a more balanced view of early radio history, mostly in the USA,
see the "White Pages" (as I call this collection by Thomas H. White) at -

http://earlyradiohistory.us/index.html

There are 24 principal sections there, #23 having early radio regulation.
Section #12 covers "pioneering hams." In section #12 one can find out
that the Radio League of America and the United American Relay Club
were there before the ARRL. The very first USA radio club was RCA,
the Radio Club of America founded in 1909, five years before the ARRL.

Section #12 will also recount a couple of trans-continental amateur
relay failures which probably aren't in the "official" history book titled
"200 Meters and Down." :-)

LHA / WMD

2466. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 12:52:23 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <102k9fis45h8255@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 87142

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
> As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
> tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in a
> way
> where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are already
> authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any knowledge
> of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.

The ARRL petition is not "making things right".

It will continue the Extra code exam that Commission stated
"serves no regulatory purpose"; and, in my opinion, is not
in conformity with 5 USC 706.

The ARRL petition will waive valid writtem exams for
a special group of incumbenent licesees, who did not ask
to be upgraded.

It appears to me that ARRL is giving away free upgrades in return
for support the Extra code exam.

If the Commission wants to "make things right", they should have
issued a MO&O in December to delete 47 CFR 97.503(a).

Larry, kc8epo

2467. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 13:29:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402A2E1D.6010807@psu.edu>
Source record: 87143

Leo wrote:
> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 22:44:04 -0500, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
>>
>>Leo wrote:
>>
>>>On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 19:15:37 -0500, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!
>>>
>>>
>>>No rant intended, Mike. Just looking for facts!
>>>
>>>You wouldn't happen to have any on you, would you? :)
>>
>> Facts? I have the history I've read.
>
>
> I'll have to take that as a 'no' then....

Do you always take history as fact?

FWIW, I have read that the US amateurs and their representatives were pretty much the driving force in Amateur radio post WW1. The numbers of Amateurs in the US was roughly equal to the Amateurs in the rest of the world. These numbers coupled with a few organizations that represented them from one country instead of spread out over the globe, would naturally have a major influence on the hobby/avocation.

Now I don't know that for sure, since I wasn't around then, but it seems sensible and logical enough, so I assign it a good probability.

- Mike KB3EIA

2468. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 13:51:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <5ebk2099al4t3t4j1orocgknm2udcj5b9n@4ax.com>
Source record: 87144

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 03:30:43 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:fn0j20dfeur0dm6f3vs5e7anvik9m8le5s@4ax.com...
>> On 11 Feb 2004 00:00:18 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >Except for Japanese 4th class licensees, how many hams are there in the
>rest of
>> >the planet?
>>
>> Well, my trusty EuroCall 2003 CD lists 276,446 callsigns in Europe
>> alone - even if a couple of guys died, there's probably more than that
>> now. I don't have figures for Asia, Africa, Oceania or the rest of
>> the Americas (except that there's around 56,000 or so up here...).
>>
>> Quite a few, anyway! DX wouldn't be the same without 'em..... ;)
>>
>
>Excluding Japan, the last time I checked the Radio Amateur Call book listed
>about 600,000+ for the combined rest of the world. Roughly equal to the
>number of US Amateurs.

Sounds about right. (Japan has 1,000,000 hams? That explains the
number of Japanese amateur products out there - they built their own
user base for 'em!).

However, voting rights in the ITU, CCITT or other global entities
aren't weighted entirely upon the number of licensees or service users
that each country has. If they were, the US could control the ITU like
a corporation - claim a 51% user share and set global amateur policy
on their own votes alone. Fortunately, it doesn't work that way :)

Agreed that the US is obviously a major player - but I'm sure that
even if they had gone their own way, the rest of the world would not
necessarily follow. The role of agencies like the ITU is to
coordinate global resources so as to prevent chaos on the bands - not
to act as an agent of US policy.

>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

73, Leo

2469. Re: KE4TEW, Riley's buddy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 14:48:27 UTC
From: Bob Reed <w2ce@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <8eOdnYwCKoVX3bfdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 87145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Looks to me like he satisfied whatever complaints were filed against him and that in the short term renewal period no other complaints were filed against him thereby allowing his renewal. Apparently he behaved as asked and was allowed to renew. All of that is writen in the FCC Enforcement releases, nothing is hidden or corrupt.

"mick" <drunkfiredcop@hiccup.net> wrote in message news:HxcVb.15802$8a5.578@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679
>
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>
> Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
> retest? Looks like corruption to me.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>

2470. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 15:04:15 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <g4dk20dt0ff0jl2q2ak4843amp536lkgs7@4ax.com>
Source record: 87146

```
On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 03:25:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com...
>> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>> >news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>> >> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >snip
>> >> >
>> >> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>> >>
>> >> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>> >> is still going strong there.....
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >snip
>> >>
>> >> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >>
>> >> 73, Leo
>> >>
>> >
>> >Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently closed
>> >after World War I. The other countries did not have enough amateurs to
>> >justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably that they would
>> >have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted the shortwave
>> >frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign amateurs would
>not
>> >have had enough leverage to have held on to the spectrum.
>>
>> Dee,
>>
>> Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
>> depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
>> the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
>> back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
>> the war. Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
```

>> number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale? Keeping in
>> mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but
>> not an overwhelming influence. Foreign stations still boom over here
>> today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
>> they can. The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
>> control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
>> either.
>>
>
>Although records in the early 1900s are sketchy, if you pick periods in time
>that are documented, the number of US amateurs was roughly equal to the rest
>of the world combined. This is still true today if one excludes Japan, which
>has over 1 million licensed users but with an abysmally low activity rate
>(Japanese licenses are for life, many children are licensed in school
>programs and never use the licenses, and no renewal is required).

As of our last restructuring,Canadian licences (actually,
"Certificates of Proficiency") are also valid for life - no renewal
required.

> While theUS would not have been an "overwhelming" influence, it still would have been
>a major player. How long could amateurs in other countries have been
>effective against government and commercial interests in the ITU if the US
>had remained in an "amateur radio black hole?" It is difficult to say of
>course but there would have been much less strength available to resist the
>encroachment. Yes one cannot say with absolute certainty which way it would
>have gone but I do believe that amateur radio would be a lot less common now
>if the US had not been involved. Also keep in mind that due to our form of
>government, our civilian population (in this case hams) do have more
>influence in shaping our governments approach to items like amateur radio
>than is and was prevalent in a lot of countries.

I wonder if that is true - the FCC does not appear to have a history
of implementing what the ARRL requests, for example - and they
represent many thousands of amateurs. Sure, comments and suggestions
are encouraged - but it is not a true democratic process - the FCC is
under no obligation whatsoever to implement the will of the majority.
Plus, the comment and review procedure is massive - thousands of
individual public comments and proposals to go through, another round
of proposals and responses, then review, and on and on - a juggernaut
of a process that may well take years to run its course.

Here, Industry Canada asked our national radio association (RAC) to
gather data on what Canadian amateurs wanted to do with licensing
requirements if the Morse requirement was dropped at WRC-03. The RAC
set up a web page with a questionnaire on it, and opened it up to all
licenced Canadian amateurs (not just RAC members). The results were
collected and tabulated, recommendations prepared, and forwarded to IC
for their consideration. As licensing changes within the Amateur
service do not have an impact on either the general public or
commercial interests, this approach makes sense.

Now there is a system that amateurs have direct influence over!

Also, look at how quickly amateurs in Great Britain, Australia, Germany and many others were able to have the Morse requirement dropped following WRC-03. No red tape, no seemingly endless discussion - just done. Many did this in direct response to the request of their own national radio clubs to do so if permitted post-WRC-03. Now there is real democracy in action!

>
>
>> According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
>> wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
>> the US - it was the US Military. The ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
>> the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
>> but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
>> from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful. And, in
>> the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
>> for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>>
>
>I did indeed mean to include military. Sorry about that. In the context of
>lobbying the US government for keeping amateur frequencies and re-opening
>them after WWI, I do believe that in the absence of the ARRL another body
>could have formed (and probably would have) and done the same as the ARRL.
>But you know what, we would then be having this same discussion of "ZZZZ"
>organization and the people who today slam the ARRL would be slamming the
>"ZZZZ." The rest of us would then be defending "ZZZZ". Same game,
>different names.

But Dee, other governments re-opened the amateur bands after WW1 without the assistance of the ARRL - in many foreign countries. I'm neither praising nor slamming the ARRL - just stating that their achievement was a local, not a global, one. Canadian hams were back on the air months before the ARRL's victory in the US - I'm sure that others were as well in various places around the world. Seems natural enough - activities were suspended due to the conflict, and reinstated after the hostilities ended. Not everyone's military tried to keep the bands indefinitely for their own private use!

>
>> In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally
>> transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US
>> amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.
>>
>> As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to
>> enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to
>> that
>>
>
>But would they have had enough clout in subsequent ITU conferences to stave
>off the commercial and military seekers of the bands. In any disagreement,

>you don't want the strongest player sitting on the sidelines or playing on
>the other side.

I don't see why not - the ITU voting structure isn't that heavily weighted based on the size of the US - otherwise, they would be in business strictly to globalize US policy. Or, countries like China could assert that as they have 4 times the population of the US, they should control 4 times as many votes. Countries like Japan could claim that they have 3 times the number of licenced Amateurs, and monopolize the process. If that were the case, how many countries would have remained members of the ITU? None, I'd say.

>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

73, Leo

2471. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 15:28:53 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <i6hk20pl0bgvfnj6i6pgb2ljumkufa6j3d@4ax.com>
Source record: 87147

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 08:29:01 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 22:44:04 -0500, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>
>>>Leo wrote:
>>>
>>>>On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 19:15:37 -0500, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>No rant intended, Mike. Just looking for facts!
>>>>
>>>>You wouldn't happen to have any on you, would you? :)
>>>
>>> Facts? I have the history I've read.
>>
>>
>> I'll have to take that as a 'no' then....
>
>
> Do you always take history as fact?

Not always, Mike. Depends on whether the source of the historical
information quotes verifiable references or not. Otherwise, it's just
the opinion of the writer.

I never take hearsay as fact, however.

The fact is, other countries were back on the air well before the ARRL
was successful in restoring amateur privileges in the US. Neither the
US nor the ARRL was responsible for the restoration of amateur
privileges in other sovereign nations.

Perhaps the ARRL overstated its importance in the lobbying for the
return of Amateur privileges as well - in recent history, the FCC does
not always follow their suggestions (incentive licensing comes to
mind, for one). Maybe the Government would have told the military to
back off and get out of the radio monopolization business? If the

military had been successful, there would have been no commercial
radio either - just military.

But hey, if you're lobbying for something and it ends up going your
way, then you get to claim that you made it happen, right! Even if it
would have happened anyway - who's to disagree? :)
>
>
> FWIW, I have read that the US amateurs and their representatives were
>pretty much the driving force in Amateur radio post WW1. The numbers of
>Amateurs in the US was roughly equal to the Amateurs in the rest of the
>world. These numbers coupled with a few organizations that represented
>them from one country instead of spread out over the globe, would
>naturally have a major influence on the hobby/avocation.

If the international unions were structured like corporations, that
would be true. The US would have a majority share, and could
implement anything that they wanted based upon the number of
'shareholders' (amateurs, in this case) that they represented.

In reality, it's not structured like that at all. Otherwise, how would
comparitively small countries like Albania or Turkey have any chance
of having their national interests recognized?

>
>Now I don't know that for sure, since I wasn't around then, but it seems
>sensible and logical enough, so I assign it a good probability.

Perhaps they were a driving force - but if they hadn't been (i.e. if
the US military had successfully locked them out after WW1), why on
Earth would the rest of the planet have abandoned amateur radio? It
might have been different, and ther might have been contention between
US military traffic and the rest of the world - but I really don't
believe for a second that the US influence over the amateur policies
of the rest of the world was ever that strong. Not then - and not
today.

Historically speaking.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA

73, Leo

2472. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 18:57:10 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0dtu0qtv07$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87148

Hello, Dee and the group,

at the ITU, each country has only ONE vote, see the post about albania and san marino etc.

And about the strength of the national radio clubs like your ARRL, or the RAC, DARC: ARRL is holding abt 25% of the hams, in Europe the average member number of the club is over 60% of all hams in this country. But I agree, lobbying the government is a game they know how to play in the US.

73 & 88 de
OE8SOQ
Helmut

2473. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 19:16:03 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87149

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040210203202.07155.00000635@mb-m06.aol.com:

> In article <v_dWb.1639$t16.1328749@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>As I indicated in another post, early on in amateur radio, it would
>>have been easy for the ITU to have allocated all the frequencies to
>>commericial and government interests. The size of the US amateur
>>community was, in those early days, very probably a key element in
>>keeping an allocation for amateurs.
>
> There was NO "ITU" before WW2. There was the CCITT.
>
> The size of the US amateur community was, in those early days,
> miniscule compared to the broadcasters getting started. Ham radio's
> oinks weren't near "numerous" until AFTER WW2.
>
> But, to hear the spin from the league, they and Stl Hiram
> practically invented ham radio and saved it from perdition.
>
> Selective editing of the REAL history of all radio doesn't make it
> "truth." Except to the devout Believers...
>
> LHA / WMD

They even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence, when the
truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for the
league's opposition!

2474. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 19:21:27 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948C91F66B89Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87150

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:40295032.3030108@psu.edu:

> Alun wrote:
>
>> Ah well, Leo, they still think that the United states is the centre of
>> the universe (or even the center of the universe, HI!). We used to
>> think the same thing about the British Empire, and we were wrong too!
>
> Trolling, eh?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Not atall. I'm serious. We did think we were the centre of everything, but that is an illusion that passes. Trust me. All things pass. The Roman empire, the British empire ... you get the idea.

2475. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 19:23:01 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948C923A4BBD7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87151

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:sSdWb.1638$t16.1327427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >snip
>> >
>> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I
>> >don't.
>>
>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>> is still going strong there.....
>>
>> >
>> >snip
>>
>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>
> Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently
> closed after World War I. The other countries did not have enough
> amateurs to justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably
> that they would have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted
> the shortwave frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign
> amateurs would not have had enough leverage to have held on to the
> spectrum.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

If you beleive that, you'll beleive almost anything.

2476. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 19:24:37 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948C927F97E24elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87152

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in
news:t-CdnfXclJ216bTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com:

> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>> "Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>> news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>>
>>>On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>snip
>>>>
>>>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I
>>>>don't.
>>>
>>>Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>>is still going strong there.....
>>>
>>>
>>>>snip
>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>73, Leo
>>>
>>
>>
>> Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently
>> closed after World War I. The other countries did not have enough
>> amateurs to justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably
>> that they would have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone
>> wanted the shortwave frequencies at that time and without the US, the
>> foreign amateurs would not have had enough leverage to have held on to
>> the spectrum.
>
> Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US
> rant!
>
> 8^)
>
> FWIW, I'm really disapointed in thoes two. 8^(
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>
>

Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond help.

2477. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 19:43:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402A85DD.4030308@psu.edu>
Source record: 87153

Alun wrote:

> Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
> America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond help.

It's a troll, Alun. Go post the same message anywhere on netnews and
watch the reaction.

If you don't believe it, then you're probably beyond help.

Of course the world doesn't revolve around the US. The world revolves
around it's axis.

How is the ARRL proposal going to affect the rest of the world's
amateurs anyway?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2478. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 20:11:13 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <o52l20d04e3jnvvlt2f32l9gkq8jobdou2@4ax.com>
Source record: 87154

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 14:43:25 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Alun wrote:
>
>> Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
>> America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond help.
>
>
>It's a troll, Alun. Go post the same message anywhere on netnews and
>watch the reaction.

Mike, I didn't take Alun's message as a troll - just a response in
context to the thread to a rather lofty assertion that without the
ARRL (and by definition, the US Amateur Radio Service, since that is
all the ARRL influences), the world would never have known the joys of
Amateur Radio.

Which is just a tad jingoistic, I'd say - and nigh-on impossible to
substantiate without resorting to theory, opinion and conjecture.

> If you don't believe it, then you're probably beyond help.
>
> Of course the world doesn't revolve around the US. The world revolves
>around it's axis.
>
> How is the ARRL proposal going to affect the rest of the world's
>amateurs anyway?

It won't.

Yet, according to the comments earlier in the thread, historically,
without the ARRL there would be no amateur radio anywhere in the
world.

Really? I don't think so.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2479. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 20:13:06 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948C9AB722601elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87155

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
news:iqri20h470kvjbpvrttf0jvfaanhh9ls85@4ax.com:

> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 23:32:40 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>>news:1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com...
>>> On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>> >snip
>>> >
>>> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I
>>> >don't.
>>>
>>> Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>> is still going strong there.....
>>>
>>> >
>>> >snip
>>>
>>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>> 73, Leo
>>>
>>
>>Without the ARRL, US amateur radio would have remained permanently
>>closed after World War I. The other countries did not have enough
>>amateurs to justify keeping the frequencies and it is highly probably
>>that they would have all gone to commercial interests. Everyone wanted
>>the shortwave frequencies at that time and without the US, the foreign
>>amateurs would not have had enough leverage to have held on to the
>>spectrum.
>
> Dee,
>
> Perhaps, but I'm not comfortable that it is fact. In 1917 (or 1916,
> depending on the source), there were some 6,000 amateurs operating in
> the US - not sure how many there were when amateur radio was turned
> back on in 1919, but it was probably less than that, due to losses in
> the war. Even at 6,000, though, would that constitute a sufficient
> number of amateurs to influence policy on a global scale? Keeping in
> mind that the US, as a member of the ITU, has voting privileges but

> not an overwhelming influence. Foreign stations still boom over here
> today on part of our 40 meter band - because the ITU agreements say
> they can. The Americas can request, and debate, and vote upon, but not
> control ITU policy. I doubt very much that they could back then,
> either.
>
> According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
> wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
> the US - it was the US Military. The ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
> the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
> but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
> from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful. And, in
> the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
> for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>
> In fact, your happy ham neighbours to the North were legally
> transmitting again as of May 1, 1919 - a full 5 months before the US
> amateurs were allowed back on the air on October 1st of that year.
>
> As I recall from history class, the US military hasn't attemped to
> enforce US policy up here since 1814 - and never successfully prior to
> that :o0
>
> Source: http://www.ve4.net/history/part1.txt
>
> Does anyone have any further documentation pertaining to this subject?
> I know that the Netherlands didn't regain operating privileges until
> the early 1920s - Alun, old son, what was the history of this over the
> pond?
>
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> 73, Leo
>
>

I have to confess ignorance as to exactly when the hams got back on the air in the UK after WW1.

I do know something about the 1927 conference, though. I think that this may be the source of the theory that America saved ham radio, but like most things it's not that simple.

Many of the delegates, including the UK, did not want to recognise ham radio as a service in the international regulations. What you have to understand, though, is that they did have amateur radio in these countries, and that it would have continued much the same without ITU recognition. The war was long over by then, and they had all let everyone get back on the air already, long before the conference. This point is noticeably absent from the postings advancing the 'America saved the world' theory.

The US proposal was carried, and what it did was to get recognition of the amateur service in return for the code test. This was no loss to American hams, who already had to pass a code test anyway. However, many (most?) of the other countries had no code test before 1927. The UK certainly did not. It's quite possible that many delegates may have opposed the US proposal less because they didn't want to recognise hams, but more because they didn't want a code test! I don't know. The UK clearly had no objection to amateur radio continuing in being, but just didnt consider it to be a service (many people still dispute that point today).

If the American proposal hadn't been carried in 1927, it is quite clear that amateur radio would not have dissappeared. Without ITU recognition of amateur radio, it is true that there would have been much more variation in allocations between countries, although there is still quite a bit anyway. I understand that Australia had entirely different HF bands to everyone else at that time, and that might have continued for a while longer at least.

So, there is a grain of truth in that it was the US that put forward the proposal that got amateur radio recognised, but it had nothing to do with numbers, as they had only one vote, just as they do today.

Unrecognised services exist without needing any permission from the ITU. Just look at CB. Yes, I know you'd rather not(!), but it exists in a large number of countries without any ITU recognition, many of them even using the same channels. Of course, it is a good thing that amateur radio is not in this position, but you all know what I'm coming to next.

The price we paid. The @#%#&$& code test! You can all say your piece about whether there should be a code test or not, but there's one thing that none of you can honestly deny. The existence of the ITU code test requirement caused more ill feeling than anything else in the hobby. I did put that in the past tense because it has gone, and the past is the only place it belongs.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2480. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 20:32:23 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0e3gf$p4c$04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87156

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59@posting.google.com...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > Hi, Len,
> >
> > after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did not find
> > anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but nothing
> > about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one very
> > important thing.
> >
> > What impact will Broadband over Powerlines, or PLC, have on the Amateur
> > Radio Policy.
> >
> > Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I will
> > take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and the
> > Moderator of this Newsgroup. Please take my apology for the poor quoting
> > habits, I am not jet skilled enough in this magic art.
> >
> > Please don't cite me impatient, but may I await your reply soon? Today?
> >
> > Best regards
> > Helmut
> > --
>
> Hi Dave.

Billy the Beeper,

Did you reply to the wrong post?
You did not read the header?

This is not Dave whoever, its HELMUT here!

Anyway, greetings from Europe

73 de OE8SOQ

2481. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 20:48:06 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948CA0A6FE1B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87157

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in news:20040210194505.25517.00004239
@mb-m15.aol.com:

> In article <Xns948B80C21E6B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>>
>>> w3rv
>>
>>Anyone would try to think you were trying to get rid of me, LOL!
>
> Independent thought must be abolished from this group.
>
> It makes the regular natives restless and they might take up
> their spears and fight against Abrams tanks...
>
> LHA / WMD
>

Well, the joke's on them anyway. I could move to Canada (lovely country,
but too cold for me) and still plague them on rrap.

2482. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 20:53:17 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ks4l20tjqakkuf2jsjv9m5u43l86egc66p@4ax.com>
Source record: 87158

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 21:32:23 +0100, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
wrote:

>sniph
>
>This is not Dave whoever, its HELMUT here!
>
>Anyway, greetings from Europe

They most certainly are from Europe - if you have a look at the
message headers, Helmut is posting from the ISP t-online.de, which is
located in beautiful Germany.

Vilkommen, Helmut. Angenehm!

>
>73 de OE8SOQ

73, Leo

2483. Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-11 21:00:33 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948CA2C3794Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87159

Another domino falls

2484. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:00:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211190002.01632.00000705@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 87160

In article <g4dk20dt0ff0jl2q2ak4843amp536lkgs7@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>As of our last restructuring,Canadian licences (actually,
>"Certificates of Proficiency") are also valid for life - no renewal
>required.

If there are no renewals, how does IC know when a ham dies? Or is the
situation like Japan, where the license is only cancelled if someone makes
the effort to tell the govt. (with proper documentation) that the ham in
question
is, indeed, dead, and to cancel the license?
>
>> While theUS would not have been an "overwhelming" influence, it still would
>>have been
>>a major player. How long could amateurs in other countries have been
>>effective against government and commercial interests in the ITU if the US
>>had remained in an "amateur radio black hole?" It is difficult to say of
>>course but there would have been much less strength available to resist the
>>encroachment. Yes one cannot say with absolute certainty which way it would
>>have gone but I do believe that amateur radio would be a lot less common now
>>if the US had not been involved. Also keep in mind that due to our form of
>>government, our civilian population (in this case hams) do have more
>>influence in shaping our governments approach to items like amateur radio
>>than is and was prevalent in a lot of countries.
>
>I wonder if that is true - the FCC does not appear to have a history
>of implementing what the ARRL requests, for example - and they
>represent many thousands of amateurs.

Actually the ARRL has a pretty good track record on that account. PRB-1, and RF
exposure, to name just two.

>Sure, comments and suggestions
>are encouraged - but it is not a true democratic process - the FCC is
>under no obligation whatsoever to implement the will of the majority.

As was made clear in the 2000 restructuring.

>Plus, the comment and review procedure is massive - thousands of
>individual public comments and proposals to go through, another round
>of proposals and responses, then review, and on and on - a juggernaut
>of a process that may well take years to run its course.

It's not really that bad. The various proposals will be allowed to run their
course, comments categorized by a few characteristics, and then the FCC takes

what
it thinks are the best features and makes an NPRM.
>
>Here, Industry Canada asked our national radio association (RAC) to
>gather data on what Canadian amateurs wanted to do with licensing
>requirements if the Morse requirement was dropped at WRC-03. The RAC
>set up a web page with a questionnaire on it, and opened it up to all
>licenced Canadian amateurs (not just RAC members). The results were
>collected and tabulated, recommendations prepared, and forwarded to IC
>for their consideration.

Which may or may not be a fair process. For example, what protection was there to avoid multiple "votes" by the same person? What provision for those who do not have internet access?

>As licensing changes within the Amateur
>service do not have an impact on either the general public or
>commercial interests, this approach makes sense.

Some would dispute that! For example, if amateur radio were to wither away, at least some of the frequencies could be reallocated to other services. If amateur numbers grow like mad, there could be pressure to expand amateur allocations.

There's also the effect that the loss of amateur public service on the general public.

btw, there's a new book out called "10 Days In Utah: The Search For Elizabeth Smart" which documents the use of ARES (Amateur Radio Emergency Service) help in providing communications for the search for kidnapped Elizabeth Smart.
>
>Now there is a system that amateurs have direct influence over!

What about the input from nonhams? Or is commentary limited to those already licensed?
>
>Also, look at how quickly amateurs in Great Britain, Australia,
>Germany and many others were able to have the Morse requirement
>dropped following WRC-03. No red tape, no seemingly endless
>discussion - just done.

A number of reasons:

1) Much smaller amateur populations
2) Much more homogenous (sp?) populations and culture
3) Ground work prepared far ahead of WRC-03 so there was little doubt of the outcome if/when the treaty changed
4) Much higher percentage of hams belonging to national organization.(in many countries, it is practically or legally a requirement to be a member)
5) Complete disregard of dissenting opinions.

>Many did this in direct response to the
>request of their own national radio clubs to do so if permitted

>post-WRC-03. Now there is real democracy in action!

Only if it can be shown that what the national radio clubs want was really
a majority opinion! I recall reading that a survey of German hams showed
that a majority wanted the code test to stay - but they were overruled.

And the number of countries who have made this change is only a small
percentage.

If the ARRL can be faulted for anything in this restructure thingie, it's that
they did not have a proposal ready to go in mid-July of 2003. Everyone knew
that Wrc-03 was going to happen, and that the chances were very very good that
S25.5 would change. So where were the surveys, discussions and proposals before
WRC-03?
>
>>> According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
>>> wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
>>> the US - it was the US Military. The ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
>>> the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
>>> but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
>>> from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful. And, in
>>> the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
>>> for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>>
>>I did indeed mean to include military. Sorry about that. In the context of
>>lobbying the US government for keeping amateur frequencies and re-opening
>>them after WWI, I do believe that in the absence of the ARRL another body
>>could have formed (and probably would have) and done the same as the >>ARRL.

I disagree. One of the key factors was that the pre-war ARRL directors put up
money to restart the League, lobby in Washington, restart QST and ask the old
membership for help. It was because they had a base of operations already
established that they were able to get going again quickly.

For a modern-day example, look at the BPL situation. Does anyone think that
unpaid volunteers working in their spare time could do the work of W1RFI and
others in making observations, gathering data, preparing serious engineering
commentary, coordinating with other services, and all the other things needed
to fight the "professionals" who want BPL?

What other group of hams could do what ARRL has done in the BPL area?

>>But you know what, we would then be having this same discussion of "ZZZZ"
>>organization and the people who today slam the ARRL would be slamming the
>>"ZZZZ." The rest of us would then be defending "ZZZZ". Same game,
>>different names.
>
>But Dee, other governments re-opened the amateur bands after WW1
>without the assistance of the ARRL - in many foreign countries.

How many?

Remember too that there were no "amateur bands" in those days. Amateurs were simply assigned wavelengths shorter than 200 meters at the whim of the governments.

Note also that amateur radio did not exist as a separate radio service, but rather as part of "experimental and educational" stations. IOW, stations that could not be classed as marine, military, government, or commercial.

And although other govts. may have allowed their hams back on the air, when it came time to have international conferences (1924, 1925, 1927), many of those same countries proposed rules that were so restrictive as to essentially eliminate amateur radio.

>I'm
>neither praising nor slamming the ARRL - just stating that their
>achievement was a local, not a global, one. Canadian hams were back
>on the air months before the ARRL's victory in the US - I'm sure that
>others were as well in various places around the world.

Such as? Most of the histories of amateur radio in other countries start in the 1920s.

>Seems natural
>enough - activities were suspended due to the conflict, and reinstated
>after the hostilities ended. Not everyone's military tried to keep
>the bands indefinitely for their own private use!

In many countries there were no or very few hams before WW1.

>>But would they have had enough clout in subsequent ITU conferences to stave
>>off the commercial and military seekers of the bands. In any disagreement,
>>you don't want the strongest player sitting on the sidelines or playing on
>>the other side.
>
>I don't see why not - the ITU voting structure isn't that heavily
>weighted based on the size of the US - otherwise, they would be in
>business strictly to globalize US policy. Or, countries like China
>could assert that as they have 4 times the population of the US, they
>should control 4 times as many votes. Countries like Japan could claim
>that they have 3 times the number of licenced Amateurs, and monopolize
>the process. If that were the case, how many countries would have
>remained members of the ITU? None, I'd say.

Each country gets one vote.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2485. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:01:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402111601.20dc26f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87161

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040211015634.29660.00002866@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <FnhWb.1718$t16.1360628@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >> That is an interest.
> > >
> > >Actually he likes to antagonize over anything he can manage to twist into an
> > >argument.
> >
> > Only to counter the revisionist history of radio as presented by the
> > ARRL. :-)

And ARRL historians and supporters. For example, did you know that a
Morse Code exam now acts as a disincentive to CW use on HF? But only
now. It wasn't always so.

I know, I know. We've had that very same disincentive since 1912, and
they fought their hardened little hearts out to preserve it. And we
fought to remove it - the Morse Code Exam, not their hardened little
hearts. But now somehow its a disincentive to CW use.

"We've got a bleeder!"

TAFKA Rev. Jim must be in catharsis.

2486. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:02:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402111602.8cd2c41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87162

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040211015633.29660.00002865@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
> >> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?
> >
> >"We've got a bleeder!"
> >
> >from: When Harry Met Sally
>
> Don't forget the redux on the Oriongasm scene by the other guy... :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Is that where he revived the little dog with energized lamp cord?

2487. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:04:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402111604.3f8b9d60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87163

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040208134932.05539.00004192@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402051522.1d36e348@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> > > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very
> same
> >> > > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> >> > >
> >> > > Why?
> >> >
> >> > Why, Jim?
> >>
> >> Why, Jim?
> >
> >Jim, don't you know why you say the things you say?
>
> Lack of an answer must be due to endorphin overload or lack
> of oxygen from the running. Maybe just lack of oxygen from his
> rareified heights of code superiority.
>
> Or maybe solder fumes from building a kit to add to his
> collection of all home-built and designed ham rigs.
>
> LHA / WMD

No. Tourette Syndrome.

2488. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:17:19 UTC
From: kd1s@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <b2ca1e4e.0402111617.3c8e2151@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87164

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>
> Summary:
>
> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra

Can we water it down any more?

> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only

Why not just elminate the code requirement entirely. To me 5WPM code
is so awfully slow that it's painful.

> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
> and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General

This free ride stuff has got to stop. I'm a 20WPM Extra damn it - now
I can bitch and moan like the old farts. My friend KH6HZ is probably
getting a good laugh out of this.

> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.

I suppose I can't complain much on this. Most of us are pretty much
appliance operators - when is the last time you played around with
SMT inside your radio?

2489. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:19:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402111619.96f5e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87165

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040210194505.25517.00004239@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns948B80C21E6B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
> >>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Anyone would try to think you were trying to get rid of me, LOL!
>
> Independent thought must be abolished from this group.

That's precisely why I didn't let Dave, Dick, Bruce, Steve, Larrah,
TAFKA Rev. Jim, the other Steve, and Ed run be off.

> It makes the regular natives restless and they might take up
> their spears and fight against Abrams tanks...

That's how one of their weaker minds ends up declaring that a Morse
Code Exam is a disincentive to CW use on HF.

I know, I know, they've finally realized that they're a ragtag bunch
of Neanderthals throwing spears at Abrams tanks...

Or have they?

2490. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 00:40:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211194034.21232.00004211@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 87166

In article <402A2E1D.6010807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Leo wrote:
>> On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 22:44:04 -0500, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Leo wrote:
>>>
>>>>On Tue, 10 Feb 2004 19:15:37 -0500, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Doggone it Dee! Your factual post is going to ruin another anti-US rant!
>>>>
>>>>No rant intended, Mike. Just looking for facts!
>>>>
>>>>You wouldn't happen to have any on you, would you? :)
>>>
>>> Facts? I have the history I've read.
>>
>> I'll have to take that as a 'no' then....
>
> Do you always take history as fact?

Do you take ARRL sole-source history as "fact?"

> FWIW, I have read that the US amateurs and their representatives were
>pretty much the driving force in Amateur radio post WW1. The numbers of
>Amateurs in the US was roughly equal to the Amateurs in the rest of the
>world. These numbers coupled with a few organizations that represented
>them from one country instead of spread out over the globe, would
>naturally have a major influence on the hobby/avocation.

Feel free to believe what you want to believe.

The entire four-decade period up to about 1930 was one of great
change, reorganization, new technology discovery, etc. in "radio."
Something involving communications at the speed of light and
without wires was suddenly created after 1895. NO ONE had a
real coherent, expert prognostication of the future of "radio" in the
early days, those first four decades. Everyone involved with this
new thing was groping in the dark, experimenting, entrepreneurs
seeing potential profit, tinkerers busy with a fascinating new
technological interest.

As to communications by 1895, there was already the beginnings
of international cooperation in wired commercial telegraphy

standards and practices, that made firm over two decades prior to that turning-point year. [Marconi's experiments started in 1895 but were witnessed by only one other person...a full demonstration was not done until the following year] This whole last decade of the 1800s involved a lot more international discussion of other things besides mysterious "radio."

As with any technological breakthrough showing potential monetary profit, lawyers and courts began to get busy on patent disputes which continued on into the 1930s; one of the things affecting Ed Armstrong's personal life and subsequent depression was a constant coming and going to courts for patent suits that lasted over a decade. The newly-formed Marconi Company in England was proceding at a fast pace to attempt international control of as many patents in "radio" as possible. International political relations were a fighting ground, made worse by the armed conflict of World War One. Lots and lots and lots of folks in the commercial and government fields were fighting it out to control "radio" in all manner, shape, and use. With the advent of the first active control valve for electrons, the triode vacuum tube promising miraculous applications for other than radio, the fighting got worse.

The beginnings of the RCA Corporation (originally Radio Corporation of America) was due to an effort to keep "foreign" monopolization of "radio" technology out (i.e., England was as "foreign" as anybody to American businessmen and government men). The main cause was the mechatronics of radio (on the way to obsolescence then) to be replaced by electronics, the "foreigners" trying to hold control of the mechanical side of radio away from US.

The beginnings of broadcasting was in the 1920s with enormous potential profit for business. There was NO regulation of radio in the USA until 1912 and everyone plopped down on whatever "frequency" they were comfortable at (or that primitive technology of that time allowed). RF-wise, the spectrum was chaos. With the first regulation of the EM spectrum came the restricted-to-broadcasters broadcast band at the low half of the MF band. Tinkerers such as amateurs were shoved off to a relatively unknown region of "short waves," largely unexplored territory at wavelengths shorter than 200 meters. Broadcasters needed fixed frequencies for thousands, then millions of listeners, listeners having still-primitive technology receivers. Broadcasting had the potential for enormous control over public opinion, especially for the thought-control processes known as "advertising" (already begun in printed media).

Wired telegraphy didn't just disappear but it was in a steady decline from the previous turn of the century. The cause was the teleprinter displacing the telegraphers reading paper tapes. "Stock tickers" with their pretty glass domes were appearing on executives' desks able to tell those executives quickly how stock values were going. Telegrams were delivered with nice printed strips of text glued onto message forms, no longer scribbled with handwriting or that new

writing machine called a "typewriter." Teleprinters did the text printing. Teleprinting didn't need morse code specialists at wired communications circuits. Even as the commercial morse comm carriers were peaking at their busiest time, the teleprinters were edging them out, first at a small scale then on and on in a juggernaut of displacement of old, manual wired comm technology.

The maritime world got a bonanza, a miracle in "radio" able to reach over the visible horizon. It was something they never had before. Maritimers could get by on LF with relatively slow pace of water travel. The maritime world was the first big user of "radio" and the radio operators got their nickname of "Sparkies" from using that high-tech transmitter known as "spark." Arc, spark, and alternator "transmitters" reached a peak of 1 MegaWatt on LF...but eventually would have to go since they transmitted simultaneously on MF and on up into HF (mostly without realizing it). While "radio" was not a popular topic of conversation at the ordinary dining table then, many were involved in its use and millions of dollars involved in equipment contracts. "Radio" was already big business by the start of 1920.

Displaced morsemen, downsized from landline wire comms by the teleprinter and telephone, took to radio. Early radio could only communicate by simple on-off keying of primitive RF generators. Landline telegraphy was on-off keying of a battery source. Landline telegraphers need only learn how to twist radio knobs, throw radio switches to use their morse skills. They "upgraded" to high-tech of the times...and invented all sorts of mythology about their new craft using old skills. That mythology persists in some minds today. The print media ate all the mythology up and printed glorious tales of "pioneering in technology" in the exaggerated prose of earlier times around the previous turn of the century. Journalism it was not, storytelling it was.

>Now I don't know that for sure, since I wasn't around then, but it seems
>sensible and logical enough, so I assign it a good probability.

If the only source of information comes from one source, a special interest group, you should be aware that some things ar (deliberately) left out in order to improve the status of the particular special interest group. You will be hard-pressed to find objective history of the radio amateur organizations that existed before the formation of the ARRL from ARRL publications. Such history does exist in 90-year-old archives of other print media, of government records, of patent papers.

Special interest groups must be self-serving for survival. ARRL is a special interest group. For a more objective view of early radio history, Thomas H. White has done a superb job of presenting a part of that overall history in the USA. See it beginning at -

http://earlyradiohistory.us/index.html

No special interests involved other than showing a more complete picture of early USA radio history, of ALL radio, not just amateurism. Fascinating stuff to see all the chaos, change, triumphs and tragedies in the first few decades of a more-than-fascinating technology.

Or, you can be content with being spoon-fed "history" from a single source who controls what they want you to hear. Your choice.

LHA / WMD

2491. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204209.21457.00003913@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87169

In article <1e4e3692.0402111604.3f8b9d60@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Or maybe solder fumes from building a kit to add to his
>> collection of all home-built and designed ham rigs.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>No. Tourette Syndrome.

Thank you! You have hit on the correct diagnosis!

LHA / WMD

2492. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204210.21457.00003914@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87175

In article <1e4e3692.0402111602.8cd2c41@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040211015633.29660.00002865@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
>> >> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?
>> >
>> >"We've got a bleeder!"
>> >
>> >from: When Harry Met Sally
>>
>> Don't forget the redux on the Oriongasm scene by the other guy... :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Is that where he revived the little dog with energized lamp cord?

I can't remember. The movie was under the Hayes Code, not the
morse code.

All I remember is that Meg was faking it in the coffee shop...just
like all the code-loving extra specials are faking it in here. Shrug.

LHA / WMD

2493. Re: New Game on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204211.21457.00003915@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87174

In article <1e4e3692.0402111601.20dc26f8@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040211015634.29660.00002866@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <FnhWb.1718$t16.1360628@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >> That is an interest.
>> >
>> >Actually he likes to antagonize over anything he can manage to twist into
>an
>> >argument.
>>
>> Only to counter the revisionist history of radio as presented by the
>> ARRL. :-)
>
>And ARRL historians and supporters. For example, did you know that a
>Morse Code exam now acts as a disincentive to CW use on HF? But only
>now. It wasn't always so.

Amazing, isn't it? :-)

>I know, I know. We've had that very same disincentive since 1912, and
>they fought their hardened little hearts out to preserve it. And we
>fought to remove it - the Morse Code Exam, not their hardened little
>hearts. But now somehow its a disincentive to CW use.

Absolutely. If a code-loving extra special of three dozen years says
it's so, IT IS SO! We have Heard The Word! :-)

>"We've got a bleeder!"
>
>TAFKA Rev. Jim must be in catharsis.

Might I suggest catatonia?

Northern catatonia, that is... :-)

LHA / WMD

2494. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204212.21457.00003917@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87171

In article <Xns948CA0A6FE1B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in news:20040210194505.25517.00004239
>@mb-m15.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns948B80C21E6B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>>>>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>>>
>>>> w3rv
>>>
>>>Anyone would try to think you were trying to get rid of me, LOL!
>>
>> Independent thought must be abolished from this group.
>>
>> It makes the regular natives restless and they might take up
>> their spears and fight against Abrams tanks...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Well, the joke's on them anyway. I could move to Canada (lovely country,
>but too cold for me) and still plague them on rrap.

Move to southern California and hear about the wrap parties in the
entertainment biz. :-)

[mental picture of Zulus against Bradley Fighting Vehicles...:-)]

LHA / WMD

2495. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204212.21457.00003916@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87173

In article <1e4e3692.0402111619.96f5e1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040210194505.25517.00004239@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns948B80C21E6B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>> >>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>> >>
>> >> w3rv
>> >
>> >Anyone would try to think you were trying to get rid of me, LOL!
>>
>> Independent thought must be abolished from this group.
>
>That's precisely why I didn't let Dave, Dick, Bruce, Steve, Larrah,
>TAFKA Rev. Jim, the other Steve, and Ed run be off.
>
>> It makes the regular natives restless and they might take up
>> their spears and fight against Abrams tanks...
>
>That's how one of their weaker minds ends up declaring that a Morse
>Code Exam is a disincentive to CW use on HF.

Must have been a momentary weakness by the mighty macho
morsemen.

>I know, I know, they've finally realized that they're a ragtag bunch
>of Neanderthals throwing spears at Abrams tanks...
>
>Or have they?

Not yet. They won't stop or admit they were EVER wrong, not
until the last code key is forcibly removed from the cold, dead
fingers of the last PCTA. Sigh.

LHA / WMD

2496. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204213.21457.00003918@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87170

In article <b2ca1e4e.0402111617.3c8e2151@posting.google.com>, kd1s@yahoo.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>...
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1

>I suppose I can't complain much on this. Most of us are pretty much
>appliance operators - when is the last time you played around with
>SMT inside your radio?

TAFKA Rev. Jim has both an MSEE and BSEE and has been a
40 WPM extra special for over 36 years. I doubt he has ever diddled
with any surface mount devices...that isn't operating morse code.

LHA / WMD

2497. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204213.21457.00003919@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87172

In article <402A85DD.4030308@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Alun wrote:
>
>> Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
>> America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond help.
>
>It's a troll, Alun. Go post the same message anywhere on netnews and
>watch the reaction.

You ADMIT to personal trolling, yet accuse others of that act?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...

> If you don't believe it, then you're probably beyond help.
>
> Of course the world doesn't revolve around the US. The world revolves
>around it's axis.

Different kind of spin than what the league is revolving...

> How is the ARRL proposal going to affect the rest of the world's
>amateurs anyway?

W1AW will have more "important message alerts to amateurs!"

Or maybe Sumner's "Residence Radio Club" will have a 24-hour
cue-so party with the world through Geneva?

The PCTA will come on here more than once a day and call the NCTA
"putz" and "scum?"

I know...there will be an important editorial in QST on the evils of
pornography and the horrifying antics on broadcast radio-TV!

In CW nobody can tell you are breathing hard...

LHA / WMD

2498. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204214.21457.00003921@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87167

In article <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>They even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence, when the
>truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for the
>league's opposition!

It's going to be somewhat interesting to hear the Devout spin that
around now...unfortunately, there's no real creation in religious
beliefs and barking dogma of jingoism.

"Our karma ran over their dogma..." :-)

LHA / WMD

2499. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 01:42:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211204214.21457.00003920@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87168

In article <Xns948C91F66B89Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>Not atall. I'm serious. We did think we were the centre of everything, but
>that is an illusion that passes. Trust me. All things pass. The Roman
>empire, the British empire ... you get the idea.

Mike is trying to "head them off at the pass." :-)

That's as good as Custer looking around the Big Horn Battlefield
and wondering "where did all those #$%^!!! indians come from?"

LHA / WMD

2500. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 02:29:58 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <a8kl20dulql6fs91qc5p6ud6p74vc9u4o0@4ax.com>
Source record: 87176

On 12 Feb 2004 00:00:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <g4dk20dt0ff0jl2q2ak4843amp536lkgs7@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>As of our last restructuring,Canadian licences (actually,
>>"Certificates of Proficiency") are also valid for life - no renewal
>>required.
>
>If there are no renewals, how does IC know when a ham dies? Or is the
>situation like Japan, where the license is only cancelled if someone makes
>the effort to tell the govt. (with proper documentation) that the ham in
>question
> is, indeed, dead, and to cancel the license?

Three ways:

- the family notifies IC that their beloved ham relative is no longer
a user of oxygen.

- someone notifies IC of the passing of the amateur because they want
his or her old call. This method is most popular with the coveted
two-letter suffix ones....

- according to the regs, the license automatically expires on the
125th birthday of the holder.

>>
>>> While the US would not have been an "overwhelming" influence, it still would
>>>have been
>>>a major player. How long could amateurs in other countries have been
>>>effective against government and commercial interests in the ITU if the US
>>>had remained in an "amateur radio black hole?" It is difficult to say of
>>>course but there would have been much less strength available to resist the
>>>encroachment. Yes one cannot say with absolute certainty which way it would
>>>have gone but I do believe that amateur radio would be a lot less common now
>>>if the US had not been involved. Also keep in mind that due to our form of
>>>government, our civilian population (in this case hams) do have more
>>>influence in shaping our governments approach to items like amateur radio
>>>than is and was prevalent in a lot of countries.
>>
>>I wonder if that is true - the FCC does not appear to have a history
>>of implementing what the ARRL requests, for example - and they
>>represent many thousands of amateurs.
>
>Actually the ARRL has a pretty good track record on that account. PRB-1, and RF

>exposure, to name just two.

I was thinking more of the incentive licensing fiasco that was
discussed here recently.

>
>>Sure, comments and suggestions
>>are encouraged - but it is not a true democratic process - the FCC is
>>under no obligation whatsoever to implement the will of the majority.
>
>As was made clear in the 2000 restructuring.
>
>>Plus, the comment and review procedure is massive - thousands of
>>individual public comments and proposals to go through, another round
>>of proposals and responses, then review, and on and on - a juggernaut
>>of a process that may well take years to run its course.
>
>It's not really that bad. The various proposals will be allowed to run their
>course, comments categorized by a few characteristics, and then the FCC takes
>what
>it thinks are the best features and makes an NPRM.

They are going to have a bear of a time picking the best features out
of the various proposals and thousands of comments that they have on
hand right now. The FCC has managed to create a massive task out of a
relatively simple issue....

>>
>>Here, Industry Canada asked our national radio association (RAC) to
>>gather data on what Canadian amateurs wanted to do with licensing
>>requirements if the Morse requirement was dropped at WRC-03. The RAC
>>set up a web page with a questionnaire on it, and opened it up to all
>>licenced Canadian amateurs (not just RAC members). The results were
>>collected and tabulated, recommendations prepared, and forwarded to IC
>>for their consideration.
>
>Which may or may not be a fair process. For example, what protection was there
>to avoid multiple "votes" by the same person? What provision for those who do
>not have internet access?

One vote was allowed per callsign. No internet access, no vote, I
guess - there was no other cost-effective mechanism for the RAC to use
to poll all of the licensees. Statistically, though, if the sample
group is large and diverse enough, the results should be accurate.

I could speculate here that the amateurs with no Internet access may
well be those most in favour of retaining Morse testing, but I won't
:)

How many of its members did the ARRL poll for their opinions before
they released their proposal to the FCC?

>
>>As licensing changes within the Amateur
>>service do not have an impact on either the general public or
>>commercial interests, this approach makes sense.
>
>Some would dispute that! For example, if amateur radio were to wither away,
>at least some of the frequencies could be reallocated to other services. If
>amateur numbers grow like mad, there could be pressure to expand amateur
>allocations.
>
>There's also the effect that the loss of amateur public service on the general
>public.

I was of course speaking of the dropping of Morse and potential
restructuring of levels and test requirements. These issues would not
affect anyone outside the hobby.

>
>btw, there's a new book out called "10 Days In Utah: The Search For Elizabeth
>Smart" which documents the use of ARES (Amateur Radio Emergency Service) help
>in providing communications for the search for kidnapped Elizabeth Smart.
>>
>>Now there is a system that amateurs have direct influence over!
>
>What about the input from nonhams? Or is commentary limited to those already
>licensed?

As above, the post-WRC 03 changes would affect only those currently
engaged in the hobby - I believe that no non-ham input has been
requested at this time.

>>
>>Also, look at how quickly amateurs in Great Britain, Australia,
>>Germany and many others were able to have the Morse requirement
>>dropped following WRC-03. No red tape, no seemingly endless
>>discussion - just done.
>
>A number of reasons:
>
>1) Much smaller amateur populations
>2) Much more homogenous (sp?) populations and culture
>3) Ground work prepared far ahead of WRC-03 so there was little
>doubt of the outcome if/when the treaty changed
>4) Much higher percentage of hams belonging to national organization.(in many
>countries, it is practically or legally a requirement to be a member)
>5) Complete disregard of dissenting opinions.

Or a bit of all of these things. Neverless, they did it - and pretty
quickly too! Without the administrative nightmare that the FCC is in
the middle of. I shudder to think what the review and processing of
the thousands of documents regarding the restructuring of amateur
radio will cost the taxpayer.....

>
>>Many did this in direct response to the
>>request of their own national radio clubs to do so if permitted
>>post-WRC-03. Now there is real democracy in action!
>
>Only if it can be shown that what the national radio clubs want was really
>a majority opinion! I recall reading that a survey of German hams showed
>that a majority wanted the code test to stay - but they were overruled.

Well, if the local administration sets their rules up to match the ITU
standards, then a change in these would result in a change in local
standards. It ain't necessarily a democratic process - they weren't
removing rights to operate from anyone, simply dropping a testing
requirement.

>
>And the number of countries who have made this change is only a small
>percentage.

I don't see the correlation to numbers here, Jim - these are entire
countries that are changing their own regulations. As time passes
more and more are getting it done. Just today, Denmark joined the
club!

>
>If the ARRL can be faulted for anything in this restructure thingie, it's that
>they did not have a proposal ready to go in mid-July of 2003. Everyone knew
>that Wrc-03 was going to happen, and that the chances were very very good that
>S25.5 would change. So where were the surveys, discussions and proposals before
>WRC-03?

Good point.

There is a second and very major fault though - did the proposal for
restructuring that the ARRL recently submitted to the FCC come from
the members, or the ARRL BoD?

>>
>>>> According to The Wayback Machine, it wasn't commercial interests that
>>>> wanted control of these bands post-WWI (all radio bands, actually!) in
>>>> the US - it was the US Military. The ARRL did a fine job of lobbying
>>>> the US government to have the frequencies reopened to US amateurs -
>>>> but I don't think that the rest of the world would have walked away
>>>> from amateur radio forever if the ARRL had been unsuccessful. And, in
>>>> the absence of the ARRL, other alliances may have been formed to lobby
>>>> for this right - just like they did in the rest of the world.
>>>
>>>I did indeed mean to include military. Sorry about that. In the context of
>>>lobbying the US government for keeping amateur frequencies and re-opening
>>>them after WWI, I do believe that in the absence of the ARRL another body
>>>could have formed (and probably would have) and done the same as the >>ARRL.
>
>I disagree. One of the key factors was that the pre-war ARRL directors put up

>money to restart the League, lobby in Washington, restart QST and ask the old
>membership for help. It was because they had a base of operations already
>established that they were able to get going again quickly.
>
>For a modern-day example, look at the BPL situation. Does anyone think that
>unpaid volunteers working in their spare time could do the work of W1RFI and
>others in making observations, gathering data, preparing serious engineering
>commentary, coordinating with other services, and all the other things needed
>to fight the "professionals" who want BPL?
>
>What other group of hams could do what ARRL has done in the BPL area?

Good point - that is definitely a worthwile project. But the ARRL is
not involved in the research on BPL that is in progress up here....for
one.

In the US example, I'd suggest that if BPL is killed off it will
likely be due to the objections of the broadcast interests, the
Military and the various emergency management and security divisions
within the US government who claim that HF band interference would be
a problem for homeland security or emergency management. Whether or
not BPL messes up a hobby group's activities would come in at a much
lower level of priority, I'd think.

Not necessarily fact, but that is what I've gathered so far.

>
>>>But you know what, we would then be having this same discussion of "ZZZZ"
>>>organization and the people who today slam the ARRL would be slamming the
>>>"ZZZZ." The rest of us would then be defending "ZZZZ". Same game,
>>>different names.
>>
>>But Dee, other governments re-opened the amateur bands after WW1
>>without the assistance of the ARRL - in many foreign countries.
>
>How many?

Don't have a number at this time - stats on this are hard to find!
Some histories (like Japan, for example) suggest that there were
numbers of experimenters prior to the implementation of licensing - no
records of how many exist!

>
>Remember too that there were no "amateur bands" in those days. Amateurs were
>simply assigned wavelengths shorter than 200 meters at the whim of the
>governments.

Yup. Sorry, wrong phrase!

>
>Note also that amateur radio did not exist as a separate radio service, but
>rather as part of "experimental and educational" stations. IOW, stations that
>could not be classed as marine, military, government, or commercial.

>
>And although other govts. may have allowed their hams back on the air, when it
>came time to have international conferences (1924, 1925, 1927), many of those
>same countries proposed rules that were so restrictive as to essentially
>eliminate amateur radio.

And the ARRL fixed that for them? That was nice.

>
>>I'm
>>neither praising nor slamming the ARRL - just stating that their
>>achievement was a local, not a global, one. Canadian hams were back
>>on the air months before the ARRL's victory in the US - I'm sure that
>>others were as well in various places around the world.
>
>Such as? Most of the histories of amateur radio in other countries start in the
>1920s.

There were unlicensed experimenters in several places. Licensing for
many began in the 20s, but there were already folks engaged in
experimentation....

>
>>Seems natural
>>enough - activities were suspended due to the conflict, and reinstated
>>after the hostilities ended. Not everyone's military tried to keep
>>the bands indefinitely for their own private use!
>
>In many countries there were no or very few hams before WW1.

At least licensed ones, anyway!

>
>>>But would they have had enough clout in subsequent ITU conferences to stave
>>>off the commercial and military seekers of the bands. In any disagreement,
>>>you don't want the strongest player sitting on the sidelines or playing on
>>>the other side.
>>
>>I don't see why not - the ITU voting structure isn't that heavily
>>weighted based on the size of the US - otherwise, they would be in
>>business strictly to globalize US policy. Or, countries like China
>>could assert that as they have 4 times the population of the US, they
>>should control 4 times as many votes. Countries like Japan could claim
>>that they have 3 times the number of licenced Amateurs, and monopolize
>>the process. If that were the case, how many countries would have
>>remained members of the ITU? None, I'd say.
>
>Each country gets one vote.

That they do!

Just one, regardless of population or commercial interests
represented. Real democracy in action!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

2501. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 02:47:16 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <UOBWb.11368$uV3.27753@attbi_s51>
Source record: 87177

>
> The price we paid. The @#%#&$& code test!

Alun .... We really don't have to tolerate that type of language on this newsgroup ..... I wish more guys would use the above symbols than the language ....then we could use our imagination. I translate the above string as "necessary" give or take a few characters.

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R

2502. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 02:52:29 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <MTBWb.10943$_44.15867@attbi_s52>
Source record: 87178

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns948CA2C3794Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17...
> Another domino falls

That is not really a surprise given they have legalized prostitution and
some drugs which pragmatically I would have to agree with. Now if we could
...... naaa why go further.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom

2503. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 03:04:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gtmdnfl8NrfecLfdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87179

Alun wrote:

> Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
> America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond help.

Do you know how all Americans think or feel about whatever issues? I wouldn't presume to assume what "every Canadian thinks"

When I've been in Canada, I've met lots of nice folk with lots of differing opinions - Just like us. My boy went to Hockey school there every summer, and we often tagged along for vacation.

BTW, speaking of mistaken impressions, every time we went there, the darn temperature was in the 90's. Canada is sure one HOT country!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2504. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 03:07:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gtmdne08NrdrcLfdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87180

Leo wrote:

> On 12 Feb 2004 00:00:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>
>>In article <g4dk20dt0ff0jl2q2ak4843amp536lkgs7@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>As of our last restructuring,Canadian licences (actually,
>>>"Certificates of Proficiency") are also valid for life - no renewal
>>>required.
>>
>>If there are no renewals, how does IC know when a ham dies? Or is the
>>situation like Japan, where the license is only cancelled if someone makes
>>the effort to tell the govt. (with proper documentation) that the ham in
>>question
>>is, indeed, dead, and to cancel the license?
>
>
> Three ways:
>
> - the family notifies IC that their beloved ham relative is no longer
> a user of oxygen.

Well, technically not quite correct. Oxygen just used in a different
way - ick.

Perhaps that the ham has assumed room temperature? 8^)\

- Mike KB3EIA -

2505. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 03:20:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <QhCWb.1893$t16.1511126@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87181

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:5ebk2099al4t3t4j1orocgknm2udcj5b9n@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 03:30:43 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> Agreed that the US is obviously a major player - but I'm sure that
> even if they had gone their own way, the rest of the world would not
> necessarily follow. The role of agencies like the ITU is to
> coordinate global resources so as to prevent chaos on the bands - not
> to act as an agent of US policy.
>

If your strongest player is sitting on the sidelines or playing for the
other team (i.e. government & commercial interests in the case of ham
radio), it's still possible to win the game but it is much harder.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2506. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 03:26:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <AnCWb.1894$t16.1512708@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87182

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:o52l20d04e3jnvvlt2f32l9gkq8jobdou2@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 14:43:25 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Alun wrote:
> >
> >> Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
> >> America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond
help.
> >
> >
> >It's a troll, Alun. Go post the same message anywhere on netnews and
> >watch the reaction.
>
> Mike, I didn't take Alun's message as a troll - just a response in
> context to the thread to a rather lofty assertion that without the
> ARRL (and by definition, the US Amateur Radio Service, since that is
> all the ARRL influences), the world would never have known the joys of
> Amateur Radio.
>
> Which is just a tad jingoistic, I'd say - and nigh-on impossible to
> substantiate without resorting to theory, opinion and conjecture.
>
>
> > If you don't believe it, then you're probably beyond help.
> >
> > Of course the world doesn't revolve around the US. The world revolves
> >around it's axis.
> >
> > How is the ARRL proposal going to affect the rest of the world's
> >amateurs anyway?
>
> It won't.
>
> Yet, according to the comments earlier in the thread, historically,
> without the ARRL there would be no amateur radio anywhere in the
> world.
>
> Really? I don't think so.
>
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

We are not saying that the ARRL was the only thing that made this happen. Simply that they were a significant player in the US and that the US was a significant player in the world. Without the ARRL, US amateurs would have had a much tougher time. If the US amateur community had been seriously weakened, it would have affect to some degree the amateur community in the rest of the world.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2507. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 03:34:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040211223431.22081.00004005@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87183

In article <20040209235513.01019.00000378@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>> Remember, morse code gets through when everything else will.

Moreover, it gets through when almost nothing else will! This makes it a mode which all radio amateurs wishing to possess total communications capability simply cannot ignore. It is well worth the time and effort it takes to learn.

>>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>
>>Good one Len ..... have to remember it ....
>
> Credit Brian Burke with the phrase. He had that truism right,
> worthy of repeating. :-)

Brian was right, Lennie, but he left out the last part I just added! Sorry, still no cigar for you and Brian!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2508. Re: "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: The Pool)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 04:00:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040211230013.06226.00002893@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87184

In article <pr2j20tlupm30hpaadvrut766paakm1bli@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 10 Feb 2004 10:14:34 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>snip
>
>>> Heath SB-400. The Pride of 1964 :)
>
>Oh yeah - and my basement!
>
>>
>>Amazing how well a 40 year old box full of glowbottles is still
>>useful, huh?
>>15 Hz stability from a one-tube Hartley is pretty decent.
>>>
>>> With a narrowband signal like this, it doesn't take much drift! I'm
>>> seeing a frequency decrease of up to 15 Hz, beginning a few seconds
>>> after keying. B+ to the VFO appears to be well regulated - maybe not
>>> tight enough though. Might have to replace the 0A2 with a few zeners
>>> - haven't tried that yet....
>>
>>First try replacing the 0A2 regulator and 6AU6A oscillator tubes -
>>different
>>ones may have slightly different characteristics.
>
>That was one of the things I tried when I rbuilt the TX back in the
>summer - ended up with an 0A2WA regulator and a 6136 in the LMO. That
>brought it much closer...that and some conductive silver grease in the
>bearings of the LMO tuning cap (I didn't even know they made that
>stuff till I dug into the Web and discovered that TRW used it when
>they built the LMOs for Heath, and it dries out over time.....)

Lotta subtleties in old gear. Not as "primitive" as some folks try to tell
us...
>
>>But the real problem may be that the heater voltage is changing when
>>transmitting, rather than the B+. Another possibility is that heat
>>from the
>>6146s and power supply may be causing a bit of drift, because PSK31 is
>>a very
>>high duty cycle mode and a lot of heat gets dissipated on transmit.
>
>That is very possible - it's also possible that the drift is in one of
>the other oscillator sections other than the LMO. Haven't had time to

>tear it apart and see yet....one of these days!

Two xtal and one tunable oscillator in that heterodyne scheme.

Upwards drift in the het osc will make the operating freq go higher
Upwards drift in the LMO will make the operating freq go lower
Upwards drift in the BFO will make the operating freq go lower

So there's a bit of compensation *if* the oscillators all drift the same way.

>Thanks for the info!

You're welcome.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2509. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 04:27:08 UTC
From: Barnacle Bill <quahog@fish.net>
Message-ID: <102m04sesjmo831@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 87185

In article <102l8akp9tsfpad@news.supernews.com>, Keith wrote:
> Check out the man on the cover of QST March 2004 smoking a Morse Code
> bong!
>
> I really had to look twice to see what the hell he was doing. I'm sure this
> will make Ham Radio very popular with the inner city kids. ;-)
>
And of course, kids in the suburbs would NEVER know what a bong is...

Bill...

2510. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:00:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040212000016.12501.00006161@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87187

In article <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>They

[the ARRL]

>even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence,

Where, Alun? Can you show where ARRL claims credit for the Tech losing its code test?

>when the
>truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for the
>league's opposition!

Not true!

The Tech lost its code test in early 1991. 20 years earlier was 1971. The first FCC attempt at a nocodetest amateur license was in 1975, and if enacted would have not taken effect sooner than 1976. That's 15 years, not 20.

And in 1975, ARRL polled its entire membership with a detailed questionnaire. A large and pervasive majority opposed a nocodetest ham license of any kind.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2511. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:00:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040212000017.12501.00006162@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87186

In article <b2ca1e4e.0402111617.3c8e2151@posting.google.com>, kd1s@yahoo.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0401191008.a3c8376@posting.google.com>...
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/01/19/1/?nc=1
>>
>> Summary:
>>
>> 3 classes of license: Novice, General, Extra
>
>Can we water it down any more?

There are some folks (not me!) who only want one class of license.

>
>> 5 wpm code test retained for Extra only
>
>Why not just elminate the code requirement entirely. To me 5WPM code
>is so awfully slow that it's painful.

5 wpm is a minimum speed. Someone can always ask for a faster test as an accomodation.

>> Existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra, Techs
>> and Tech Pluses get free upgrade to General
>
>This free ride stuff has got to stop.

When was the last one?

I agree that the proposed free upgrades are not a good idea.

>I'm a 20WPM Extra damn it - now
>I can bitch and moan like the old farts. My friend KH6HZ is probably
>getting a good laugh out of this.

yep.

>
>> Novice test to be 25 questions on "basics", General to be
>> derived from Tech and General, Extra pretty much as-is.
>
>I suppose I can't complain much on this.

That's about the same test I took 37 years ago for my Novice...

>Most of us are pretty much
>appliance operators -

Not me!

> when is the last time you played around with
>SMT inside your radio?
>
No SMT in any of my ham gear. It's not necessary. And I have quite a bit of homebrew ham gear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2512. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:06:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402B09C0.1D574254@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87188

Alun wrote:

> Trust me. All things pass. The Roman
> empire, the British empire ... you get the idea.

Let's try an experiment. Swallow an avocado seed. Report back in a few days and let us know the results.

Dave K8MN

2513. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:09:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87189

Alun wrote:
>
> Another domino falls

Was it the Germans again this time?

Dave K8MN

2514. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:19:32 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948D336CE802elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87190

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in news:UOBWb.11368$uV3.27753
@attbi_s51:

>
>>
>> The price we paid. The @#%#&$& code test!
>
> Alun .... We really don't have to tolerate that type of language on this
> newsgroup ..... I wish more guys would use the above symbols than the
> language ....then we could use our imagination. I translate the above
> string as "necessary" give or take a few characters.
>
> God Bless 73 Tom KI3R
>
>
>
>

If you think I meant necessary I might have to add a few real characters in
there to dispel that notion!

2515. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:25:17 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948D430B2D41elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87191

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040212000016.12501.00006161@mb-m04.aol.com:

> In article <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>They
>
> [the ARRL]
>
>>even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence,
>
> Where, Alun? Can you show where ARRL claims credit for the Tech losing
> its code test?

They did at the time

>
>>when the
>>truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for the
>>league's opposition!
>
> Not true!
>
> The Tech lost its code test in early 1991. 20 years earlier was 1971.
> The first FCC attempt at a nocodetest amateur license was in 1975, and
> if enacted would have not taken effect sooner than 1976. That's 15
> years, not 20.

So it's not true because it was only 15 years not 20? That's only a matter
of degree, not substance.

So you admit they opposed it for 15 years, and I can assure you they tried
to claim credit when it happened.

>
> And in 1975, ARRL polled its entire membership with a detailed
> questionnaire. A large and pervasive majority opposed a nocodetest ham
> license of any kind.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>
Exactly, the ARRL opposed it.

2516. Re: KE4TEW, Riley's buddy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 05:59:28 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <VyEWb.15595$A75.595@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 87192
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.dx

He missed his re-test and had his call revoked. He never took the
retest, and Riley still gave him his ticket back. He is the only one to
acheive this feat. Let me quote what you either failed to read or did
not understand:

First:

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC
personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
license was consequently cancelled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.

Then the 180 degree switch:
TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
his license was cancelled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
did not elaborate.

All stations failing to appear for re-test had their calls cancelled.
Not Dimmy Dale. What was the "Agreement"? The FCC has pending FOIA
requests on this issue, and some Congressional complaints have been made
as well. Soon we will all know about the "Agreement".

Bob Reed wrote:
> Looks to me like he satisfied whatever complaints were filed against him and
> that in the short term renewal period no other complaints were filed against
> him thereby allowing his renewal. Apparently he behaved as asked and was
> allowed to renew. All of that is writen in the FCC Enforcement releases,
> nothing is hidden or corrupt.
>
>
> "mick" <drunkfiredcop@hiccup.net> wrote in message
> news:HxcVb.15802$8a5.578@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
>

>>http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679
>>
>>http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>>
>>Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
>>retest? Looks like corruption to me.
>>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
>>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>>
>
>
>

2517. Re: KE4TEW, Riley's buddy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 06:24:14 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <IVEWb.38352$8a5.16139@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 87193
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.dx

What a ugly family!

Arf! Arf! wrote:
> He missed his re-test and had his call revoked. He never took the
> retest, and Riley still gave him his ticket back. He is the only one to
> acheive this feat. Let me quote what you either failed to read or did
> not understand:
>
> First:
>
>
>
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
> August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
> notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
> Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC
> personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
> Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
> license was consequently cancelled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
> continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.
>
>
>
>
>
> Then the 180 degree switch:
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
> KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
> license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
> failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
> June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
> his license was cancelled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
> accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
> appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
> General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
> did not elaborate.
>
>
> All stations failing to appear for re-test had their calls cancelled.
> Not Dimmy Dale. What was the "Agreement"? The FCC has pending FOIA
> requests on this issue, and some Congressional complaints have been made
> as well. Soon we will all know about the "Agreement".

>
>
>
> Bob Reed wrote:
>
>> Looks to me like he satisfied whatever complaints were filed against
>> him and
>> that in the short term renewal period no other complaints were filed
>> against
>> him thereby allowing his renewal. Apparently he behaved as asked and was
>> allowed to renew. All of that is writen in the FCC Enforcement releases,
>> nothing is hidden or corrupt.
>>
>>
>> "mick" <drunkfiredcop@hiccup.net> wrote in message
>> news:HxcVb.15802$8a5.578@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
>>
>>> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679
>>>
>>> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>>>
>>> Just why did Riley renew this moron's liscense after he failed to
>>> retest? Looks like corruption to me.
>>>
>>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
>>>
>>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>

2518. Re: Asshole N4CND loses wife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 06:25:34 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <BWEWb.38359$8a5.6746@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 87194
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Those chaps look faggot to me! Maybe Suzy Rottencrotch caught him
blowing porkbutt!

edo wrote:

> In article <R8tVb.26928$qK3.15478@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>http://profiles.yahoo.com/dr_oris
>
>
> Poor WHORASS, I guess his hag of a wife got fed up with him
> sexually abusing Shelby and Michelle.....
>

2519. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 11:59:26 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <aiqm20tb2go0tn41nnicmqf6vsoeu7cmbj@4ax.com>
Source record: 87195

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 22:04:35 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>Alun wrote:
>
>> Mike, how is it anti-US to point that the world doesn't revolve around
>> America? Of course, if you think it does, then you're probably beyond help.
>
> Do you know how all Americans think or feel about whatever issues? I
>wouldn't presume to assume what "every Canadian thinks"
>
> When I've been in Canada, I've met lots of nice folk with lots of
>differing opinions - Just like us. My boy went to Hockey school there
>every summer, and we often tagged along for vacation.
>
> BTW, speaking of mistaken impressions, every time we went there, the
>darn temperature was in the 90's. Canada is sure one HOT country!! 8^)

Not right now! We're in the 20's at the moment..... Brrrrrrrrr.....!

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2520. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 13:00:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040212080013.05539.00004274@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87196

In article <Xns948D430B2D41elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040212000016.12501.00006161@mb-m04.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>>They
>>
>> [the ARRL]
>>
>>>even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence,
>>
>> Where, Alun? Can you show where ARRL claims credit for the Tech losing
>> its code test?
>
>They did at the time

Where? Can you cite any references?

1991 is not ancient history yet. I "was there", wrote letters, followed the
issue closely. In 1990, ARRL BoD policy changed from opposition of any form of
nocodetest ham license to support of a VHF/UHF-only limited license. This was
driven by several factors, including member opinion that was divided 50-50 on
that specific issue.

But I recall no claim that the BoD originated the idea.
>>
>>>when the
>>>truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for the
>>>league's opposition!
>>
>> Not true!
>>
>> The Tech lost its code test in early 1991. 20 years earlier was 1971.
>> The first FCC attempt at a nocodetest amateur license was in 1975, and
>> if enacted would have not taken effect sooner than 1976. That's 15
>> years, not 20.
>
>So it's not true because it was only 15 years not 20? That's only a matter
>of degree, not substance.

It's an error of ~33% (1/3 of 15 is 5)

It's an indication that your recollection of the occurrences surrounding the introduction of nocodetest ham licenses in the USA, and the ARRL's role in them, may be somewhat inaccurate.
>
>So you admit they opposed it for 15 years, and I can assure you they tried
>to claim credit when it happened.

Based on what? I can assure you that "they" did not claim credit for coming up with the idea.

>> And in 1975, ARRL polled its entire membership with a detailed
>> questionnaire. A large and pervasive majority opposed a nocodetest ham
>> license of any kind.
>>
>Exactly, the ARRL opposed it.
>
And that's a good thing. Too bad they couldn't see their way to doing another such survey or two.

The 1975 survey gave a clear indication of what the membership - almost all of it - really wanted ARRL to do at the time. How can anyone fault them for following the clear mandate of the membership?

73 de Jim, N2EY.

2521. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 13:34:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87197

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
> Alun wrote:
> >
> > Another domino falls
>
> Was it the Germans again this time?
>
> Dave K8MN

It was the Little Mermaid.

2522. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 14:19:38 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_XLWb.9517$I67.3683703@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 87198

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns948CA2C3794Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17...
> Another domino falls

Aptly put.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2523. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 15:11:16 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns948D678646C76elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87199

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040212080013.05539.00004274@mb-m16.aol.com:

> In article <Xns948D430B2D41elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20040212000016.12501.00006161@mb-m04.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
>>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>They
>>>
>>> [the ARRL]
>>>
>>>>even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence,
>>>
>>> Where, Alun? Can you show where ARRL claims credit for the Tech
>>> losing its code test?
>>
>>They did at the time
>
> Where? Can you cite any references?
>
> 1991 is not ancient history yet. I "was there", wrote letters, followed
> the issue closely. In 1990, ARRL BoD policy changed from opposition of
> any form of nocodetest ham license to support of a VHF/UHF-only limited
> license. This was driven by several factors, including member opinion
> that was divided 50-50 on that specific issue.
>
> But I recall no claim that the BoD originated the idea.

I was there too, and I recall several such claims.

>>>
>>>>when the
>>>>truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for
>>>>the league's opposition!
>>>
>>> Not true!
>>>
>>> The Tech lost its code test in early 1991. 20 years earlier was 1971.
>>> The first FCC attempt at a nocodetest amateur license was in 1975,
>>> and if enacted would have not taken effect sooner than 1976. That's

>>> 15 years, not 20.
>>
>>So it's not true because it was only 15 years not 20? That's only a
>>matter of degree, not substance.
>
> It's an error of ~33% (1/3 of 15 is 5)
>
> It's an indication that your recollection of the occurrences
> surrounding the introduction of nocodetest ham licenses in the USA, and
> the ARRL's role
> in them, may be somewhat inaccurate.
>>
>>So you admit they opposed it for 15 years, and I can assure you they
>>tried to claim credit when it happened.
>
> Based on what? I can assure you that "they" did not claim credit for
> coming up with the idea.
>
>>> And in 1975, ARRL polled its entire membership with a detailed
>>> questionnaire. A large and pervasive majority opposed a nocodetest
>>> ham license of any kind.
>>>
>>Exactly, the ARRL opposed it.
>>
> And that's a good thing. Too bad they couldn't see their way to doing
> another such survey or two.
>
> The 1975 survey gave a clear indication of what the membership - almost
> all of it - really wanted ARRL to do at the time. How can anyone fault
> them for following the clear mandate of the membership?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY.
>
>

2524. KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 16:02:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>
Source record: 87200

No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.

I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.

A few thoughts first:

There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason to change my prediction in the pool.

The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes, since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.

This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.

It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.

To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect there.

I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now. Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.

The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they are, with privileges staying the same.

After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:

Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the process.

General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never

entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.

Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.

The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2 year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that pretty easily!

Bands and sub bands:

At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a "practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.

So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.

Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit that we know it will work.

Comments?

- Mike KB3EIA -

*My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and Extra as practiced now.

2525. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 18:17:51 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <vrfn20d9hfh3oq1m7co7amjpijjjt5g09t@4ax.com>
Source record: 87201

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 22:07:35 -0500, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>
>> On 12 Feb 2004 00:00:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <g4dk20dt0ff0jl2q2ak4843amp536lkgs7@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>As of our last restructuring,Canadian licences (actually,
>>>>"Certificates of Proficiency") are also valid for life - no renewal
>>>>required.
>>>
>>>If there are no renewals, how does IC know when a ham dies? Or is the
>>>situation like Japan, where the license is only cancelled if someone makes
>>>the effort to tell the govt. (with proper documentation) that the ham in
>>>question
>>>is, indeed, dead, and to cancel the license?
>>
>>
>> Three ways:
>>
>> - the family notifies IC that their beloved ham relative is no longer
>> a user of oxygen.
>
> Well, technically not quite correct. Oxygen just used in a different
>way - ick.
>
> Perhaps that the ham has assumed room temperature? 8^)\

That works...or perhaps, shunted to ground (or earthed, for Alun)!
>>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2526. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 18:53:55 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <kein20d7dc6oel5fovtgr29268klnt7knp@4ax.com>
Source record: 87202

On Wed, 11 Feb 2004 13:40:06 -0800, Keith
<kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM> wrote:

> Check out the man on the cover of QST March 2004 smoking a Morse Code
>bong!
>
>I really had to look twice to see what the hell he was doing. I'm sure this
>will make Ham Radio very popular with the inner city kids. ;-)

Just got my copy in the mail this morning.

What I found interesting was the pattern on the (Tek?) scope above the
rig.....must have an incredibly slow sweep setting and very long CRT
persistance to display 'CQ' in pulses from the key like that! < :o0

73, Leo

2527. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 19:07:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <O9QWb.2845$W74.1070@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87203

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu...
> No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps
> because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or
> perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.
>
> I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.
>
>
> A few thoughts first:
>
> There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think
> it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason
> to change my prediction in the pool.
>
> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
> is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When
> Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
> since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
> sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>
>
> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
> peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
> privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
> proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
> free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>
> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
> those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>
> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
> to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
> that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
> time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect
there.
>
> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
> Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.
>
> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
> are, with privileges staying the same.
>
> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>

> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
> questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
> operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
> give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
> process.
>
> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
> with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
> entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>
>
> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
> questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
> your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>
>
> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
> year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
> pretty easily!
>
>
> Bands and sub bands:
>
> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
> will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
> "practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
> actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>
>
> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
> that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
> major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>
> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
> Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
> that we know it will work.
>
> Comments?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> *My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one
> class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and
> Extra as practiced now.
>
>

How is this?

1. Remove ALL names of ALL licences.

2. Call everyone licensed a 'Amateur Radio Operator'.

And make any modes, other than SSB phone require a 'indorsement' to operate.

Simple and end of discussion.

The league and the FCC are going to do what ever they want, all we can do is pay attention and send in your comments when the time comes.

Dan/W4NTI

2528. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 23:36:39 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <b6UWb.15849$yE5.71824@attbi_s54>
Source record: 87204

> > Check out the man on the cover of QST March 2004 smoking a Morse Code
> > bong!

The use of breath power to key a rig goes back at least 32 years that I am aware of. There were patients of mine who used that system to play pinball machines ...for flipper control. I also recall having a QSO a number of years ago with a fellow who used a puff keying system. I haven't read the article yet to see if there was a new "twist"..... also had patients who used the system for scooter control .... tried it once ...took out some woodwork and plaster.

God Bless 73s KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

2529. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-12 23:38:50 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <e8UWb.16891$_44.18036@attbi_s52>
Source record: 87205

> >> The price we paid. The @#%#&$& code test!
> >
> > Alun .... We really don't have to tolerate that type of language on this
> > newsgroup ..... I wish more guys would use the above symbols than the
> > language ....then we could use our imagination. I translate the above
> > string as "necessary" give or take a few characters.
> >
> > God Bless 73 Tom KI3R
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> If you think I meant necessary I might have to add a few real characters
in
> there to dispel that notion!

Sort of reminds me what I said after a few of my organic chem tests years
ago.

Take care Alun 73 Tom KI3R

2530. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 01:04:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040212200426.22081.00004022@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87206

In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it

>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years.

I think it needs a bit of tweaking, but not a fullscale makeover as some seem to think.

>When
>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.

I'm not sure what you mean by "Morse code was ascendant" - can you explain a bit more?

I would say that *any* knowledge or skill requires time to develop, whether it's theory knowledge,
practical radio knowhow or Morse skills. Thus, there will still be a need for several license classes.
I think there should be more levels than three, but FCC's action in 1999 makes it clear that's
probably a lost cause. So three classes it is:

One that's easy to get so that people can get started without having to learn everything in one go
One that gives full privileges and requires some serious knowledge
One intermediate step so that it's not a huge jump.
>
> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.

I agree 100%! Indeed, there is still criticism of the IL plan 36 years after it was put
in place, and in many places from people who did not become hams until long after
it was in effect!

> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.

Better yet, you render your enemies ineffective. But most of all you don't anger your

friends unnecessarily.
>
> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and

>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect there.

I disagree!

Given the popularity of Morse code in amateur radio, it makes no sense to not have it be
a part of the testing for a license. Imagine if there were no questions on SSB in the tests -
would that make sense?

The Morse Code test has been portrayed as the boogieman, as if it is the source of all
of amateur radio's problems. Yet there is no proof of these claims.

> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.

This means all Techs have VHF/UHF only?
>
> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
>are, with privileges staying the same.

What about Novice?
>
> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>
> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>process.

Perhaps, but what that does is to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF rather than HF. And
since VHF/UHF gear tends to be harder to homebrew and more complex than HF equipment,
it tends to funnel newcomers to manufactured equipment. Also, since there is relatively little
use of Morse Code for casual operating on VHF/UHF, it tends to funnel newcomers to FM
voice operation.
>
> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.

Needs to have some serious HF centric stuff, though.
>
> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.

> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>pretty easily!

I'd say the experience requirements should be included.

> Bands and sub bands:
>
> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.

I don't see the need for that. Better to open up some of the lower part of the
bands for newcomers to use Morse.

The natural tendency is for Morse to be at the bottom of the band, data in the
middle, and 'phone at the top. Rather than fight that trend, the newcomer
segments should reinforce it.

The Novice subbands were originally put in the middle of their bands in a
misguided effort to keep them from straying outside the band edges. Since
Novices were originally required to use crystal control, this made little sense
even in 1951.
>
> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>
> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>that we know it will work.
>
> Comments?
>
I agree that massive changes and giveaways are a bad idea.

However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level license
is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2531. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 01:48:41 UTC
From: noname <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a95f70668b09532989721@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 87207

In article <e8UWb.16891$_44.18036@attbi_s52>, garigue@comcast.net
says...
>
> > >> The price we paid. The @#%#&$& code test!
> > >
> > > Alun .... We really don't have to tolerate that type of language on this
> > > newsgroup ..... I wish more guys would use the above symbols than the
> > > language ....then we could use our imagination. I translate the above
> > > string as "necessary" give or take a few characters.
> > >
> > > God Bless 73 Tom KI3R
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > If you think I meant necessary I might have to add a few real characters
> in
> > there to dispel that notion!
>
> Sort of reminds me what I said after a few of my organic chem tests years
> ago.

I'm watching this whole discussion. BTW, the wags at the Retro Computing
Society of Rhode Island actually proposed a TCP/IP over morse code RFP a
while ago.

Bloody slow but it'd be interesting as morse has the necessary states to
shuttle binary data.

2532. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 02:29:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040212212912.29815.00003251@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 87209

In article <Xns948CA2C3794Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>
>Another domino falls

Alun:

Just make it easy on yourself and consider them all fallen. Code testing is on the way out everywhere, including the U.S. -- and that story is old news. The big thing now is BPL. Check out the ARRL website and look at their BPL test video. Terrifying. This will do a lot more harm to the ARS than a few thousand lazy whiners who finally got their HF phone privileges handed to them for nothing.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2533. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 02:29:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040212212913.29815.00003252@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 87208

In article <102l8akp9tsfpad@news.supernews.com>, Keith
<kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM> writes:

>
> Check out the man on the cover of QST March 2004 smoking a Morse Code
>bong!
>
>I really had to look twice to see what the hell he was doing. I'm sure this
>will make Ham Radio very popular with the inner city kids. ;-)

I thought it was a special hamshack drink dispenser that allowed you to
select between Scotch, Bourbon, or Vodka.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2534. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 02:47:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040212214719.29815.00003253@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 87210

In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
>
>A few thoughts first:
>
> There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think

>it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason
>to change my prediction in the pool.
>
> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it

>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When
>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>
>
> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>
> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>
> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and

>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect there.
>
> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.
>
> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
>are, with privileges staying the same.
>
> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>
> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will

>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>process.
>
> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>
>
> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>
>
> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>pretty easily!
>
>
> Bands and sub bands:
>
> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>
>
> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>
> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>that we know it will work.
>
> Comments?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>*My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one
>class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and
>Extra as practiced now.

Mike:

Sounds like the wishful thinking of a typical no-code whiner who is too stinking lazy to learn a useful communications skill like the Morse code. Nothing new here. Yawn!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2535. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 03:11:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JfXWb.2135$t16.1693175@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87211

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu...
> No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps
> because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or
> perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.
>
> I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.
>
>
> A few thoughts first:
>
> There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think
> it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason
> to change my prediction in the pool.
>
> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
> is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When
> Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
> since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
> sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>
>
> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
> peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
> privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
> proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
> free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>
> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
> those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>
> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
> to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
> that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
> time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect
there.
>
> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
> Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.
>
> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
> are, with privileges staying the same.
>
> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>

> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
> questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
> operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
> give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
> process.
>
> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
> with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
> entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>
>
> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
> questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
> your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>
>
> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
> year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
> pretty easily!
>
>
> Bands and sub bands:
>
> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
> will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
> "practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
> actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>
>
> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
> that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
> major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>
> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
> Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
> that we know it will work.
>
> Comments?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

If Morse code testing goes, this is a pretty reasonable approach. However several people have proposed even simpler plans. Simply drop the element 1 for the requirements for one or more levels and beef up the writtens. Leave all else alone. Although no one knows what the FCC will do, my opinion is that it will be one of the simplest proposals that will be adopted rather than any restructuring.

>
> *My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one

> class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and
> Extra as practiced now.
>

Except that this is likely to slow the growth of ham radio rather than increase the growth. Although the old incentive licensing scheme was mishandled and many existing amateurs lost privileges, the growth increased markedly as potential applicants saw that they could approach the license in a stepwise fashion. If we were to return to a single license class for the future, as you indicated the testing ought to be stiffer than the General and that could deter people from ever becoming involved.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2536. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 03:18:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4mXWb.2137$t16.1694038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87213

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040212200426.22081.00004022@mb-m17.aol.com...
>
> However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level
license
> is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
> The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
> rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the code. Tech study guide and test does include some very basic questions on HF propagation, procedures, rules, etc. Unfortunately too many instructors ignore the HF side of things and don't bother to give much encouragement to go after the code so then the students end up on VHF/UHF only. My instructor, many moons ago, really emphasized going for the "complete" Tech license (Novice written + Tech written + code). I'm glad he did.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2537. Re: Asshole N4CND loses wife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 03:19:19 UTC
From: Roger <Stawkur@NoEmail>
Message-ID: <c0hfnnkum0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 87212
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:BWEWb.38359$8a5.6746@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
Those chaps look faggot to me! Maybe Suzy Rottencrotch caught him
blowing porkbutt!

You still pissed at Rich after all these years?

2538. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 03:54:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YdadnZqcE8Po17Hd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87214

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu...
>
>>No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps
>>because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or
>>perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.
>>
>>I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.
>>
>>
>>A few thoughts first:
>>
>>There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think
>>it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason
>>to change my prediction in the pool.
>>
>>The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
>>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When
>>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>>
>>
>>This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
>>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>>
>>It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>>
>>To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
>>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect
>
> there.
>
>>I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.
>>
>>The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they

>>are, with privileges staying the same.
>>
>>After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>>
>>Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
>>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>>process.
>>
>>General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>>
>>
>>Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>>
>>
>>The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>>pretty easily!
>>
>>
>>Bands and sub bands:
>>
>>At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>>
>>
>>So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>>
>>Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>>that we know it will work.
>>
>>Comments?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>
> If Morse code testing goes, this is a pretty reasonable approach. However
> several people have proposed even simpler plans. Simply drop the element 1

> for the requirements for one or more levels and beef up the writtens. Leave
> all else alone. Although no one knows what the FCC will do, my opinion is
> that it will be one of the simplest proposals that will be adopted rather
> than any restructuring.

I'm a little confused, Dee. What you just said is pretty much a
condensed version of what I was saying!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2539. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 04:03:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aqidnbxw3Ljh0bHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87215

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>
>>A few thoughts first:
>>
>> There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think
>
>
>>it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason
>>to change my prediction in the pool.
>>
>> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
>
>
>>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When
>>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>>
>>
>> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
>>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>>
>> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>>
>> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
>
>
>>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect there.
>>
>> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.
>>
>> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
>>are, with privileges staying the same.

>>
>> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>>
>> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
>>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>>process.
>>
>> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>>
>>
>> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>>
>>
>> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>>pretty easily!
>>
>>
>> Bands and sub bands:
>>
>> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>>
>>
>> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>>
>> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>>that we know it will work.
>>
>> Comments?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>*My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one
>>class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and
>>Extra as practiced now.
>
>

> Mike:
>
> Sounds like the wishful thinking of a typical no-code whiner who is too
> stinking lazy to learn a useful communications skill like the Morse code.
> Nothing new here. Yawn!

Well, I'm not a no-code whiner, Larry. And I've learned Morse.

As I posted before:

>>Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see,
>>it's major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.

And you appear to be one of those people that are already pretty angry.
How's that working out for you?

If I had my way, I would not end code testing at all. But it's almost
certain to happen. I'll be happy if it doesn't, but life will go on.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2540. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 04:19:48 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <e1jo20p6modsqfe79moav3bu70a4ml9c4o@4ax.com>
Source record: 87216

On 13 Feb 2004 02:47:19 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>snip

>> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>>that we know it will work.
>>
>> Comments?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>*My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one
>>class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and
>>Extra as practiced now.
>
>Mike:
>
>Sounds like the wishful thinking of a typical no-code whiner who is too
>stinking lazy to learn a useful communications skill like the Morse code.
>Nothing new here. Yawn!

I doubt that many here would agree with your observation, Larry - I
have seen no evidence in this or any of his previous posts of either
whining about Morse or being too lazy to learn it.

OTOH, his posts - without exception, tend to be well thought out,
insightful and presented in a civil and friendly manner....qualities
which are the real definition of useful communications skills.

Your comment above, whether sent by Morse Code, TCP/IP, voice or
carrier pigeon, meets none of these criteria...not a single one.

Perhaps you're right - nothing new here. Yawn.

>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

73, Leo

2541. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 04:25:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402C51B9.7C99EC26@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87217

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40253C6F.2D2714D4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40215E2A.C8F57755@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian Kelly wrote:

> > > You brought back a lot of hilarious memories of "electronerd
> > > educations" gone awry David. Gawd we had fun . . !
> > >
> > The best I've ever heard was deliverd at the Dayton banquet one year by
> > Jean Shepherd.
>
> I'd love to read it if his talk has been archived somewhere. I'll bet
> that if some Shepherd-type individual went out and compiled tales
> about all the goofy stunts and missteps kid hams got into back when in
> a book it would sell.

I can only hope that someone recorded that banquet talk. Of course most
of Shepherd's stuff was that entertaining. That voice we hearing
narrating "A Christmas Story" is his.

He and Jack Fulmer W4HAV (later W4YF) opened a Volkswagen dealership way
too soon after the war. People weren't quite ready for the car. The
place was on the Kentucky shore opposite Cincinnati, where Jean was
working at WLW.

> > Well, in my case it was a one-time Christmas deal--the one BIG present
> > and that was second-hand from Allied's big, used equipment list. The
> > receiver I saved for was also from the same list.
>
> I wonder if there are any Allied employees left from the days when
> they were in the ham biz.

I think there a few still around. There was no one left working from
the old days at the time I went to work for them in 1980. Everything
was Tandy and run from Fort Worth.

> > More newspaper
> > deliveries, an after-school job at the local hobby shop several days
> > each week and the writing of a sports column for the local newspaper
> > provided coaxial cable and connectors, a key, antenna wire and the
> > like.

>
> My first store-bought rcvr was a new Hallicrafters S-40B. Which I
> bought from Sears & Roebuck believe it or not. At the time Sears sold
> the S-38, the S-40, and a couple higher-end Hallicrafters rcvrs. I
> think one of 'em was the SX-71. The S-40 catalog price was $119.95.
> But I had an aunt who lived in Chicago and worked for Sears so I was
> able to get her employee's 10% discount. A whole twelve bucks. I was
> as interested in SWLing as much as I was into becoming a Novice so I
> spent more time chasing SW BC "rare ones" than I did tuning the W1AW
> code practice sessions. Eventually though, maybe a year after I got
> the rcvr I had 7.5 wpm down cold and was close to 10 wpm so I trundled
> off downtown, took the test and put the S-40 to the real task.

A nice bit of nostalgia! Most of the catalog houses had at least some
ham gear. It is interesting to note that famed industrial designer
Raymond Loewy designed the S-40 cabinetry. He is the fellow who brought
us the '47 Studebaker Starlight Coupe and '53 Starliner Coupe, the '61
Avanti,
the S-1 steam locomotive (Pennsylvania RR), that sharp-looking fifties
Coca-Cola dispenser that we'd see in diners and drug stores, and all
sorts of products from pencil sharpeners to refrigerators.

I bought an S-40A from W7LR a few years back. The design is still
stunning.

W4JBP willed me his 1937 Hallicrafters Sky Challenger years back. He
bought it new from Steinberg's appliance store on Vine Street in
Cincinnati. Steinberg's sold ham gear through the end of 1968

> > Some of that money was also spent on a big U.S. call area map and
> > some (sorry, no choice of color) QSL cards from WRL.
>
> Now yer really rubbing it in . . . The Globe King, the King of the
> Hill . . ! I understand that Leo is now 93 and is still at it at.

K8CFT, who administered my Novice exam, had a Globe King 500-C in his
shack. I've always wanted one but they are bloody expensive these days.

> > All of this nostalgia has me fired up to grab my collection of the West
> > Coast DX Bulletin to re-read some of Cass's gems.
>
> I subscribed to one or another of the dx bulletins but I forget which
> one it was. I don't remember a "Cass". I had a big asset in the dx
> spots game, I was geographically right in the middle of the FRC 2m
> "spots network". I left the rcvr on 24/7, when I heard it light up I
> knew there was a goodie lurking somewhere, got into the shack pronto,
> fired up and joined the throng on the freq. Some of the poor dx
> stations we jumped all over probably wondered what hit 'em.

Cass is Hugh Cassidy WA6AUD. His "West Coast DX Bulletin" was tops.
Cass had a flair for writing and brought us the Old Timer living on top
of the hill; the local QRPer, full of questions (often rhetorical) for

the Old Timer; Red-Eyed Louie, always doing the dawn patrol looking for rare DX and the Palos Verdes Sundancers. There are numerous other characters. When Cass retired, his mailing list went to the fellows at Madison Electronics in Texas. Bill Kennamer K5FUV edited their "QRZ DX" for a number of years before going to the DXCC desk in Newington to replace Don Search.

> Then there was the Ham Trader yellow sheets . . I moved a *lotta* gear
> in and out with those.

I subscribed to the "Yellow Sheets" as well and had Alton's "Ham Equipment Buyer's Guide" volumes too.

Dave K8MN

2542. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 04:33:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402C53A7.EE1DAEC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87218

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>snip
> >>
> >>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
> >
> >Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
> >is still going strong there.....
>
> Irrelevant to this group, Leo. ARRL "represents all amateurs." They say
> so up front.
>
> W1AW reaches the edges of the known world...a couple provinces of
> Canada, as far west as Ohio, down to Atlanta, Georgia. Their concept
> of "world."

As with many other things relating to amateur radio, you simply don't know what you are talking about. Yes, W1AW is heard quite nicely on the West Coast and can be heard in any states. Pick an appropriate band and tune it in. W1AW is easily heard in Finland. I've heard numerous W1AW bulletins and code practice runs when I lived in Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Botswana and Tanzania.

> Every single radio amateur in the USA "owes everything" to Saint Hiram
> Percy Maxim who "went to Washington" in 1919 to "restore ham radio"
> after WW One. ARRL tells everyone that, forever and ever. Happened
> 85 years ago when all the seven-year-old amateur extras in here were
> young. Clap clap.

It happens that HPM did go to Washington for the stated purpose. ARRL says that because it is factual. What have you done for amateur radio, Leonard?

Dave K8MN

2543. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 04:37:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <w5OdnT3yHryVyrHdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87219

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The
> big thing now is BPL. Check out the ARRL website and look at their BPL test
> video. Terrifying. This will do a lot more harm to the ARS than a few
> thousand lazy whiners who finally got their HF phone privileges handed to them
> for nothing.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Here is the response I received from Alan Shark, president and CEO of the Power Line Communications Association, on my question of the intereference that will be caused by BPL. These guys are simply ignoring any facts because big money is at stake. Other countries have abandoned BPL because of the intereference it causes, yet this guy claims "there is no hard evidence to suport the AWRL (ARRL) concerns." I emailed him back and suggested he go to the ARRL web site and take a look at the videos made that clearly shows the level of interference. I also asked him who these scientists are he refers to and if they had any hard evidence that BPL will not cause interference to the HF spectrum. Think there is some reason for his last name being Shark?

****
I appreciate your concern. To date there is no such hard evidence to support the AWRL concerns. In fact scientists have disputed such claims. Let's see what the NTIA and the FCC come up with by way of real-life field tests. As a veteran who has fought for our country, and who loves this country, I would not support something that would in anyway be harmful to local, state or national security.

Alan R. Shark, D.P.A., CAE
President & CEO
AMTA/PLCA
200 N. Glebe Road, Suite 1000
Arlington, Virginia 22203
arshark@amtausa.org
Direct: 202.835.7814
Fax 202.331.9062
Mobile:202.669.6544

2544. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 05:06:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402C5B6A.79D4A9CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87220

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0402100952.7e377dfc@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >af1q@netzero.com (James F. Aguiar) wrote in message
> >news:<6884c75d.0402091316.230de5c5@posting.google.com>...
> >> I think the ARRL is doing a super job of taking care of its own cash
> >> cow.
> >
> >Do you think all of the work done at ARRL Hq could be done by unpaid
> >volunteers?
>
> According to the ARRL's tax return of 2002 their income was $12
> million. That money was going where? :-)

The League has quite a large paid staff. In addition to salaries, there
are the expenses of printing and mailing, the need to maintain the HQ
building and W1AW, the costs for utilities, insurance and all sorts of
other necessities. Where does your money go?

> >> Ham Radio as we know it is changing in the interest of progress
> >> with no considration for the hobby.
> >
> >I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, inflexibility to understand the reality of now.
>
> If you don't agree with it, you "don't understand it." :-)

If it isn't written so that anyone can understand it, how can anyone
agree or disagree with it?

> >> I bet if everyone who subscribes
> >> to QST was to cancel their subscriptions,in other words, BOY COTT the
> >> ARRL, their trend of thought would take a sudden change of direction.
> >
> >Of course it would.
>
> No, it would not. QST sells enough ad space to keep itself going.

It would be difficult to sell ads if there aren't many readers. I'd
change "No, it would not" to "Yes, it certainly would".

> However, if the ARRL loses its demographic base to show
> advertisers, they will not bother buy more ad space.

No kidding? Once again, you've managed to sum up the perfectly obvious.

> >But why should the members do that? What issue
> >would make all of the members decide to drop out?
>
> Perish the thought. BELIEVERS would still belong...just like the
> followers of Osama hang onto his very word today...

What's his call?

> >> Who cares about manufactures who pay for glossy pages of advertisment
> >> in QST.
> >
> >I care about one or two of them.
>
> Do you care enough to buy the very best? :-)

> Or are you still designing your own kits?
>
> >> After all didn't we all used to make our own radios once.
> >
> >Some of us still do.
>
> "Design them" too! :-)

Unjustifiable snipe noted. I really like the use of quotes too. Reminds
me of your "experience" in amateur radio.

> >> It seems as though the reciepe is to dismantle the hobby of amateur
> >> radio and ARRL is trying to hang on to what ever will keep them going
> >> as money making tax free organization.
> >
> >What, exactly, is ARRL doing that you disagree with? Please be
> >specific.
>
> TAFKA Rev. Jim's response to Aguiar's reply ought to be something!
>
> >> Ask your self, what has the ARRL ever done for you personally or for
> >> anyone you know, I bet the answer is zero, nada.
> >
> >You lose!
> >
> >Here are some things ARRL has done for me:
> >
> > - Excellent publications that helped me learn radio theory and practice
>
> Drexel didn't teach you anyting? :-)
>
> > - W1AW code practice helped me improve code skills
>
> W1AW isn't heard in all the states in the union.

You'd be wrong, Mr. "If I need facts, I just make them up".

> > - PRB-1
>
> To help fight the evil, money-grubbing, dictatorial home neighborhood
> organizations?

That isn't what PRB-1 does. It is quite useful in seeing that towns and
cities don't establish regulations which arbitrarily restrict the
installation of antennas and supports.

> > - Fight against BPL
>
> A few OTHER companies and organizations and LOTS of individuals
> have voiced their objection to BPL here, PLC overseas. There's over
> 5000 Comments on NOI 03-104 on the FCC ECFS not from ARRL.

That's a good thing, but you can't have helped noticing that the ARRL
took the lead in matters relating to the threat to HF radio from BPL.

> > - Best ham magazine ever printed (QST)
>

> Hardly. RSGB's "Radio Communication" is an English language
> monthly with a wider scope of amateur radio interests.

RadComm has a wider scope of amateur radio interests? I don't think so.
It also has far less content than QST because it serves a much smaller
membership.

> QST NEVER compared to HAM RADIO magazine during HR's 22
> years of independent monthly publication.

It certainly didn't. Ham Radio catered to one thin slice of hamdom.
QST is a general interest magazine, broader in scope than HR or Radcomm.
QST is still printed. HR is defunct.

> HR was far better, did
> not cater to any BoD stuffiness.

That's pretty easy. No BoD stuffiness. Why? We ain't got no stinkin'
BoD. If you have no membership and if you have a staff of a few people
why would you need a board of directors?

> > - Representation in Washington and internationally, as well as
> >information.
>
> Special Interest Groups abound in DC. All it takes is money to pay
> them for their services representing the BoD's opinion.

Precisely! The trick is in selecting folks who know something about
amateur radio and the ARRL to represent the League. The ARRL has those
people and they do lobby on behalf of the ARRL.

> With the Internet, ALL citizens can now communicate with our
> federal government at the speed of enlightenment. We don't have to
> be filtered through any organization or SIG having its own agenda.

ALL citizens have had access to paper, envelopes and stamps for generations. Citizens have had telephones for decades. Are you so much of a rube that you don't see that lobbyists abound because they are able to accomplish things? If that wasn't true, there wouldn't be any lobbyists.

> >> I am glad that I have at least had the past 47 or so years of amateur
> >> radio.
> >
> >Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>
> You owe EVERYTHING to your ARRL. Start paying up...

I paid up in 1978. You can pony up too, Leonard and become an Associate Member.

> >I've been a ham for 36+ years, too.
>
> Sure. Just like the standards and practices of the 1930s. You are
> 49 going on 94.

That doesn't make much sense. The standards and practices of the 1930s have been a ham for 36+ years? The standards and practices of the 1930s are 49 going on 94?

> >> That is how I feel and I just want to voice my personal opinion even
> >> though I am going to get bashed for it.
> >
> >No bashing, just some questions. You may *feel* the ARRL does nothing
> >for you, but the reality is quite different.
>
> ARRL never gave me anything except six issues of QEX that Ed Hare
> kindly sent me at league expense...from a stack of unsold issues at Hq.
> [the last time I ever received anything from Newington without paying
> shipping charges...:-)]

...and I can see that you are dripping with gratitude.

> ARRL has wasted my time, the late Vic Clark included.

How can the ARRL waste your time when 1) you aren't doing anything but posting newsgroup messages 2) aren't a radio amateur and 3) aren't an ARRL member. Maybe you spend much of your spare time (and it is apparent that you have oodles of it) making aluminum foil hats to protect you from those signals which W1AW is beaming your way.

Dave K8MN

2545. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 05:20:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402C5E92.9E954322@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87221

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0402101131.37f8be01@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >I wonder if there are any Allied employees left from the days when
> >they were in the ham biz.
>
> Allied Radio is still an electronics parts distributor, was never solely
> in the "ham biz."

Who said it was?

> Allied is now a division of Hamilton-Avnet and
> MUCH bigger than it was when they had a single building in Chicago.

They've been bigger since about 1970 when Tandy bought 'em. Allied had quite a chain of strip mall and downtown stores across the country. That's precisely why Tandy bought them. Almost all of them became Radio Shack stores.

> I'd been there...impressive showroom to a 15 year old, but not that
> great in 1956 when I was 23.

It takes a lot to impress a suave man-of-the-world such as you.

> Newark Electronics is still in the electronics parts distributor biz,
> also bigger than it was in the 1950s.

Pittsburgh's Cameradio is still in business as CAM/RPC after merging with Cleveland's Radio Parts Company (the RPC). Hughes-Peters is still in business though the company has been sold. None of them were ever solely in the amateur radio business. Hughes-Peters Cincinnati Division had nine hams on staff and always advertised in the GCARA's "Mike and Key". Many of our customers had radio amateurs employed. The company had a busy parts counter and figured that dollars from hams were as good as dollars from anyone else.

> There's lots more places to get parts for hum radios now, but the
> old-style parts of a half century are very, very scarce. :-)

No, Leonard, they aren't. There are simply fewer places selling them. With the stock I have out in the barn, I might run out in another fifty or so years.

> You really ought to get out more...

...sez our resident expert in all things electronic.

Dave K8MN

2546. Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 05:22:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <fbWdnRPKTe89_7HdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87222

Picked this up on the shortwave group. Looks like the 14th might be a good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our frequencies.

**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC (gmt) the brand new offshore radio station RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL is expecting to have its first official TEST TRANSMISSION from international waters between the frequency of 3933 - 3937 khz, is 3.933 - 3.937 mhz. in the 76 meter band.
The stations technicians want to have listeners reports from listeners. It will be a live program from the radio ship with acquaintance with ship and crew. They are asking to sent your e mails directly to the ship on this adress; radiorainbow@hotmail.com
Following evenings there will be more test transmissions with nice music programs, in which you can participate by sending a e mail during the programs.
Please sent this mail to the press and all interested people.
The message came from
**********RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL, THE VOICE OF PEACE**********

2547. Re: Asshole N4CND loses wife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 08:34:54 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <c0i27f$g4j$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 87223
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:BWEWb.38359$8a5.6746@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
Those chaps look faggot to me! Maybe Suzy Rottencrotch caught him
blowing porkbutt!

edo wrote:

> In article <R8tVb.26928$qK3.15478@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>http://profiles.yahoo.com/dr_oris
>
>
> Poor WHORASS, I guess his hag of a wife got fed up with him
> sexually abusing Shelby and Michelle........
>

Maybe, just maybe if he had hit her in the face with a Pepsi bottle he could
have shown her how much he loved her. Pepsi bottles work wonders, do they
not?

2548. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 11:00:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213060010.08626.00003083@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87225

In article <Xns948D678646C76elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040212080013.05539.00004274@mb-m16.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns948D430B2D41elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>>news:20040212000016.12501.00006161@mb-m04.aol.com:
>>>
>>>> In article <Xns948C910C126Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>, Alun
>>>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>They
>>>>
>>>> [the ARRL]
>>>>
>>>>>even claim they were responsible for the no-code licence,
>>>>
>>>> Where, Alun? Can you show where ARRL claims credit for the Tech
>>>> losing its code test?
>>>
>>>They did at the time
>>
>> Where? Can you cite any references?
>>
>> 1991 is not ancient history yet. I "was there", wrote letters, followed
>> the issue closely. In 1990, ARRL BoD policy changed from opposition of
>> any form of nocodetest ham license to support of a VHF/UHF-only limited
>> license. This was driven by several factors, including member opinion
>> that was divided 50-50 on that specific issue.
>>
>> But I recall no claim that the BoD originated the idea.
>
>I was there too, and I recall several such claims.

So point us to them. How were the claims made? They must have
been in QST, right?

>>>>>when the
>>>>>truth is the FCC would have introduced one 20 years earlier but for
>>>>>the league's opposition!
>>>>

>>>> Not true!
>>>>
>>>> The Tech lost its code test in early 1991. 20 years earlier was 1971.
>>>> The first FCC attempt at a nocodetest amateur license was in 1975,
>>>> and if enacted would have not taken effect sooner than 1976. That's
>>>> 15 years, not 20.
>>>
>>>So it's not true because it was only 15 years not 20? That's only a
>>>matter of degree, not substance.
>>
>> It's an error of ~33% (1/3 of 15 is 5)
>>
>> It's an indication that your recollection of the occurrences
>> surrounding the introduction of nocodetest ham licenses in the USA, and
>> the ARRL's role
>> in them, may be somewhat inaccurate.
>>>
>>>So you admit they opposed it for 15 years, and I can assure you they
>>>tried to claim credit when it happened.
>>
>> Based on what? I can assure you that "they" did not claim credit for
>> coming up with the idea.
>>
>>>> And in 1975, ARRL polled its entire membership with a detailed
>>>> questionnaire. A large and pervasive majority opposed a nocodetest
>>>> ham license of any kind.
>>>>
>>>Exactly, the ARRL opposed it.
>>>
>> And that's a good thing. Too bad they couldn't see their way to doing
>> another such survey or two.
>>
>> The 1975 survey gave a clear indication of what the membership - almost
>> all of it - really wanted ARRL to do at the time. How can anyone fault
>> them for following the clear mandate of the membership?

Well?

73 de Jim, N2EY.

2549. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 11:00:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213060011.08626.00003084@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87224

In article <20040212212912.29815.00003251@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>The
>big thing now is BPL. Check out the ARRL website and look at their BPL test
>video. Terrifying.

That's what I've been saying since last summer.

>his will do a lot more harm to the ARS than a few
>thousand lazy whiners who finally got their HF phone privileges handed to
>them for nothing.

And FCC is now going to issue an NPRM for BPL. (see ARRL letter and other sources). From the current conservative, thousand-points-of-light, get-the-government-off-your-back, republican-cloth-coat administration.......

73 de Jim, N2EY

2550. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 11:00:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213060012.08626.00003085@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87226

In article <402C51B9.7C99EC26@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

> It is interesting to note that famed industrial designer
>Raymond Loewy designed the S-40 cabinetry. He is the fellow who brought
>us

(brought us the styling, that is)

of

>the '47 Studebaker Starlight Coupe and '53 Starliner Coupe, the '61
>Avanti, the S-1 steam locomotive (Pennsylvania RR),

The GG-1 electric locomotive (also PRR),

>that sharp-looking fifties
>Coca-Cola dispenser that we'd see in diners and drug stores, and all
>sorts of products from pencil sharpeners to refrigerators.

Loewy (and others) also made it clear that purely functional objects could look
really cool, too, without significant cost increases. In fact, his style
changes to
the GG-1 (including the use of a welded rather than riveted body and the use of

smoother lines) resulted in *reduced* cost.

Unfortunately he was not available to help style the Southgate Type 7.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

2551. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:01:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213080120.22081.00004026@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87227

In article <kein20d7dc6oel5fovtgr29268klnt7knp@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>What I found interesting was the pattern on the (Tek?) scope above the
>rig.....must have an incredibly slow sweep setting and very long CRT
>persistance to display 'CQ' in pulses from the key like that! < :o0

Not necessarily!

At 30 wpm, the displayed code requires a sweep time of about 1.2 sec

73 de Jim, N2EY

2552. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:01:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213080120.22081.00004025@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87228

In article <4mXWb.2137$t16.1694038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040212200426.22081.00004022@mb-m17.aol.com...
>>
>> However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level
>license
>> is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
>> The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
>> rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the
>code.

Well, I dunno if I'd call it "gumption". But yes, there's nothing that
prevents
a raw newcomer from getting an HF ham license "right out of the box".

>Tech study guide and test does include some very basic questions on
>HF propagation, procedures, rules, etc. Unfortunately too many instructors
>ignore the HF side of things and don't bother to give much encouragement to
>go after the code so then the students end up on VHF/UHF only. My
>instructor, many moons ago, really emphasized going for the "complete" Tech
>license (Novice written + Tech written + code). I'm glad he did.

Me too!

But even though it *can* be done, the license structure works against it. This
isn't a new thing - way back in the bad old days, one would sometimes hear of a
new ham going straight to General rather than mucking around with Novice. But
those
folks were very rare.
>
If you look at the "new licenses" listings at

http://www.ah0a.org

you'll see that each month a few new hams each month bypass Tech and go for
General or even Extra "right out of the box". But they are only a few, compared
to the thousands who start with Tech.

As you noted in another post, a multistep license is needed because most people
find a stepwise approach more doable and less intimidating than a one-shot
comprehensive exam. So most folks will take the upgrades in steps. The current

system actually pushes newcomers *away* from Morse and HF use by putting those things father away.

The new ham who goes for Tech-with-HF finds that s/he has a mountain of VHF/UHF privileges but only a tiny bit of HF. And while there are some HF questions in the Tech pool, the focus is primarily on VHF/UHF - which it has to be, in order to match the privileges.

IOW, to be blunt, the current license structure tends to make HF and Morse look harder than they are, and to nudge newbies into getting on the local repeaters rather than HF Morse. (Which *appears* easier to most newcomer - buying an HT and taking it "out of the box* or learning Morse, putting up an antenna, assembling an HF station with all the needed stuff and getting on 80/40 CW?)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2553. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:13:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402CCD60.8050300@psu.edu>
Source record: 87229

N2EY wrote:
> In article <kein20d7dc6oel5fovtgr29268klnt7knp@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>What I found interesting was the pattern on the (Tek?) scope above the
>>rig.....must have an incredibly slow sweep setting and very long CRT
>>persistance to display 'CQ' in pulses from the key like that! < :o0
>
>
> Not necessarily!
>
> At 30 wpm, the displayed code requires a sweep time of about 1.2 sec
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Can a person even do 30 wpm with one of those? I didn't read the article
yet, but that seems pretty fast.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2554. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:15:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402CCDD7.6040304@psu.edu>
Source record: 87230

Dave Heil wrote:

> It happens that HPM did go to Washington for the stated purpose. ARRL
> says that because it is factual. What have you done for amateur radio,
> Leonard?

Provide a noise floor in here? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2555. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:47:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <gvkp20tgu3fh11c5b3d0if2jgcvniu304e@4ax.com>
Source record: 87231

On Fri, 13 Feb 2004 08:13:04 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <kein20d7dc6oel5fovtgr29268klnt7knp@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>>>What I found interesting was the pattern on the (Tek?) scope above the
>>>rig.....must have an incredibly slow sweep setting and very long CRT
>>>persistance to display 'CQ' in pulses from the key like that! < :o0
>>
>>
>> Not necessarily!
>>
>> At 30 wpm, the displayed code requires a sweep time of about 1.2 sec

Agreed - but at a sweep of 1.2 seconds, the phosphor would need to
have a pretty long persistance to make a nice even display like the
one pictured.......bright, too!

My Tek 465 can't do that - where can I buy one of those? :)

>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Can a person even do 30 wpm with one of those? I didn't read the article
>yet, but that seems pretty fast.

The article claims 25 wpm or more from this device. Maintenance isn't
mentioned, though - one shudders to think what that thing would be
like after a couple of weeks of use! Ewwww.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

2556. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:52:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402130552.4b3df6f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87232

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040211204210.21457.00003914@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402111602.8cd2c41@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040211015633.29660.00002865@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
> >> >> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?
> >> >
> >> >"We've got a bleeder!"
> >> >
> >> >from: When Harry Met Sally
> >>
> >> Don't forget the redux on the Oriongasm scene by the other guy... :-)
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Is that where he revived the little dog with energized lamp cord?
>
> I can't remember. The movie was under the Hayes Code, not the
> morse code.
>
> All I remember is that Meg was faking it in the coffee shop...just
> like all the code-loving extra specials are faking it in here. Shrug.
>
> LHA / WMD

I wonder if TAFKA Rev. Jim was faking it for all of those years that
he demanded a disincentive exam for access to CW on HF?

2557. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 13:59:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402130559.46c02f71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87233

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040211204212.21457.00003916@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>
> Not yet. They won't stop or admit they were EVER wrong, not
> until the last code key is forcibly removed from the cold, dead
> fingers of the last PCTA. Sigh.
>
> LHA / WMD

I hope it doesn't come to that.

Instead, they should cleanse their souls by explaining why they argued
for maintaining the Morse Code Exam for HF access, and now how its a
disincentive to CW use on HF. It just doesn't make sense to me.

2558. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 14:04:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402130604.49bff22e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87234

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c0e3gf$p4c$04$1@news.t-online.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59@posting.google.com...
> > "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
> news:<c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > > Hi, Len,
> > >
> > > after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did not find
> > > anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but nothing
> > > about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one very
> > > important thing.
> > >
> > > What impact will Broadband over Powerlines, or PLC, have on the Amateur
> > > Radio Policy.
> > >
> > > Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I will
> > > take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and the
> > > Moderator of this Newsgroup. Please take my apology for the poor quoting
> > > habits, I am not jet skilled enough in this magic art.
> > >
> > > Please don't cite me impatient, but may I await your reply soon? Today?
> > >
> > > Best regards
> > > Helmut
> > > --
> >
> > Hi Dave.

> Billy the Beeper,

Hi Dave. It's not "Billy the Beeper," its Billy Beeper. But you can
call me William if you like.

> Did you reply to the wrong post?

No.

> You did not read the header?

No. I read your writing style and word choice.

> This is not Dave whoever, its HELMUT here!

That would be Dave Heil, Helmut.

> Anyway, greetings from Europe

Greetings from a tarpaper shack in Pickerington.

2559. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 14:49:07 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a96f41e8008fa7c989687@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87235

In article <1e4e3692.0402130604.49bff22e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com says...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c0e3gf$p4c$04$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > news:1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59@posting.google.com...
> > > "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
> > news:<c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > > > Hi, Len,
> > > >
> > > > after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did not find
> > > > anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but nothing
> > > > about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one very
> > > > important thing.
> > > >
> > > > What impact will Broadband over Powerlines, or PLC, have on the Amateur
> > > > Radio Policy.
> > > >
> > > > Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I will
> > > > take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and the
> > > > Moderator of this Newsgroup. Please take my apology for the poor quoting
> > > > habits, I am not jet skilled enough in this magic art.
> > > >
> > > > Please don't cite me impatient, but may I await your reply soon? Today?
> > > >
> > > > Best regards
> > > > Helmut
> > > > --
> > >
> > > Hi Dave.
>
> > Billy the Beeper,
>
> Hi Dave. It's not "Billy the Beeper," its Billy Beeper. But you can
> call me William if you like.
>
> > Did you reply to the wrong post?
>
> No.
>
> > You did not read the header?
>
> No. I read your writing style and word choice.
>

> > This is not Dave whoever, its HELMUT here!
>
> That would be Dave Heil, Helmut.
>
> > Anyway, greetings from Europe
>
> Greetings from a tarpaper shack in Pickerington.

OE8SOQ Lookups: 79
HELMUT K. STROEML
SCHUBERTSTRASSE 8
SPITTAL A D DRAU A-9800
AUSTRIA

Path: newsspool2.news.pas.earthlink.net!stamper.news.pas.earthlink.net!
stamper.news.atl.earthlink.net!elnk-atl-nf1!newsfeed.earthlink.net!
border2.nntp.ash.giganews.com!nntp.giganews.com!newsfeed00.sul.t-
online.de!newsmm00.sul.t-online.com!t-online.de!news.t-online.com!not-
for-mail
From: "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Re: Question for LEN OVER 21
Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2004 21:32:23 +0100
Organization: T-Online
Lines: 40
Message-ID: <c0e3gf$p4c$04$1@news.t-online.com>
References: <20040208134921.05539.00004180@mb-m16.aol.com> <c063bv$kbo
$06$1@news.t-online.com> <1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59
@posting.google.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: news.t-online.com 1076531535 04 25740 WHUYGGKrczJd01Y 040211
20:32:15
X-Complaints-To: usenet-abuse@t-online.de

http://www.t-online.com/
.

.
T-Online is a central point of reference on the World Wide Web. German-
language content includes the latest news, diversified entertainment,
extensive services, and comprehensive online shopping.

2560. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 15:22:47 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <bZ5Xb.306594$na.461415@attbi_s04>
Source record: 87236

Looks like this may only be heard in Europe if it is
still off the East coast of Ireland. See:
http://homepage.tinet.ie/~kieranmurray/radio_photo_gallery/pages/rainbow2.htm

2561. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 15:47:20 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0iri4$bo9$04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87237

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:MPG.1a96f41e8008fa7c989687@news.west.earthlink.net...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402130604.49bff22e@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com says...
> > "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c0e3gf$p4c$04$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > > news:1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<c063bvkbo06$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > > > > Hi, Len,
> > > > >
> > > > > after reading through your last 25 posts to 10 threads, and did
not find
> > > > > anything useful, exept wrong spelled english and german, but
nothing
> > > > > about Amateur Radio Policy, I have to ask you directly about one
very
> > > > > important thing.
> > > > >
> > > > > What impact will Broadband over Powerlines, or PLC, have on the
Amateur
> > > > > Radio Policy.
> > > > >
> > > > > Thank you in advance for your honest and honorable answer, which I
will
> > > > > take from you as the only one expert in Amateur Radio Policy and
the
> > > > > Moderator of this Newsgroup. Please take my apology for the poor
quoting
> > > > > habits, I am not jet skilled enough in this magic art.
> > > > >
> > > > > Please don't cite me impatient, but may I await your reply soon?
Today?
> > > > >
> > > > > Best regards
> > > > > Helmut
> > > > > --
> > > > >
> > > > Hi Dave.
> > >
> > > Billy the Beeper,
> > >
> > Hi Dave. It's not "Billy the Beeper," its Billy Beeper. But you can

> > call me William if you like.
> >
> > > Did you reply to the wrong post?
> >
> > No.
> >
> > > You did not read the header?
> >
> > No. I read your writing style and word choice.
> >
> > > This is not Dave whoever, its HELMUT here!
> >
> > That would be Dave Heil, Helmut.
> >
> > > Anyway, greetings from Europe
> >
> > Greetings from a tarpaper shack in Pickerington.
>
> OE8SOQ Lookups: 79
> HELMUT K. STROEML
> SCHUBERTSTRASSE 8
> SPITTAL A D DRAU A-9800
> AUSTRIA
>
>
> Path: newsspool2.news.pas.earthlink.net!stamper.news.pas.earthlink.net!
> stamper.news.atl.earthlink.net!elnk-atl-nf1!newsfeed.earthlink.net!
> border2.nntp.ash.giganews.com!nntp.giganews.com!newsfeed00.sul.t-
> online.de!newsmm00.sul.t-online.com!t-online.de!news.t-online.com!not-
> for-mail
> From: "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Question for LEN OVER 21
> Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2004 21:32:23 +0100
> Organization: T-Online
> Lines: 40
> Message-ID: <c0e3gf$p4c$04$1@news.t-online.com>
> References: <20040208134921.05539.00004180@mb-m16.aol.com> <c063bv$kbo
> $06$1@news.t-online.com> <1e4e3692.0402101836.aa86f59
> @posting.google.com>
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
> X-Trace: news.t-online.com 1076531535 04 25740 WHUYGGKrczJd01Y 040211
> 20:32:15
> X-Complaints-To: usenet-abuse@t-online.de
> http://www.t-online.com/
> T-Online is a central point of reference on the World Wide Web. German-
> language content includes the latest news, diversified entertainment,
> extensive services, and comprehensive online shopping.

>
Hello Steve and William,

firstly, I have to apologize at Dave, for plagiate his writing style.
<sarcasm> It took me several month of studying this newsgroup to catch the
twist <sarcasm ends>

Actually, thank you, William, this is a great honour for me as a non-native
english speaker/writer, to be compared with such.

Thank you Steve, for taking this effort to look me up at QRZ, and to gathert
all this information about the Deutsche Telekom and their internet services.

To post from this account, you have to be physical resident in Germany to
get one. Deutsche Telekom or T-Online as their ISP is not the only ISP in
Germany, but it is the only telephone service provider.

I have a Question about Dave Heil: Is he the one who ownes the HEIL
Microphone company?

When can we meet on the air waves? Which bands are you on? Any HOTSPOTS you
frequently visit on HF? ow is propagation over there in the US? What time
20m is open across the entire Country? How about on 40m day or night?

Catch ya boys and gals

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut
current QTH abt. 50 Miles NorthEast of Stuttgart, Germany
Echolink Node # 107658
Local time: GMT+1, EST+6, PST+9

2562. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 16:08:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402CF685.1030101@psu.edu>
Source record: 87238

N2EY wrote:
> In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
>
>
>>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years.
>
>
> I think it needs a bit of tweaking, but not a fullscale makeover as some seem
> to think.

Agreed! Most proposals I have seen have been either too radical or too
complicated.

>
>>When
>>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>
>
> I'm not sure what you mean by "Morse code was ascendant" - can you explain a
> bit more?

At one time, if you were going to be a Ham, you were almost certain to
be using Morse CW as a major part of your Operating activities. There
was a time when the two major alternatives were AM or CW.

> I would say that *any* knowledge or skill requires time to develop, whether
> it's theory knowledge,
> practical radio knowhow or Morse skills. Thus, there will still be a need for
> several license classes.
> I think there should be more levels than three, but FCC's action in 1999 makes
> it clear that's
> probably a lost cause. So three classes it is:
>
> One that's easy to get so that people can get started without having to learn
> everything in one go
> One that gives full privileges and requires some serious knowledge
> One intermediate step so that it's not a huge jump.
>
>> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase

>>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>
>
> I agree 100%! Indeed, there is still criticism of the IL plan 36 years after it
> was put in place, and in many places from people who did not become hams until long
> after it was in effect!

One of these days I might come to the conclusion that there are a lot
of cranky hams out there! ;^)

>
>
>> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>
>
> Better yet, you render your enemies ineffective. But most of all you don't
> anger your
> friends unnecessarily.
>
>> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
>
>
>>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect there.
>
>
> I disagree!
>
> Given the popularity of Morse code in amateur radio, it makes no sense to not
> have it be a part of the testing for a license. Imagine if there were no questions on SSB
> in the tests - would that make sense?

In the testing, yes, but I think a Fail Element 1 = no license is simply
a dog that isn't going to hunt.

> The Morse Code test has been portrayed as the boogieman, as if it is the source
> of all of amateur radio's problems. Yet there is no proof of these claims.

It isn't the boogieman! That's just an excuse for lack of effort (the
same thing Larry accuses me of!) We've already seen that some prime
agitators for elimination of Element one are now taking the next step
and supporting a radical easing of the writtens.

Nothing is easy enough. Remember what I said about the direction of the
tide some months back? I haven't seen anything to suggest I was wrong.

>> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.

>
>
> This means all Techs have VHF/UHF only?

Yup. And it's a good idea. Gives those that might want to be on HF some
incentive, and they neither gain or lose privileges. Did everyone know
that there are Technicians out there that are perfectly happy with what
they have now?

>> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
>>are, with privileges staying the same.
>
>
> What about Novice?

Oops, forgot the Novices. Yeah, they would retain the privileges they
have now. I really don't know how many people this will really affect.
Probably not too many active Novices any more.

>> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>>
>> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
>>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>>process.
>
>
> Perhaps, but what that does is to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF rather than HF.
> And since VHF/UHF gear tends to be harder to homebrew and more complex than HF
> equipment, it tends to funnel newcomers to manufactured equipment. Also, since there is
> relatively little use of Morse Code for casual operating on VHF/UHF, it tends to funnel
newcomers
> to FM voice operation.

Remember they will still have 6 meter operation available to them. But
I still like this because it is an incentive to upgrade. And with no
Element 1, what is the impedance to upgrading?

>> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>
>
> Needs to have some serious HF centric stuff, though.

Good point. Consider it added.

>> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>
>

>> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>>pretty easily!
>
>
> I'd say the experience requirements should be included.

Yippee! Got one person on board with that one! I really do think it's a
good idea, and it doesn't unduly punish anyone.

>> Bands and sub bands:
>>
>> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>
>
> I don't see the need for that. Better to open up some of the lower part of the
> bands for newcomers to use Morse.
>
> The natural tendency is for Morse to be at the bottom of the band, data in the
> middle, and 'phone at the top. Rather than fight that trend, the newcomer
> segments should reinforce it.
>
> The Novice subbands were originally put in the middle of their bands in a
> misguided effort to keep them from straying outside the band edges. Since
> Novices were originally required to use crystal control, this made little sense
> even in 1951.
>
>> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>>
>> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>>that we know it will work.
>>
>> Comments?
>>
>
> I agree that massive changes and giveaways are a bad idea.
>
> However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level license
> is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
> The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
> rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.

I'm still big on the idea of a person having a good reason to upgrade.
This does it, and allows a real entry level opportunity for people, yet
allows a niche for those who are happy to stay there. And there will be

plenty of people that will be happy to stay there.

Without a real reason to upgrade, I can't really support a three class system. I don't think that there are enough different privileges to offer between three classes, unless you make one of the privileges HF access.

And I can't really support power limits as a incentive to upgrade. It's a forced distinction (keeping in mind that all distinctions are arbitrary at some level) that I do not find acceptable.

RF safety and safety around high voltages is of critical importance for amateurs. The RF field calculations are one thing, but to me even more important is the potential for RF burns and B+ shocks.

The Technician is exposed to these dangers at events such as Field day or contesting with other hams - I know I was.

And while a Unlicensed person may be operating the equipment too, they are much more likely to be afraid to touch anything but the PTT switch. The Technician will be more likely to be careless through familiarity.

I cannot in good conscience support a testing regimen that does not test extensively for safety at the base level. And since the newly minted Ham would have the knowledge of High-power levels and high voltage, to limit them to low power would be arbitrary and punitive.

So that is my rationale for a system that has three classes, HF access for two of them, and doesn't penalize or overly promote anyone.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2563. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 16:53:09 UTC
From: manitoumagic@aol.commuter
Message-ID: <20040213115309.00995.00000750@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87239

>....Looks like the 14th might be a
>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our frequencies.
>
>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL is
>TESTING TRANSMISSION
>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz

1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will allow any US stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.

2564. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 16:57:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <JdmdnaSDeqVsn7DdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87240

Manitoumagic wrote:
>>....Looks like the 14th might be a
>>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our frequencies.
>>
>>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL is
>>TESTING TRANSMISSION
>>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
>
>
> 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will allow any US
> stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.

Do you think only American hams have access to this group?

2565. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 17:10:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87241

JJ wrote:
>
> Manitoumagic wrote:
> >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our frequencies.
> >>
> >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL is
> >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > >
> > >
> > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will allow any US
> > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> >
> > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?

While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.

Dave K8MN

2566. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 17:15:23 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0j0n6qqa07$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87242

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
>
>
> JJ wrote:
> >
> > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
frequencies.
> > >>
> > >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
is
> > >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > >
> > >
> > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
allow any US
> > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> >
> > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
>
> While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
> 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yup, that's your baby!
But you will never hear it cry!

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

2567. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 18:16:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402D1484.2000500@psu.edu>
Source record: 87243

N2EY wrote:
> In article <4mXWb.2137$t16.1694038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040212200426.22081.00004022@mb-m17.aol.com...
>>
>>>However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level
>>
>>license
>>
>>>is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
>>>The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
>>>rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the
>>code.
>
>
> Well, I dunno if I'd call it "gumption". But yes, there's nothing that
> *prevents*
> a raw newcomer from getting an HF ham license "right out of the box".
>
>
>>Tech study guide and test does include some very basic questions on
>>HF propagation, procedures, rules, etc. Unfortunately too many instructors
>>ignore the HF side of things and don't bother to give much encouragement to
>>go after the code so then the students end up on VHF/UHF only. My
>>instructor, many moons ago, really emphasized going for the "complete" Tech
>>license (Novice written + Tech written + code). I'm glad he did.
>
>
> Me too!
>
> But even though it *can* be done, the license structure works against it. This
> isn't a new thing - way back in the bad old days, one would sometimes hear of a
> new ham going straight to General rather than mucking around with Novice. But
> those
> folks were very rare.
>
> If you look at the "new licenses" listings at

>
> http://www.ah0a.org
>
> you'll see that each month a few new hams each month bypass Tech and go for
> General or even Extra "right out of the box". But they are only a few, compared
> to the thousands who start with Tech.
>
> As you noted in another post, a multistep license is needed because most people
> find a stepwise approach more doable and less intimidating than a one-shot
> comprehensive exam. So most folks will take the upgrades in steps. The current
> system actually pushes newcomers *away* from Morse and HF use by putting those
> things father away.
>
> The new ham who goes for Tech-with-HF finds that s/he has a mountain of VHF/UHF
> privileges but only a tiny bit of HF. And while there are some HF questions in
> the Tech pool, the focus is primarily on VHF/UHF - which it has to be, in order
> to match the privileges.
>
> IOW, to be blunt, the current license structure tends to make HF and Morse look
> harder than they are, and to nudge newbies into getting on the local repeaters
> rather than HF Morse. (Which *appears* easier to most newcomer - buying an HT
> and taking it "out of the box* or learning Morse, putting up an antenna,
> assembling an HF station with all the needed stuff and getting on 80/40 CW?)

Do you think that most new amateurs are willing to be boxed in like
that? I mean that after one contest with the club and I was determined
to get my General license. I suppose that different people might act
differently, but the privileges of my Technician license were EXACTLY
what made me go for my General license.

Satisfaction is highly overrated! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2568. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 18:18:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402D14EF.7050801@psu.edu>
Source record: 87244

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu...
>
>>No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps
>>because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or
>>perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.
>>
>>I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.
>>
>>
>>A few thoughts first:
>>
>>There is going to be a change, of that there is no doubt. I still think
>>it is going to take a longer rather than shorter time. I see no reason
>>to change my prediction in the pool.
>>
>>The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
>>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years. When
>>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.
>>
>>
>>This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
>>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>>
>>It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.
>>
>>To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
>>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect
>
> there.
>
>>I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.
>>
>>The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
>>are, with privileges staying the same.

>>
>>After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>>
>>Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
>>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>>process.
>>
>>General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.
>>
>>
>>Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.
>>
>>
>>The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>>pretty easily!
>>
>>
>>Bands and sub bands:
>>
>>At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.
>>
>>
>>So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>>
>>Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>>that we know it will work.
>>
>>Comments?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>
> If Morse code testing goes, this is a pretty reasonable approach. However
> several people have proposed even simpler plans. Simply drop the element 1
> for the requirements for one or more levels and beef up the writtens. Leave

> all else alone. Although no one knows what the FCC will do, my opinion is
> that it will be one of the simplest proposals that will be adopted rather
> than any restructuring.
>
>
>
>>*My version of the ideal plan in post Morse code era, would be a one
>>class system, with the requirements being somewhere between General and
>>Extra as practiced now.
>>
>
>
> Except that this is likely to slow the growth of ham radio rather than
> increase the growth. Although the old incentive licensing scheme was
> mishandled and many existing amateurs lost privileges, the growth increased
> markedly as potential applicants saw that they could approach the license in
> a stepwise fashion. If we were to return to a single license class for the
> future, as you indicated the testing ought to be stiffer than the General
> and that could deter people from ever becoming involved.

that is certainly possible, Dee. Of course I doubt we'll ever see it
happen!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2569. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 18:24:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402D166F.3010201@psu.edu>
Source record: 87245

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040212200426.22081.00004022@mb-m17.aol.com...
>
>>However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level
>
> license
>
>>is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
>>The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
>>rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the
> code.

Indeed!

> Tech study guide and test does include some very basic questions on
> HF propagation, procedures, rules, etc. Unfortunately too many instructors
> ignore the HF side of things and don't bother to give much encouragement to
> go after the code so then the students end up on VHF/UHF only. My
> instructor, many moons ago, really emphasized going for the "complete" Tech
> license (Novice written + Tech written + code). I'm glad he did.

Although there isn't a tech plus any more, if I were to teach a class, I would leave no doubt that I expected the students to go on beyond the Technician license, and would probably even have a little time devoted to trying out Morse code to see what would happen. But even for the new licenses, if Morse code goes by the wayside, I'd include a little bit of the General information to try to whet the student's appetites for one of the advanced licenses.

Question for the group:

Is learning more a bad thing or something?

- mike KB3EIA -

2570. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 18:46:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402131046.2256dc8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87246

Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net> wrote in message
news:<4029c5d5$0$99190$45beb828@newscene.com>...
> In <20040203205637.05539.00004128@mb-m16.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>

(old stuff snipped to save bw)

> >>So you might accept grandfathering, if it occurred at some asymptotic
> >>point in the past, and only affected a small minority of hams?
>
> >Depends on the situation. The old Extra waiver only began after there was no
> >difference
> >among the operating privileges of a General, Conditional, Advanced or Extra
> >(1952 or later). IOW it was
> >just a title sort of thing - didn't make any difference in practical
> >application. And anyone who qualified
> >for it was an OT from the very early days (35 years at least). By the time the
> >waiver meant anything
> >in terms of operating privileges, that gap was over 51 years.
>
> According to W2XOY, the upgrade to Extra given to pre-1917 Hams with a
> General or Advanced-class license started in 1951:
>
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Ham-Radio-History/message/5330
>
> along with the renaming of Class A to Advanced, Class B to General, C to
> Conditional, and the introduction of the Novice and Technician.

That's correct.
>
> So there was some short period of time (until the "Giveaway of 1953"),
> where this "free upgrade" gave additional phone privileges on 75 and 20
> meters for some of those pre-1917 hams. Specifically, those that held a
> General class (formerly "Class B") license. That would be *accurate*.

Yes, it would be! I should have mentioned that earlier.

However, very few actually used that waiver, because

- there were not that many hams before May 1917
- there were fewer who had a Class B/General license
- full privs could be had with an Advanced, which was still available
until the end of 1952.

> More information on this, just received today, is given below.
>

> >And the more I think about it, the more I think the old Extra waiver was a bad
> >idea, and that there may be
> >no scenario that would be worthwhile.
>
> >>What about a proposal that
> >>grandfathers some percentage of hams in-between?
>
> >I say no to free upgrades, then.
>
> So nearly all of the previous discussion above is moot because there is
> no "free upgrade" scenario that you will support regardless of the
> percentage of hams affected, or their status/seniority.

There may be a free upgrade scenario that I would support, but I have
not seen one yet.
>
> >>Remember that at some time in the future, we may be looking on this
> >>grandfathering as occurring at some asymptotic point in the past, as
> >>with the pre-1917 waiver above.
>
> >You mean like when the Advanced has been unavailable for 35+ years and their
> >numbers are down to about 1% of the ARS total?
>
> Well, yes, that's what I was driving at. You want to wait until then.

I want to wait until someone presents a convincing argument as to why
such giveaways are needed for the good of the ARS.

> I want to deal with the matter sooner. At least I got you to explicitly
> bound your answers tighter than "never" or 0%. And what would you do
> then?

Depends entirely on the situation at the time.
>
> >>You ask below what is the long-term
> >>plan. I say one aspect of the plan is to be able to look back on this
> >>grandfathering in the same way that we look upon the pre-1917 waiver.
>
> >We don't look back on it the same way.
>
> >And why was it done?
>
> The Restructuring FAQ at arrl.org omits the mention of waiver of the
> written test, so it too is incomplete. I dropped a line to N1KB, who is
> listed as the author of the document, with a request for correction and
> clarification. He replied to me with pointers to some sources,
> including Ham-Radio-History group noted above, which dates the origin of
> the waiver, and "free upgrade," to 1951. W1UED just replied today with
> an answer as to why. George E. Sterling, W1AE, was the first (and
> likely only) radio amateur to come up through the ranks at the FCC and
> be appointed Commissioner. The Amateur Extra license first appeared in

> the 1920's and lasted through the 1930's, when it was discontinued as a
> budget-cutting measure.

It didn't grant much in the way of more privileges, either, and very
few were actually issued.

> During the 1951 restructuring, which restored
> the Amateur Extra license, W1AE was an FCC Commissioner:
>
> http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/commish-list.html
>
> As a pre-WWI licensee himself, he thought it would be an appropriate
> honor to that group of hams if they were given the restored Amateur
> Extra license, and had the political clout to make it happen. So, the
> 1951 restructuring gave anyone who was licensed prior to April 1917 and
> who presently held a General or Advanced-class license, a "free upgrade"
> to Extra.

IOW it was one guy's idea, and nobody was going to tell The
Commissioner that it wasn't a good one. Particularly since it only
affected a few hams anyway.

> The following QST article describes the 1951 Restructuring and FCC
> Dockets 10073 and 10077:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/members-only/qqnsearch.html?search=1&words=FCC+dockets&year=1951&sel
pub=QST
>
> (ARRL Members-Only Link)
>
> A photocopy of the full article is available for $3 ($5 for non-members)
> postpaid from the ARRL.

Don't need it - I have those QSTs.
>
> That still supports my original assertion that free upgrades given to
> existing licensees, based on seniority or status, can be
> non-controversial, especially when viewed from the long-term future.

Perhaps. Or perhaps they were "noncontroversial" because nobody wanted
The Commisioner mad at them.

>
> >To put it simply: Just leave the closed-off classes alone, and let them
> >go away by attrition.
>
> >This is exactly what was done with the Advanced from the beginning of 1953
> >until 1967 - more than 14 years. What problems did it cause?
>
> The Advanced-class was eventually opened back up to new licensees, so we
> do not know what the longer-term effects would have been.

True - but it was well over a decade before that reopening was even
discussed! And FCC had no problem with keeping those folks on the
records, even with a noncomputerized database.

> I see no
> realistic likelihood that Advanced will be (or even should be) reopened
> in any foreseeable future.

That's what folks said exactly 50 years ago, too.

> The outcome that you propose, which is to
> carry them on the books for at least 35 more years or until they
> constitute less than 1% of all hams, may introduce further problems than
> the previous, and much shorter, 14-year period.

But all that avoids the main question of "what's the problem"? If
those Advanceds are satisfied with their license, why not let them
alone? If
they're not satisfied, is the Extra written test so difficult that
they
need a waiver?

In 4 years the number of Advanced has dropped by about 17,000. If it
keeps dropping in a linear (not asymptotic) fashion, the last one will
be gone
in less than 20 years.
>
> >> I
> >>would argue against that, for the reasons I have given previously
> >>(streamlining of license classes, streamlining of band plans, reduction
> >>of regulatory burden, reduction in confusion for amateurs and the FCC,
> >>harmonization with the deletion of S25.5 and with other countries'
> >>regulations, etc.).
>
> >All it takes to keep those classes is a few sentences in Part 97.
>
> "A few sentences" in laws or regulations can have non-trivial
> implications about the regulatory infrastructure that is necessary to
> give them force.

OK, fine.

The difference between an Advanced and an Extra for enforcement
purposes is just 8 little slices on 4 HF ham bands. Is that a real
enforcement burden?
Four of those slices (the lower 25 kHz of CW/data) are the same as for
General, too, so the effective difference is just the 'phone subbands
on 75/40/20/15.

> An Advanced-class license is one more alternative to
> program into the licensing computer,

It's already there!

> one more piece of regulation to be
> understood and enforced by regulators,

Already in place.

> and overall, one more class of
> amateurs to track and incorporate into any regulatory policies and
> agendas. The implementation of all of that is significantly more than a
> few sentences.

No, it isn't. Look at Part 97 and see just how much would come out if
all Advanceds were upgraded to Extra. It's not very much.

Also, note that the free upgrades would *create* work for FCC, by
requiring that the databases and licensing stuff be updated to change
all those licenses.

Will FCC issue a new license to every ham that gets a free upgrade, or
will they
keep their old ones until renewal/upgrade time, which may be 12 years
hence (if someone just renewed, and doesn't renew again until near the
end of the grace period).

> >>If license classes are consolidated to a smaller number, one alternative
> >>is simply to grandfather existing hams, which the ARRL has advocated.
>
> >A more accurate term is "free upgrade", because that's what it is.
>
> >"Grandfather" implies letting a person keep what they already have without
> >recertification. That's not what is proposed by the ARRL BoD for Techs and
> >Advanceds.
>
> >>One other implicit alternative (say, #5), is to make every Novice,
> >>Advanced (and possibly non-Plus, or would that be non-Plussed, Tech)
> >>come back in to take written tests to upgrade to the next level, or
> >>otherwise lose privileges.
>
> >That's the worst alternative.
>
> Which is why I specifically identify it and dismiss it early.
>
> >>I would argue against that also, for the
> >>reasons I have also given previously (it is impractical to retest
> >>everyone,
>
> >It could easily be done over time by saying that you either retest before Date
> >X
> >or you'll be reclassified at a lower license class.
>
> There is a legitimate distinction between "easy" and "straightforward."

In this case they're the same. The VECs do the testing and most of the
paperwork. That's why FCC required existing Tech Pluses from before

March 21, 1987 to do a testless VE session in ordr to get Generals.

> Anyone with engineering experience surely knows that something could be
> conceptually simple, but still complex and time-consuming in its actual
> implementation.

Been there, done that.

> Mass re-testing might be straightforward, but would not
> be easy within FCC and VEC budget/manpower constraints.

We're talking about spreading it out over many years. And there's an upside - some of them will upgrade all the way to Extra while they're at the VE session.

Besides, if things go the way NCVEC wants, they won't have the "burden" of code tests anymore anyway, so what's the problem?
>
> Mass re-testing would be a regulatory burden for the FCC,

Not if it were spread out over time, as outlined above.

>a personal
> burden on VEC's who would have play de-facto judge and jury for large
> numbers of existing peers, friends, fellow club members, etc.,
> concerning whether or not they could retain former privileges (what
> volunteer would want to endure that for very long?),

How would that be any different than now? VECs don't pass judgement on written tests, they simply proctor and grade them in multiple-choice format. Where's the "personal burden" other than the crowd being a little bigger?

Or do you imagine that the VECs would somehow sit in judgement?

> and would go
> against where the FCC is heading, which is towards less regulation and
> fewer grand schemes.

Like BPL?

> I might also argue that mass-retesting is sounding
> very much like a repeat of the scenario played out in the 1960's with
> Incentive Licensing.
>
And that would kill it stone dead.

There's another angle, too:

Mandatory retesting would reveal how many hams were either totally inactive or had lost interest to the point that they'd let the license expire. Would probably cause a massive drop in the number of hams on the database. Not a good thing from a political point of view.

By the same token, if FCC automatically issues new licenses to all
free-upgraded hams, a number of them will come back labeled "not at
this address" or "deceased" or some such. Which could have a similar
effect to the above. And since it's a requirement to keep FCC aware of
address changes....

> There's a lot of debate in this newsgroup about the Incentive Licensing
> scheme of the 1960's, who initiated it, what was intended, who supported
> it, why it failed, who was to blame, etc., but one thing that most can
> agree on is that it's very easy to start out with good intentions, and
> what comes out the exit door of regulatory agencies might be
> unrecognizable as something that would give the desired result.

Agreed! The original 1963 ARRL IL proposal bore little resemblance to
what finally came out the door.

And in 1999, the R&O bore little resemblance to the NPRM. Example: The
NPRM called for Advanced to stay.

> Hence
> the expression, "The road to hell is paved with good intentions." Mass
> re-testing could also be viewed as well-intentioned, but ultimately a
> road to hell.
>
That argues for leaving everything just as it is now. OK, fine,
we'll just do that.

> So, it's a good thing that neither of us are arguing in favor of testing
> to avoid losing privileges, right?

Depends on whether privs are actually "lost".

> >>and such existing hams are a large, stable user base such as
> >>that in the definition of grandfathering below).
>
> >"Large, stable user base"? We don't really know about that. How many
> >of those folks are active? Why have so few Advanceds upgraded to
> >Extra?
>
> You are teetering very close to making a non-falsifiable argument here.

A true statement is, by definition, non-falsifiable, is it not?

> You argue here, and in other threads, that Advanced should be left alone
> because:
>
> - There are still quite a few of them, who are happy with their present
> privileges, who would get a free upgrade unfairly, and crowd the Extra
> phone bands.

Not just the phone bands!

> *AND*
>
> - There may not be very many of them, active at least, so any upgrade

> would not give much benefit, anyway.

Covers all bases, doesn't it?

> You also argue that Novice should be left alone because there aren't
> very many of them, but then advocate restructuring that you believe
> would bring back its "heyday" with many more licensees in that class,
> which of course, should then be left alone.

The idea is that the Novice would be *changed*, not simply reopened.
>
> Which is it? Too many, or too few, to justify elimination?

The idea is to cover all bases. Does anybody really know why so few
Advanceds have upgraded?

> If neither
> is a sufficient criteria to argue for or against elimination of a
> license class, then that's a non-falsifiable argument.

The idea is to do what will give the best results for the ARS with the
minimum amount of negative effects.
>
> >IOW, we allow them to continue doing what they're doing because they've shown
> >a lack of problems in the past. But we require more of new systems.
> >It *doesn't* say we allow free upgrades.
>
> When you say "we require more of new systems" above, are you referring
> to people or license classes?

I'm referring to *systems*.

> There is a subtle distinction. A group
> of people may not want to change, but license classes may need to. A
> set of license classes is a ladder, to be climbed as far as the licensee
> wishes to develop his skills.

Some reject that idea, and say that there should be just one license
class. How do we answer them?

> It is also a taxonomy, with a specific
> regulatory purpose. That purpose is to ensure that limited frequency
> spectrum is being put to the best and highest use via the distribution
> of privileges over that spectrum. Implicit in this is structuring the
> license class system to ensure that all amateur radio spectrum (HF, VHF,
> UHF, Microwave) is not only used, but used well, in ways that fulfill
> the Basis and Purpose (FCC Part 97.1).

But how can any license structure actually do that? Or, to take a
different
approach, why not have just one class (as some have argued here) with
all amateur privileges?
>
> Since technologies, modes, and frequency usage patterns change over

> time, the taxonomy should change as well, hence the need for periodic
> restructuring over amateur radio's 100-year lifetime (Though I would
> argue that not doing the "Giveway of 1953," and staying with the 1951
> restructuring until the no-code issue came to a head in the 1980's,
> would have avoided the backlash that resulted in Incentive Licensing of
> 1968).

I agree! So *why* was the "Great Giveaway" of December 1952 done, particularly since FCC had just spent several years going in the opposite direction? Why was the restructure of 1951 turned on its head just as it was going into full effect?

Was it:

- Sudden personnel changes at FCC?
- Desire to push the use of SSB by hams?
- Desire to get hams off of 10-11 meters (the only HF bands open to General and Conditional 'phone) to alleviate TVI?
- Desire to get more hams using HF mobile (which was only opened to hams after WW2)?
- Combination of the above?

I have yet to find a definitive answer to why the "Great Giveaway" was done, either in the written histories or in the recollections of hams from that time. The answer could be as simple as "The Commissioner changed his mind".

Out of time right now. Will answer the rest in Part Two

73 de Jim, N2EY

2571. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 19:01:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402D1F0F.6060102@psu.edu>
Source record: 87247

Helmut wrote:

> I have a Question about Dave Heil: Is he the one who ownes the HEIL
> Microphone company?

No but he's been know to give people heil here once in a while.

>
> When can we meet on the air waves? Which bands are you on? Any HOTSPOTS you
> frequently visit on HF? ow is propagation over there in the US? What time
> 20m is open across the entire Country? How about on 40m day or night?

Do you do PSK31?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2572. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 19:41:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D286F.311A8EC7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87248

Helmut wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > JJ wrote:
> > >
> > > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > > >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > > >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
> frequencies.
> > > >>
> > > >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
> is
> > > >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > > >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
> allow any US
> > > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> > >
> > > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
> >
> > While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> > access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
> > 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yup, that's your baby!
> But you will never hear it cry!

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. Perhaps you meant, "Those
tomatoes won't be ripe until June" or "Brian sees Dave behind every tree
and rock".

Dave K8MN

2573. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 20:07:30 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0japr$rb7$06$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87249

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:402D1F0F.6060102@psu.edu...
> Helmut wrote:
>
> > I have a Question about Dave Heil: Is he the one who ownes the HEIL
> > Microphone company?
>
>
> No but he's been know to give people heil here once in a while.
>
> >
> > When can we meet on the air waves? Which bands are you on? Any HOTSPOTS
you
> > frequently visit on HF? ow is propagation over there in the US? What
time
> > 20m is open across the entire Country? How about on 40m day or night?
>
>
> Do you do PSK31?
>

Yes, I do. Where? When? Now? 14070? 21070? From State College/PA to
Reston/VA how far is this? do we have some shortskip up there, would it be
better to go to 40 or 80?
You tel me, and I will see, if the TRX is available over there at W4MQs
location.

seeya
73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2574. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 20:13:50 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0jb5n$l7$04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87250

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:402D286F.311A8EC7@earthlink.net...
> Helmut wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > JJ wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > > > >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > > > >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
> > frequencies.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW
INTERNATIONAL
> > is
> > > > >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > > > >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
> > allow any US
> > > > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> > > >
> > > > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
> > >
> > > While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> > > access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access
to
> > > 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Yup, that's your baby!
> > But you will never hear it cry!
>
> I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. Perhaps you meant, "Those
> tomatoes won't be ripe until June" or "Brian sees Dave behind every tree
> and rock".
>
> Dave K8MN
```

Dear Dave,

in plain language this means:

This QRG is only available for REGION 2 hams. But you never will get som QRM
due to time and location of the transmitter.

Sorry for encoding my first post.
Your translations where not bad either.

73 de Helmut
OE8SOQ

2575. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 20:49:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <402D3841.2020205@psu.edu>
Source record: 87301

Leo wrote:
> On Fri, 13 Feb 2004 08:13:04 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <kein20d7dc6oel5fovtgr29268klnt7knp@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>What I found interesting was the pattern on the (Tek?) scope above the
>>>>rig.....must have an incredibly slow sweep setting and very long CRT
>>>>persistance to display 'CQ' in pulses from the key like that! < :o0
>>>
>>>
>>>Not necessarily!
>>>
>>>At 30 wpm, the displayed code requires a sweep time of about 1.2 sec
>>
>
> Agreed - but at a sweep of 1.2 seconds, the phosphor would need to
> have a pretty long persistance to make a nice even display like the
> one pictured.......bright, too!
>
> My Tek 465 can't do that - where can I buy one of those? :)
>
>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Can a person even do 30 wpm with one of those? I didn't read the article
>>yet, but that seems pretty fast.
>
>
> The article claims 25 wpm or more from this device.

Wow!

> Maintenance isn't
> mentioned, though - one shudders to think what that thing would be
> like after a couple of weeks of use! Ewwww.

Good point! Ever see the mouthpiece of a saxophone after a couple weeks
use? It isn't pretty...

- Mike KB3EIA -

2576. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 20:58:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402131258.7ca0e105@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87302

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c0iri4$bo9$04$1@news.t-online.com>...

> Hello Steve and William,
>
> firstly, I have to apologize at Dave, for plagiate his writing style.
> <sarcasm> It took me several month of studying this newsgroup to catch the
> twist <sarcasm ends>
>
> Actually, thank you, William, this is a great honour for me as a non-native
> english speaker/writer, to be compared with such.

Not a problem, just don't be so quick to assume it as a compliment.

> Thank you Steve, for taking this effort to look me up at QRZ, and to gathert
> all this information about the Deutsche Telekom and their internet services.
>
> To post from this account, you have to be physical resident in Germany to
> get one. Deutsche Telekom or T-Online as their ISP is not the only ISP in
> Germany, but it is the only telephone service provider.

Similarly, for me to post from here I have to be here.

> I have a Question about Dave Heil: Is he the one who ownes the HEIL
> Microphone company?

Nope, that would be Bob/K9EID. Dave Heil has a tarpaper shack in West
Virginia, and QSL cards from out-of-band Frenchmen.

> When can we meet on the air waves? Which bands are you on? Any HOTSPOTS you
> frequently visit on HF? ow is propagation over there in the US? What time
> 20m is open across the entire Country? How about on 40m day or night?

Do you have any portion of 6M not authorized to you?

2577. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 21:04:17 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0je4aadd03$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87303

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:1e4e3692.0402131258.7ca0e105@posting.google.com...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c0iri4$bo9$04$1@news.t-online.com>...
>
> > Hello Steve and William,
> >
> > firstly, I have to apologize at Dave, for plagiate his writing style.
> > <sarcasm> It took me several month of studying this newsgroup to catch
the
> > twist <sarcasm ends>
> >
> > Actually, thank you, William, this is a great honour for me as a
non-native
> > english speaker/writer, to be compared with such.
>
> Not a problem, just don't be so quick to assume it as a compliment.
>
> > Thank you Steve, for taking this effort to look me up at QRZ, and to
gathert
> > all this information about the Deutsche Telekom and their internet
services.
> >
> > To post from this account, you have to be physical resident in Germany
to
> > get one. Deutsche Telekom or T-Online as their ISP is not the only ISP
in
> > Germany, but it is the only telephone service provider.
>
> Similarly, for me to post from here I have to be here.
>
> > I have a Question about Dave Heil: Is he the one who ownes the HEIL
> > Microphone company?
>
> Nope, that would be Bob/K9EID. Dave Heil has a tarpaper shack in West
> Virginia, and QSL cards from out-of-band Frenchmen.
>
> > When can we meet on the air waves? Which bands are you on? Any HOTSPOTS
you
> > frequently visit on HF? ow is propagation over there in the US? What
time
> > 20m is open across the entire Country? How about on 40m day or night?
>
> Do you have any portion of 6M not authorized to you?

In Europe we can work from 50 - 52 MHz, how about you??

oe8soq
Helmut

2578. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 21:04:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402131304.3bb1f762@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87304

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040213060011.08626.00003084@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <20040212212912.29815.00003251@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >The
> >big thing now is BPL. Check out the ARRL website and look at their BPL test
> >video. Terrifying.
>
> That's what I've been saying since last summer.
>
> >his will do a lot more harm to the ARS than a few
> >thousand lazy whiners who finally got their HF phone privileges handed to
> >them for nothing.
>
> And FCC is now going to issue an NPRM for BPL. (see ARRL letter and other
> sources). From the current conservative, thousand-points-of-light,
> get-the-government-off-your-back, republican-cloth-coat administration.......
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Now getting the government off our backs is a bad thing?

You're just full of suprises and contradictions, TAFKA Rev. Jim.

BPL is not allowed to interfere with your amateur communications.
Would you have it any other way?

bb

2579. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 21:08:35 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c0jecb$t39$02$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87305

Hey, William do you have a callsign you can sign your post with??

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:1e4e3692.0402131258.7ca0e105@posting.google.com...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c0iri4$bo9$04$1@news.t-online.com>...
>
> > Hello Steve and William,
> >
> > firstly, I have to apologize at Dave, for plagiate his writing style.
> > <sarcasm> It took me several month of studying this newsgroup to catch
the
> > twist <sarcasm ends>
> >
> > Actually, thank you, William, this is a great honour for me as a
non-native
> > english speaker/writer, to be compared with such.
>
> Not a problem, just don't be so quick to assume it as a compliment.
>
> > Thank you Steve, for taking this effort to look me up at QRZ, and to
gathert
> > all this information about the Deutsche Telekom and their internet
services.
> >
> > To post from this account, you have to be physical resident in Germany
to
> > get one. Deutsche Telekom or T-Online as their ISP is not the only ISP
in
> > Germany, but it is the only telephone service provider.
>
> Similarly, for me to post from here I have to be here.
>
> > I have a Question about Dave Heil: Is he the one who ownes the HEIL
> > Microphone company?
>
> Nope, that would be Bob/K9EID. Dave Heil has a tarpaper shack in West
> Virginia, and QSL cards from out-of-band Frenchmen.
>
> > When can we meet on the air waves? Which bands are you on? Any HOTSPOTS
you
> > frequently visit on HF? ow is propagation over there in the US? What

time
> > 20m is open across the entire Country? How about on 40m day or night?
>
> Do you have any portion of 6M not authorized to you?

2580. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 22:48:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6vcXb.2270$t16.1842831@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87307

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:YdadnZqcE8Po17Hd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> I'm a little confused, Dee. What you just said is pretty much a
> condensed version of what I was saying!
>

I should have made it clearer. You were asking for a two year wait between
General and Extra. And that is a significant change.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2581. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 22:49:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402131449.20fb8593@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87306

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<4mXWb.2137$t16.1694038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040212200426.22081.00004022@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >
> > However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level
> license
> > is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
> > The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
> > rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the
> code.

Sorry, Dee, but our resident Extra expert, TAFKA Rev. Jim, says that a
code exam is a disincentive to CW use on HF.

I just wonder what took him so long to recognize that fact as the
disincentive has been in place since 1912, and he has vehemently
disagreed with his new found philosophy for the past decade.

2582. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 22:54:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402131454.619bb87c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87308

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402D286F.311A8EC7@earthlink.net>...
> Helmut wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > JJ wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > > > >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > > > >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
> frequencies.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
> is
> > > > >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > > > >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
> allow any US
> > > > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> > > >
> > > > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
> > >
> > > While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> > > access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
> > > 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN

Never stopped you before. Go ahead and work 'em. ;^)

> > Yup, that's your baby!
> > But you will never hear it cry!
>
> I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. Perhaps you meant, "Those
> tomatoes won't be ripe until June" or "Brian sees Dave behind every tree
> and rock".
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you crack me up.

2583. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-13 23:27:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213182739.12501.00006188@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87309

In article <aqidnbxw3Ljh0bHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>If I had my way, I would not end code testing at all.

If I had my way, I would require a code test for all ham licenses.

>But it's almost certain to happen.

And many of us will oppose it as long as there's a way to do so.

>I'll be happy if it doesn't, but life will go on.

Yep.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2584. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190541.21955.00000488@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87311

In article <402D166F.3010201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Question for the group:
>
> Is learning more a bad thing or something?

For amateur radio in the US of A?

All that is needed is hard work, discipline, and constant practice at
morse code. That is all that is needed.

Such will demonstrate to the amateur community your sincerety,
commitment and dedication to olde-tyme hamme tradition.

That, and total personal Belief that the ARRL is god of all radio,
knows all, etc., and never does wrong (even when it does).

We now return you to the noise level of Total Unquestioning Belief
in the amateur radio standards and practices of the 1920s.

LHA / WMD

2585. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190542.21955.00000489@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87319

In article <4mXWb.2137$t16.1694038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the
>code.

Hoops. Jump through the hoops like good little doggies. Arf, arf.

As a newcomer to HF 51 years ago, I got on HF without needing one bit of morse code knowledge, skill, or anything else.

HF propagation hasn't changed since then. Solar cycles are still cycling.

The only difference is that hams have solid-state toys now instead of glass, metal, and vacuum active devices. Some still insist on ON-OFF keying of their carriers, even with sophisticated radios that can do much more.

>Tech study guide and test does include some very basic questions on
>HF propagation, procedures, rules, etc. Unfortunately too many instructors
>ignore the HF side of things and don't bother to give much encouragement to
>go after the code so then the students end up on VHF/UHF only.

52 years ago I had good instructors at Fort Monmouth. Spent seven months there before being assigned to the 71st Sig Svc Bn in Tokyo. Only time us students had a code key was a one-afternoon hands-on class that had two-tube MOPA HF transmitters...to learn how basic HF technology was...and, in ham radio, still exists over a half century later. The code key was needed solely for "turning on transmitter's emission."

None of the students had to use any morse code for any purpose later. In Tokyo, army station ADA had 42 transmitters ranging in RF power output from 1 to 40 KW. Absolutely no on-off keying CW used then, wasn't used in 1978 when the HF facility was disbanded and returned to the Japanese.

>My
>instructor, many moons ago, really emphasized going for the "complete" Tech
>license (Novice written + Tech written + code). I'm glad he did.

Wow, yeah, full hoop set. Good for you.

Now, if someone invents a time machine, you can hop back to 1953 and serve your country doing "radio" just like they did back then. Except the VHF, UHF, and microwave stuff, of course.

LHA / WMD

2586. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190543.21955.00000490@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87310

In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps
>because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or
>perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.
>
>I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.

Did the FCC reject it?

Ahem...this group, unbeknownst to them, doesn't make any regulations!

Only demands.

Especially those about love, honor, and obeying morse code tradition.

Forever.

We now return you to the noise floor of incessant bickering, devoid of
independent thought. Amateur radio status quo must be maintained
at all costs!

LHA / WMD

2587. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190543.21955.00000491@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87315

In article <1e4e3692.0402130552.4b3df6f6@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040211204210.21457.00003914@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0402111602.8cd2c41@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040211015633.29660.00002865@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>,
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
>> >> >> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?
>> >> >
>> >> >"We've got a bleeder!"
>> >> >
>> >> >from: When Harry Met Sally
>> >>
>> >> Don't forget the redux on the Oriongasm scene by the other guy... :-)
>> >>
>> >> LHA / WMD
>> >
>> >Is that where he revived the little dog with energized lamp cord?
>>
>> I can't remember. The movie was under the Hayes Code, not the
>> morse code.
>>
>> All I remember is that Meg was faking it in the coffee shop...just
>> like all the code-loving extra specials are faking it in here. Shrug.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I wonder if TAFKA Rev. Jim was faking it for all of those years that
>he demanded a disincentive exam for access to CW on HF?

Who knows for sure? All that comes back in replies is expurgated
with [expletive deleted] all over the place. Fake rules. Real stuff is
labeled "[expletive deleted]" and not allowed.

LHA / WMD

2588. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190544.21955.00000492@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87312

In article <gvkp20tgu3fh11c5b3d0if2jgcvniu304e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Agreed - but at a sweep of 1.2 seconds, the phosphor would need to
>have a pretty long persistance to make a nice even display like the
>one pictured.......bright, too!
>
>My Tek 465 can't do that - where can I buy one of those? :)

Tek makes lots of DSOs now. They can do so without straining.

Do you need a Tucker Electronics catalog? Tucker used to sell
ham equipment until business in that line got way too unprofitable
(apparently all Texas hams get Southgate Type 7s or Elecraft or
something).

Morse code can do anything. Slowly, to be sure. Morse code gets
through when everything else will.

LHA / WMD

2589. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190545.21955.00000494@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87314

In article <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
>> Alun wrote:
>> >
>> > Another domino falls
>>
>> Was it the Germans again this time?
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>It was the Little Mermaid.

Never mind correcting the god of radio, Brian. As a "key member" of the
foreign service diplomatic community, he still thinks that Denmark is
some kind of province of Germany. All kinds of smarts in the U.S.
government these days.

He doesn't know beloved fairy tales of Hans Christian Andersen, only
the fairy tales of the ARRL (beloved by mighty macho morsemen).

LHA / WMD

2590. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190545.21955.00000493@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87316

In article <20040213080120.22081.00004026@mb-m17.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <kein20d7dc6oel5fovtgr29268klnt7knp@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>What I found interesting was the pattern on the (Tek?) scope above the
>>rig.....must have an incredibly slow sweep setting and very long CRT
>>persistance to display 'CQ' in pulses from the key like that! < :o0
>
>Not necessarily!
>
>At 30 wpm, the displayed code requires a sweep time of about 1.2 sec

Sigh...STORAGE SCREEN oscilloscopes can hold a display for
as long as AC power is on. Most DSOs (Digital Storage
Oscilloscopes) can do the same thing, just refreshing the screen
constantly with the same sampling.

Tektronix had screen-memory models and now has DSOs, along
with John Fluke, LeCroy, and other companies. I thought you were
employed in electronics, TAFKA Rev. Jim?

I used a Memoscope (serial #14) in 1957, 47 years ago, for
accelerometer pickup waveform recording in environmental testing.
Not a biggie except to a crowd that knows only P4 phosphors.

beep bong

LHA / WMD

2591. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190546.21955.00000495@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87318

In article <1e4e3692.0402130559.46c02f71@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040211204212.21457.00003916@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>>
>> Not yet. They won't stop or admit they were EVER wrong, not
>> until the last code key is forcibly removed from the cold, dead
>> fingers of the last PCTA. Sigh.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I hope it doesn't come to that.

It already has. Many are already mentally dead and refuse to budge,
compromise or anything else on morse code testing. They keep
misspelling 'compromise' as "captitulation" to their opinions.

>Instead, they should cleanse their souls by explaining why they argued
>for maintaining the Morse Code Exam for HF access, and now how its a
>disincentive to CW use on HF. It just doesn't make sense to me.

They should go to confession and be rewarded with having to do 100
Hail Hirams as penance. Their afterlife will be better for them.

Or, they could repent and nail some theses to a church door. That
worked for Marty Luther a long time back.

I get the impression that some of these cold, dead finger souls equate
morse code testing with Latin and the need to use only Latin in talking
to God (who, in their beliefs, apparently loves morse). Marty didn't
think so and spoke regularly with the Big Boss Above, started a whole
reformation in Protestantism. Millions followed him over the centuries.

We now return all to the noise floor of independent thought, a no-no
to certain newsgroupies in here. :-)

LHA / WMD

2592. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190547.21955.00000496@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87313

In article <402CCDD7.6040304@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>
>> It happens that HPM did go to Washington for the stated purpose. ARRL
>> says that because it is factual. What have you done for amateur radio,
>> Leonard?
>
>Provide a noise floor in here? 8^)

No, an overall data/information "floor" to show that "facts" are not solely those of the selective-editing of facts (removal of information that is not in favor of the ARRL) from their "documentation."

The "noise floor" as you put it has already been raised to astronomical heights by the arrogant, uncompromising PCTAs who stoutly insist on the old ways such as the absolute necessity of testing for morse code in this new millennium of technological progress.

Independent thought is the bane of the fraternalists, the lifestylers, those who inhabit an imaginary world of their entire reason for being centered around the mighty morse machismo of seven decades ago.

If you have some kind of problem with "noise," then I would suggest you have this newsgroup CLOSED, moderated to let only the established thought rule the content. See Paul Schleck about having the newsgroup closed and inaccessible to anyone but those with the correct papers, checked at the door.

LHA / WMD

2593. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190548.21955.00000497@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87317

In article <AnCWb.1894$t16.1512708@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>We are not saying that the ARRL was the only thing that made this happen.

Yes you are. The evidence is the constant evangelical beliefs in the ARRL doing it all for hams in the USA.

>Simply that they were a significant player in the US and that the US was a >significant player in the world.

ARRL was a relative late-comer in national amateur radio organizations in the USA. They were incorporated in 1914. The very first, and still existing radio club in the USA is the Radio Club of America, organized in 1909.

>Without the ARRL, US amateurs would have had a much tougher time.

You are proposing a "what if" situation in an alternate universe. You have absolutely no verification of what you said above. It is your personal opinion and nothing more.

>If the US amateur community had been seriously >weakened, it would have affect to some degree the amateur community in the >rest of the world.

Probably so but do not elevate the ARRL to some kind of divine order of things. Remember that other organizations were already around before the ARRL and were remarking to the U.S. federal government concerning amateur radio. Many, many more citizens of the USA were involved in this new "radio" between 1909 and 1914 and that ALL, amateurs included, had very little technological knowledge or operational experience with "radio." You cannot believably "predict" these alternate universe conditions of then anymore than you can "predict" or even "know what will happen" due to regulation changes.

LHA / WMD

2594. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 00:05:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213190549.21955.00000498@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87320

In article <a8kl20dulql6fs91qc5p6ud6p74vc9u4o0@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>>What about the input from nonhams? Or is commentary limited to those already
>>licensed?
>
>As above, the post-WRC 03 changes would affect only those currently
>engaged in the hobby - I believe that no non-ham input has been
>requested at this time.

The code test requirements very much affect the "non-hams." Those
that do not care for any morse code test or those that cannot do any
sufficient morse would be affected in that they would not bother
trying to get a license grant.

Radio amateurs who have already achieved the top "upgrade" license
class in their country would NOT be affected in their privileges. Their
only "affect" is a psychological disturbance due to newcomers not
having to do exactly as they did many years ago.

I don't know that much about Industry Canada's charter in Canadian
law but the FCC is NOT required to provide psychological sustenance
to already-licensed radio amateurs.

At present, the majority expressed opinions of radio amateurs both
in here and elsewhere treat the hobby activity of amateur radio as a
glorified fraternal order insofar as requirements in law are concerned.
The FCC is not chartered as a fraternal order, is merely a radio
regulating agency.

Amateur radio is not a vital need or concern for any nation's security
or safety or well-being, regardless of the emotional spins turning
around from existing amateur fraternal orders. It is a fun hobby,
a relaxing (to most) avocation involving radio activity. Some poor
souls cannot be satisfied with anything but a fantasy mindset of ham
radio as an entire raison d'etre, a reason for existance. Those
mentalities will never be satisfied, cannot compromise in anything
unless all test for and be granted licenses exactly as they had to
endure once upon a time. They are outraged, fed up, cannot take it
anymore the minute anyone puts forth a change in regulations they
do not like.

If ALL the commentary on new regulations come only from already-
licensed amateurs, then this is NOT adhering to good democratic
principles of federal rule. It is merely going by very long established
tradition of the insular fraternal order ruling only itself by itself. That

is
fine for fraternal orders...except no amateur radio service in any
country that I'm familiar with requires their governments to regulate
amateur radio as or by fraternal order principles.

LHA / WMD

2595. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 01:06:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D749F.B72C704E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87321

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402D286F.311A8EC7@earthlink.net>...
> > Helmut wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > > news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > JJ wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > > > > >....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > > > > >good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
> > frequencies.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
> > is
> > > > > >TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > > > > >between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
> > allow any US
> > > > > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
> > > >
> > > > While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> > > > access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
> > > > 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.

>
> Never stopped you before. Go ahead and work 'em. ;^)

When I was operating from Europe or Africa, I never operated above 3.800
MHz. I am now in the U.S. where I may operate on 3.933. I frequently
choose not to do so.

> > > Yup, that's your baby!
> > > But you will never hear it cry!
> >
> > I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. Perhaps you meant, "Those
> > tomatoes won't be ripe until June" or "Brian sees Dave behind every tree

> > and rock".

> Dave, you crack me up.

Believe me, Brian, it is mutual. Your "Dave-as-Helmut" material is a scream. I don't post as anyone but me.

Dave K8MN

2596. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 01:14:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D767B.946CFA8C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87322

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4mXWb.2137$t16.1694038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Newcomers with any gumption can have some HF if they choose to pass the
> >code.
>
> Hoops. Jump through the hoops like good little doggies. Arf, arf.

You seem to have a problem passing exams required of others. No matter
and certainly no loss.

> As a newcomer to HF 51 years ago, I got on HF without needing one bit
> of morse code knowledge, skill, or anything else.

When and if you pass an amateur exam, you can be a newcomer to amateur
radio. Right now, if it is HF you want, you'll still have to climb that
5 wpm mountain.

> HF propagation hasn't changed since then. Solar cycles are still cycling.

That's right. I've enjoyed those cycles immensely.

> The only difference is that hams have solid-state toys now instead of
> glass, metal, and vacuum active devices. Some still insist on ON-OFF
> keying of their carriers, even with sophisticated radios that can do much
> more.

My solid state toy drives a pair of vacuum active devices. I'll use
whichever mode I desire as a radio amateur. You may do as you can.

I generally choose "on-off" keying rather than the more abrupt "ON-OFF".

Dave K8MN

2597. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 01:18:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D7780.3CB5116E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87323

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >No one commented on my proposal that I made earlier in the week. Perhaps
> >because it was hidden away in another thread (which I changed), or
> >perhaps it was stupid beyond belief.
> >
> >I'll post it again in hopes of some feedback.
>
> Did the FCC reject it?
>
> Ahem...this group, unbeknownst to them, doesn't make any regulations!
>
> Only demands.

You don't make regulations. You've commented to the FCC. Did you consider you comments as DEMANDS? You've commented here. Do you consider your comments as DEMANDS? Did the FCC reject your views? They certainly haven't been met with wild cheers here.

> Especially those about love, honor, and obeying morse code tradition.
>
> Forever.

What has any of that to do with you? You aren't involved. You're a bystander.

Dave K8MN

2598. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 01:27:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D7977.B263A1BD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87324

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
> >> Alun wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Another domino falls
> >>
> >> Was it the Germans again this time?
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >It was the Little Mermaid.
>
> Never mind correcting the god of radio, Brian.

I wish the several of you inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson would
come to a concensus on whether I am a god, the god or not a god of
radio.
There seems to be enormous disagreement among you. In a recent post, I
believe you refer to the ARRL as the god of radio.

> As a "key member" of the
> foreign service diplomatic community, he still thinks that Denmark is
> some kind of province of Germany.

It is "Foreign Service" and "Key Officer", Len. I don't believe that
Denmark is now a province of Germany. The last time Denmark was a
domino which fell, the German army marched right in.

> All kinds of smarts in the U.S.
> government these days.

There've always been "smarts" within the USG. I haven't been employed
by the USG for over three years. Do you ever get anything right?

> He doesn't know beloved fairy tales of Hans Christian Andersen, only
> the fairy tales of the ARRL (beloved by mighty macho morsemen).

I'm actually entertained by the tales of Len NoCode Anderson, never a
radio amateur, but he knew a few.

Dave K8MN

2599. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 01:29:41 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <qqrq205j4c42n8o11kuisds4ti7ipr2dun@4ax.com>
Source record: 87325

On 14 Feb 2004 00:05:49 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <a8kl20dulql6fs91qc5p6ud6p74vc9u4o0@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>>What about the input from nonhams? Or is commentary limited to those already
>>>licensed?
>>
>>As above, the post-WRC 03 changes would affect only those currently
>>engaged in the hobby - I believe that no non-ham input has been
>>requested at this time.
>
> The code test requirements very much affect the "non-hams." Those
> that do not care for any morse code test or those that cannot do any
> sufficient morse would be affected in that they would not bother
> trying to get a license grant.

Good point. I was thinking more of the impact of removing code (per
the WRC-03 decision) not having a (negative) impact. You are correct,
there would be an impact on non-hams should IC choose to retain code,
even though no longer required...I missed that possibility!

>
> Radio amateurs who have already achieved the top "upgrade" license
> class in their country would NOT be affected in their privileges. Their
> only "affect" is a psychological disturbance due to newcomers not
> having to do exactly as they did many years ago.

True as well. Those who achieved their license under a more rigorous
testing scheme will naturally see any reduction in testing
requirements as an erosion of standards, and will be offended by it.
That is simple human nature. Most affected by this are the folks at
the top level of licensing. Which makes sense - they put in the
greatest effort under the old system.

>
> I don't know that much about Industry Canada's charter in Canadian
> law but the FCC is NOT required to provide psychological sustenance
> to already-licensed radio amateurs.

Exactly the same in this regard. They regulate, not placate....

>
> At present, the majority expressed opinions of radio amateurs both
> in here and elsewhere treat the hobby activity of amateur radio as a
> glorified fraternal order insofar as requirements in law are concerned.

> The FCC is not chartered as a fraternal order, is merely a radio
> regulating agency.
>
> Amateur radio is not a vital need or concern for any nation's security
> or safety or well-being, regardless of the emotional spins turning
> around from existing amateur fraternal orders. It is a fun hobby,
> a relaxing (to most) avocation involving radio activity. Some poor
> souls cannot be satisfied with anything but a fantasy mindset of ham
> radio as an entire raison d'etre, a reason for existance. Those
> mentalities will never be satisfied, cannot compromise in anything
> unless all test for and be granted licenses exactly as they had to
> endure once upon a time. They are outraged, fed up, cannot take it
> anymore the minute anyone puts forth a change in regulations they
> do not like.

Yup - there is clearly a notion that everyone who is not subjected to
the same rigorous testing as they were years ago is somehow getting a
free ride. What isn't being adequately taken in to account are the
underlying reasons for simplification, elimination or change of the
various test elements.

>
> If ALL the commentary on new regulations come only from already-
> licensed amateurs, then this is NOT adhering to good democratic
> principles of federal rule. It is merely going by very long established
> tradition of the insular fraternal order ruling only itself by itself. That
>is
> fine for fraternal orders...except no amateur radio service in any
> country that I'm familiar with requires their governments to regulate
> amateur radio as or by fraternal order principles.

I believe that IC was simply giving the amateur community first chance
to voice their opinion - not from the perspective of a closed shop per
se, but because they wanted to hear the opinions of those currently
involved in the hobby before they decided what to do next. I'm no
expert in the inner workings of the government here, but I believe
that NPRM is the next step, and public comment is requested at that
stage.

Remember, with no incentive licensing scheme here, the perception of a
'class structure' of a hierarchical nature is not nearly as prevalent.
Most of the folks I have talked to welcome the elimination of code
testing - after all, it isn;t code that is being eliminated, just the
mandatory practical test - which only survived as far as 2003 because
of the ITU requirements. In the poll submitted from the amateur
community to IC, almost two thirds of the lecensed amateurs here want
code testing dropped from our requirements! Approximately the opposite
of the ARRL numbers bandied about here....

BTW, a question - does the FCC operate based entirely upon democratic
principles? From what I'm hearing on the group, specifically WRT
incentive licensing several years ago, they seemed to ignore the will

of the majority and come up with something on their own.....which seems to have annoyed everyone. Oh well, at least they got everyone to agree on something!

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

2600. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 01:35:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402D7B66.ED21ED10@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87326

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <402CCDD7.6040304@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> >> It happens that HPM did go to Washington for the stated purpose. ARRL
> >> says that because it is factual. What have you done for amateur radio,
> >> Leonard?
> >
> >Provide a noise floor in here? 8^)
>
> No, an overall data/information "floor" to show that "facts" are not solely
> those of the selective-editing of facts (removal of information that is not
> in favor of the ARRL) from their "documentation."
>
> The "noise floor" as you put it has already been raised to astronomical
> heights by the arrogant, uncompromising PCTAs who stoutly insist on
> the old ways such as the absolute necessity of testing for morse code
> in this new millennium of technological progress.

Just as an aside to you, Len: I find you arrogant and uncompromising.
No one here can possibly know as much or have done as much as you. You
leave no room for compromise on the issue of morse testing, having only
its abolition as your desired end result.

> Independent thought is the bane of the fraternalists, the lifestylers,
> those who inhabit an imaginary world of their entire reason for being
> centered around the mighty morse machismo of seven decades ago.

Talk about your imaginary worlds! Aren't you the guy who has appointed
himself an advocate for removal of morse testing in the amateur radio
service in which you are not a participant. Give my best to the rest of
the Mitty clan, Walter.

What's it to you, Len? You aren't involved.

Dave K8MN

2601. Re: KB3EIA proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 02:11:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213211125.06226.00002933@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87329

In article <402CF685.1030101@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <402BA3B0.10306@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>> The present system is not "broken" It doesn't need fixed. It is what it
>>>is, and is just one of those things that grew up over the years.

>> I think it needs a bit of tweaking, but not a fullscale makeover as some
>> seem to think.
>
> Agreed! Most proposals I have seen have been either too radical or too
>complicated.
>
And tick off too many people.

>>>When
>>>Morse code was ascendant, there was a need for multiple license classes,
>>>since Morse is one of those skills that takes time to hone, and it made
>>>sense then to have a rank beginner level, and work up from there.

>> I'm not sure what you mean by "Morse code was ascendant" - can you explain
>> a bit more?
>
>At one time, if you were going to be a Ham, you were almost certain to
>be using Morse CW as a major part of your Operating activities.

That was a long long time ago, Mike.

You can go back to the late 1940s or further and read histories of hams who got
their
Class B or C tickets and promptly went on 'phone from the getgo. Some were on
VHF/UHF,
some on 10-11 meters. Many quickly went for their Class A so they could do 75
and 20
'phone as well. (There was a one-year wait for Class A, but it required the
same 13 wpm code test).

There used to be a requirement that a ham actually operate Morse for a certain
amount of time in the months before renewing, but that was changed to simply
"operating" (any mode) about 1948 and eventually dropped altogether. And
"operating" could theoretically consist of just calling CQ...

>There
>was a time when the two major alternatives were AM or CW.

Yep - but except as noted above, there was no requirement to use either. And while CW equipment gets the most out of the simplest, AM can be pretty simple too. For example, back in the old 5 and 2-1/2 meter days, 3 tube "transceivers" were popular with hams. These consisted of a 3 tube rig: one tube functioned as a superregenerative detector on receive, and a modulated oscillator on transmit. The other 2 tubes were a 2 stage aduio amplifier, used as the audio chain on receive and the modulator on transmit. With a dynamotor or vibrapack, could be used mobile, and with a decent antenna, one could work all over a metro area and then some.

AM on HF cost more than an equivalent CW rig, of course, but with warsurplus parts and low power the difference wasn't prohibitive for many hams, particularly if they were satisfied with low power.

>
>> I would say that *any* knowledge or skill requires time to develop, whether
>> it's theory knowledge,
>> practical radio knowhow or Morse skills. Thus, there will still be a need
>> for several license classes.
>> I think there should be more levels than three, but FCC's action in 1999
>> makes it clear that's
>> probably a lost cause. So three classes it is:
>>
>> One that's easy to get so that people can get started without having to
>> learn
>> everything in one go
>> One that gives full privileges and requires some serious knowledge
>> One intermediate step so that it's not a huge jump.
>>
>>> This is the system we have however, and we tinker with it at our own
>>>peril. We do not want to remove privileges, nor do we want to increase
>>>privileges without any testing. The reduction issue seems to have been
>>>proven by the Incentive licensing problem in the 60's, and giving away
>>>free upgrades will only serve to anger people in the other direction.
>>
>>
>> I agree 100%! Indeed, there is still criticism of the IL plan 36 years
>> after it
>> was put in place, and in many places from people who did not become hams
>> until long
>> after it was in effect!
>
> One of these days I might come to the conclusion that there are a lot
>of cranky hams out there! ;^)
>
Only on the internet.

>>> It is a foolish system that angers people on purpose. You don't anger
>>>those who are your friends, you anger your enemies.

>> Better yet, you render your enemies ineffective. But most of all you don't
>> anger your friends unnecessarily.
>>

>>> To have a Morse code test for entry into HF is not going to happen, and
>>>to have a Morse code test for Amateur Extra doesn't make sense, given
>>>that the Extra is the highest level license, and Morse code was at one
>>>time required for the lowest level, Novice. There is a big disconnect
>>>there.

>> I disagree!

>> Given the popularity of Morse code in amateur radio, it makes no sense to
>> not
>> have it be a part of the testing for a license. Imagine if there were no
>> questions on SSB
>> in the tests - would that make sense?
>
>In the testing, yes, but I think a Fail Element 1 = no license is simply
> a dog that isn't going to hunt.

No dog will hunt if nobody even asks it to. If we simply roll over and play
dead,
who can blame FCC if they simply drop Element 1?

>> The Morse Code test has been portrayed as the boogieman, as if it is the
>> source
>> of all of amateur radio's problems. Yet there is no proof of these claims.
>
> It isn't the boogieman!

Exactly.

>That's just an excuse for lack of effort (the
>same thing Larry accuses me of!) We've already seen that some prime
>agitators for elimination of Element one are now taking the next step
>and supporting a radical easing of the writtens.

And just as I predicted, they're using the same arguments used against the code
test.

> Nothing is easy enough. Remember what I said about the direction of the

>tide some months back? I haven't seen anything to suggest I was wrong.

Nor I. But that doesn't mean we have to simply accept it. I don't.

>>> I therefore propose a system that is quite like what we have now.
>>>Technician, General, and Amateur Extra. Privileges the same.

>> This means all Techs have VHF/UHF only?
>
>Yup. And it's a good idea. Gives those that might want to be on HF some
>incentive, and they neither gain or lose privileges. Did everyone know
>that there are Technicians out there that are perfectly happy with what
>they have now?

Sure - been that way since 1951.
>
>>> The two orphan classes, Tech plus and Advanced, will remain where they
>>>are, with privileges staying the same.
>
>> What about Novice?
>
> Oops, forgot the Novices. Yeah, they would retain the privileges they
>have now. I really don't know how many people this will really affect.
>Probably not too many active Novices any more.

There are more now than when I was one...

>>> After the changeover, the new testing regimen will be:
>>>
>>> Technician: heavy on RF safety, Light on electronics theory. Some
>>>questions related to the VHF and UHF where the tech's will largely
>>>operate The technician is considered a preparatory license, and will
>>>give a good base of how to get on the air without frying yourself in the
>>>process.
>>
>> Perhaps, but what that does is to funnel newcomers into VHF/UHF rather than
>> HF.
>> And since VHF/UHF gear tends to be harder to homebrew and more complex than
>> HF
>> equipment, it tends to funnel newcomers to manufactured equipment. Also,
>> since there is
>> relatively little use of Morse Code for casual operating on VHF/UHF, it
>> tends to funnel newcomers
>> to FM voice operation.
>
> Remember they will still have 6 meter operation available to them.

Sure - but how often does 6 open up when the spots are down? How easy is it to build a 6 meter rig from scratch? How much routine, slow CW ragchewing is there on 6?

>But
>I still like this because it is an incentive to upgrade. And with no
>Element 1, what is the impedance to upgrading?

The written!

My point in the "funnel" stuff is that many people are heavily influenced by first impressions. If they see hamshacks full of gear Made In Japan, that's "normal" to them. If they think of ham radio as being local voice stuff using FM, that's "normal". If they think of antennas as being little aluminum things...you get the idea.

But if they start out with a wider range of choices...

>>> General: General test will scale back on the RF safety, and replace it
>>>with more theory. Antenna questions and operating procedures. The never
>>>entertaining band edge questions will get a few more questions.

>> Needs to have some serious HF centric stuff, though.
>
> Good point. Consider it added.

Done

>>> Extra: more in depth treatment of theory. No band edge or safety
>>>questions, at this point, if you don't know safety, you've already fried
>>>your mind. questions demonstrating knowledge of different modes.

>>> The only controversial part of my proposal is that there would be a 2
>>>year wait between General and Extra. I could be persuaded to drop that
>>>pretty easily!

>> I'd say the experience requirements should be included.

> Yippee! Got one person on board with that one! I really do think it's a

>good idea, and it doesn't unduly punish anyone.

Some will say it does on the following grounds:

1) New ham has to attend at least 2 VE sessions. Can't get the Extra "right out of the box". More work for ham and VEs

2) 2 years wait doesn't mean 2 years experience. License could just sit in a drawer for 2 years.

3) Vanity calls

4) Perceived as a raising of requirements - hasn't been an experience requirement since the mid 1970s.
>
>>> Bands and sub bands:
>>>
>>> At this point, the bands will remain the same. Bandplan adjustments
>>>will be made. Novice sections will remain, and will be considered a
>>>"practice ground" for those who want to learn Morse code. note: this may
>>>actually be a way to kick start Morse code use.

>> I don't see the need for that. Better to open up some of the lower part of
>> the
>> bands for newcomers to use Morse.
>>
>> The natural tendency is for Morse to be at the bottom of the band, data in
>> the
>> middle, and 'phone at the top. Rather than fight that trend, the newcomer
>> segments should reinforce it.
>>
>> The Novice subbands were originally put in the middle of their bands in a
>> misguided effort to keep them from straying outside the band edges. Since
>> Novices were originally required to use crystal control, this made little
>> sense even in 1951.
>>
This was one of the worst features of the old Novice. None of the Novice slots

were harmonically related, so you needed a different set of xtals for each band. Indeed, the harmonics of the old 80 and 40 meter Novice segments were completely outside the ham bands (except 10 meters) Woe to the Novice who forgot and left a 40 meter rock in the rig and shifted to 15, or left an 80 meter xtal and shifted to 40! the rig would tune up just fine but be out of band!

>>> So there you have it. Here is a plan that shouldn't p**s anyone off
>>>that isn't *already* mad about something, and as far as I can see, it's
>>>major disadvantage is that it isn't glamorous or exciting.
>>>
>>> Is it the "ideal" plan?* Heck no! But it accomplishes moving past the
>>>Morse code issue with a minimum of disruption, and has the side benefit
>>>that we know it will work.
>>>
>>> Comments?
>>
>> I agree that massive changes and giveaways are a bad idea.
>>
>> However, I think that one of the problems today is that the entry-level
>> license
>> is too VHF/UHF/voice/applicane operator-centric.
>> The entry level license should offer a wide selection of bands and modes,
>> rather than what we have now where newcomers get all of VHF/UHF but no HF.
>
> I'm still big on the idea of a person having a good reason to upgrade.

That reason should be things like more power and more spectrum. Not HF vs. VHF/UHF.

>This does it, and allows a real entry level opportunity for people, yet
>allows a niche for those who are happy to stay there. And there will be
>plenty of people that will be happy to stay there.
>
> Without a real reason to upgrade, I can't really support a three class
>system. I don't think that there are enough different privileges to
>offer between three classes, unless you make one of the privileges HF
>access.

See my three class idea of some posts back.

> And I can't really support power limits as a incentive to upgrade. It's

>a forced distinction (keeping in mind that all distinctions are
>arbitrary at some level) that I do not find acceptable.

Why not? The old Novice had a power limit of only 75 watts input. My first rig (the Southgate Type 1) ran 10-15 watts input on 80, and would light a Christmas tree bulb to full brilliance when tuned up right. Yet I made lots of QSOs and had lots of fun.
>
> RF safety and safety around high voltages is of critical importance for

>amateurs. The RF field calculations are one thing, but to me even more
>important is the potential for RF burns and B+ shocks.

All the more reason for power level as an incentive.

The power supply for the Type 1 was the cut-down chassis of an old Philco TV set. 250 watt power transformer, 5U4 rectifier, big capacitors and choke. I had enough sense at 13 not to get zapped.

> The Technician is exposed to these dangers at events such as Field day
>or contesting with other hams - I know I was.

For me the big danger was falling out of trees while putting up antennas. Never did, though.

> And while a Unlicensed person may be operating the equipment too, they
>are much more likely to be afraid to touch anything but the PTT switch.
>The Technician will be more likely to be careless through familiarity.

Again - all the more reason to have power level as an incentive.
>
> I cannot in good conscience support a testing regimen that does not
>test extensively for safety at the base level. And since the newly
>minted Ham would have the knowledge of High-power levels and high
>voltage, to limit them to low power would be arbitrary and punitive.

There's no test for working on 110/220 house current, which will easily kill you stone cold dead.
>
> So that is my rationale for a system that has three classes, HF access
>for two of them, and doesn't penalize or overly promote anyone.
>
Which is pretty close to what we have now!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2602. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 02:11:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213211126.06226.00002934@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87328

In article <gvkp20tgu3fh11c5b3d0if2jgcvniu304e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>Agreed - but at a sweep of 1.2 seconds, the phosphor would need to
>have a pretty long persistance to make a nice even display like the
>one pictured.......bright, too!

Long exposure on the camera, that's all. I once did an 8 hour time exposure...
>
>My Tek 465 can't do that - where can I buy one of those? :)

P7 in an old Dumont will do the job.

Of course it's probably just photoshopped. Like what they did to Google on
fark.com

73 de Jim, N2EY

2603. Re: ARRL QST: Build a Morse Code Bong

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 02:11:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213211127.06226.00002935@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87327

In article <402CCD60.8050300@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Can a person even do 30 wpm with one of those?

Maybe. Can't use it in iambic mode, tho......

>I didn't read the article yet, but that seems pretty fast.

30 isn't so fast....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2604. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 02:14:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <z42dnbJWFNEUGLDdRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87330

William wrote:

> BPL is not allowed to interfere with your amateur communications.
> Would you have it any other way?
>
> bb

Ah so naive, that is what they say now; just wait, if it starts to make big money, that will change. You really don't think they are going to take BPL down just to avoid interference to hams do you?

2605. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [inappropriate callsign deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 03:40:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040213224024.12501.00006189@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87331

In article <5aOdncGrVq2_arvdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> I would point out that *most* kids, beaten or not, will not grow up to be
>> serial killers. But the legacy of violence plays out in other ways.
>
>Very true! There have been children that have been abused that turn out
>fine, and those with tranquil lives that turn out terrible. What the
>discipline or lack of it will do is bring out latent problems.

There's an old saying that goes something like:

"The battle does not always go to the strong
Nor the race to the swift.
But that's the way to bet!"

> The really whacked ones will be that way regardless.

Maybe, but they are relatively few. Point it that there are plenty of whackos
who could have been pretty normal if they'd been raised better.

And what reason can there be to intentionally make a child miserable?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2606. BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 03:48:06 UTC
From: Keith <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM>
Message-ID: <102r6jm7qeeif5@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 87332
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Broadband over Power Lines has been approved for a NPRM by the full 5
commissioners of the FCC. What this means for all short wave listeners
is that once BPL is deployed a SWL is not protected by any
interference caused by BPL transmissions. SWL's use part 15 devices and
most accept any interference.
If BPL interfered with local Radio or TV broadcast then the
licensee of those stations could complain, however I doubt
if any SWL in America will be able to get a international
broadcaster to complain to a utility company about BPL interference.
Basically this could lead to the death of shortwave listening and
ham radio is equally threatened.
Ham radio and CB operators will face irate neighbors
who have their BPL Internet connection interfered with by
transmissions. I can easily see enraged neighbors calling
their congress person complaining about the 'CBer' wiping
out all the Internet connections in their neighborhoods
and congress quickly passing a law placing the burden on
the Ham Radio and CB Operator not to interfere with Internet BPL.
The FCC has allowed the beginning of the end of HF operation
by allowing BPL to use HF frequencies.

IMHO

--
Best Regards, Keith
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
http://linux.com http://freebsd.org http://apple.com

2607. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 04:54:17 UTC
From: Maximus <nomail@here.com>
Message-ID: <ZRhXb.3389$WW3.1211@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It may work, but I question how well. One reason for granting permission is to extend internet to rural areas that can't be served by conventinal means. This Summer may prove whether it will be feasible or not. If the energy grid goes down, no one will be surfing on power lines. There is concern about the stability of the power grid and its vulnerability to terrorists and wackos. I question surfers' personal safety and security using a power line setup. I already have a great deal of interefernce all up and down the bands from some sort of constant computer signal in the area - power line transmission does not turn me on. It seems like recycling old rickety infrastucture to use new technology whose needs are not going to be well met by a means of transmission that is insecure and unreliable. Beside that, increasing the traffic on circuits already maxed out by spam and hackers is going to do nothing good to existing users of the internet. The Service Providers already lack sufficient bandwidth, and increasing traffic will not improve service if the providers cannot provide enough servers and secure enough transmission lines. To crash a program or a computer it is only necessary to gable enough ones and zeros - maybe even just one.

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM> wrote in message
news:102r6jm7qeeif5@news.supernews.com...
> Broadband over Power Lines has been approved for a NPRM by the full 5
> commissioners of the FCC. What this means for all short wave listeners
> is that once BPL is deployed a SWL is not protected by any
> interference caused by BPL transmissions. SWL's use part 15 devices and
> most accept any interference.
> If BPL interfered with local Radio or TV broadcast then the
> licensee of those stations could complain, however I doubt
> if any SWL in America will be able to get a international
> broadcaster to complain to a utility company about BPL interference.
> Basically this could lead to the death of shortwave listening and
> ham radio is equally threatened.
> Ham radio and CB operators will face irate neighbors
> who have their BPL Internet connection interfered with by
> transmissions. I can easily see enraged neighbors calling
> their congress person complaining about the 'CBer' wiping
> out all the Internet connections in their neighborhoods
> and congress quickly passing a law placing the burden on
> the Ham Radio and CB Operator not to interfere with Internet BPL.
> The FCC has allowed the beginning of the end of HF operation
> by allowing BPL to use HF frequencies.
>
> IMHO
>

> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> http://linux.com http://freebsd.org http://apple.com

2608. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 05:09:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214000948.11422.00002145@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87334

Well the way I look at it is, that if it makes the spectrum useless, then I will use my gear for nothing more than a 24 Hour Beacon. Which in turn should make BPL pretty much useless. Not worried about the neighbors, the will never know whats causing there service to fail, and sooner than latter they will drop the Service.

2609. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 05:23:48 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <EhiXb.18027$4f.14979@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 87335
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Keith,

Don't worry about the neighbors on this one. This could indeed become a tacky situation. Since amateurs are supposed to used the minimum amount of power for reliable communications, some coordination via the internet/telephone may be in order. You pick a frequency with a lot of interference from BPL. This means that both ends will have to use substantial power. Where there is an egress, there also exists an ingress; i.e., amateur transmissions will cause problems for BPL. At this point, complaints may well be made. The amateur will also have to enter a complaint. At this point, push is gonna come to shove. I suspect that some government/public communications will also have a problem. Obviously, they don't want to run much up into VHF or there would be a *ton* of problems, but there will have to be a point that someone either says we need reasonable coordination and protection - or - to heck with it, big money gets everything. Notice how (at least in my newspaper today) they are starting to talk about cutting social security? Not because it is going broke; rather, because the feds are 'borrowing' these funds to keep the deficite only rediculous rather than insane. The feds have to pay it back (and they already want to welch on it). It is about time that we see in print what the government *really* wants.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM> wrote in message
news:102r6jm7qeeif5@news.supernews.com...
> Broadband over Power Lines has been approved for a NPRM by the full 5
> commissioners of the FCC. What this means for all short wave listeners
> is that once BPL is deployed a SWL is not protected by any
> interference caused by BPL transmissions. SWL's use part 15 devices and
> most accept any interference.
> If BPL interfered with local Radio or TV broadcast then the
> licensee of those stations could complain, however I doubt
> if any SWL in America will be able to get a international
> broadcaster to complain to a utility company about BPL interference.
> Basically this could lead to the death of shortwave listening and
> ham radio is equally threatened.
> Ham radio and CB operators will face irate neighbors
> who have their BPL Internet connection interfered with by
> transmissions. I can easily see enraged neighbors calling
> their congress person complaining about the 'CBer' wiping
> out all the Internet connections in their neighborhoods
> and congress quickly passing a law placing the burden on

> the Ham Radio and CB Operator not to interfere with Internet BPL.
> The FCC has allowed the beginning of the end of HF operation
> by allowing BPL to use HF frequencies.
>
> IMHO
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> http://linux.com http://freebsd.org http://apple.com

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.588 / Virus Database: 372 - Release Date: 2/13/04

2610. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 07:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214021045.23307.00006597@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 87336

In article <qqrq205j4c42n8o11kuisds4ti7ipr2dun@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 14 Feb 2004 00:05:49 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <a8kl20dulql6fs91qc5p6ud6p74vc9u4o0@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>>What about the input from nonhams? Or is commentary limited to those
>already
>>>>licensed?
>>>
>>>As above, the post-WRC 03 changes would affect only those currently
>>>engaged in the hobby - I believe that no non-ham input has been
>>>requested at this time.
>>
>> The code test requirements very much affect the "non-hams." Those
>> that do not care for any morse code test or those that cannot do any
>> sufficient morse would be affected in that they would not bother
>> trying to get a license grant.
>
>Good point. I was thinking more of the impact of removing code (per
>the WRC-03 decision) not having a (negative) impact. You are correct,
>there would be an impact on non-hams should IC choose to retain code,
>even though no longer required...I missed that possibility!

I should have written "non-hams considering getting a license."
There are a couple of newsgroupies in here who demand adoration
and dedication to the 'service' which they equate to 'interest.' :-)

Few radio amateurs consider the whole of amateur radio. Their
activity is intensely personal, one-on-one with their radio. If using
morse then they are devoid of normal human clues to the other
contact's whole personality...no visuals, no voice tone, no clues to
gender, no real sense of emotion of the other. Voice mode is better
with normal voice clues to the other party. During all contacts on
the radio they remain in a relatively isolated spectral bandwidth even
if netted with several others. There is sufficiently long time for the
mind to imagine many things about the 'service,' to expand far from
its reality into realms of fantasy greatness.

The major identification with the entirety of any national radio activity
is publications of a special-interest nature. To a rather large extent
in the USA, the ARRL uses their text to build upon the imagination of

its readers, to identify with it. That lends reinforcement of the imaginary grouping, provides a "sense of belonging" otherwise not happening in radio use or even in a home workshop by themselves building something.

As a result of this insular activity having little in the way of regular human interaction with others, the individual amateur will use their own experiences in the hobby as a basis of what others are expected to do. The self-identification of personal desire with what should be (in their minds) for others does not make a reasonable consideration of future regulations that affect many, many others, including those not yet licensed in amateur radio.

What adds to the unreasonableness is the ignorance of what other radio services are doing and there being a great number of different radio 'service' people using, maintaining, designing non-amateur radios. The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own ignorance. All radios work by the same laws of physics. Human made legislation does not change the way a 'service's' radio works or that a non-amateur entering amateur radio be considered a "beginner." [I am certain there are Canadians as unreasonable as our esteamed robustness, Heil]

There is another factor which is common to those amateurs not engaged in a radio-specific occupation...that the state of the art of everything in amateur remain rooted in the familiar they know. That's almost impossible since radio is only 107 years old and the technology involved has been advancing in large plateau jumps all the while. That is true of all electronics-related fields of work. They want the state of the art to be fixed so they can enjoy what they found emotionally satisfying long ago when they reached their personal best in the hobby. Others of the modern day are little interested in meeting antiquated standards of entering amateur radio.

>> Radio amateurs who have already achieved the top "upgrade" license
>> class in their country would NOT be affected in their privileges. Their
>> only "affect" is a psychological disturbance due to newcomers not
>> having to do exactly as they did many years ago.
>
>True as well. Those who achieved their license under a more rigorous
>testing scheme will naturally see any reduction in testing
>requirements as an erosion of standards, and will be offended by it.
>That is simple human nature. Most affected by this are the folks at
>the top level of licensing. Which makes sense - they put in the
>greatest effort under the old system.

Add to that the uncertainty of understanding modern radio, other than the emotionally-loaded advertisements for amateur radio equipment and to use that to be one up on their fellows.

That "simple human nature" aspect can alienate them in the eyes of others. Some of those do not profess to care citing their long tenure and alleged self-worthiness. Those are just trying to put "greatness"

in the hobby activity by using themselves as top-level role models.

>> I don't know that much about Industry Canada's charter in Canadian
>> law but the FCC is NOT required to provide psychological sustenance
>> to already-licensed radio amateurs.
>
>Exactly the same in this regard. They regulate, not placate....

Placation is for the membership organizations. In the USA the ARRL
tries to pose as a second-level "government." They are not but decades
of propaganda have created a large following of Believers. It works very
well for the ARRL; the propaganda is self-serving survival activity but
Believers in the league will not believe they have been brainwashed. :-)

>> At present, the majority expressed opinions of radio amateurs both
>> in here and elsewhere treat the hobby activity of amateur radio as a
>> glorified fraternal order insofar as requirements in law are concerned.
>> The FCC is not chartered as a fraternal order, is merely a radio
>> regulating agency.
>>
>> Amateur radio is not a vital need or concern for any nation's security
>> or safety or well-being, regardless of the emotional spins turning
>> around from existing amateur fraternal orders. It is a fun hobby,
>> a relaxing (to most) avocation involving radio activity. Some poor
>> souls cannot be satisfied with anything but a fantasy mindset of ham
>> radio as an entire raison d'etre, a reason for existance. Those
>> mentalities will never be satisfied, cannot compromise in anything
>> unless all test for and be granted licenses exactly as they had to
>> endure once upon a time. They are outraged, fed up, cannot take it
>> anymore the minute anyone puts forth a change in regulations they
>> do not like.
>
>Yup - there is clearly a notion that everyone who is not subjected to
>the same rigorous testing as they were years ago is somehow getting a
>free ride. What isn't being adequately taken in to account are the
>underlying reasons for simplification, elimination or change of the
>various test elements.

Much of that resentment is strictly personal, about themselves. Such
clouds judgement on what might be good for all, especially those not
yet licensed.

What has been stable, or relatively so over the years is known,
familiar. Such stability can be comforting. Change, newness is to be
avoided since an unknown condition can cause much anxiety. Then
too, personal rank, status, title might lessen if regulations change to
remove some of that.

>I believe that IC was simply giving the amateur community first chance
>to voice their opinion - not from the perspective of a closed shop per
>se, but because they wanted to hear the opinions of those currently
>involved in the hobby before they decided what to do next. I'm no

>expert in the inner workings of the government here, but I believe
>that NPRM is the next step, and public comment is requested at that
>stage.

I see little wrong with that to get an INITIAL opinion by any regulator.
I see lots wrong with it if the regulators do not hear from others prior
to decisions.

>Remember, with no incentive licensing scheme here, the perception of a
>'class structure' of a hierarchical nature is not nearly as prevalent.
>Most of the folks I have talked to welcome the elimination of code
>testing - after all, it isn;t code that is being eliminated, just the
>mandatory practical test - which only survived as far as 2003 because
>of the ITU requirements. In the poll submitted from the amateur
>community to IC, almost two thirds of the lecensed amateurs here want
>code testing dropped from our requirements! Approximately the opposite
>of the ARRL numbers bandied about here....

The decades of propaganda by the ARRL is showing up in the un-
swerving Belief that the old ways are still supposed to be best. Part of
that (on the part of ARRL) has been the catering to the insularity of
amateurs, of keeping the status as much quo as possible so as not
to upset the old-time amateur membership.

>BTW, a question - does the FCC operate based entirely upon democratic
>principles?

Fairly well. Everything they receive in text is put on public view, even
the "sunshine" commentary on NOI 03-104, the FCC thing on BPL.

"Sunshine" things are for public viewing but are not supposed to be
used by FCC on regulatory matters. [I have no idea how the name came
to be] On the BPL NOI, of 5,199 documents, 8 are in the "sunshine"
category. One of those 8 is from a Canadian. :-)

The FCC openly invites the public to communicate...and they get a LOT
of communications about all of USA civil radio. That includes letters and
other communications from federal elected officers who are forwarding
complaints from their constituents to the FCC. It is all out in the open
except for a very few legal matters, almost all legal action documentation
which does not concern regulatory legislation.

By the way, it is quite possible that the FCC was all for BPL from the
first. The NOI or Notice of Inquiry was NOT about whether or not the
service should exist...the Notice Of Inquiry was for the purposes of
determining what the standards of RFI should be. Almost none of the
5,199 documents submitted any such standards or levels. :-) All were
caught up in a wildfire confligration of opinion saying "BPL is BAD!"

The FCC has had an intenal program to improve rural America's tie to
the Internet. BPL would fit right in with that noble goal. Connection to
the Internet over existing power lines involves very, very little additional
cost to anyone. Almost no one has bothered to think of that side of the

equation.

>From what I'm hearing on the group, specifically WRT
>incentive licensing several years ago, they seemed to ignore the will
>of the majority and come up with something on their own.....which
>seems to have annoyed everyone. Oh well, at least they got everyone
>to agree on something!

Sigh. More human nature. Since certain sides didn't get their way,
they quaff the juice of fermented spoiled grapes...they whine before
the time. :-)

Many demand that the "majority" of anything do as they do or that
what they do IS what the "majority" does. They are absolutely,
poselutely for-sure knowing such, cannot be considered otherwise.

The caste system of the "IL" or Incentive Licensing definitely exists
in USA amateur radio and continues today. It fits to a T the notion of
(or desire of) some who NEED some way to show they are "better
than others" through some sort of federal whatsis. Now that Internet
has robbed much of the ARRL's monopoly on communications direct
with the FCC, the FCC might be seeing a different picture of what
the feelings are in USA amateur radio.

ARRL still doesn't have more than a quarter of all USA licensees as
members. They were always a minority group but had sufficent income
from publication profits to afford legal counsel and a lobbying company
in Washington, DC. At one time back the FCC just rubber-stamped
what the ARRL wanted. Not so anymore.

LHA / WMD

2611. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 08:01:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402140001.392ee5b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87337
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Keith <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM> wrote in message
news:<102r6jm7qeeif5@news.supernews.com>...
> Broadband over Power Lines has been approved for a NPRM by the full 5
> commissioners of the FCC. What this means for all short wave listeners
> is that once BPL is deployed a SWL is not protected by any
> interference caused by BPL transmissions. SWL's use part 15 devices and
> most accept any interference.
> If BPL interfered with local Radio or TV broadcast then the
> licensee of those stations could complain, however I doubt
> if any SWL in America will be able to get a international
> broadcaster to complain to a utility company about BPL interference.
> Basically this could lead to the death of shortwave listening and
> ham radio is equally threatened.
> Ham radio and CB operators will face irate neighbors
> who have their BPL Internet connection interfered with by
> transmissions. I can easily see enraged neighbors calling
> their congress person complaining about the 'CBer' wiping
> out all the Internet connections in their neighborhoods
> and congress quickly passing a law placing the burden on
> the Ham Radio and CB Operator not to interfere with Internet BPL.
> The FCC has allowed the beginning of the end of HF operation
> by allowing BPL to use HF frequencies.
>
> IMHO

WRONG but never mind.

w3rv

2612. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 13:02:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <30pXb.2360$t16.1953873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Maximus" <nomail@here.com> wrote in message
news:ZRhXb.3389$WW3.1211@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> It may work, but I question how well. One reason for granting permission
is
> to extend internet to rural areas that can't be served by conventinal
means.

Serving the rural areas happens to be the biggest marketing lie in the whole mess. It won't be econmically feasible in the rural areas. There simply are not enough customers per square mile to justify the amount of equipment (e.g. signal boosters and transformer bypasses) that will have to be installed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2613. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:05:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402140605.27a12e4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87339

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040214000948.11422.00002145@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> Well the way I look at it is, that if it makes the spectrum useless, then I
> will use my gear for nothing more than a 24 Hour Beacon. Which in turn should
> make BPL pretty much useless. Not worried about the neighbors, the will never
> know whats causing there service to fail, and sooner than latter they will drop
> the Service.

But, Bruce, you're not on HF. You said so yourself.

2614. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:13:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402140613.6533ff03@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87340

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040213190545.21955.00000494@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
> >> Alun wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Another domino falls
> >>
> >> Was it the Germans again this time?
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >>
> >It was the Little Mermaid.
>
> Never mind correcting the god of radio, Brian. As a "key member" of the
> foreign service diplomatic community, he still thinks that Denmark is
> some kind of province of Germany. All kinds of smarts in the U.S.
> government these days.
>
> He doesn't know beloved fairy tales of Hans Christian Andersen, only
> the fairy tales of the ARRL (beloved by mighty macho morsemen).
>
> LHA / WMD

Yes, yes, I'm sure the Nazi's have infiltrated the Danish Ministry of Communications and caused such an important domino to fall into uselessness.

Why is it that Dave can mention Nazi agression, but no one else?

2615. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:17:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402140617.127279c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87341

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402D749F.B72C704E@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402D286F.311A8EC7@earthlink.net>...
> > > Helmut wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > > > news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > JJ wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > > > > > >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > > > > > >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
> frequencies.
> > > > > > >>
> > > > > > >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
> is
> > > > > > >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > > > > > >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
> allow any US
> > > > > > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
> > > > >
> > > > > While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> > > > > access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
> > > > > 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.
> >
> > Never stopped you before. Go ahead and work 'em. ;^)
>
> When I was operating from Europe or Africa, I never operated above 3.800
> MHz. I am now in the U.S. where I may operate on 3.933. I frequently
> choose not to do so.

Amazing that you can show restraint when operating under a US license.

> > > Yup, that's your baby!
> > > But you will never hear it cry!

> > >
> > > I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. Perhaps you meant, "Those
> > > tomatoes won't be ripe until June" or "Brian sees Dave behind every tree
> > > and rock".
>
> > Dave, you crack me up.
>
> Believe me, Brian, it is mutual. Your "Dave-as-Helmut" material is a
> scream. I don't post as anyone but me.

Poor Helmut. Thinks I complimented him.

2616. Re: TAFKA Rev Jim used to prefer disincentives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:18:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402140618.ffef611@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87342

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040213190543.21955.00000491@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402130552.4b3df6f6@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040211204210.21457.00003914@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402111602.8cd2c41@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040211015633.29660.00002865@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <1e4e3692.0402101841.26c4befc@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >> C'mon, Jim, do you really expect us to believe that the Morse Code
> >> >> >> exam is a disincentive to using CW on HF?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >"We've got a bleeder!"
> >> >> >
> >> >> >from: When Harry Met Sally
> >> >>
> >> >> Don't forget the redux on the Oriongasm scene by the other guy... :-)
> >> >>
> >> >> LHA / WMD
> >> >
> >> >Is that where he revived the little dog with energized lamp cord?
> >>
> >> I can't remember. The movie was under the Hayes Code, not the
> >> morse code.
> >>
> >> All I remember is that Meg was faking it in the coffee shop...just
> >> like all the code-loving extra specials are faking it in here. Shrug.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >I wonder if TAFKA Rev. Jim was faking it for all of those years that
> >he demanded a disincentive exam for access to CW on HF?
>
> Who knows for sure? All that comes back in replies is expurgated
> with [expletive deleted] all over the place. Fake rules. Real stuff is
> labeled "[expletive deleted]" and not allowed.
>
> LHA / WMD
```

Maybe he now thinks that a Morse Code Exam is [expletive deleted]?

2617. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:23:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402140623.1f7e5486@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87343

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040213190546.21955.00000495@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402130559.46c02f71@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040211204212.21457.00003916@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Not yet. They won't stop or admit they were EVER wrong, not
> >> until the last code key is forcibly removed from the cold, dead
> >> fingers of the last PCTA. Sigh.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >I hope it doesn't come to that.
>
> It already has. Many are already mentally dead and refuse to budge,
> compromise or anything else on morse code testing. They keep
> misspelling 'compromise' as "captitulation" to their opinions.
>
> >Instead, they should cleanse their souls by explaining why they argued
> >for maintaining the Morse Code Exam for HF access, and now how its a
> >disincentive to CW use on HF. It just doesn't make sense to me.
>
> They should go to confession and be rewarded with having to do 100
> Hail Hirams as penance. Their afterlife will be better for them.
>
> Or, they could repent and nail some theses to a church door. That
> worked for Marty Luther a long time back.
>
> I get the impression that some of these cold, dead finger souls equate
> morse code testing with Latin and the need to use only Latin in talking
> to God (who, in their beliefs, apparently loves morse). Marty didn't
> think so and spoke regularly with the Big Boss Above, started a whole
> reformation in Protestantism. Millions followed him over the centuries.
>
> We now return all to the noise floor of independent thought, a no-no
> to certain newsgroupies in here. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

"noise floor of independant thought?"

You're a genius. No wonder they hate you.

2618. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:32:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402140632.21476a44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87344

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c0jecb$t39$02$1@news.t-online.com>...
> Hey, William do you have a callsign you can sign your post with??
>
> 73 de OE8SOQ
> Helmut

Helmut, my call sign is november zero india mike delta. I prefer to
keep the spam down in my "real" email account by using a throw-away
email address (billybeeper) and not giving out personal info.

If you were to send an email to billybeeper it would never get read.

bb

2619. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:43:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87345

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <qqrq205j4c42n8o11kuisds4ti7ipr2dun@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
> writes:
>
> >On 14 Feb 2004 00:05:49 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >
> >>In article <a8kl20dulql6fs91qc5p6ud6p74vc9u4o0@4ax.com>, Leo
> ><nomail@noway.com>
> >>writes:

> I should have written "non-hams considering getting a license."
> There are a couple of newsgroupies in here who demand adoration
> and dedication to the 'service' which they equate to 'interest.' :-)

You really need to be more careful in your reading. Neither adoration
nor dedication to the ARS has been deemed necessary, nor has any
"demand" (one of your favorite words) been made. In your case, you've
written of "interest" a number of times but have never quite been
interested enough over the course of decades, to have actually taken an
amateur radio exam.

> Few radio amateurs consider the whole of amateur radio.

There's Len's false premise #1.

> Their
> activity is intensely personal, one-on-one with their radio. If using
> morse then they are devoid of normal human clues to the other
> contact's whole personality...no visuals, no voice tone, no clues to
> gender, no real sense of emotion of the other.

That's no different from newsgroup posts, e-mails or even a letter.

> Voice mode is better
> with normal voice clues to the other party.

I'd have to agree. If you aren't using a voice mode, you certainly
aren't going to have any "voice clues".

> During all contacts on
> the radio they remain in a relatively isolated spectral bandwidth even
> if netted with several others. There is sufficiently long time for the
> mind to imagine many things about the 'service,' to expand far from
> its reality into realms of fantasy greatness.

I know there must be a point here somewhere. Radio amateurs may use any mode authorized them. There are voice modes. There are modes which lack "voice clues". Those would include any keyboard mode as well as morse. Does your line about "fantasy greatness" come from your personal feelings of fantasy greatness?

> The major identification with the entirety of any national radio activity
> is publications of a special-interest nature. To a rather large extent
> in the USA, the ARRL uses their text to build upon the imagination of
> its readers, to identify with it.

I see. Then National Geographic, Gun Digest, Southern Living, Gourmet, Field and Stream do the same.

> That lends reinforcement of the imaginary
> grouping, provides a "sense of belonging" otherwise not happening in
> radio use or even in a home workshop by themselves building something.

Imaginary grouping? It isn't imaginary, Leonard. Being an amateur radio operator and belonging to the ARRL are very, very real. The sense of belonging comes from actually belonging. One can be as involved in the goings on or as uninvolved as one chooses.

> As a result of this insular activity having little in the way of regular
> human interaction with others, the individual amateur will use their own
> experiences in the hobby as a basis of what others are expected to do.

Now we have Len's false premise #2. In reality, amateur radio is as much about interacting with others as anything else. Hams chew the rag on the air, via letters, on the telephone and on the internet.

> The self-identification of personal desire with what should be (in their
> minds) for others does not make a reasonable consideration of future
> regulations that affect many, many others, including those not yet
> licensed in amateur radio.

Len's false premise #3.

Any changes in amateur radio regulations have an effect on both those desiring entry into amateur radio and those currently licensed in amateur radio.

> What adds to the unreasonableness is the ignorance of what other
> radio services are doing and there being a great number of different
> radio 'service' people using, maintaining, designing non-amateur radios.

It certainly isn't clear what is meant by the statement above. What other services do or don't do has little to do with what radio amateurs do or don't do. That's probably one of the reasons that there are *different* radio services. What is good for some point-to-point, channelized service isn't necessarily good for amateur radio.

> The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false
> and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own > ignorance.

The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood. Ignorance would be to assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.

> All radios work by the same laws of physics.

All of everything seems to work by the same laws of physics as physics are now understood.

> Human made legislation
> does not change the way a 'service's' radio works...

Of course not. Legislation regulates how they may or may not be used and where they may or may not be used.

> ...or that a non-amateur
> entering amateur radio be considered a "beginner."

Now that you've seen your sentence broken in half, does it occur that it could use some work? A non-radio amateur who enters amateur radio is always going to be a beginner in amateur radio just as a non-painter who starts painting is a beginner in painting. Those who've just started driving taxicabs are beginners at driving a cab. Why not write what you really mean: that it chafes you to be thought of as a beginner.

> [I am certain there
> are Canadians as unreasonable as our esteamed robustness, Heil]

Oh, you mean those who don't agree with you and who might agree with me? That's very likely. In fact, it is very likely that are quite a few of 'em.

> There is another factor which is common to those amateurs not engaged
> in a radio-specific occupation...that the state of the art of everything in
> amateur remain rooted in the familiar they know.

It is tough to keep a running tally on the number of false premises. I think this one is #4. You'd have no idea of whether this happens in reality. Radio magazines are full of articles and adverts featuring new devices, new equipment and new ideas. A lot of what radio amateurs discuss is new devices, new equipment and new ideas.

> That's almost
> impossible since radio is only 107 years old and the technology involved
> has been advancing in large plateau jumps all the while.

There's a masterful re-statment of the obvious!

> That is true of
> all electronics-related fields of work.

It is true of many fields of endeavor. It doesn't make your previous statement correct.

> They want the state of the art to
> be fixed so they can enjoy what they found emotionally satisfying long
> ago when they reached their personal best in the hobby.

Let's see, that's false premise #5, I believe. I've encountered no such thinking. Was your personal best in radio those days at ADA? Those are days you keep bringing up here?

> Others of
> the modern day are little interested in meeting antiquated standards of
> entering amateur radio.

You mean *you* aren't interested in passing a morse code exam.

> >> Radio amateurs who have already achieved the top "upgrade" license
> >> class in their country would NOT be affected in their privileges. Their
> >> only "affect" is a psychological disturbance due to newcomers not
> >> having to do exactly as they did many years ago.
> >
> >True as well. Those who achieved their license under a more rigorous
> >testing scheme will naturally see any reduction in testing
> >requirements as an erosion of standards, and will be offended by it.
> >That is simple human nature. Most affected by this are the folks at
> >the top level of licensing. Which makes sense - they put in the
> >greatest effort under the old system.
>
> Add to that the uncertainty of understanding modern radio, other than
> the emotionally-loaded advertisements for amateur radio equipment
> and to use that to be one up on their fellows.

Why you condescending windbag! Where do you get the idea that no one but you can possibly understand modern radio? How did you get the idea that someone would only want the best equipment in order to play a game of one-upmanship? Did it ever occur to you that someone would want the best equipment because it can do the job better than something which isn't as good? It must chafe you to realize that someone obtains the latest transceiver, filled with all sorts of DSP tools and then uses those tools to assist in hearing a weak morse signal on a static-filled hunk of medium wave spectrum.

> That "simple human nature" aspect can alienate them in the eyes of
> others. Some of those do not profess to care citing their long tenure
> and alleged self-worthiness. Those are just trying to put "greatness"
> in the hobby activity by using themselves as top-level role models.

I've observed "simple human nature" here when someone proclaims himself an advocate for regulation change in an activity in which he has no involvement. I've observed it in one who brings up his military service and insults the military service of others. Such "simple human nature" comes up when someone talks of his PROFESSIONAL credentials and accomplishments and insults the professional credentials and accomplishments of others. Do you have any idea of who I mean?

It might be a guy who has little worthiness (self or otherwise), a guy who has no tenure, a guy who has no "greatness" and a guy who has little time to develop himself into any kind of role model within amateur radio. If you'd like to talk reality, Len, here's some for you: You aren't a radio amateur. You have no involvement in amateur radio.

> >Exactly the same in this regard. They regulate, not placate....
>
> Placation is for the membership organizations. In the USA the ARRL
> tries to pose as a second-level "government."

Len's false premise #6. It is simply an Andersonian ploy to smear the ARRL with false accusations. Leonard, you are as involved in the affairs of the ARRL as you are with amateur radio.

> They are not but decades
> of propaganda have created a large following of Believers. It works very
> well for the ARRL; the propaganda is self-serving survival activity but
> Believers in the league will not believe they have been brainwashed. :-)

In what do you believe, Leonard? Do you believe in amateur radio? Do you believe you'll ever be a participant in amateur radio? Do you believe that Dennis Kucinich has more support for his ideas than you for yours?

> >Yup - there is clearly a notion that everyone who is not subjected to
> >the same rigorous testing as they were years ago is somehow getting a
> >free ride. What isn't being adequately taken in to account are the
> >underlying reasons for simplification, elimination or change of the
> >various test elements.
>
> Much of that resentment is strictly personal, about themselves.

How much of your obvious resentment of radio amateurs and the ARRL is strictly personal--about you?

> Such
> clouds judgement on what might be good for all, especially those not
> yet licensed.

As one who is not yet licensed, do you believe your judgment on amateur radio issues might be clouded by your personal feelings?

> What has been stable, or relatively so over the years is known,
> familiar. Such stability can be comforting. Change, newness is to be
> avoided since an unknown condition can cause much anxiety. Then
> too, personal rank, status, title might lessen if regulations change to
> remove some of that.

You can take comfort in the known, Len. You're still not a radio amateur.
You have nothing to do with the changes, lack of them, rank, status, titles within amateur radio.

> >I believe that IC was simply giving the amateur community first chance
> >to voice their opinion - not from the perspective of a closed shop per
> >se, but because they wanted to hear the opinions of those currently
> >involved in the hobby before they decided what to do next. I'm no
> >expert in the inner workings of the government here, but I believe
> >that NPRM is the next step, and public comment is requested at that
> >stage.
>
> I see little wrong with that to get an INITIAL opinion by any regulator.
> I see lots wrong with it if the regulators do not hear from others prior
> to decisions.

You've been heard from. Regulators are not mandated to take positive
action on your views.

> >Remember, with no incentive licensing scheme here, the perception of a
> >'class structure' of a hierarchical nature is not nearly as prevalent.
> >Most of the folks I have talked to welcome the elimination of code
> >testing - after all, it isn;t code that is being eliminated, just the
> >mandatory practical test - which only survived as far as 2003 because
> >of the ITU requirements. In the poll submitted from the amateur
> >community to IC, almost two thirds of the lecensed amateurs here want
> >code testing dropped from our requirements! Approximately the opposite
> >of the ARRL numbers bandied about here....
>
> The decades of propaganda by the ARRL is showing up in the un-
> swerving Belief that the old ways are still supposed to be best. Part of
> that (on the part of ARRL) has been the catering to the insularity of
> amateurs, of keeping the status as much quo as possible so as not
> to upset the old-time amateur membership.

I think you may have the cart before the horse. Quite a number of long
time League members support continued morse testing. It is in the
ARRL's best interest to consider the views of its core membership, those
who provide money, while doing a delicate balancing act in trying to
attract new members. The League does cater to the insularity of radio
amateurs.
Catering to the insularity of radio fields is left to other
organizations which don't want to upset their core memberships.

> By the way, it is quite possible that the FCC was all for BPL from the
> first.

Possible? That fact was impossible to miss. It took surgeons several
hours to remove Kathleen Abernathy's shoe from her yap.

> The NOI or Notice of Inquiry was NOT about whether or not the
> service should exist...the Notice Of Inquiry was for the purposes of
> determining what the standards of RFI should be. Almost none of the
> 5,199 documents submitted any such standards or levels. :-) All were
> caught up in a wildfire confligration of opinion saying "BPL is BAD!"

That all took place, no doubt, because BPL at HF and the lower VHF frequencies is BAD.

> The FCC has had an intenal program to improve rural America's tie to
> the Internet. BPL would fit right in with that noble goal. Connection to
> the Internet over existing power lines involves very, very little additional
> cost to anyone. Almost no one has bothered to think of that side of the
> equation.

Lots of people have considered that side. Cost isn't everything. The FCC denied amateurs a slice of LF spectrum based largely upon the idea that such operation (at very low power) could interfere with electric company low level communications via the power grid. The law of reciprocity hasn't been repealed.

> >From what I'm hearing on the group, specifically WRT
> >incentive licensing several years ago, they seemed to ignore the will
> >of the majority and come up with something on their own.....which
> >seems to have annoyed everyone. Oh well, at least they got everyone
> >to agree on something!
>
> Sigh. More human nature. Since certain sides didn't get their way,
> they quaff the juice of fermented spoiled grapes...they whine before
> the time. :-)

Are you writing of your personal feelings that the FCC has not yet done away with morse testing in amateur radio or are you writing of your bitterness that you've not yet attained that "Extra right out of the box" or any other amateur radio license?

> Many demand that the "majority" of anything do as they do or that
> what they do IS what the "majority" does. They are absolutely,
> poselutely for-sure knowing such, cannot be considered otherwise.

You've been DEMANDING that radio amateurs do as you wish. You aren't even involved. Why the feelings that you know what is right for amateur radio?
Why can't you consider otherwise?

> The caste system of the "IL" or Incentive Licensing definitely exists
> in USA amateur radio and continues today. It fits to a T the notion of
> (or desire of) some who NEED some way to show they are "better
> than others" through some sort of federal whatsis. Now that Internet
> has robbed much of the ARRL's monopoly on communications direct
> with the FCC, the FCC might be seeing a different picture of what
> the feelings are in USA amateur radio.

Don't let the actuality of how incentive licensing came to be detract from a wild-eyed rant, Len.

> ARRL still doesn't have more than a quarter of all USA licensees as
> members. They were always a minority group but had sufficent income
> from publication profits to afford legal counsel and a lobbying company
> in Washington, DC. At one time back the FCC just rubber-stamped

> what the ARRL wanted. Not so anymore.

Your disingenuous side shines brightly, Len. The ARRL "minority" has been for decades, the largest organization of radio amateurs by an enormous margin. Rubber stamp this.

Dave K8MN

2620. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:46:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402E34D0.DAF6B1BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87346

William wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040213190545.21955.00000494@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
> > >> Alun wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > Another domino falls
> > >>
> > >> Was it the Germans again this time?

> Yes, yes, I'm sure the Nazi's have infiltrated the Danish Ministry of
> Communications and caused such an important domino to fall into
> uselessness.
>
> Why is it that Dave can mention Nazi agression, but no one else?

Because, sweet William, I didn't accuse anyone of being a Nazi.

"Aggression". Master it and make it your own.

Dave K8MN

2621. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 14:49:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402E3581.74D7A283@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87347

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402D749F.B72C704E@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402D286F.311A8EC7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Helmut wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > > > > news:402D050F.1D1D0EA3@earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > JJ wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Manitoumagic wrote:
> > > > > > > >>....Looks like the 14th might be a
> > > > > > > >>good time to fire up on the upper end of 75 and protect our
> > frequencies.
> > > > > > > >>
> > > > > > > >>**Saturday februari 14 at 19.00 hours UTC >RADIO RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
> > is
> > > > > > > >>TESTING TRANSMISSION
> > > > > > > >>between the frequency of 3933 - 3937khz
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > 1900Z eh?... I doubt 75m propogation at 2pm on the East Coast will
> > allow any US
> > > > > > > > stations to even hear the broadcast, let alone QRM it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Do you think only American hams have access to this group?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > While it is true that there are others not in North America who have
> > > > > > access to this group, remember that the EU amateurs don't have access to
> > > > > > 3.933 MHz. The band stops for them at 3.800.
> > >
> > >
> > > Never stopped you before. Go ahead and work 'em. ;^)
> >
> > When I was operating from Europe or Africa, I never operated above 3.800
> > MHz. I am now in the U.S. where I may operate on 3.933. I frequently
> > choose not to do so.
>

> Amazing that you can show restraint when operating under a US license.

I've never operated on frequencies not authorized by my licenses
anywhere in the world, William.

> > > > > Yup, that's your baby!
> > > > > But you will never hear it cry!
> > > > >
> > > > > I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. Perhaps you meant, "Those
> > > > > tomatoes won't be ripe until June" or "Brian sees Dave behind every tree
> > > > > and rock".
> > >
> > > > Dave, you crack me up.
> > >
> > > Believe me, Brian, it is mutual. Your "Dave-as-Helmut" material is a
> > > scream. I don't post as anyone but me.
> >
> Poor Helmut. Thinks I complimented him.

Poor Brian. Thought I was posting as Helmut.

Dave K8MN

2622. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 15:19:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402140719.3280fa94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87348

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214021045.23307.00006597@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> I should have written "non-hams considering getting a license."
> There are a couple of newsgroupies in here who demand adoration
> and dedication to the 'service' which they equate to 'interest.'

What you SHOULD write, Lennie, is an apology to every licensed
Amateur for your rude behaviour, misrepresentations and bolfaced
lying.

As fo "demand(ing) adoration", I think yuo've got your foot in
that bucket too, Scummy One.

> Few radio amateurs consider the whole of amateur radio.

Please, Lennie...

From your VAST experience IN Amateur Radio, tell US allllllll
about "the whole of (A)mateur (R)adio.

> Their
> activity is intensely personal, one-on-one with their radio. If using
> morse then they are devoid of normal human clues to the other
> contact's whole personality...no visuals, no voice tone, no clues to
> gender, no real sense of emotion of the other.

And an absolutely CLUELESS representation of what you PERCIEVE to
be the truth, Lennie...

Ab-so-LUTE-ly clueless!

> Voice mode is better with normal voice clues to the other party.

In your OPINION, Lennie...And an unsubstantiated one, at that.

> What adds to the unreasonableness is the ignorance of what other
> radio services are doing and there being a great number of different
> radio 'service' people using, maintaining, designing non-amateur radios.
> The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false
> and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own ignorance.
> All radios work by the same laws of physics. Human made legislation
> does not change the way a 'service's' radio works or that a non-amateur
> entering amateur radio be considered a "beginner." [I am certain there
> are Canadians as unreasonable as our esteamed robustness, Heil]

Again, Lennie, you express an arrogant, obviously spiteful and
unabashedly biased and NON-FACTUAL "OPINION".

> Others of
> the modern day are little interested in meeting antiquated standards of
> entering amateur radio.

"Others", Lennie? Or just you?

Obviously YOU are incapable of meeting ANY standard since you are
not licensed.

Therefore, having NOT gone through the process, having NOT
actaully laid eyes on an Amateur examination or participating in the
process, you once again voice an UNINFORMED opinion based solely upon
spite and your own jaundiced view of Amateur Radio.

> >> Radio amateurs who have already achieved the top "upgrade" license
> >> class in their country would NOT be affected in their privileges. Their
> >> only "affect" is a psychological disturbance due to newcomers not
> >> having to do exactly as they did many years ago.
> >
> >True as well. Those who achieved their license under a more rigorous
> >testing scheme will naturally see any reduction in testing
> >requirements as an erosion of standards, and will be offended by it.
> >That is simple human nature. Most affected by this are the folks at
> >the top level of licensing. Which makes sense - they put in the
> >greatest effort under the old system.
>
> Add to that the uncertainty of understanding modern radio, other than
> the emotionally-loaded advertisements for amateur radio equipment
> and to use that to be one up on their fellows.

All three assertions false.

ANY change to Amateur Radio affects ALL licensees.

> That "simple human nature" aspect can alienate them in the eyes of
> others. Some of those do not profess to care citing their long tenure
> and alleged self-worthiness. Those are just trying to put "greatness"
> in the hobby activity by using themselves as top-level role models.

As opposed to you who is trying to put himslef in a position of
greatness without having actually contributed ANYTHING of value to the
service, Lennie?

> What has been stable, or relatively so over the years is known,
> familiar. Such stability can be comforting. Change, newness is to be
> avoided since an unknown condition can cause much anxiety. Then
> too, personal rank, status, title might lessen if regulations change to
> remove some of that.

So far the one person who is most resistant to change in Amateur
Radio is you, Your Lyingness.

As for the "rank, status" rhetoric you flail about in, well, all
I can say is that it's yet one more bit of evidence of your lack of
realtime experience IN Amateur Radio.

> The decades of propaganda by the ARRL is showing up in the un-
> swerving Belief that the old ways are still supposed to be best. Part of
> that (on the part of ARRL) has been the catering to the insularity of
> amateurs, of keeping the status as much quo as possible so as not
> to upset the old-time amateur membership.

I find it interesting you refer to ARRL policies and practicies
as "propaganda", yet three yeas after having uttered your assertion of
"the ARRL is dishonest", you ahve yet to provide evidence of same.

I find it hard to accept your opinons as valid when all you have
to back them up is MORE unsubstantiated rhetoric based solely upon
your "nose against the glass looking in" observations.

> >From what I'm hearing on the group, specifically WRT
> >incentive licensing several years ago, they seemed to ignore the will
> >of the majority and come up with something on their own.....which
> >seems to have annoyed everyone. Oh well, at least they got everyone
> >to agree on something!
>
> Sigh. More human nature. Since certain sides didn't get their way,
> they quaff the juice of fermented spoiled grapes...they whine before
> the time.

So far you're the only whiner here. Repetitively.

> Many demand that the "majority" of anything do as they do or that
> what they do IS what the "majority" does. They are absolutely,
> poselutely for-sure knowing such, cannot be considered otherwise.

And YOU suggest we ignore the opinions of those EXPERIENCED in
Amateur Radio as opposed to your own INEXPERIENCED, third-party
rhetoric.

Uh huh...

> The caste system of the "IL" or Incentive Licensing definitely exists
> in USA amateur radio and continues today. It fits to a T the notion of
> (or desire of) some who NEED some way to show they are "better
> than others" through some sort of federal whatsis. Now that Internet
> has robbed much of the ARRL's monopoly on communications direct
> with the FCC, the FCC might be seeing a different picture of what
> the feelings are in USA amateur radio.

Thankfully they generally don't reflect the pro-socialist,
anti-education opinons you espouse, Lennie, but I am sure it warms
your heart that they are getting there.

I've been watching with some interest lately the lambasting the
FCC commissioners ahve been taking over THIER "lack of experience",
adn certainly their lack of common sense in recent broadcasting flaps.

Ironic, I think, that 30 years ago when the FCC was ripe with
staffers who had callsigns of thier own that the FCC seemed to be able
to keep control of nearly ALL problems in ALL areas or

radiocommunication.

Now that "fuzzy-feelgood" political correctness and a COMPLETE lack of contact with the world of reality, we have Senate panels reading the riot act to media leaders because a hip-hop performer flashed us for less than 5 seconds with a pastie-coevered breast.

> At one time back the FCC just rubber-stamped
> what the ARRL wanted. Not so anymore.

Whew...!

Took a lot of gumption to post THAT mistruth, Lennie!

Just about EVERY Amateur journal of the last 50 years is ripe with reams of coverage of "stuff" the League either promoted to or fought against the FCC, only to be second guessed by the FCC. In most cases the FCC found itself regretting it DIDN'T follow the League's advice...But that's "civil government" at it's best....

Now, PLEASE do some FACT-BASED RESEARCH before making any more outlandish and obviously flawed postings...Your "credentials" as a "radio professional" only fade in "value" everytime you utter such idiotic assertions in public. (Which in YOUR case are frequent)

Steve, K4YZ

2623. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 15:49:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87349

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> >> >Sohl"
> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >[snip]
> >> >
> >> >> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
> >> >access
> >> >> >to
> >> >> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level.
So
> >> >giving
> >> >> >them
> >> >> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
> >> >
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> >>
> >> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
> >> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
> >> >
> >> >Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> >>
> >> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
> >
> >You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
> >to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
>
> [expletive deleted]
>

> > well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...
>
> I'm not squirming or stretching, Carl. Just pointing out some facts. And I
> don't
> know what you intended to mean - I just know what you actually wrote.
Frankly,
> I was very surprised that you support free upgrades without *written*
testing
> for over 400,000 US hams
>
> >> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
> >> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
> >
> >I'm not ...
>
> Let's get this clear right now.
>
> ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade to
> General with no additional testing.
>
> They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra
> with no additional testing.
>
> Do you support those free upgrades or not?

I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.

> If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction in
> the written test requirements for those licenses.

Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
requirements. THAT is the critical difference.

> Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction, but
it's
> still a reduction.

It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
permanent reductions in requirements.

> And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.

If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why, because
no one losses any privileges.

> >>Yet now I see that same person
> >> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
> >> tests...
> >
> >As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written

> >tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in
a
> >way
> >where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are
already
> >authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any
knowledge
> >of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
>
> Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech
written is
> adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not simply
dump
> the General question pools into the Extra, and use the current Tech pool
for
> General?

If that's what YOU want, then file comments supporting that yourself.
Bottom line, 2 years from now no one will care.

> >> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >>
> >> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
> >> >> is there?
> >> >
> >> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?

I'd expect the FCC will NOT reissue anyone that gets a free upgrade
a new license at all. There's no need to.

> >> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
> >
> >Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
> >(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
> >
> How do you know what FCC wants?

How do you? Ultimately the FCC will decide.

> >> >I (personally, not as NCI)
> >> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >> >
> >> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
> >> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
> >
> >Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you have
> >a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
>
> I don;t have any hangups about the tests. I'm all for them.
>

> If the difference isn't so great, why require the General test at all?

If YOU accept that, then file comments as such with the FCC.

> >> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the
changes
> >> take
> >> place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
> >
> >Give me a break ...
>
> What do you mean? That's exactly what a lot of people will do.
>
> Those with no license or an existing Novice will have an incentive
> to get a Tech before the rules change and ride the free upgrade
> bus to General.

If "lots" of non-hams suddenly became hams by that process I'll
be truly surprised. As for the existing novices...that is now
down to about 30,000...assuming everyone of them did what you
suggest.

> Those with Tech will have a *disincentive* to
> actually take (or study for) the General.

Life's a bitch and then we die.

> Same for Advanceds and the Extra.

The arte at which advaceds have been upgrading is pathetically
low already.

> >your arguments are just plain lame
>
> How? Do you think people won't do this?

Some will, but it won't be significant.

> >and your "someone might
> >get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as I
took"
> >is REALLY showing.
>
> Nobody today can even take the tests I took. You couldn't pass the tests I
> took,
> Carl.

Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.

> The tests I took are not the issue. Free upgrades and reduction in written
test
> requirements are the issue.

The issue is ONE time free upgrades only. No effort is being made to
lower the General or Extra requirements.

Cheers...and add Hong Kong to the list of countries dropping ALL code tests.

Bill K2UNK

2624. Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 16:05:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <UGrXb.4535$W74.321@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87350

Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
dropping code testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2625. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 16:10:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214111006.15185.00001149@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87351

>Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
>dropping code testing.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>

WHO CARES, HAM RADIO IS NOTHING MORE THAN A GLOIRIFIED CB SERVICE ANYMORE.

2626. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 16:43:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402E5028.963CC842@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87352

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
> dropping code testing.

I'm sure that your news will be greeted with great elation by the roughly 360 radio amateurs (including club stations and those licensed by, but no longer living in Hong Kong) of Hong Kong. The world is slowly being freed from this morse testing oppression.

It is truly a great day for something-or-other.

Dave K8MN

2627. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 17:07:35 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rBsXb.844$aH3.20078@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 87353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM> wrote in message
news:102r6jm7qeeif5@news.supernews.com...
> Broadband over Power Lines has been approved for a NPRM by the full 5
> commissioners of the FCC. What this means for all short wave listeners
> is that once BPL is deployed a SWL is not protected by any
> interference caused by BPL transmissions. SWL's use part 15 devices
and
> most accept any interference.

[snip]

It's my guess that interference and the FCC are the least of BPL's
problems. Now let's see if it's fast and reliable enough to get people
to pay for it.

Frank Dresser

2628. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 17:11:07 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0402140911.383dc253@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87354

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214021045.23307.00006597@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> There is another factor which is common to those amateurs not engaged
> in a radio-specific occupation...that the state of the art of everything in
> amateur remain rooted in the familiar they know. That's almost
> impossible since radio is only 107 years old and the technology involved
> has been advancing in large plateau jumps all the while. That is true of
> all electronics-related fields of work. They want the state of the art to
> be fixed so they can enjoy what they found emotionally satisfying long
> ago when they reached their personal best in the hobby. Others of
> the modern day are little interested in meeting antiquated standards of
> entering amateur radio.

Amen, brother... you've gotten to the core of the problem. But, it is
WORSE than you state, as these people can't simply go on doing what
they've been doing, they try to STOP others from doing new things...
they are actually PRO-ACTIVE in their actions. I used to think it was
simply "foot-dragging" - but it is worse than that... they are like
little children, as they are being taken kicking and screaming to
their beds for the night, they will lash out or wildly grab onto
ANYTHING they can to slow the process... but, inevitably they WILL go
to sleep, and they just end up looking all the more PATHETIC for their
TANTRUM-THROWING.

- Stewart (N0MHS)
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

2629. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 17:36:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87355

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

>>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
>
>
> I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.

Uh huh!

I'll ask:

Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?

>
>>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction in
>>the written test requirements for those licenses.
>
>
> Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> requirements. THAT is the critical difference.

Give me a break, Bill!

Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?

>>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction, but
>
> it's
>
>>still a reduction.
>
>
> It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
> to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> permanent reductions in requirements.

Are the people qualified?
>
>>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>
>
> If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why, because
> no one losses any privileges.

Are they qualified?

A few things here.

IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the evil Morse code supporters.

If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great disservice.

Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed* support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF. I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just do this once and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.

I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements. I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access to HF. A pattern forms.

2630. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 18:07:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214130732.25815.00006658@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87356

In article <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> >> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Bill
>> >> >Sohl"
>> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >[snip]
>> >> >
>> >> >> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>> >> >access
>> >> >> >to
>> >> >> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level.
>So
>> >> >giving
>> >> >> >them
>> >> >> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>> >> >
>> >> >Jim,
>> >> >
>> >> >I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>> >>
>> >> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>> >> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>> >>
>> >> >Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>> >>
>> >> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>> >
>> >You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
>> >to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know

>>
>> [expletive deleted]
>>
>> > well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...
>>
>> I'm not squirming or stretching, Carl. Just pointing out some facts. And I
>> don't
>> know what you intended to mean - I just know what you actually wrote.
>Frankly,
>> I was very surprised that you support free upgrades without *written*
>testing
>> for over 400,000 US hams
>>
>> >> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>> >> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
>> >
>> >I'm not ...
>>
>> Let's get this clear right now.
>>
>> ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade to
>> General with no additional testing.
>>
>> They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra
>> with no additional testing.
>>
>> Do you support those free upgrades or not?
>
>I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.

I (N2EY) don't support it.

Why is it OK because it's a one-time thing?
>
>> If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction in
>> the written test requirements for those licenses.
>
>Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
>mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
>requirements.

That's a good point. The reduction affects only those who have certain licenses
on a certain date.

But it's still a reduction for a very large number of hams.

>THAT is the critical difference.
>
And it raises a critical question: Why is it OK as a one-time thing but not as
a permanent change?

>> Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction, but
>> it's still a reduction.
>
>It is a ONE time reduction.

Agreed - but it's still a reduction. And Carl said he would not support any reductions in written testing. Now, all of a sudden it's OK because it's a one time thing.

>You and I can disagree about the reason's
>to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
>time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
>permanent reductions in requirements.

True.

But why is a one-time reduction OK, and not a permanent one?

>> And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>
>If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.

That's what they said 40 years about incentive licensing.

>Why, because no one losses any privileges.

Maybe. Or maybe not.
>
>> >>Yet now I see that same person
>> >> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
>> >> tests...
>> >
>> >As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
>> >tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right" in
>a
>> >way
>> >where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are
>already
>> >authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any
>knowledge
>> >of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
>>
>> Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech
>> written is
>> adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not simply
>> dump
>> the General question pools into the Extra, and use the current Tech pool
>> for General?
>
>If that's what YOU want, then file comments supporting that yourself.

No, it's not what I want.

But how do we argue against those who want it?

>Bottom line, 2 years from now no one will care.

How do you know?

In the past 12 months, FCC issued over 20,000 new ham licenses. Most of those were Techs. Why is it OK for them to get General privileges based on having passed the 35 question Tech test, and having less than 1 year experience, but not OK for future hams?
>
>> >> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>> >>
>> >> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>> >> >> is there?
>> >> >
>> >> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>> >> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>
>I'd expect the FCC will NOT reissue anyone that gets a free upgrade
>a new license at all. There's no need to.

So they keep their old licenses. And the database still has their old license class.
>
>> >> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>> >
>> >Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
>> >(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
>> >
>> How do you know what FCC wants?
>
>How do you?

I don't claim to. The person who wrote that something "doesn't comport" is claiming to know what FCC wants.

>Ultimately the FCC will decide.

Just like BPL. Should we not oppose BPL?

>> >> >I (personally, not as NCI)
>> >> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> >> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>> >> >
>> >> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test requirements
>> >> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
>> >
>> >Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you have
>> >a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
>>
>> I don;t have any hangups about the tests. I'm all for them.
>>
>> If the difference isn't so great, why require the General test at all?
>

>If YOU accept that, then file comments as such with the FCC.

I'll file comments to do the opposite. Maybe a proposal, too.
>
>> >> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the
>changes
>> >> take
>> >> place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>> >
>> >Give me a break ...
>>
>> What do you mean? That's exactly what a lot of people will do.
>>
>> Those with no license or an existing Novice will have an incentive
>> to get a Tech before the rules change and ride the free upgrade
>> bus to General.
>
>If "lots" of non-hams suddenly became hams by that process I'll
>be truly surprised.

20,000 in the past 12 months.

>As for the existing novices...that is now
>down to about 30,000...assuming everyone of them did what you
>suggest.

34,000 or so.
>
>> Those with Tech will have a *disincentive* to
>> actually take (or study for) the General.
>
>Life's a

[expletive deleted]

> and then we die.
>
Apply that philosophy to accepting the code test.

>> Same for Advanceds and the Extra.
>
>The arte at which advaceds have been upgrading is pathetically
>low already.

17% in 4 years. Gotta wonder why. Maybe the code test wasn't a problem after
all....
>
>> >your arguments are just plain lame
>>
>> How? Do you think people won't do this?
>
>Some will, but it won't be significant.

How do you know?
>
>> >and your "someone might
>> >get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as I
>took"
>> >is REALLY showing.
>>
>> Nobody today can even take the tests I took. You couldn't pass the tests I
>> took, Carl.
>
>Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.

Nope. Not at all.

It means that I met different qualifications. And I've seen the qualifications, both written and code, slowly reduced for over a quarter century. And that's not a good thing.

>> The tests I took are not the issue. Free upgrades and reduction in written
>> test requirements are the issue.
>
>The issue is ONE time free upgrades only. No effort is being made to
>lower the General or Extra requirements.

Not yet. But a one-time upgrade is one more step. And it paves the way.

>Cheers...and add Hong Kong to the list of countries dropping ALL code tests.
>
That makes what - a dozen countries?

I wonder what HK's written test requirements are.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2631. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 18:33:05 UTC
From: N8IE <dot.com@dot.com>
Message-ID: <BRtXb.5063$9H3.3600@fe2.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 87357

Who cares?
The ARRL is a joke.
The hobby is a joke.

Ham Radio is dead, RIP.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:UGrXb.4535$W74.321@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
> dropping code testing.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.572 / Virus Database: 362 - Release Date: 1/27/2004

2632. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 18:34:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <IcudnXhqWabP97PdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87358

N2EY wrote:

> In article <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>>In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>
>>"Bill
>>
>>>>>>Sohl"
>>>>>>
>>>>>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>[snip]
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll have
>>>>>>
>>>>>>access
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM level.
>>
>>So

>>
>>>>>>giving
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>them
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing Extras.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jim,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>>>>>
>>>>>Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
>>>>>required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
>>>>>
>>>>>>Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
>>>>>
>>>>>You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
>>>>
>>>>You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your attempt
>>>>to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
>>>
>>>[expletive deleted]
>>>
>>>
>>>>well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...
>>>
>>>I'm not squirming or stretching, Carl. Just pointing out some facts. And I
>>>don't
>>>know what you intended to mean - I just know what you actually wrote.
>>
>>Frankly,
>>
>>>I was very surprised that you support free upgrades without *written*
>>
>>testing
>>
>>>for over 400,000 US hams
>>>
>>>
>>>>>And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
>>>>>in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
>>>>
>>>>I'm not ...
>>>
>>>Let's get this clear right now.
>>>
>>>ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade to
>>>General with no additional testing.
>>>
>>>They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra

>>>with no additional testing.
>>>
>>>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
>>
>>I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
>
>
> I (N2EY) don't support it.
>
> Why is it OK because it's a one-time thing?

'tisn't, Jim.

>
>>>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction in
>>>the written test requirements for those licenses.
>>
>>Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
>>mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
>>requirements.
>
>
> That's a good point. The reduction affects only those who have certain licenses
> on a certain date.

On the contrary, I believe that they DO support permanent reductions of
the written requirements.

> But it's still a reduction for a very large number of hams.
>
>
>>THAT is the critical difference.
>>
>
> And it raises a critical question: Why is it OK as a one-time thing but not as
> a permanent change?
>
>
>>>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction, but
>>>it's still a reduction.
>>
>>It is a ONE time reduction.
>
>
> Agreed - but it's still a reduction. And Carl said he would not support any
> reductions in written testing. Now, all of a sudden it's OK because it's a one
> time thing.

ahem....

>
>>You and I can disagree about the reason's

>>to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
>>time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
>>permanent reductions in requirements.
>
>
> True.
>
> But why is a one-time reduction OK, and not a permanent one?
>
>
>>>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>>
>>If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.
>
>
> That's what they said 40 years about incentive licensing.
>
>
>>Why, because no one losses any privileges.
>
>
> Maybe. Or maybe not.
>
>>>>>Yet now I see that same person
>>>>>supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take *written*
>>>>>tests...
>>>>

>>>>As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
>>>>tests is not that large

Whhhoooaaaahhhh!

And there my friend is the first shot in the next volley that will
attempt to permanently reduce the written requirements!

"The difference betweent the Tech and General written tests is not that
large". How about that?

Lessee.... 1. we don't support reductions in the test requirements

2. we support a one shot upgrade

3. the difference between the Tech and General written
tests is not that large

<snip>
>>a
>>
>>>>way
>>>>where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those Techs are
>>
>>already

>>
>>>>authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any
>>
>>knowledge
>>
>>>>of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
>>>
>>>Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech
>>>written is
>>>adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not simply
>>>dump
>>>the General question pools into the Extra, and use the current Tech pool
>>>for General?
>>
>>If that's what YOU want, then file comments supporting that yourself.
>
>
> No, it's not what I want.
>
> But how do we argue against those who want it?
>
>
>>Bottom line, 2 years from now no one will care.
>
>
> How do you know?
>
> In the past 12 months, FCC issued over 20,000 new ham licenses. Most of those
> were Techs. Why is it OK for them to get General privileges based on having
> passed the 35 question Tech test, and having less than 1 year experience, but
> not OK for future hams?

Kinda makes you wonder, eh? I cannot come ot any logical conclusion
that does not include a permanent reduction in the qualifications.

The rest snipped, I gotta go do some housework.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2633. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 19:44:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <KUuXb.5396$hm4.1477@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87359

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>
> >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> >
> >
> > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
>
> Uh huh!
>
>
> I'll ask:
>
>
> Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?

Why would they be "unqualified?" Let's be serious here!
In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.

> >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction
in
> >>the written test requirements for those licenses.
> >
> > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
>
> Give me a break, Bill!
>
> Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?

Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
what?

> >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
> > >but it's still a reduction.
> >
> > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
> > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one

> > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> > permanent reductions in requirements.
>
> Are the people qualified?

YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges they would be unqualified.

> >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> >
> > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why, because
> > no one losses any privileges.
>
> Are they qualified?

Broken record here it seems.

> A few things here.
>
> IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
> reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you
> are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
> evil Morse code supporters.

I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive system as created simply asks for passage of another test on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only" spectrum from that of a General operating in the General spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted power.

> If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
> and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great
> disservice.
>
> Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.

The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new" novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)

> I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just
> do this once

Believe whatever makes you feel good.

> and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.

The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
or Advanced to Extra.

> I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
> I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
> here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
> to HF. A pattern forms.

Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
background too.

Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2634. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 20:17:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87360

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040214130732.25815.00006658@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >> In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >> >> >> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >"Bill
> >> >> >Sohl"
> >> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >[snip]
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> If all 83,000 Advanceds get a free upgrade to Extra, they'll
have
> >> >> >access
> >> >> >> >to
> >> >> >> those choice slices and they'll probably increase the QRM
level.
> >So
> >> >> >giving
> >> >> >> >them
> >> >> >> a free upgrade *does* take something away from existing
Extras.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Jim,
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
> >> >>
> >> >> Only a few? I'm willing to share them with as many as can pass the
> >> >> required tests. Particularly the *written* tests.
> >> >>

> >> >> >Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.
> >> >>
> >> >> You're the one willing to share with "a few"....
> >> >
> >> >You're squirming pretty hard and stretching pretty far with your
attempt
> >> >to twist my use of the words "a few others" into something you know
> >>
> >> [expletive deleted]
> >>
> >> > well I didn't mean the way you're trying to spin it ...
> >>
> >> I'm not squirming or stretching, Carl. Just pointing out some facts.
And I
> >> don't
> >> know what you intended to mean - I just know what you actually wrote.
> >Frankly,
> >> I was very surprised that you support free upgrades without *written*
> >testing
> >> for over 400,000 US hams
> >>
> >> >> And I do recall someone saying they'd **NEVER** support a reduction
> >> >> in the **WRITTEN** test requirements.
> >> >
> >> >I'm not ...
> >>
> >> Let's get this clear right now.
> >>
> >> ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade
to
> >> General with no additional testing.
> >>
> >> They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to
Extra
> >> with no additional testing.
> >>
> >> Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> >
> >I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
>
> I (N2EY) don't support it.
>
> Why is it OK because it's a one-time thing?

Because there's no real harm to anyone...and if you want an
incentive licensing scheme to be retained, this does it plus
it simplifies licensing and regs for the FCC and does it in one
snapshot of time.

> >> If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction
in

> >> the written test requirements for those licenses.
> >
> >Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> >mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> >requirements.
>
> That's a good point. The reduction affects only those who have certain
licenses
> on a certain date.
>
> But it's still a reduction for a very large number of hams.

Agreed.

> >THAT is the critical difference.
> >
> And it raises a critical question: Why is it OK as a one-time thing but
not as
> a permanent change?

Because it harms no one to get to the simplified scheme AND
it then continues with the incentive system as before.

> >> Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
but
> >> it's still a reduction.
> >
> >It is a ONE time reduction.
>
> Agreed - but it's still a reduction. And Carl said he would not support
any
> reductions in written testing. Now, all of a sudden it's OK because it's a
one
> time thing.

Time and situations change and people change.

> >You and I can disagree about the reason's
> >to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> >time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> >permanent reductions in requirements.
>
> True.

Thank you!

> But why is a one-time reduction OK, and not a permanent one?

See prior coments on the same thing.

> >> And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> >
> >If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.

>
> That's what they said 40 years about incentive licensing.

Big difference. Every General that lost privileges still understands
that loss. With this, no one losses anything.

> >Why, because no one losses any privileges.
>
> Maybe. Or maybe not.

If maybe not, please point to what privileges will
be lost by which license holders.

> >> >>Yet now I see that same person
> >> >> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take
written
> >> >> tests...
> >> >
> >> >As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
> >> >tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right"
i
> >> >a way where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those
> >> > Techs are already
> >> >authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any
> >> >knowledge of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
> >>
> >> Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech
> >> written is
> >> adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not simply
> >> dump
> >> the General question pools into the Extra, and use the current Tech
pool
> >> for General?
> >
> >If that's what YOU want, then file comments supporting that yourself.
>
> No, it's not what I want.
>
> But how do we argue against those who want it?

YOU are assuming someone will file another petition to do that.
I'll worry about reacting/commenting on that...if and when it happens.

> >Bottom line, 2 years from now no one will care.
>
> How do you know?

SWAG applied with common sense.

> In the past 12 months, FCC issued over 20,000 new ham licenses. Most of
those
> were Techs. Why is it OK for them to get General privileges based on
having

> passed the 35 question Tech test, and having less than 1 year experience,
but
> not OK for future hams?

As above, because it will be a one time situation.

> >> >> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >> >>
> >> >> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them
upgrades,
> >> >> >> is there?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >> >> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >
> >I'd expect the FCC will NOT reissue anyone that gets a free upgrade
> >a new license at all. There's no need to.
>
> So they keep their old licenses. And the database still has their old
license
> class.

The database could be updated overnight by replacing all licenses with their
upgraded license. Doing that does not require an actual new paper
license to be issued if Part 97 contains the following statement:

Any license holder whos paper license is Tech is now recognized to be
General and (ditto for Advanced to Ectra).

> >> >> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
> >> >
> >> >Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
> >> >(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
> >> >
> >> How do you know what FCC wants?
> >
> >How do you?
>
> I don't claim to. The person who wrote that something "doesn't comport" is
> claiming to know what FCC wants.

Take it as a best quess then.

> >Ultimately the FCC will decide.
>
> Just like BPL. Should we not oppose BPL?

Different subject for a different thread.

> >> >> >I (personally, not as NCI)
> >> >> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
> >> >> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >> >> >

> >> >> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test
requirements
> >> >> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
> >> >
> >> >Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you
have
> >> >a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
> >>
> >> I don;t have any hangups about the tests. I'm all for them.
> >>
> >> If the difference isn't so great, why require the General test at all?
> >
> >If YOU accept that, then file comments as such with the FCC.
>
> I'll file comments to do the opposite. Maybe a proposal, too.

As is your right to do so.

> >> >> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the
> >> >> changes take place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
> >> >
> >> >Give me a break ...
> >>
> >> What do you mean? That's exactly what a lot of people will do.
> >>
> >> Those with no license or an existing Novice will have an incentive
> >> to get a Tech before the rules change and ride the free upgrade
> >> bus to General.
> >
> >If "lots" of non-hams suddenly became hams by that process I'll
> >be truly surprised.
>
> 20,000 in the past 12 months.

We'll likly lose that many to attrition this year alone. Look at
the future expirations per Joe Speroni's web site. There's one
month alone that has (I think) over 10,000 expirations.

> >As for the existing novices...that is now
> >down to about 30,000...assuming everyone of them did what you
> >suggest.
>
> 34,000 or so.

minor difference in the scope of this conversation.

> >> Those with Tech will have a *disincentive* to
> >> actually take (or study for) the General.
> >
> >Life's a
>
> [expletive deleted]

> > and then we die.
> >
> Apply that philosophy to accepting the code test.

God grant us the wisdom to...
Accept the things we cannot change, change those
we can and hopefully have the wisdom to know the difference.

> >> Same for Advanceds and the Extra.
> >
> >The rate at which advaceds have been upgrading is pathetically
> >low already.
>
> 17% in 4 years. Gotta wonder why. Maybe the code test wasn't a problem
after
> all....

No one said it was the only roadblock to all
Advanced hams going to Extra.

> >> >your arguments are just plain lame
> >>
> >> How? Do you think people won't do this?
> >
> >Some will, but it won't be significant.
>
> How do you know?

SWAG and common sense. Do you see a floodgate opening
of new hams rushing to become techs before the FCC
implements free upgrades on a certain date?

> >> >and your "someone might
> >> >get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as I
> >> >took" is REALLY showing.
> >>
> >> Nobody today can even take the tests I took. You couldn't pass the
tests I
> >> took, Carl.
> >
> >Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
>
> Nope. Not at all.
>
> It means that I met different qualifications. And I've seen the
qualifications,
> both written and code, slowly reduced for over a quarter century. And
that's
> not a good thing.

And if that is your true meaning, why would you state
that "You (Carl) couldn't pass the tests I (Jim) took, Carl."
Do you really think Carl would be unable to pass the same

written tests if he had to?

> >> The tests I took are not the issue. Free upgrades and reduction in written
> >> test requirements are the issue.
> >
> >The issue is ONE time free upgrades only. No effort is being made to
> >lower the General or Extra requirements.
>
> Not yet. But a one-time upgrade is one more step. And it paves the way.

As you have said.

> >Cheers...and add Hong Kong to the list of countries dropping ALL code tests.
> >
> That makes what - a dozen countries?

I believe so.

> I wonder what HK's written test requirements are.....

I don't really care.

Cheers again,
Bill K2UNK

2635. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 20:47:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214154746.06226.00002939@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87362

In article <30pXb.2360$t16.1953873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Maximus" <nomail@here.com> wrote in message
>news:ZRhXb.3389$WW3.1211@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> It may work, but I question how well. One reason for granting permission is
>> to extend internet to rural areas that can't be served by conventinal means.
>
>Serving the rural areas happens to be the biggest marketing lie in the whole
>mess. It won't be econmically feasible in the rural areas. There simply
>are not enough customers per square mile to justify the amount of equipment
>(e.g. signal boosters and transformer bypasses) that will have to be
>installed.

You "know" all those technical things from experience and learning how to twiddle a morse key in amateur radio? :-)

Please point to a trade-technical press with detailed technical information on any of the proposed BPL systems. Detailed descriptions including signal levels, not computer simulations based on assumptions.

LHA / WMD

2636. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 20:47:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214154747.06226.00002940@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87363

In article <1e4e3692.0402140623.1f7e5486@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"noise floor of independant thought?"
>
>You're a genius. No wonder they hate you.

Independent thought is a no-no in U.S. amateur radio.

ARRL does every ham's thinking for them, outlines the standards
and practices, tells them what to do, how to do it, how to talk
about it, what they must like and what they should dislike. It even
supplies the official radiogram forms that all must use for the
fabled NTS. They are official.

Morse loving Extras will reinforce that by assuming a parental
role in "knowing what is good for everyone." They are so because
they say they are. None may disagree with those gods.

All others are inferior.

LHA / WMD

2637. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 20:47:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214154748.06226.00002942@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87361

In article <1e4e3692.0402140613.6533ff03@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040213190545.21955.00000494@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
>> >> Alun wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > Another domino falls
>> >>
>> >> Was it the Germans again this time?
>> >>
>> >> Dave K8MN
>> >
>> >It was the Little Mermaid.
>>
>> Never mind correcting the god of radio, Brian. As a "key member" of the
>> foreign service diplomatic community, he still thinks that Denmark is
>> some kind of province of Germany. All kinds of smarts in the U.S.
>> government these days.
>>
>> He doesn't know beloved fairy tales of Hans Christian Andersen, only
>> the fairy tales of the ARRL (beloved by mighty macho morsemen).
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Yes, yes, I'm sure the Nazi's have infiltrated the Danish Ministry of
>Communications and caused such an important domino to fall into
>uselessness.
>
>Why is it that Dave can mention Nazi agression, but no one else?

Good old Extra double-standard again. :-)

His SA strike again!

LHA / WMD

2638. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 20:47:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214154748.06226.00002941@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87364

In article <5f4fe4c2.0402140911.383dc253@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040214021045.23307.00006597@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> There is another factor which is common to those amateurs not engaged
>> in a radio-specific occupation...that the state of the art of everything
in
>> amateur remain rooted in the familiar they know. That's almost
>> impossible since radio is only 107 years old and the technology involved
>> has been advancing in large plateau jumps all the while. That is true of
>> all electronics-related fields of work. They want the state of the art
to
>> be fixed so they can enjoy what they found emotionally satisfying long
>> ago when they reached their personal best in the hobby. Others of
>> the modern day are little interested in meeting antiquated standards of
>> entering amateur radio.
>
>Amen, brother... you've gotten to the core of the problem. But, it is
>WORSE than you state, as these people can't simply go on doing what
>they've been doing, they try to STOP others from doing new things...
>they are actually PRO-ACTIVE in their actions. I used to think it was
>simply "foot-dragging" - but it is worse than that... they are like
>little children, as they are being taken kicking and screaming to
>their beds for the night, they will lash out or wildly grab onto
>ANYTHING they can to slow the process... but, inevitably they WILL go
>to sleep, and they just end up looking all the more PATHETIC for their
>TANTRUM-THROWING.

Not a pretty picture to present to the public on "advancing the state
of the art" or showing all that "inherent good will." :-)

Ah, but the morsemen are the parental figures telling all the rest of
us how things should be in radio "for our good." If those are the
"parents" it's no wonder that they appear as a dysfunctional family.
[the Jukes on them, so to speak...]

Seven year old Extras, perfectly "qualified" in radio. Uh, huh...

LHA / WMD

2639. Re: DAVEMADE, BILLS 2 WAY next in the AKC rat-out pipeline!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 21:22:04 UTC
From: KILLERMAN305@YAHOO.COM
Message-ID: <5364d15c.0402141322.796f1009@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.personals.gay,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

redneck rampage <redneck@bubba.com> wrote in message
news:<43487b62d5868dec667a76c305ca4333@news.bubbanews.com>...
> On Mon, 09 Feb 2004 07:42:30 -0600, Duke Of Windsor <duke@hen.com>
> wrote:
>
> >WA3MOJ@none.com wrote in news:20040209072110.106$dz@newsreader.com:
> >
> >> N8WWM (AKC SLAPS PACETRONICS HARD!) wrote:
> >>> WA3MOJ@none.com wrote in message
> >>> news:<20040208205930.974$Fb@newsreader.com>...
> >>> > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >>> > > BELIEVE it.
> >>> > >
> >>> > > PACETRONICS went down.
> >>> > >
> >>> > > More will soon.
> >>> > >
> >>> > > The goal is a world without KEYCLOWNS.
> >>> > >
> >>> > > It CAN happen.
> >>> > >
> >>> > I've always heard good things about Bills 2 way for CB gear.
> >>>
> >>> Who gives a shit...he deserves it for amps.
> >>>
> >> Find another hobby you repeater jamming, felony living freak!
> >
> >
> >Easy Moped, Curt will have to spank you agin.
I DONT REALLY CARE WHAT YOU SAY JAG OFF

2640. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 21:49:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214164944.01692.00000619@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 87367

In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <expletive_deleted@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040214130732.25815.00006658@mb-m07.aol.com...
>> In article <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Why is it OK because it's a one-time thing?
>
>Because there's no real harm to anyone...and if you want an
>incentive licensing scheme to be retained, this does it plus
>it simplifies licensing and regs for the FCC and does it in one
>snapshot of time.

On the contrary, Bill, to olde-tyme hammes, the "unqualifications"
(not being licensed under old standards and practices) causes
irreconcileable psychological HARM to those olde-tymers.

They will LOSE some of their bragging rights and rank/status/
privilege that made them so arrogantly "superior." Ho hum.

>> That's a good point. The reduction affects only those who have certain
licenses
>> on a certain date.
>>
>> But it's still a reduction for a very large number of hams.
>
>Agreed.
>
>> >THAT is the critical difference.
>> >
>> And it raises a critical question: Why is it OK as a one-time thing but not
as
>> a permanent change?
>
>Because it harms no one to get to the simplified scheme AND
>it then continues with the incentive system as before.

"Incentive?" Incentive towards bragging rights, I'm sure.

Such seems to be a very important part of today's amateur radio,
almost as much as morsemanship...

>> Agreed - but it's still a reduction. And Carl said he would not support any
>> reductions in written testing. Now, all of a sudden it's OK because it's a

one
>> time thing.
>
>Time and situations change and people change.

Mr. Expletive_deleted does NOT ALLOW anyone to change their
minds! Hiram forbid that anyone, ever changes their minds!

>> That's what they said 40 years about incentive licensing.
>
>Big difference. Every General that lost privileges still understands
>that loss. With this, no one losses anything.

...except psychological harm. :-)

>> >Why, because no one losses any privileges.
>>
>> Maybe. Or maybe not.
>
>If maybe not, please point to what privileges will
>be lost by which license holders.

The "loss" is very deep, very personal. Their world is collapsing
around them, the sky is falling, and all is lost.

>> No, it's not what I want.
>>
>> But how do we argue against those who want it?
>
>YOU are assuming someone will file another petition to do that.
>I'll worry about reacting/commenting on that...if and when it happens.

No change! No change! Hold back the dawn! :-)

>> So they keep their old licenses. And the database still has their old
license
>> class.
>
>The database could be updated overnight by replacing all licenses with their
>upgraded license. Doing that does not require an actual new paper
>license to be issued if Part 97 contains the following statement:
>
> Any license holder whos paper license is Tech is now recognized to be
> General and (ditto for Advanced to Ectra).

Everything to these olde-tymers is wrapped up in that pretty piece
of paper (suitable for framing). Change cannot happen until that
license certificate is officially modified by an official of the official
government. Officially.

>> I don't claim to. The person who wrote that something "doesn't comport" is
>> claiming to know what FCC wants.
>

>Take it as a best quess then.

Mr. Expletive_deleted has previously claimed "insider knowledge."

He KNOWS. Ho hum.

>> >Ultimately the FCC will decide.
>>
>> Just like BPL. Should we not oppose BPL?
>
>Different subject for a different thread.

Normal misdirection by Mr. Expletive_deleted. :-)

>> I'll file comments to do the opposite. Maybe a proposal, too.
>
>As is your right to do so.

Absolutely.

>> 20,000 in the past 12 months.
>
>We'll likly lose that many to attrition this year alone. Look at
>the future expirations per Joe Speroni's web site. There's one
>month alone that has (I think) over 10,000 expirations.

Morsemanship doesn't guarantee immortality?!?!?

Tsk, tsk, tsk!

>> >Life's a
>>
>> [expletive deleted]
>
>> > and then we die.
>> >
>> Apply that philosophy to accepting the code test.
>
>God grant us the wisdom to...
>Accept the things we cannot change, change those
>we can and hopefully have the wisdom to know the difference.

Some cannot be changed, do not permit change that infringes
on their rank/status/privilege. Federals must support their
bragging rights no matter what. :-)

>> How do you know?
>
>SWAG and common sense. Do you see a floodgate opening
>of new hams rushing to become techs before the FCC
>implements free upgrades on a certain date?

He WILL "see" such and be inventive in his rationalization of same!

Take that to the bank. :-)

>> It means that I met different qualifications. And I've seen the
qualifications,
>> both written and code, slowly reduced for over a quarter century. And
that's
>> not a good thing.
>
>And if that is your true meaning, why would you state
>that "You (Carl) couldn't pass the tests I (Jim) took, Carl."
>Do you really think Carl would be unable to pass the same
>written tests if he had to?

Finally you getting a glimpse of Mr. Expletive_deleted's motives. :-)

U.S. amateur radio has always been about morsemanship? To
some that is a Maxim.

>> I wonder what HK's written test requirements are.....
>
>I don't really care.

He is worried. :-)

LHA / WMD

2641. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 21:49:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214164946.01692.00000620@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 87368

In article <KUuXb.5396$hm4.1477@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
>> Bill Sohl wrote:
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>
>> >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
>> >
>> > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
>>
>> Uh huh!
>>
>> I'll ask:
>>
>> Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
>
>Why would they be "unqualified?" Let's be serious here!
>In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
>at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
>I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
>life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
>permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.

Irrelevant, Bill. At stake is the beloved rank, status, title obtained
under the old system. Old standards MUST remain.

That can NEVER change. To change means a personal threat
to bragging rights enforced by federal title/status/privilege.

>> >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction in
>> >>the written test requirements for those licenses.
>> >
>> > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
>> > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
>> > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
>>
>> Give me a break, Bill!
>>
>> Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
>
>Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
>what?

"Unqualified" to have rank/status/title in the Archaic Radio-
telegraphy Service.

>> >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
>> > >but it's still a reduction.
>> >
>> > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
>> > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
>> > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
>> > permanent reductions in requirements.
>>
>> Are the people qualified?
>
>YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
>unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
>they would be unqualified.

All who do not think like him are "unqualified." No problem in
determining that to me.

>> >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>> >
>> > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
because
>> > no one losses any privileges.
>>
>> Are they qualified?
>
>Broken record here it seems.

Since his record is broken he is giving you the needle. :-)

>> A few things here.
>>
>> IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
>> reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you
>> are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
>> evil Morse code supporters.
>
>I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
>relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
>system as created simply asks for passage of another test
>on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
>that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
>that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
>spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
>spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
>power.

Olde-tyme Extras gave everyone the Word on "being qualified."

Morsemanship is the epitome of U.S. amateur radio. So it shall
be...because the olde-tyme Extras said so. Ho hum.

>> If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
>> and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great
>> disservice.
>>
>> Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
>> support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
>
>The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
>novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
>power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
>
>> I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just
>> do this once
>
>Believe whatever makes you feel good.

I believe that Coslo IS all that naive...along with the ARRL and
their idea that EVERYONE getting into amateur radio knows
little about radio...and must then "begin at the lowest possible
level in order to satisfy the (mythical) amateur community."

>> and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
>
>The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
>thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
>be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
>or Advanced to Extra.
>
>> I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
>> I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
>> here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
>> to HF. A pattern forms.
>
>Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
>background too.
>
>Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.

He ran aground.

LHA / WMD

2642. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 21:49:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214164947.01692.00000621@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 87366

In article <IcudnXhqWabP97PdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:

>> In the past 12 months, FCC issued over 20,000 new ham licenses. Most of
those
>> were Techs. Why is it OK for them to get General privileges based on having
>> passed the 35 question Tech test, and having less than 1 year experience,
but
>> not OK for future hams?
>
> Kinda makes you wonder, eh? I cannot come ot any logical conclusion
>that does not include a permanent reduction in the qualifications.

Hiram forbid you EVER lose your rank, status, privileges obtained
under old standards! Cannot that...ever!

The old standards must remain inviolate, never ever changed!

The ONLY ones "qualified" are those who took the same tests
you took.

Yup, you are SO qualified. Nobody else is if they didn't take the
same tests you did. [we get the picture]

> The rest snipped, I gotta go do some housework.....

Are you QUALIFIED to do housework? :-)

LHA / WMD

2643. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 21:55:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214165542.08626.00003103@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87369

In article <c08g7k$f4$04$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>Hi, Jim,

Hello Helmut - sorry to take so long to reply
>
>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
>news:c2356669.0402090633.3f2b1d3a@posting.google.com...
>> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
>news:<c07i32$53c$03$1@news.t-online.com>...
>> > Hi all, on this thread,
>>
>> Hello!
>> >
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
>> > news:20040208235456.07984.00000516@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> > > In article <j4mdnWJeFNc9ZrvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> > > <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> writes:
>> > > >
>> > > >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> > > >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > > >> Jim,
>> > > >> I'm willing to share the Extra sub-bands with a few others.
>> > > > Only a few?
>> > > > Fun fact:
>> > > > When I got my Extra there were fewer than 10,000 others (other Extras,
>> > that
>> > > > is). Now there are over 104,000 others. Doesn't bother me a bit. The
>more
>> > the
>> > > > merrier - IF they pass the tests.
>> >
>> > You all are on the wrong numbers, as you might recall, that the airwaves
>> > wont stop ath the borders of your country.
>>
>> The "others" I wrote of above are other US Amateur Extra licensees.
>
>HF-Bands are not only for EXTRA licensed hams from the US, and the
>expression "SANDBOX" means the whole spectrum accessible for radio amateurs
>all over the world.

Wasn't meant that way at all.

My philosophy is that anyone in any country who can pass the required tests of that
country and get the required license is welcome on the ham bands.

In the USA, parts of some bands are reserved for Extras. The USA has long had a multilevel license structure, designed to reward increased knowledge and skill with
more spectrum space.

>In the process of restructuring after WRC03 zillion of
>hams will be able to enter this spectrum.

How many will really do it, though?

And remember that the restructuring is determined by the governments of each country. The ITU sets minimum requirements - the signatory countries can have more requirements for a license.

>Most of them did not pass the "US
>GOLD CARD EXTRA" tests. They are given full HF privileges by the
>authorities.

Sure - that's up to the governments of their countries. And what US hams get is up
to the FCC.

>This will also occur in the United States in the near future.

You mean the FCC will eliminate the Extra class license? How and why?

>Do you realy think, your authority will step back from their voting at
>WRC03? Do you think they want to loose their face towards those other
>countries they were partnering at the WRC03?

I'm not sure what you mean.

If you're talking about the Morse code test, all that changed at WRC03 was that it stopped being an international requirement. Each country can now choose whether or not to have a Morse code test. So far, FCC hasn't changed any US rules.

If you're talking about the written tests, all that changed at WRC03 was that it stopped being a vague statement about each country setting its own standards and became an international recommendation with specific standards of what hams should know. Each country is expected to meet the standards in its own way. So far, FCC hasn't changed any US rules.
>
>They all are your fellow hams. Your friends, buddies, pals, or fellas. Why
>don't you try to do the same, as the rest of the worlds hams are doing to
>their hamfriends, stepping up now into the heaven of ham radio?

I've been in the heaven of ham radio for almost 37 years now, Helmut. Last night I worked an OK1 on 40 CW and an F5 on 80 CW with my 100W homebrew rig. Got the OK1 on the first buzz but there was quite a pile on the F5.

>Welcome
>them, elmer them, if you think they are not skilled enough, and give them
>the feeling of beeing welcome in your part of the spectrum.

Been doing that for almost 37 years now.

>Exept in the US
>and a few other countries, you can tell the license class from the callsign.

Sort of. In the US, the license class *sometimes* tells the license class. For example, all 1x2 and 2x1 callsigns are Extras, but Extras can also have other callsigns. I know hams with callsigns like WA3IYC who have been Extras for 30+ years.

>From all the others around the globe you cannot tell, if they've got their
>HF-privileges after the WRC without passing a test.

You're missing the point, Helmut.

What is being proposed by some is that some existing hams get a free upgrade to the next-higher license class without a *written* test that is required of everyone else. Some of us don't think that's a good idea.

>What will your reaction
>be? "Go home, this is MY PARTof the spectrum"?

No. But I will oppose changing the rules.

>There will be poor operational skills around for a while.

That's not the issue at all.

>Just recall YOUR first months of HF-operation.

October 1967.

>No master ever fell out of the blue sky, they all had to take
>their lesson and do her homework and practice.

But first they had to take the required tests.

>Beeing a ham worldwide includes to be:
>CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>pleasure of others.
>LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local
>clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in
>the United States is represented nationally and internationally.
>
>PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient
>station and operation above reproach.
>
>FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and
>counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration
>for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.
>
>BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to

>family, job, school or community.
>
>PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and
>community.

I agree with all of that. But that code does not mean that I must accept
without protest any and all proposed changes to the ARS.
>
>--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928.
>Nowadays there has to be added: global thinking

What does global thinking have to do with requirements for an amateur radio
license
in the USA? Maybe the rest of the world should adopt the USA's ideas.
>
>> Most of what is discussed here is amateur radio policy in the USA.
>
>> That's simply a result of it being US based and in English.
>
>And concerning this newsgroup as to be US-based and written in english
>language is not protecting you of beeing a ham. Act like, speak like and
>write like it is to the honor of amateur radio.

What have I written that is dishonorable? I have said that *all* who pass the
required tests and get the required license are welcome in *our* sandbox.
>
>> > > >So am I. They need to be tested though, and they need to take the
>> > > >test that other Extra's take.
>
>I've heard the same song across the bands after they dropped the CW-test to
>5wpm. Did it help anything?

I don't see where dropping the code test to 5 wpm helped much. A lot of
existing US hams
upgraded their existing licenses, but an even greater number did not. There was
a
very slight increase in the number of US hams. But not a large increase.

Several countries around the globe have dropped their Morse code tests
entirely.
Have they gotten lots more new hams as a result?

>Your authority ignored it. Do you think they did
>change their habit to please 10 percent of the american hams?

The USA reduced code testing to 5 wpm back in April 2000, even though
the majority of American hams who expressed an opinion to the government
wanted more than 5 wpm.

>> > > Exactly.

>> > > >> Be careful ... your "not in my sandbox" motives are showing.

>> > > > as are your motives.
>> > >
>> > > As I said before - all who pass the required tests are welcome in
>> > > *our* sandbox.

See?

>> > What is "your sandbox"?
>>
>> I don't have one!
>>
>> > Where can I make a test to access 40m above 7.100 ?
>>
>> Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
>>
>> The reason hams in Regions 1 and 3 don't have 7.100-7.300 is that
>> their governments wanted that spectrum for shortwave broacasting in 1938.
>> It's not the fault of hams or governments in Region 2.

To be even more specific: In the Cairo convention of 1938, certain central
European governments insisted on taking part of the ham band for SWBC.
Their allies in the Far East agreed. The compromise was that Region 2
kept 40 meters as 7000-7300.

And although those governments are long gone, it has taken more than
60 years to change things.
>
>You are right on this. It will get regulated after 2007 when the 40m
>allocation will be 7000 - 7200 exclusive for all hams worldwide. This was
>also concluded in Geneva.

Because Region 1 and Region 3 SWBC changed.

>> > Where can I do the test for usage of 146 - 148 MHz?
>>
>> Move to ITU Region 2. Or convince your government to change the rules.
>>
>> > This is your sandbox, I
>> > assume.
>>
>> Not mine. Ours.

"Ours" meaning "all the hams in the world who have the required licenses" not
just US hams.

>> > But all the other Ham frequencies are also the sandbox and
>> > playground of all the hams in the world. Their numbers are a lot more
>> > than just 100k.
>>
>> And they're all welcome. But how many of them are actually using, say,
>> 7.000 to 7.025?

Well, Helmut? Do *you* use those frequencies? I used some of them less than 24
hours ago.

>> > > >>>>Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.

>> > > >>>If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them upgrades,
>> > > >>>is there?

>> > > >> They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>> > > >> sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>> >
>> > > >>>>83,000 advanced today who are either SK, inactive or just
>> > > >>>>don't see the need to upgrade and you expect even a measurable
>> > > >>>>increase in QRM because some of them may suddenly start
>> > > >>>>operating in the Extra only segments.
>> > > >>>
>> > > >>>Then just leave 'em be!
>> >
>> > > >> That would require essentially maintaining the status quo, which
>> > > >> is unacceptable.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Why? What happens if the staus quo is maintaned?
>> > > >
>> > > Good question.
>> > > > >
>> > > >> The FCC wants to simplify - the ARRL wants to create a viable
>> > > >> entry level class with meaningful HF privs and reasonable power
>> > > >> limits.
>> > > > >
>> > > >On what relevant statements do you base this?
>> > > > >
>> > > >> After careful consideration of Ed Hare's (personal, not ARRL)
>> > > >> comments on the subject on eHam.net, I (personally, not as NCI)
>> > > >> think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> > > >> to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > As a person that would never support a reduction in the written test
>> > > >requirements, how do you support your rationale?
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Do you now support a reduction in the test requirements? Obviously
>the
>> > > >answer is yes.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Are these benificiaries of the so called "one shot deal" qualified
>to
>> > > >operate at the level to which they will be advanced?
>> >
>> > Thats the usual procedure in most countries of the globe to make a one
>shot
>> > exam.
>>
>>
>> That's not the case in the USA. We have several classes of license,
>> with a very easy and simple exam for the limited-privileges licenses and a
>more

>> advanced exam for the full-privileges license. By the standards of
>> most of the rest of the world, the USA exams are very easy.
>>
>> What is being discussed in this thread is a proposal that would give
>> more privileges to many with limited-privileges license *without* any
>> more tests. I think that's a bad idea.
>
>> > > >
>> > > > Assuming your answer is yes, what is the reasoning behind those who
>> > > >come after the "one shot deal" to have to take a more difficult test?
>> > > >
>> > > That's the real problem - particularly for the Tech-to-General
>upgrade.
>> >
>> > Effective after Aug. 15, 2003, this kind of upgrade from non-HF to HF-
>Hams
>> > has occured after the WRC03 throughout the world.
>>
>> Are you talking about the code test? We're talking about the *written*
>> tests.
>>
>> > This has been of greatest
>> > benefit to ham radio after its developement. Now as there is young blood
>on
>> > the bands, it will keep the ITU from knibbling on the bands.
>>
>> How much difference has it really made?
>>
>> How many countries have changed their rules?
>>
>> How many new hams have gotten on the air since those changes?
>>
>> How does the number of new hams since the changes compare to an equal
>> period of time before the changes?
>
>Jim, it is not the difference in numbers, it is just the fact, that it
>happend.

If there is no difference in numbers, why make the change?

>Give yourself the cream upon the cake and think positive about the
>new situation.

I do!

>Showing anger and agressiv language against those beeing a
>"victim" of the restructuring process doesn't bring any good to the ham
>family.

I see far more anger from others who disagree with me. Your friend Len
Anderson is very angry and aggressive. He is not a ham and would not
make a good ham, judging by how he writes here.

>Not in your country, and not around the world. And where we cannot
>do anything against it, it's not worth to argue about it.

But maybe something can be done about it.

I don't think the written tests for a US amateur radio license with full
privileges should be made easier. In fact, I think they are too easy.
The *written* tests! Should I just be quiet about it?

>It is NOT negotiable.

Yes, it is. The USA has to meet the minimum requirements of the
treaty, but does not have to stay at the minimum.
>
>Here in Europe, we even did'nt have the time to try negotiating. The
>authorities of the various countries just signed the bill and thats it.

That's why I live in the USA. We have the right to argue and negotiate. It's
called the democratic process. Some of my distant ancestors invented it
thousands of years ago.

>Your FCC should do the same.

I disagree. Our FCC should go through the democratic process, not simply
hand down rules with no discussion.

>This would save you all here on this thread a lot of nerves.

Maybe. But discussion is part of the process.
>
>God bless, stay calm, and have a nice week

You too, Helmut.
>
>73 de OE8SOQ
>
>Helmut
>
>ps: meet me on echolink node # 107658 if you would like to talk.
>
Not set up for that here.

Meet me on 7.020 CW sometime.....

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2644. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 22:24:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402141424.20b204cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87370

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402E3581.74D7A283@earthlink.net>...
>
> Poor Brian. Thought I was posting as Helmut.
>
> Dave K8MN

You were.

2645. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 22:45:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <402EA4F3.6050404@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87371

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
>dropping code testing.
>
>
>
I thought that Hong Kong is now ruled by communist China.
So HK is not a country.

>
>

2646. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 22:47:12 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <s8l2g1-2i9.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87373

"N8IE" <dot.com@dot.com> wrote in message
news:BRtXb.5063$9H3.3600@fe2.columbus.rr.com...
> Who cares?

Since you cared enough to respond, I guess this is a rhetorical question?

> The ARRL is a joke.

Even if that is true, what has that got to do with Hong Kong? You do know it
is part of China, not the USA, don't you?

> The hobby is a joke.

Get another hobby if you don't like it.

> Ham Radio is dead, RIP.

Luckily, sensible people know that this sort of change does not prevent them
from doing what interests them nor does it negate the personal satisfaction
anyone may get from learning/using Morse.

Mark

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:UGrXb.4535$W74.321@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
> > dropping code testing.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

2647. Re: Pirate shortwave station on 75 meters.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 22:48:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402EA5BE.56E93595@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87372

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402E3581.74D7A283@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Poor Brian. Thought I was posting as Helmut.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

> You were.

There, there, Brian. Stay in bed and keep taking aspirin. Let's hope
that fever breaks.

Dave K8MN

2648. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 23:07:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402141507.25e8589d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87374

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402140632.21476a44@posting.google.com>...

> If you were to send an email to billybeeper it would never get read.

Actually it was yet another "Lennie Did It, So Will I" attempt to
mask your identity until you, like he, got a bit to proud of your
"smartness" and signed a "BullyBeeper" post with your own name...Then
there was no getting the cat back in the bag.

Steve, K4YZ

2649. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 23:11:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402141511.67cb2364@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87375

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message

> Be nice to the gunnery nurse or he will call you "scum" and "putz"
> and make you get down and give you ten.

Many here have disagreed with me without the need to resort to
such adjectives, Lennie...

It's just that YOUR conduct, lying and other anti-social
behaviour EARNED you the endearments..."You Reap What You Sew", etc
etc etc...

Embrace them, Your Scumminess...You earned them...They're yours
to keep. I am sure you're proud of them.

Steve, K4YZ

2650. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 23:15:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402EAC18.488E92E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87376

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >
> > >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> > >
> > >
> > > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> >
> > Uh huh!
> >
> >
> > I'll ask:
> >
> >
> > Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
>
> Why would they be "unqualified?"

Let's be specific: It is because they will not have passed the exam
which the FCC says they must pass in order to qualify for a specific
class of license.

> Let's be serious here!

It is getting tougher to be serious when you persist in yanking our
lanyards.

> In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
> at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.

Let's do this one in your manner: Whatever floats your boat. Life's
a--well, you know the drill.

> I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.

How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit on VHF/UHF. I'm
betting that the answer is "none".

> > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction
> in
> > >>the written test requirements for those licenses.

> > >
> > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> >
> > Give me a break, Bill!
> >
> > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
>
> Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> what?

They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher class
license. No ifs, ands or buts.

> > >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
> > > >but it's still a reduction.
> > >
> > > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
> > > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> > > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> > > permanent reductions in requirements.
> >
> > Are the people qualified?
>
> YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
> they would be unqualified.

By your statement, you are supporting a watering down of both the
General and Extra class licenses. I'm quite certain that this is
something you stated that you'd never support.

> > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> > >
> > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
> because
> > > no one losses any privileges.
> >
> > Are they qualified?
>
> Broken record here it seems.

The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not been
forthcoming.

> > A few things here.
> >
> > IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
> > reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you
> > are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
> > evil Morse code supporters.

>
> I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
> relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
> system as created simply asks for passage of another test
> on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
> that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
> that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
> spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
> spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
> power.

So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of the
elimination of incentive licensing. There can be no other explanation.
If your agenda extends not just to the elimination of morse testing but
to the watering down of the written exams, why not be bold? Come out and
say so.

> > If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
> > and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great
> > disservice.
> >
> > Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> > support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
>
> The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)

The League's position provides a "gimme" to tens of thousands by
granting a by on testing. It is apparent that if it can be done on a
one-time basis, it can be done permanently.

> > I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just
> > do this once
>
> Believe whatever makes you feel good.

Is that how you decide what to believe?

> > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
>
> The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> or Advanced to Extra.

You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from Tech
to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
thousands.
Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it necessary
to do.

> > I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
> > I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
> > here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
> > to HF. A pattern forms.
>
> Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> background too.

I didn't hear music. I did read your words and Carl's words. What you are writing these days is at odds with the earlier statements. Your earlier statements which traditionally began, "all we want is..." sound disingenuous.

> Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.

Opposition to the League's plan floats mine right now. I suppose your comment is better than one of Lennie's "TS" brushoffs.

Dave K8MN

2651. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-14 23:32:00 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <ssn2g1-ln9.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87377

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net...
<snip>
> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false
> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own >
ignorance.
>
> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.

Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get a
"real feel" of it by doing similar things.

I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as being
an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the operations -
there are licences, there are regulations, there are serious conversations,
there are "rag chew" conversations, there is problem solving and information
exchange. These is even a "siblinghood" (is that the PC equivalent of
"brotherhood"? ;-)) amongest the operators.

What exactly are you suggesting is so different in AR that it is completely
alien from any other activity?

> Ignorance would be to
> assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
> his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.

This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even very
similar activities.

<snip>

2652. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 00:03:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402141603.1671543a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87378

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402E5028.963CC842@earthlink.net>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
> > dropping code testing.
>
> I'm sure that your news will be greeted with great elation by the
> roughly 360 radio amateurs (including club stations and those licensed
> by, but no longer living in Hong Kong) of Hong Kong. The world is
> slowly being freed from this morse testing oppression.
>
> It is truly a great day for something-or-other.
>
> Dave K8MN

Did the Germans march on Hong Kong?

2653. Dept of State

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 00:09:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402141609.29a84e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87379

* Department of State ham club on the air for Presidents' Day: The Daily DX <http://www.dailydx.com> reports that the Department of State Amateur Radio Club's W3DOS will be on the air February 14-16 to celebrate Presidents' Day. Approximate operating frequencies will be CW: 3.530, 7.030, 10.130 14.030, 18.080, 21.030, 24.910 and 28.030 MHz. SSB: 3.880, 7280, 14280, 18150, 21380, 24.980 and 28.480 MHz.

2654. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 00:14:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402141614.2341a827@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87380

"N8IE" <dot.com@dot.com> wrote in message
news:<BRtXb.5063$9H3.3600@fe2.columbus.rr.com>...
> Who cares?
> The ARRL is a joke.
> The hobby is a joke.
>
> Ham Radio is dead, RIP.

Code Forever!!!

Right?

Damn near killed ham radio.

Necrology from QRZ:

I've been licensed since 1992, my old call was N8VZU. Currently I operate 99% CW/QRP and can be found on or near 14.060, or 7.040 most nights, if you hear me give me a call.
I do some contesting, (I took first place in the 2000 Ohio QSO Party for QRP, and first place for Ohio/Great Lakes Division SSB/QRP in the 2000 ARRL Sweeps) but mostly enjoy ragchewing.

I belong to the Flying Pigs, #-6, FISTS, #4985, QRP-l, #1404, plus a few more. Currently I manage the Sprints for FISTS.

I am a proud member and club call trustee for the Flying Pigs QRP Club, International W8PIG. We are dedicated to promoting CW, QRP, and most of all FUN! Our club motto: No Dues, No Rules, Just FUN. Membership is open to everyone, drop by http://www.fpqrp.com and join today.

72, oo Dan, N8IE

2655. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 00:24:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214192433.12501.00006204@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87381

In article <20040214165542.08626.00003103@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <c08g7k$f4$04$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
>writes:

>My philosophy is that anyone in any country who can pass the required tests of
that
>country and get the required license is welcome on the ham bands.

...but not in here where only "real" hams belong... :-)

>>Most of them did not pass the "US
>>GOLD CARD EXTRA" tests. They are given full HF privileges by the
>>authorities.
>
>Sure - that's up to the governments of their countries. And what US hams get
is up
>to the FCC.

...all after severe and almost solo lobbying by the ARRL in older times.

>>This will also occur in the United States in the near future.
>
>You mean the FCC will eliminate the Extra class license? How and why?

You are the "insider" at the FCC, what are they "really thinking?" :-)

>>Do you realy think, your authority will step back from their voting at
>>WRC03? Do you think they want to loose their face towards those other
>>countries they were partnering at the WRC03?
>
>I'm not sure what you mean.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you never followed the reports via the IARU and other
nations' administrative delegations, did you? :-)

>>They all are your fellow hams. Your friends, buddies, pals, or fellas. Why
>>don't you try to do the same, as the rest of the worlds hams are doing to
>>their hamfriends, stepping up now into the heaven of ham radio?
>
>I've been in the heaven of ham radio for almost 37 years now, Helmut. Last
>night I worked an OK1 on 40 CW and an F5 on 80 CW with my 100W
>homebrew rig. Got the OK1 on the first buzz but there was quite a pile on
>the F5.

You didn't answer the question...

>>Welcome
>>them, elmer them, if you think they are not skilled enough, and give them
>>the feeling of beeing welcome in your part of the spectrum.
>
>Been doing that for almost 37 years now.

Of course you have, spending hours and hours on the computer telling
everyone to follow the old ways, to concentrate on telegraphy as the
most valuable skill. :-)

>>From all the others around the globe you cannot tell, if they've got their
>>HF-privileges after the WRC without passing a test.
>
>You're missing the point, Helmut.

You are missing Helmut's point, James.

>What is being proposed by some is that some existing hams get a free
>upgrade to the next-higher license class without a *written* test that is
>required of everyone else. Some of us don't think that's a good idea.

Yes, it robs you of your federally-guaranteed bragging rights. :-)

>>What will your reaction
>>be? "Go home, this is MY PARTof the spectrum"?
>
>No. But I will oppose changing the rules.

The status quo must remain. Forever. Ho hum.

>>There will be poor operational skills around for a while.
>
>That's not the issue at all.

Is BPL the issue? :-)

>>Just recall YOUR first months of HF-operation.
>
>October 1967.

Mine was in February, 1953. :-) I was already an
adult, of age...

>>No master ever fell out of the blue sky, they all had to take
>>their lesson and do her homework and practice.
>
>But first they had to take the required tests.

I didn't take any tests. Just followed orders. Did that for 3
years with 43 HF transmitters and/or 9 24-channel microwave
terminals. No problem.

>I agree with all of that. But that code does not mean that I must accept
>without protest any and all proposed changes to the ARS.

...yas, yas, only MORSE CODE must be followed... :-)

>>--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928.
>>Nowadays there has to be added: global thinking
>
>What does global thinking have to do with requirements for an amateur radio
>license in the USA?

Certainly, reciprocal operation...not to mention being on good terms with
other nations for negotiations with the gigantic non-amateur radio
activity.

>Maybe the rest of the world should adopt the USA's ideas.

Careful...your innate superiority is showing...

>>And concerning this newsgroup as to be US-based and written in english
>>language is not protecting you of beeing a ham. Act like, speak like and
>>write like it is to the honor of amateur radio.
>
>What have I written that is dishonorable? I have said that *all* who pass the
>required tests and get the required license are welcome in *our* sandbox.

You need to think of changing the sand...

>I don't see where dropping the code test to 5 wpm helped much. A lot of
>existing US hams
>upgraded their existing licenses, but an even greater number did not. There
>was a
>very slight increase in the number of US hams. But not a large increase.

tsk, tsk, tsk...there's only a few thousand or so OTHER hobby
activities that vie for attention. I'm sure you discount those as
inconsequential...

>Several countries around the globe have dropped their Morse code tests
entirely.
>Have they gotten lots more new hams as a result?

Was dropping the morse test requirement ALL about "getting more
hams?" I don't think so. Obviously you do.

>>Your authority ignored it. Do you think they did
>>change their habit to please 10 percent of the american hams?
>
>The USA reduced code testing to 5 wpm back in April 2000, even though
>the majority of American hams who expressed an opinion to the government
>wanted more than 5 wpm.

There were no more than 2300 Comments by individuals to FCC
NPRM 98-143. That is less than 0.3% of those licensed; a
couple of those were licensed with other countries.

There's over 5100 Comments on NOI 03-104.

"Majority?" I don't see it. But, if the ARRL said it was a "majority"
then everyone has to believe the ARRL. The ARRL can do no wrong.

>To be even more specific: In the Cairo convention of 1938, certain central
>European governments insisted on taking part of the ham band for SWBC.
>Their allies in the Far East agreed. The compromise was that Region 2
>kept 40 meters as 7000-7300.
>
>And although those governments are long gone, it has taken more than
>60 years to change things.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the 40 m issue wasn't solved at WARC-79 and didn't get
any real start at any solution until WRC-03. It won't be close to solved
until WRC-07.

In the meantime, I would suggest a review of world political change
that happened between 1938 and 1955. Was rather a lot of change
that I witnessed. Take all the time you need.

>>Jim, it is not the difference in numbers, it is just the fact, that it
>>happend.
>
>If there is no difference in numbers, why make the change?

Right...maintain the status quo foever and ever. Yawn.

>>Showing anger and agressiv language against those beeing a
>>"victim" of the restructuring process doesn't bring any good to the ham
>>family.
>
>I see far more anger from others who disagree with me. Your friend Len
>Anderson is very angry and aggressive. He is not a ham and would not
>make a good ham, judging by how he writes here.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still smarting over not getting the honor and respect
you think you deserve in newsgroups? :-)

Do you think your Amateur Extra class license puts you "above"
all others? :-) [of course you do...and you bitterly resent the
others not agreeing with you...]

>>Not in your country, and not around the world. And where we cannot
>>do anything against it, it's not worth to argue about it.
>
>But maybe something can be done about it.

Careful or you will be labeled "angry and agressive!" :-)

>I don't think the written tests for a US amateur radio license with full
>privileges should be made easier. In fact, I think they are too easy.
>The *written* tests! Should I just be quiet about it?

Right! No "quiet." Be ANGRY AND AGGRESSIVE. Every day
of the week... :-)

>>Here in Europe, we even did'nt have the time to try negotiating. The
>>authorities of the various countries just signed the bill and thats it.
>

>That's why I live in the USA. We have the right to argue and negotiate.

Except in this newsgroup where just anyone can come in! :-)

>It's
>called the democratic process. Some of my distant ancestors invented it
>thousands of years ago.

Oh my! The Greeks did it, but by males only.

The first practical application was in Iceland about 2000 years ago.
It was called the "Althing" in Scandinavian. :-)

>I disagree. Our FCC should go through the democratic process, not simply
>hand down rules with no discussion.

Oh? I thought you wanted the FCC to accept anything the ARRL
told them to do?

Saves time and energy by letting ARRL do all the dirty work.
That way you are free to "work" OKs and F5s. :-)

>>This would save you all here on this thread a lot of nerves.
>
>Maybe. But discussion is part of the process.

Except in here where "lesser" individuals are considered bottom-
feeding slime, unworthy of saying anything... :-)

LHA / WMD

2656. testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 00:28:02 UTC
From: testing <test@test.com>
Message-ID: <m2zXb.22547$1S1.20983@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 87382

```
test message
```

2657. GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 00:33:50 UTC
From: radio123 <test@test.com>
Message-ID: <O7zXb.22556$1S1.6506@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 87383

Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS radio under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.

2658. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 01:01:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214200103.25815.00006673@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87384

In article <ssn2g1-ln9.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little>
writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net...
><snip>
>> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false
>> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own
ignorance.
>>
>> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
>> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
>
>Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get a
>"real feel" of it by doing similar things.
>
>I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as being
>an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the operations -
>there are licences, there are regulations, there are serious conversations,
>there are "rag chew" conversations, there is problem solving and information
>exchange. These is even a "siblinghood" (is that the PC equivalent of
>"brotherhood"? ;-)) amongest the operators.
>
>What exactly are you suggesting is so different in AR that it is completely
>alien from any other activity?

Dave got his opinions beamed down from the Mother Ship by aliens?

>> Ignorance would be to
>> assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
>> his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
>
>This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even very
>similar activities.

It is VERY important to use PROPER PROCEDURE in all ham activity.

When hacking Western Union on the NTS, one MUST use the official
authorized radiogram forms. Net users may lose their jobs if the
official proper form is not used. All five of them.

Never at any time may other radio services' jargon, expressions, or any
other words except as officially permitted by league guides be used on
or off the air by devout amateurs. "Roger that" and "ten-four" phrases
are punishable by excommunication of any communication. The normal
penance is 100 Hail-Hirams and "sin no more" exhortations.

Proper civil courtesy on the air is to give everyone a "599" report, even if asking for repeats due to local noise. On 'phone all have superb diction and are perfectly understandable...always.

All amateur radios operate by laws of the league, not the laws of physics. Correct procedure is to always consult a Handbook, never any textbook about other radio services' equipment. Amateur radios do not work by such non-applicable laws. Only league books have official information.

The "amateur community" always rules on dedication and committment of all. Except for the Extras who are above criticsm and gods of radio.

All amateurs not expressing love, honor, and obeyance of morse code are bottom-feeding slime and shall always be treated as inferior trash not even worthy of contempt.

There, I guess this sums it up fairly well... :-)

LHA / WMD

2659. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 01:14:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <fKzXb.2459$t16.2067176@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87385

"radio123" <test@test.com> wrote in message
news:O7zXb.22556$1S1.6506@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
> Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS radio
> under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.
>
>

They must get the separate GMRS license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2660. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 01:29:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214202924.21232.00004260@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 87386

In article <ssn2g1-ln9.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little>
writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net...
><snip>
>> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false
>> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own >
>ignorance.
>>
>> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
>> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
>
>Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get a
>"real feel" of it by doing similar things.

The question, then, is "what is a similar thing?"

What would be similar to, say:

- having a baby
- running a marathon
- playing a musical instrument really well

(others are invited to add to the list)

>I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as being
>an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the operations -
>there are licences, there are regulations, there are serious conversations,
>there are "rag chew" conversations, there is problem solving and information
>exchange. These is even a "siblinghood" (is that the PC equivalent of
>"brotherhood"? ;-)) amongest the operators.

There are also big differences.
>
>What exactly are you suggesting is so different in AR that it is completely
>alien from any other activity?

Several things:

1) Hams have a level of freedom pretty much unmatched in other services. Wide variety of modes, bands, technologies, and activities. No channelization or requirement to use certain types of equipment.

2) Hams are almost all self-funded and noncommercial, using their own equipment on their own time.

3) [this it the really big one] Amateur radio is, at its core, radio communication for its own sake. To other services, radio is but a means to an end, but to hams the medium really is a big part of the message. Or to put it another way, the ham's journey is as important, if not more important, than the destination.

This is why certain things from other services don't apply to hams.

The person watching TV usually doesn't care how the signal gets to the set - VHF, UHF, terrestrical, satellite, analog, digital, cable, fiber, whatever. All the TV viewer cares about is how good the picture, sound and program are.

The military communications folks don't care how the messages are carried, just so the messages get where they need to be, when they need to be there, without the bad guys knowing about them.

Do you know or care how your email and postings get to and from your computer? If you're like 99.99% of the online population, it's not an issue as long as it happens.

Heck, many if not most cellphone users don't even think in terms of "radio" - the cellphone to them is a telephone without wires, that's all. (In fact I have had people tell me that a cellphone is *not* a radio!)

The radio amateur does radio, for the most part, for purely emotional reasons. IOW, because it's fun, rewarding, challenging, educating, etc. "Radio for it's own sake".

This is why modes like Morse code, AM voice and Baudot FSK RTTY continue in use in amateur radio. Hams like them. They're fun, and they work.

>> Ignorance would be to
>> assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
>> his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
>
>This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even very
>similar activities.

And some very big differences. Much of what is done in other radio services does not transfer to amateur radio at all. For example, every other radio service I know of seeks to eliminate the need for a skill in the operation of the radio equipment. They think in terms of "user", not "radio operator". And given their constraints, it may make sense to do so, because it is usually less expensive to buy sophisticated equipment than to pay a skilled radio operator. But to hams, radio operating skill is the whole point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2661. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 01:51:27 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <zgAXb.313140$xy6.1534723@attbi_s02>
Source record: 87387

> >> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is
false
> >> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own
> ignorance.

Huh ???? I better get another beer to figure out this one .... just who is non-rational here ???? I haven't figured this one out yet. My idea of amateur radio is a deversion from my daily routine. I do not live by it or for it. It is my desire that all involved in the hobby-service-passion what ever have a good time in fellowship.

> >> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
> >> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
> >
> >Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get
a
> >"real feel" of it by doing similar things.

OK by your argument then lets say sex ..... but your definition of "real feel" and what I say is normal may differ.

Take care 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

Enjoying ham radio for what it is to me ..not what others perceive it or wish it to be.

2662. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 01:58:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402ED21F.199B08CF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87388

Mark Little wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net...
> <snip>
> > > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is false
> > > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own >
> ignorance.
> >
> > The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
> > real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
>
> Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get a
> "real feel" of it by doing similar things.

Nonsense, yourself. There are plenty of activities which might have
some outward similarities to other things but which are actually quite
different. Hunting with a shotgun is quite different than hunting with
a rifle. Even the aiming technique is very different. Driving the
family sedan on the roads and highways doesn't give one the feel for
Formula One racing. Being a Television station engineer doesn't impart
a feel for how to chase a weak one on 160m.

> I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as being
> an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the operations -
> there are licences,

How tough was the studying for a license for which there is no exam? ;-)

> there are regulations,

The regs aren't very much alike, are they? In fact, such point-to-point
channelized communications can only be compared to amateur VHF/UHF FM
operation.

> there are serious conversations,
> there are "rag chew" conversations, there is problem solving and information
> exchange. These is even a "siblinghood" (is that the PC equivalent of
> "brotherhood"? ;-)) amongest the operators.
>
> What exactly are you suggesting is so different in AR that it is completely
> alien from any other activity?

Oh, I can't think of a thing, Mark. Let's allow an artillery officer
who has never hunted game, decide best how game hunting should be
regulated.

> > Ignorance would be to
> > assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
> > his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
>
> This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even very
> similar activities.

You can bet there are and if you've read many of Leonard H. Anderson's
posts over the years, you'll find that he doesn't see them.

Dave K8MN

2663. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 02:19:43 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3HAXb.181306$U%5.897774@attbi_s03>
Source record: 87389

> It is VERY important to use PROPER PROCEDURE in all ham activity.

Sort of like driving in the right lane so as to maximize everyone's enjoyment .... reduce frustration etc.

> When hacking Western Union on the NTS, one MUST use the official
> authorized radiogram forms. Net users may lose their jobs if the
> official proper form is not used. All five of them.

Whatever floats one's boat ...again not my call on what I define as enjoyment. Passing traffic ... not for me personally.

> Never at any time may other radio services' jargon, expressions, or any
> other words except as officially permitted by league guides be used on
> or off the air by devout amateurs. "Roger that" and "ten-four" phrases
> are punishable by excommunication of any communication. The normal
> penance is 100 Hail-Hirams and "sin no more" exhortations.

Better watch it Len ...Hiram is listening ...

> Proper civil courtesy on the air is to give everyone a "599" report,
even

.....during contests where all signals are 599 due to the ruler of the ionosphere making it so ...could never figure out this one ...but again I could never figure out contests but again whatever floats one's boat ...have a good time.

> if asking for repeats due to local noise. On 'phone all have superb
> diction and are perfectly understandable...always.

Len ...I have to get the receiver you are using and that DSP mode for diction control ...from what I have heard ..we could sure use it .

> All amateur radios operate by laws of the league, not the laws of
physics.
> Correct procedure is to always consult a Handbook, never any textbook
> about other radio services' equipment. Amateur radios do not work by
> such non-applicable laws. Only league books have official information.

Ah Len com'on ...thats a stretch even tounge in cheekedly ...besides how do you expect the league to make money? BTW are you a Diamond Club member yet ... for a couple grand you can get a discount on all league publications. That should pay for itself in a millenium or 2.

> The "amateur community" always rules on dedication and committment
> of all. Except for the Extras who are above criticsm and gods of
radio.

Len you need to talk to my wife ...she dosen't think so. I have heard her use a phrase containing God in reference to my radio as in get off that *** **** radio and do some work around here.

> All amateurs not expressing love, honor, and obeyance of morse code
> are bottom-feeding slime and shall always be treated as inferior trash
> not even worthy of contempt.

Naa not really ... but they are missing out on one tool in the box of ham radio.

> There, I guess this sums it up fairly well... :-)

eehhh ..... maybe
> LHA / WMD

Take care Len ..73 KI3R Tom

2664. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 02:24:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040214212445.12611.00002352@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 87390

>Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS radio
>under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.
>

Why not whats the difference

2665. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 02:40:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sZWdnT4mzu2WQbPdRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87391

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>
>>>>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
>>>
>>>
>>>I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
>>
>>Uh huh!
>>
>>
>>I'll ask:
>>
>>
>>Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
>
>
> Why would they be "unqualified?" Let's be serious here!
> In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
> at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
> I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.

So you now support no testing whatsoever, since the priveliges have no
bearing? Glad you finally got serious and admitted it.

>>>>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction
>
> in
>
>>>>the written test requirements for those licenses.
>>>
>>>Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
>>>mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
>>>requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
>>
>>Give me a break, Bill!
>>
>>Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?

>
>
> Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> what?

You are right Bill. There really is no need for qualification if you
don't want there to be.

>
>>>>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
>>>>but it's still a reduction.
>>>
>>>It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
>>>to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
>>>time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
>>>permanent reductions in requirements.
>>
>>Are the people qualified?
>
>
> YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
> they would be unqualified.

So why make the tests more difficult after the "one shot" upgrade? If
you think a technician is now qualified to be a General, then you should
be consistant.
>
>>>>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>>>
>>>If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
>
> because
>
>>>no one losses any privileges.
>>
>>Are they qualified?
>
>
> Broken record here it seems.

You notice?

>
>>A few things here.
>>
>>IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
>>reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you
>>are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
>>evil Morse code supporters.
>
>

> I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
> relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
> system as created simply asks for passage of another test
> on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
> that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
> that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
> spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
> spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
> power.
>
>
>>If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
>>and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great
>>disservice.
>>
>>Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
>>support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
>
>
> The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
>

The ARRL is being illogical.

And I see you don't deny my assertion.

>>I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just
>>do this once
>
>
> Believe whatever makes you feel good.

Doesn't make me feel good at all!
>
>
>>and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
>
>
> The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> or Advanced to Extra.

You're playing with my words here.

A person that takes the Technician test, then becomes a General with no
further retesting.

A person that takes a Technician test, then a General test.

Which person has done more? Unless you are suggesting that the future
General test is simply the equivalent of the Tech test.

>
>>I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
>>I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
>>here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
>>to HF. A pattern forms.
>
>
> Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> background too.

> Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.

Yeah I know, lifes a bitch.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2666. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 03:57:32 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <se73g1-csa.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87392

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040214202924.21232.00004260@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <ssn2g1-ln9.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little"
<mark@au.id.little>
> writes:
>
> >"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net...
> ><snip>
> >> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is
false
> >> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own >
> >ignorance.
> >>
> >> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
> >> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
> >
> >Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get
a
> >"real feel" of it by doing similar things.
>
> The question, then, is "what is a similar thing?"
>
> What would be similar to, say:
>
> - having a baby
According to a woman I know, passing a kidney stone. She has done both so is
probably in a good situation to know. I will take that one on faith as
neither seems that appealing.

> - running a marathon
"Hitting the wall" and the physical tribulations associated with a marathon
are not limited to running. If you have done other activities that stress
the body, then you are in a position to get the "feel". In my case, that is
just running to the end of the street. ;-)

> - playing a musical instrument really well
Anyone who has had to practice long and hard to achieve any hand skill will
know the satisfaction that comes with doing something well. I can't play the
guitar "really well", but I think it is safe to say I have a feel for what
it would be like to be able to do so.

> (others are invited to add to the list)
Jumping off a cliff - Never done it, but I have a good feel for what
happens - At the bottom, you go splattt!!!!!

> >I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as
being
> >an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the
operations -
> >there are licences, there are regulations, there are serious
conversations,
> >there are "rag chew" conversations, there is problem solving and
information
> >exchange. These is even a "siblinghood" (is that the PC equivalent of
> >"brotherhood"? ;-)) amongest the operators.
>
> There are also big differences.
> >
> >What exactly are you suggesting is so different in AR that it is
completely
> >alien from any other activity?
>
> Several things:
>
> 1) Hams have a level of freedom pretty much unmatched in other services.
Wide
> variety of modes, bands, technologies, and activities. No channelization
or
> requirement to use certain types of equipment.

I suggest that you look at the FCC page and search for "experimental licence". These couple of snippets may be of interest to show its breadth:

"Any person or entity--corporation, individual, etc. that is not a foreign government or representative of a foreign government may obtain an experimental license."

"Any frequency allocated to non-Government or Government use in the Table of Frequency Allocations may be assigned under the Experimental Radio Service, except frequencies exclusively allocated to the passive services."

Use of non-approved equipment is also permitted with this licence.

> 2) Hams are almost all self-funded and noncommercial, using their own
equipment
> on their own time.

Agreed, but again this is not unique. Plenty of people including CB operators and pleasure marine radio operators in the same boat (pun intended).

> 3) [this it the really big one] Amateur radio is, at its core, radio
> communication for its own sake. To other services, radio is but a means to
an
> end, but to hams the medium really is a big part of the message. Or to put
it
> another way, the ham's journey is as important, if not more important,
than the

> destination.

You are incorrect to assert that the medium is not important to others, especially in the scientific community. Radio propagation research by definition is interested in the medium.

It is also misleading to imply that the majority of Amateur have the medium as the primary focus of their activities. The majority of Amateurs use commercial equipment and spend the majority of their time chin-wagging. From their conversations, it is obvious that the conversation is more import than the medium.

> This is why certain things from other services don't apply to hams.
>
> The person watching TV usually doesn't care how the signal gets to the set -
> VHF, UHF, terrestrical, satellite, analog, digital, cable, fiber, whatever. All
> the TV viewer cares about is how good the picture, sound and program are.

While the person who watches TV may have no idea how it works, there is a complete army of people behind that tube that do know how it works and why it works. If one were to subtract the number of hams who cannot even fix a simple fault in their commerical rig, the odds would not be much different.

> The military communications folks don't care how the messages are carried, just
> so the messages get where they need to be, when they need to be there, without
> the bad guys knowing about them.

I'll bet its fair to say that most Amateurs do not understand how Packet, PACTOR or even just their rigs work. They simply plug in the boxes and off they go.

> Do you know or care how your email and postings get to and from your computer?

Actually, I do as I run my own servers.

> If you're like 99.99% of the online population, it's not an issue as long as it
> happens.

This is also the case for many Amateurs. Most would not know how their current rig works and they would neither have the expertise or equipment to find anything but the most trivial of faults.

> Heck, many if not most cellphone users don't even think in terms of "radio" -
> the cellphone to them is a telephone without wires, that's all. (In fact I have
> had people tell me that a cellphone is *not* a radio!)

As I said most Amateurs don't know how packet works or even how their Yaesu works. Under this defintion, most Amateurs aren't amateurs either. If one goes into particular instances, I've fixed radios for more than one full call that could not find that the battery wire had broken. Such anecdotes may be amusing, but have little value in the big picture.

> The radio amateur does radio, for the most part, for purely emotional reasons.
> IOW, because it's fun, rewarding, challenging, educating, etc. "Radio for it's
> own sake".

Certainly in the area I work, I have seen the scientists knock back very large amounts of money because it didn't have a research component that they found "fun, rewarding, challenging, educating, etc."

> This is why modes like Morse code, AM voice and Baudot FSK RTTY continue in use
> in amateur radio. Hams like them. They're fun, and they work.

Morse - still used commercially, in the forces and aviation (ident calls).
AM voice - still used in broadcasting.
FSK RTTY - still used as anyone with a communications rig can tell you.

None of these are unique to AR.

There is no doubt that these modes work and "fun" to some people. This is true even if you are a commercial operator. There are plenty of people who actually enjoy their work.

BTW, not all hams like these modes. Many people don't like Morse, many also don't like AM because of its bandwidth, especially in the lower bands and most Amateurs don't use RTTY with or without the clunking teleprinter.

> >> Ignorance would be to
> >> assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
> >> his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
> >
> >This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even very
> >similar activities.
>
> And some very big differences. Much of what is done in other radio services
> does not transfer to amateur radio at all. For example, every other radio
> service I know of seeks to eliminate the need for a skill in the operation of
> the radio equipment. They think in terms of "user", not "radio operator". And
> given their constraints, it may make sense to do so, because it is usually less
> expensive to buy sophisticated equipment than to pay a skilled radio operator.

How many Amateurs still neutralise their power amplifiers? No many. Why? Because they have decided to buy (in most cases not build) more sophisticated equipment that reduces the skill required to operate the radio. There is no difference. I don't know too many Amateurs who go to buy a rig and want the one that is the hardest to use.

> But to hams, radio operating skill is the whole point.

Unsustainable if you listen to the bands. Most people do not even comply with the statuatory requirements for identification, let alone push the envelope of operating skills.

Are you suggesting that randomly monitoring the Amateur Bands for a few hours would show a very high level of operating skill? I wouldn't bet the farm on that one, would you?

As I said, AR is by no means "unique" in what it provides and there are many people in the radio field, even if they don't hold an AR licence that would have a "really good feel" of what the Amateur Serice is all about bases on their other experiences.

It concerns me when Amateurs attempt to tell others that AR is "unique" and that a non-amateur could never underestand what it is all about, because all it does is reduce credibilty.

Mark

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2667. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 04:43:58 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <u5a3g1-d5b.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87393

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:zgAXb.313140$xy6.1534723@attbi_s02...
>
> > >> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is
> false
> > >> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own
> > ignorance.
>
> Huh ???? I better get another beer to figure out this one .... just who
is
> non-rational here ???? I haven't figured this one out yet. My idea of
> amateur radio is a deversion from my daily routine. I do not live by it
or
> for it. It is my desire that all involved in the hobby-service-passion
what
> ever have a good time in fellowship.
>
>
> > >> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
> > >> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
> > >
> > >Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot
get
> a
> > >"real feel" of it by doing similar things.
>
> OK by your argument then lets say sex ..... but your definition of "real
> feel" and what I say is normal may differ.

By taking this tack, even a licenced Amateur would not be able to get a
"real feel" as it is just about 100% certain that they will have different
interests and priorities than you.

I take a less metaphysical approach to "real feel". I mean it is relatively
easy to determine what Amateurs do and there are plenty of related things
(CB & marine radio, electronics kits, regulations, chat rooms, phones, etc)
so that a person could reasonably be expected to be about to judge whether
this would be interesting - before they went to the effort of getting a
licence.

> Take care 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>
> Enjoying ham radio for what it is to me ..not what others perceive it or
> wish it to be.

As it should be, but that does not prevent unlicenced people from knowing what the hobby is about. Whether they would enjoy those activities is a matter of personality, not of holding a licence.

regards,
Mark

2668. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 05:50:42 UTC
From: Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com>
Message-ID: <SMDXb.4423$tL3.795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87394

WA8ULX wrote:

>>Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS radio
>>under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.
>>
>
>
> Why not whats the difference

$75

:)
N6JPO

2669. who can use GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 06:29:56 UTC
From: radio123 <test@test.com>
Message-ID: <EIEXb.7160$wD5.1608@nwrddc03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 87395

Can my father use my GMRS license to communicate with my sister? What if I don't go on the vacation can they still use my license? Does the license cover the whole family where ever they are in the USA and even if I am not part of the direct communication ?

One license per family ?

2670. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 07:20:51 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <5cj3g1-jnb.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87396

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:402ED21F.199B08CF@earthlink.net...

> > I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as
being
> > an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the
operations -
> > there are licences,
>
> How tough was the studying for a license for which there is no exam? ;-)

Are you really just clueless or are you just trying to be a smart arse? In
case it is the former, this page may help:

http://wireless.fcc.gov/commoperators/

I'm not under FCC regulations so it's a real shame that I appear to know
more about them that you do.

> > there are regulations,
>
> The regs aren't very much alike, are they? In fact, such point-to-point
> channelized communications can only be compared to amateur VHF/UHF FM
> operation.

Radio regulations cover a truckload of licence types and the regulations are
many and varied. Did you read about your regulations and not understand; or
do you just make this stuff up as you go?

> > > Ignorance would be to
> > > assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
> > > his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
> >
> > This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even
very
> > similar activities.
>
> You can bet there are and if you've read many of Leonard H. Anderson's
> posts over the years, you'll find that he doesn't see them.

I didn't agree with him. I disagreed with you. His thoughts, past or
otherwise, right or wrong, aren't relevant.

Mark

2671. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 12:45:11 UTC
From: Xemu Ricecooker <phatoombe@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <6b67e$402f6b76$d1cc79f3$12738@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 87397

"radio123" <test@test.com> wrote in message
news:O7zXb.22556$1S1.6506@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
> Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS
radio
> under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.

You need to purchase a seperate GMRS Licence
from the FCC. Think it's $75 for 5 Years. Not a
bad deal really and it's cheaper and likely more
useful than a subscription to QST... ;)

2672. lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 13:38:23 UTC
From: Rileygotcha <rileygotcha@ridemamocycle.org>
Message-ID: <c0nsng$u20$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 87398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

lookin for BC-610. got truble with some local CBs
an needing to see if the bc-610 can clear the channul
up a bit.......bc-610 put out maybe 700 watt A.M.
i think but anyway it going really clear the channul
up! where can i get a bc-610 ?????

Rileygotcha

2673. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 14:02:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215090200.11022.00004125@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 87399

In article <se73g1-csa.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040214202924.21232.00004260@mb-m13.aol.com...
>> In article <ssn2g1-ln9.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little"
><mark@au.id.little>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:402E33F3.45F2EA79@earthlink.net...
>> ><snip>
>> >> > The idea that non-amateurs "not understanding" amateur radio is
>false
>> >> > and little more than an attempt at rationalization of their own >
>> >ignorance.
>> >>
>> >> The idea that one who has no experience in using amateur radio has no
>> >> real feel for amateur radio is no falsehood.
>> >
>> >Nonsense. There is nothing in life that is so insular that one cannot get
>a
>> >"real feel" of it by doing similar things.
>>
>> The question, then, is "what is a similar thing?"
>>
>> What would be similar to, say:
>>
>> - having a baby
>According to a woman I know, passing a kidney stone. She has done both so is
>probably in a good situation to know. I will take that one on faith as
>neither seems that appealing.

Those two are similar only in the pain experienced and the relief when it's
over.
But the joy of a new baby is not part of the kidney stone episode.
>
>> - running a marathon
>"Hitting the wall" and the physical tribulations associated with a marathon
>are not limited to running. If you have done other activities that stress
>the body, then you are in a position to get the "feel". In my case, that is
>just running to the end of the street. ;-)

There's a lot more to the marathon than "hitting the wall", which doesn't
happen

to all marathoners anyway. (I've run two marathons and numerous shorter races,
btw)
>
>> - playing a musical instrument really well
>Anyone who has had to practice long and hard to achieve any hand skill will
>know the satisfaction that comes with doing something well. I can't play the
>guitar "really well", but I think it is safe to say I have a feel for what
>it would be like to be able to do so.

So playing a guitar well is similar to playing a guitar really well...

>> (others are invited to add to the list)
>Jumping off a cliff - Never done it, but I have a good feel for what
>happens - At the bottom, you go splattt!!!!!

HAW!
>
>> >I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as
>> > being
>> >an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the
>> >operations -
>> >there are licences, there are regulations, there are serious
>> >conversations,
>> >there are "rag chew" conversations, there is problem solving and
>> >information
>> >exchange. These is even a "siblinghood" (is that the PC equivalent of
>> >"brotherhood"? ;-)) amongest the operators.
>>
>> There are also big differences.
>> >
>> >What exactly are you suggesting is so different in AR that it is
>> >completely
>> >alien from any other activity?
>>
>> Several things:
>>
>> 1) Hams have a level of freedom pretty much unmatched in other services.
>> Wide
>> variety of modes, bands, technologies, and activities. No channelization
>> or
>> requirement to use certain types of equipment.
>
>I suggest that you look at the FCC page and search for "experimental
>licence". These couple of snippets may be of interest to show its breadth:
>
>"Any person or entity--corporation, individual, etc. that is not a foreign
>government or representative of a foreign government may obtain an
>experimental license."
>
> "Any frequency allocated to non-Government or Government use in the Table
>of Frequency Allocations may be assigned under the Experimental Radio

>Service, except frequencies exclusively allocated to the passive services."
>
>Use of non-approved equipment is also permitted with this licence.

Not the same thing! Each experimental license is granted for a specific
purpose,
isn't it? The applicant has to make application for a specific reason, not
general
experimentation, and the license is limited to the specific experimentation
applied for.
It's not a general-purpose thing like a ham license.

How many experimental licenses are currently issued by FCC? There are over
682,000
US ham licenses issued to individuals.

How many new experimental licenses were issued by FCC last year? FCC issued
over 20,000 new ham licenses in 2003.

>> 2) Hams are almost all self-funded and noncommercial, using their own
>> equipment on their own time.
>
>Agreed, but again this is not unique. Plenty of people including CB
>operators and pleasure marine radio operators in the same boat (pun
>intended).

Those services are not about "radio for its own sake" and allow only a very
limited choice of channels and modes.

>> 3) [this it the really big one] Amateur radio is, at its core, radio
>> communication for its own sake. To other services, radio is but a means to
>> an end, but to hams the medium really is a big part of the message. Or to
put
>> it another way, the ham's journey is as important, if not more important,
>> than the destination.
>
>You are incorrect to assert that the medium is not important to others,
>especially in the scientific community. Radio propagation research by
>definition is interested in the medium.

Only to find out how it works.
>
>It is also misleading to imply that the majority of Amateur have the medium
>as the primary focus of their activities. The majority of Amateurs use
>commercial equipment and spend the majority of their time chin-wagging.
>From their conversations, it is obvious that the conversation is more import
than
>the medium.

If that were true, most of those conversations would have moved to other means
of communication long ago.

>> This is why certain things from other services don't apply to hams.
>>
>> The person watching TV usually doesn't care how the signal gets to the
>> set - VHF, UHF, terrestrical, satellite, analog, digital, cable, fiber,
>> whatever. All
>> the TV viewer cares about is how good the picture, sound and program are.
>
>While the person who watches TV may have no idea how it works, there is a
>complete army of people behind that tube that do know how it works and why
>it works.

That's true, but it's not the point. The TV viewer and the ham are both the
"end users",
but it makes no difference to the TV viewer whether the program got to him/her
by radio,
wire, etc. There *is* a difference to the ham whether the QSO is by radio or
landline.

>If one were to subtract the number of hams who cannot even fix a
>simple fault in their commerical rig, the odds would not be much different.

That's not the "how" I was referring to. A ham cares that it's "communication
by radio" - the TV viewer doesn't.
>
>> The military communications folks don't care how the messages are carried,
>> just
>> so the messages get where they need to be, when they need to be there,
>> without
>> the bad guys knowing about them.
>
>I'll bet its fair to say that most Amateurs do not understand how Packet,
>PACTOR or even just their rigs work.

I disagree. But that's not the point.

>They simply plug in the boxes and off they go.
>
Again, a ham cares that it's "communication by radio"
>
>> Do you know or care how your email and postings get to and from your
>>computer?
>
>Actually, I do as I run my own servers.

Exception that proves the rule. And once it leaves your servers?
>
>> If you're like 99.99% of the online population, it's not an issue as long
>> as it happens.
>
>This is also the case for many Amateurs. Most would not know how their
>current rig works and they would neither have the expertise or equipment to
>find anything but the most trivial of faults.

Again, not the point. A ham cares that it's "communication by radio", but most email users don't care if the medium is wire, fiber, etc.
>
>> Heck, many if not most cellphone users don't even think in terms of
>>"radio" -
>> the cellphone to them is a telephone without wires, that's all. (In fact I
>> have had people tell me that a cellphone is *not* a radio!)
>
>As I said most Amateurs don't know how packet works or even how their Yaesu
>works.

How do you know that for sure?

>Under this defintion, most Amateurs aren't amateurs either. If one
>goes into particular instances, I've fixed radios for more than one full
>call that could not find that the battery wire had broken. Such anecdotes
>may be amusing, but have little value in the big picture.

Point is they at least knew it was a radio.
>
>> The radio amateur does radio, for the most part, for purely emotional
>> reasons.
>> IOW, because it's fun, rewarding, challenging, educating, etc. "Radio for
>> it's own sake".
>
>Certainly in the area I work, I have seen the scientists knock back very
>large amounts of money because it didn't have a research component that they
>found "fun, rewarding, challenging, educating, etc."

But only as an expedient. Not as a rule.
>
>> This is why modes like Morse code, AM voice and Baudot FSK RTTY continue
>> in use in amateur radio. Hams like them. They're fun, and they work.
>
>Morse - still used commercially, in the forces and aviation (ident calls).

Some will argue that point!

>AM voice - still used in broadcasting.
>FSK RTTY - still used as anyone with a communications rig can tell you.

Baudot! Not just FSK

>None of these are unique to AR.

No, they're not. But their choice in other services is driven by considerations other than what the operators like. That's the point.
>
>There is no doubt that these modes work and "fun" to some people. This is
>true even if you are a commercial operator. There are plenty of people who
>actually enjoy their work.

Sure, but as a rule they are not the one making the choice.
>

>BTW, not all hams like these modes. Many people don't like Morse, many also
>don't like AM because of its bandwidth, especially in the lower bands and
>most Amateurs don't use RTTY with or without the clunking teleprinter.

By choice - that's the point!
>
>> >> Ignorance would be to
>> >> assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
>> >> his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
>> >
>> >This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even
>> >very similar activities.
>>
>> And some very big differences. Much of what is done in other radio
>> services
>> does not transfer to amateur radio at all. For example, every other radio
>> service I know of seeks to eliminate the need for a skill in the operation
>> of
>> the radio equipment. They think in terms of "user", not "radio operator".
>> And
>> given their constraints, it may make sense to do so, because it is usually
>> less
>> expensive to buy sophisticated equipment than to pay a skilled radio
>> operator.
>
>How many Amateurs still neutralise their power amplifiers?

I do.

>No many. Why?
>Because they have decided to buy (in most cases not build) more
>sophisticated equipment that reduces the skill required to operate the
>radio.

I build my ham rigs, either from scratch or kits.

>There is no difference.

Yes, there is.

Neutralization is an alignment adjustment, not part of operating the rig.

>I don't know too many Amateurs who go to buy
>a rig and want the one that is the hardest to use.

Not the point. Modes like ALE and conventions such as channelization have
not had much acceptance in amateur radio, even though very widely used in
other services.

>> But to hams, radio operating skill is the whole point.
>
>Unsustainable if you listen to the bands.

I do, and that's why I make the observation.

>Most people do not even comply
>with the statuatory requirements for identification, let alone push the
>envelope of operating skills.

Where have you noticed that? I see just the opposite on the bands and modes I
use.
>
>Are you suggesting that randomly monitoring the Amateur Bands for a few
>hours would show a very high level of operating skill? I wouldn't bet the
>farm on that one, would you?
>
No, I'm saying that hams value operating skills, even if they don't always have
the highest level of them. Someone who plays a guitar for fun usually values
skill at doing so, even if they're not as good as the guy on the CD.

>As I said, AR is by no means "unique" in what it provides and there are many
>people in the radio field, even if they don't hold an AR licence that would
>have a "really good feel" of what the Amateur Serice is all about bases on
>their other experiences.

Maybe. But in general I'd disagree.
>
>It concerns me when Amateurs attempt to tell others that AR is "unique" and
>that a non-amateur could never underestand what it is all about, because all
>it does is reduce credibilty.

If amateur radio is not unique, why should it exist?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2674. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 14:39:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87400

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:402EAC18.488E92E4@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >
> > > >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> > >
> > > Uh huh!
> > >
> > >
> > > I'll ask:
> > >
> > >
> > > Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
> >
> > Why would they be "unqualified?"
>
> Let's be specific: It is because they will not have passed the exam
> which the FCC says they must pass in order to qualify for a specific
> class of license.

Which, as anyone familiar with incentive licensing, has
NOTHING to do with actually being qualified to do anything
specific to amateur radio based on the additional privileges.

> > Let's be serious here!
>
> It is getting tougher to be serious when you persist in yanking our
> lanyards.

Me? I just support the ARRL petition....I didn't propose
it. Seems you don't like anyone giving an opinion
contrary to yours. If you don't agree with me, I really don't
give a damn...as the ONLY arbiter of the outcome that
matters is what the FCC will think and do.

> > In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
> > at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.

>
> Let's do this one in your manner: Whatever floats your boat. Life's
> a--well, you know the drill.

Glad to see you have nothing credible to refute my statement.

> > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
>
> How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit on VHF/UHF. I'm
> betting that the answer is "none".

Doesn't matter. They can if they want. Also, what
makes you assume ALL technicians are beginners?

> > > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
reduction
> > in
> > > >>the written test requirements for those licenses.
> > > >
> > > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> > >
> > > Give me a break, Bill!
> > >
> > > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> >
> > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > what?
>
> They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher class
> license. No ifs, ands or buts.

Yet you can't offer one operating skill or privilege that would
be covered by such lack of having passed the requisit test.

> > > >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time
reduction,
> > > > >but it's still a reduction.
> > > >
> > > > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the
reason's
> > > > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> > > > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> > > > permanent reductions in requirements.
> > >
> > > Are the people qualified?
> >
> > YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> > unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges

> > they would be unqualified.
>
> By your statement, you are supporting a watering down of both the
> General and Extra class licenses. I'm quite certain that this is
> something you stated that you'd never support.

If you want it clearer...I support the ARRL petition.
In doing so, I acknowledge that there will be, if implemented
as submitted, a ONE_TIME reduction of test requirements
for those hams that get free upgrades. I also recognize and
understand that other than the one-time upgrades, there
will be NO reduction in written test requirements for Extra
and General.

Clear enough for you?

> > > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> > > >
> > > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
> > because
> > > > no one losses any privileges.
> > >
> > > Are they qualified?
> >
> > Broken record here it seems.
>
> The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not been
> forthcoming.

The question keeps coming up because some people can't
understand the difference between a ONE-TIME waiver as
opposed to a PERMANENT change in requirements.

> > > A few things here.
> > >
> > > IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
> > > reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that
you
> > > are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
> > > evil Morse code supporters.
> >
> > I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
> > relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
> > system as created simply asks for passage of another test
> > on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
> > that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
> > that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
> > spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
> > spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
> > power.
>
> So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of the

> elimination of incentive licensing.

I do NOT support a permanant reduction of written requirements.
I support a limited incentive system but I wish the additional
privileges bore some relationship to the additional knowledge being
tested for.

There can be no other explanation.

I just gave you one above. The fact that I recognize the reality of
privileges vs knowledge being virtually non-existent, and that
I am willing to state the obvious, does not mean I must, therefore,
oppose incentive licensing.

> If your agenda extends not just to the elimination of morse testing but
> to the watering down of the written exams, why not be bold? Come out and
> say so.

Because it isn't true!

> > > If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
> > > and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a
great
> > > disservice.
> > >
> > > Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> > > support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
> >
> > The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> > novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> > power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
>
> The League's position provides a "gimme" to tens of thousands by
> granting a by on testing. It is apparent that if it can be done on a
> one-time basis, it can be done permanently.

Is that what ARRL is proposing? Is that what I have
stated I support? Answer - NO!

> > > I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll
just
> > > do this once
> > >
> > > Believe whatever makes you feel good.
>
> Is that how you decide what to believe?

Depends on the decision to be made and the circumstances.

> > > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
> > >
> > > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> > > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will

> > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> > or Advanced to Extra.
>
> You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from Tech
> to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
> thousands.
> Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it necessary
> to do.

Read the ARRL petition. ARRL makes the case and I agree with their
logic. No need to repeat it again.

> > > I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
> > > I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
> > > here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
> > > to HF. A pattern forms.
> >
> > Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> > background too.
>
> I didn't hear music. I did read your words and Carl's words. What you
> are writing these days is at odds with the earlier statements. Your
> earlier statements which traditionally began, "all we want is..." sound
> disingenuous.

What is at odds with you is that you don't understand the difference
between ONE-TIME and PERMANENT change. If it makes
you happy to think that supporting a one-time waiver makes Carl
and I supports of reducing requiremnts, then you are free
to enjoy your own beliefs.

> > Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.
>
> Opposition to the League's plan floats mine right now. I suppose your
> comment is better than one of Lennie's "TS" brushoffs.

Frankly Dave, I don't give a damn.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2675. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 14:39:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <%wLXb.5900$hm4.5267@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87401

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:sZWdnT4mzu2WQbPdRVn-uw@adelphia.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>
> >>>>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> >>
> >>Uh huh!
> >>
> >>
> >>I'll ask:
> >>
> >>
> >>Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
> >
> >
> > Why would they be "unqualified?" Let's be serious here!
> > In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
> > at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
> > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
>
> So you now support no testing whatsoever, since the priveliges have no
> bearing? Glad you finally got serious and admitted it.

Sorry Mike, your logic is seriously lacking. My
stateing the obvious about privileges vs license
in no way leads to the conclusion that I must, therefore,
oppose incentive licensing. Even Jim, N2EY has
acknowledged what I have said regarding privileges
vs license class based on written test knowledge.

> >>>>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
> >>>>reduction in the written test requirements for those licenses.
> >>>
> >>>Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't

> >>>mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> >>>requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> >>
> >>Give me a break, Bill!
> >>
> >>Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> >
> > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > what?
>
> You are right Bill. There really is no need for qualification if you
> don't want there to be.
>
> >>>>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
> >>>>but it's still a reduction.
> >>>
> >>>It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
> >>>to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> >>>time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> >>>permanent reductions in requirements.
> >>
> >>Are the people qualified?
> >
> > YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> > unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
> > they would be unqualified.
>
> So why make the tests more difficult after the "one shot" upgrade? If
> you think a technician is now qualified to be a General, then you should
> be consistant.

The problem, is that there isn't any accepted relationship
of privileges vs license to apply a truly knoweldege
based upgrade system that links the additional privileges to actual
written test knowlede.

> >>>>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> >>>
> >>>If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
> >
> > because
> >
> >>>no one losses any privileges.
> >>
> >>Are they qualified?
> >
> >
> > Broken record here it seems.
>
> You notice?
>

> >
> >>A few things here.
> >>
> >>IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
> >>reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you
> >>are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
> >>evil Morse code supporters.
> >
> > I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
> > relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
> > system as created simply asks for passage of another test
> > on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
> > that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
> > that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
> > spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
> > spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
> > power.
> >
> >>If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
> >>and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great
> >>disservice.
> >>
> >>Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> >>support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
> >
> > The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> > novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> > power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
> >
>
> The ARRL is being illogical.

Then go take it up with ARRL...assuming you are a member.

> And I see you don't deny my assertion.

Not at all...YOU refuse to see the difference
between ONE-TIME and PERMANENT.

> >>I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just
> >>do this once
> >
> > Believe whatever makes you feel good.
>
> Doesn't make me feel good at all!

Your problem, not mine.

> >>and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
> >
> > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will

> > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> > or Advanced to Extra.
>
> You're playing with my words here.

No, you are incorrectly stating the aspects of the ARRL
petition.

> A person that takes the Technician test, then becomes a General with no
> further retesting.
>
> A person that takes a Technician test, then a General test.
>
> Which person has done more? Unless you are suggesting that the future
> General test is simply the equivalent of the Tech test.

I do not dispute there is a one-time difference. That is what happens
when there is a one-time waiver.

> >>I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
> >>I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
> >>here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
> >>to HF. A pattern forms.
> >
> > Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> > background too.
> > Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.
>
> Yeah I know, lifes a bitch.....

By Jove I think he's got it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2676. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 14:39:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <0xLXb.5901$hm4.2852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87402

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:402EA4F3.6050404@ix.netcom.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
> >dropping code testing.
> >
> I thought that Hong Kong is now ruled by communist China.
> So HK is not a country.

Well it still acts like one in regards to having
separate amateur rules/regs as well as its
own separate callsign prefix.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2677. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 14:42:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215094252.25867.00001269@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87403

>Not a
>bad deal really and it's cheaper and likely more
>useful than a subscription to QST... ;)

A trip to Mcdonalds is more useful than QST

2678. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 14:59:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402150659.622aa47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87404

"Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little> wrote in message news:<5cj3g1-jnb.ln1@little.id.au>...

> I'm not under FCC regulations so it's a real shame that I appear to know
> more about them that you do.

Awwww...fer Geezus Sakes...yet another know-it-all
"I'm-Better-Than-You" antagonist who thinks that his cut-and-paste
skills replace those of practical experience in the radio service he
would seek to troll through.

> Radio regulations cover a truckload of licence types and the regulations are
> many and varied. Did you read about your regulations and not understand; or
> do you just make this stuff up as you go?

Would YOU please cite what part you seem to think Dave doesn't
ahve a grip on? Seems to me that you overlooked that part.

> > You can bet there are and if you've read many of Leonard H. Anderson's
> > posts over the years, you'll find that he doesn't see them.
>
> I didn't agree with him. I disagreed with you. His thoughts, past or
> otherwise, right or wrong, aren't relevant.

Since that was what Dave was addressing, I'd say it was VERY
relevant.

You have a ".au" address...What's your VK call?

Steve, K4YZ

2679. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:00:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87405

In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040214130732.25815.00006658@mb-m07.aol.com...
>> In article <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> >> In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> >> >> >> In article <hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> >"Bill
>> >> >> >Sohl"
>> >> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >[snip]

>> >> Let's get this clear right now.

>> >> ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free upgrade
>> >> to General with no additional testing.

>> >> They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to
>> >> Extra with no additional testing.
>> >>
>> >> Do you support those free upgrades or not?
>> >
>> >I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
>>
>> I (N2EY) don't support it.
>>
>> Why is it OK because it's a one-time thing?
>
>Because there's no real harm to anyone...

I say there *is* real harm to the ARS.

However, let's explore your claim for a bit and see where it leads.

You say that the free upgrades are OK "Because there's no real harm to anyone...". I've also seen it justified by "the difference between the Tech and General written tests is not that large".

If that's true, then what would be the harm is simply dumping the General class question pool completely and using the Technician pool in its place, with slight modifications to include General HF privs?

Who would be harmed by such a change?

By the same token, we could resurrect the old Advanced written and use it in place of the Extra.

>and if you want an
>incentive licensing scheme to be retained, this does it

I disagree! It works as a disincentive. Why should anyone study for an upgrade if there's a chance for a freebie? Would you you pay $500 for a new computer if you knew that next month it would go on sale for $300?

>plus it simplifies licensing and regs for the FCC and does it in one
>snapshot of time.

ARRL proposed similar freebies before and FCC said no, even though it would simplify the licensing and regs.
>
>> >> If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a reduction
>> >> in the written test requirements for those licenses.
>> >
>> >Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
>> >mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
>> >requirements.
>>
>> That's a good point. The reduction affects only those who have certain
>> licenses on a certain date.
>>
>> But it's still a reduction for a very large number of hams.
>
>Agreed.
>
And that's the point: Folks like Carl who said they'd NEVER support ANY reduction are now supporting a reduction because it's a one-time thing. And ignoring the fact that it affects a huge number of hams.

Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year we got about 20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many existing hams as the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.

>> >THAT is the critical difference.
>> >
>> And it raises a critical question: Why is it OK as a one-time thing but

>> not as a permanent change?
>
>Because it harms no one to get to the simplified scheme AND
>it then continues with the incentive system as before.

I say it does harm people.

But if it harms no one to get the simplified scheme, why not make it permanent?

>
>> >> Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
>> >> but it's still a reduction.
>> >
>> >It is a ONE time reduction.
>>
>> Agreed - but it's still a reduction. And Carl said he would not support
>> any
>> reductions in written testing. Now, all of a sudden it's OK because it's a
>> one time thing.
>
>Time and situations change and people change.
>
IOW, Carl's "never" didn't mean "never", it just meant "until I change my
mind".

>> >You and I can disagree about the reason's
>> >to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
>> >time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
>> >permanent reductions in requirements.
>>
>> True.
>
>Thank you!

Time and situations change and people change. Next week or next year....
>
>> But why is a one-time reduction OK, and not a permanent one?
>
>See prior coments on the same thing.

Who would be harmed by a permanent reduction?

>> >> And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>
>> >If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.

>> That's what they said 40 years about incentive licensing.
>
>Big difference. Every General that lost privileges still understands
>that loss.

I lost privileges as an Advanced. And I had to wait 2 years to even try the
Extra, even though I could have passed it the day I lost privileges.

>With this, no one losses anything.

If the existing classes are not given free upgrades, nobody loses anything either.

>> >Why, because no one losses any privileges.
>>
>> Maybe. Or maybe not.
>
>If maybe not, please point to what privileges will
>be lost by which license holders.

>> >> >>Yet now I see that same person
>> >> >> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take
>> >> >> *written* tests...
>> >> >
>> >> >As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General written
>> >> >tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things right"
>i
>> >> >a way where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those
>> >> > Techs are already
>> >> >authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any
>> >> >knowledge of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
>> >>
>> >> Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech
>> >> written is
>> >> adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not simply
>> >> dump
>> >> the General question pools into the Extra, and use the current Tech
>pool
>> >> for General?
>> >
>> >If that's what YOU want, then file comments supporting that yourself.
>>
>> No, it's not what I want.
>>
>> But how do we argue against those who want it?
>
>YOU are assuming someone will file another petition to do that.

You're assuming they won't.

>I'll worry about reacting/commenting on that...if and when it happens.

And what will you say to them? How will you argue against making the one-time freebie permanent?

After all, they can quote you and Ed and Carl saying "no one will be harmed" and "the difference between the Tech and General written tests is not that large"

What counterarguments can be used against those quotes?

>> >Bottom line, 2 years from now no one will care.
>>
>> How do you know?
>
>SWAG applied with common sense.

They said the same thing in 1969. I was there.
>
>> In the past 12 months, FCC issued over 20,000 new ham licenses. Most of
>> those were Techs. Why is it OK for them to get General privileges based on
>> having passed the 35 question Tech test, and having less than 1 year >>
experience, but not OK for future hams?
>
>As above, because it will be a one time situation.
>
Sorry, that dog won't hunt.

>> >> >> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them
>upgrades,
>> >> >> >> is there?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
>> >> >> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
>> >
>> >I'd expect the FCC will NOT reissue anyone that gets a free upgrade
>> >a new license at all. There's no need to.
>>
>> So they keep their old licenses. And the database still has their old
>> license class.
>
>The database could be updated overnight by replacing all licenses with their
>upgraded license. Doing that does not require an actual new paper
>license to be issued if Part 97 contains the following statement:
>
> Any license holder whos paper license is Tech is now recognized to be
> General and (ditto for Advanced to Ectra).

Then why wasn't it done in 2000?

>> >> >> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?

>> >> >Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
>> >> >(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to upgrade.
>> >> >
>> >> How do you know what FCC wants?
>> >
>> >How do you?
>>
>> I don't claim to. The person who wrote that something "doesn't comport" is
>> claiming to know what FCC wants.
>

>Take it as a best quess then.

OK. My best guess is that FCC doesn't care.
>
>> >Ultimately the FCC will decide.
>>
>> Just like BPL. Should we not oppose BPL?
>
>Different subject for a different thread.
>
Not at all! You're saying we should just trust FCC. BPL shows what can happen..

>> >> >> >I (personally, not as NCI)
>> >> >> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way forward
>> >> >> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test
>requirements
>> >> >> for over 400,000 hams. That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
>> >> >
>> >> >Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you
>have
>> >> >a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
>> >>
>> >> I don;t have any hangups about the tests. I'm all for them.
>> >>
>> >> If the difference isn't so great, why require the General test at all?
>> >
>> >If YOU accept that, then file comments as such with the FCC.
>>
>> I'll file comments to do the opposite. Maybe a proposal, too.
>
>As is your right to do so.

let's see....3 classes of license, no free upgrades, imporved writtens...

>> >> >> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the
>> >> >> changes take place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to General.
>> >> >
>> >> >Give me a break ...
>> >>
>> >> What do you mean? That's exactly what a lot of people will do.
>> >>
>> >> Those with no license or an existing Novice will have an incentive
>> >> to get a Tech before the rules change and ride the free upgrade
>> >> bus to General.
>> >
>> >If "lots" of non-hams suddenly became hams by that process I'll
>> >be truly surprised.
>>
>> 20,000 in the past 12 months.

>
>We'll likly lose that many to attrition this year alone. Look at
>the future expirations per Joe Speroni's web site. There's one
>month alone that has (I think) over 10,000 expirations.

And how many will renew in the grace period? You have to look longterm.

>> >As for the existing novices...that is now
>> >down to about 30,000...assuming everyone of them did what you
>> >suggest.
>>
>> 34,000 or so.
>
>minor difference in the scope of this conversation.
>
>> >> Those with Tech will have a *disincentive* to
>> >> actually take (or study for) the General.
>> >
>> >Life's a
>>
>> [expletive deleted]
>
>> > and then we die.
>> >
>> Apply that philosophy to accepting the code test.
>
>God grant us the wisdom to...
>Accept the things we cannot change, change those
>we can and hopefully have the wisdom to know the difference.

Right. So why not just accept 5 wpm and the existing classes?
>
>> >> Same for Advanceds and the Extra.
>> >
>> >The rate at which advaceds have been upgrading is pathetically
>> >low already.
>>
>> 17% in 4 years. Gotta wonder why. Maybe the code test wasn't a problem
>> after all....
>
>No one said it was the only roadblock to all
>Advanced hams going to Extra.
>
It has been touted as the boogieman for years. Now we see that it wasn't.

And let's suppose FCC enacts the ARRL proposal, and even dumps Element 1 for
Extra as well. And suppose we don't get a huge increase in the number of new
hams, just as we didn't after 2000.

You watch - there will be more proposals to further water down the writtens.

>> >> >your arguments are just plain lame
>> >>
>> >> How? Do you think people won't do this?
>> >
>> >Some will, but it won't be significant.
>>
>> How do you know?
>
>SWAG and common sense. Do you see a floodgate opening
>of new hams rushing to become techs before the FCC
>implements free upgrades on a certain date?

Yep. Plus a huge drop in upgrades. Why not? "We're having a one-time sale - get 'em now!"

Back in 1951, there was a similar one-time sale. FCC announced that they were closing out the Advanced/class A and replacing it with the much harder to get Extra at the end of 1952. But existing Class A/Advanceds would have the same privs as Extras. There was a flood of folks upgrading to beat the price increase.
>
>> >> >and your "someone might
>> >> >get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions as I
>> >> >took" is REALLY showing.
>> >>
>> >> Nobody today can even take the tests I took. You couldn't pass the >tests I
>> >> took, Carl.
>> >
>> >Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
>>
>> Nope. Not at all.
>>
>> It means that I met different qualifications. And I've seen the
>> qualifications, both written and code, slowly reduced for over a quarter >> century. And that's not a good thing.
>
>And if that is your true meaning, why would you state
>that "You (Carl) couldn't pass the tests I (Jim) took, Carl."
>Do you really think Carl would be unable to pass the same
>written tests if he had to?

If he had to, maybe. But he didn't have to.

And he couldn't pass the other tests I had to take.

And he didn't do it at 16 years of age, with no professional background. I did.
>
>> >> The tests I took are not the issue. Free upgrades and reduction in >written
>> >> test requirements are the issue.
>> >
>> >The issue is ONE time free upgrades only. No effort is being made to

>> >lower the General or Extra requirements.
>>
>> Not yet. But a one-time upgrade is one more step. And it paves the way.
>
>As you have said.
>
>> >Cheers...and add Hong Kong to the list of countries dropping ALL code
>tests.
>> >
>> That makes what - a dozen countries?
>
>I believe so.
>
>> I wonder what HK's written test requirements are.....
>
>I don't really care.
>

bwaahaahaa!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2680. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:02:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402150702.4232310@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87406

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214154748.06226.00002941@mb-m19.aol.com>...

> Seven year old Extras, perfectly "qualified" in radio. Uh, huh...

In THIS case, she IS "more qualified" than YOU, Lennie...She's
LICNESED!

uh HUH!

Maybe you can get her to act as control operator for you,
Lennie...Then there'd be TWO people there requiring adult supervision!

Steve, K4YZ

2681. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:10:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402150710.2f8e7a03@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87407

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0402140911.383dc253@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214021045.23307.00006597@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> > There is another factor which is common to those amateurs not engaged
> > in a radio-specific occupation...that the state of the art of everything in
> > amateur remain rooted in the familiar they know. That's almost
> > impossible since radio is only 107 years old and the technology involved
> > has been advancing in large plateau jumps all the while. That is true of
> > all electronics-related fields of work. They want the state of the art to
> > be fixed so they can enjoy what they found emotionally satisfying long
> > ago when they reached their personal best in the hobby. Others of
> > the modern day are little interested in meeting antiquated standards of
> > entering amateur radio.
>
> Amen, brother... you've gotten to the core of the problem. But, it is
> WORSE than you state, as these people can't simply go on doing what
> they've been doing, they try to STOP others from doing new things...

I'd ask you to please CITE a verifyable example of someone trying
to STOP some form of experimentation or "advancement of the art",
Skewart, but I know that woulod go unanswered...

Of course I'd not expect much in the way of facts from someone
who thinks "advancement" is the creation of channelized "Colt" class
licenses and thinks MURS is impervious to abuse.

> they are actually PRO-ACTIVE in their actions. I used to think it was
> simply "foot-dragging" - but it is worse than that... they are like
> little children, as they are being taken kicking and screaming to
> their beds for the night, they will lash out or wildly grab onto
> ANYTHING they can to slow the process... but, inevitably they WILL go
> to sleep, and they just end up looking all the more PATHETIC for their
> TANTRUM-THROWING.

You have yet to "prove" any tantrum throwing or examples of
"kicking and screaming" as you describe it.

Like Lennie, I believe you to be misusing adjectives to create an
untruthful representation of actual events.

Down here we just call if lying.

As for "PATHETIC",....that's what I'd call YOUR "vision" of the
future of ANY radio service. Your child-like obsession with "MURS"
being an example of your own myoptic anomoly

> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

Case in point...

Steve, K4YZ

2682. Re: who can use GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:16:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402150716.640a88d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87408

"radio123" <test@test.com> wrote in message
news:<ElEXb.7160$wD5.1608@nwrddc03.gnilink.net>...
> Can my father use my GMRS license to communicate with my sister?

Question...Does your sister WANT to communicate with your father?

> What if
> I don't go on the vacation can they still use my license? Does the license
> cover the whole family where ever they are in the USA and even if I am not
> part of the direct communication ?

You will find that the FCC considers "family" to be the residents
of the same household. If by "family" you mean anyone in your DNA
chain regardless of where they live, you'd find the FCC would frown on
that, regardless of whether you were on vacation or not.

> One license per family ?

Same household...Not everyone in the same DNA strain.

Steve, K4YZ

2683. Difference between ARRL and a WHORE House

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:19:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215101936.21785.00002213@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 87409

At least when you go to a WHORE House you know your going to get SCREWED

2684. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:53:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402150753.23135355@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87410

"Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little> wrote in message news:<5cj3g1-jnb.ln1@little.id.au>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:402ED21F.199B08CF@earthlink.net...
>
> > > I've worked in commercial/scientific radio communications as well as
> being
> > > an Amateur and there is a great deal of similarity between the
> operations -
> > > there are licences,
> >
> > How tough was the studying for a license for which there is no exam? ;-)
>
> Are you really just clueless or are you just trying to be a smart arse? In
> case it is the former, this page may help:
>
> http://wireless.fcc.gov/commoperators/
>
> I'm not under FCC regulations so it's a real shame that I appear to know
> more about them that you do.

Not according to Hoyle.

Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.
Not only should an amateur NOT know the rules of another country, but
he MUST NOT know them!

So if you should happen to know the US FCC rules, you must disregard
them, i.e., you must pretend not to know them.

> > > there are regulations,
> >
> > The regs aren't very much alike, are they? In fact, such point-to-point
> > channelized communications can only be compared to amateur VHF/UHF FM
> > operation.
>
> Radio regulations cover a truckload of licence types and the regulations are
> many and varied. Did you read about your regulations and not understand; or
> do you just make this stuff up as you go?

Well, there you have it!

> > > > Ignorance would be to
> > > > assume that because one has experience in another service, that all of
> > > > his experience in that service directly transfers to amateur radio.
> > >
> > > This is more accurate as there are some subtle differences between even

> very
> > > similar activities.
> >
> > You can bet there are and if you've read many of Leonard H. Anderson's
> > posts over the years, you'll find that he doesn't see them.
>
> I didn't agree with him. I disagreed with you. His thoughts, past or
> otherwise, right or wrong, aren't relevant.
>
> Mark

Welcome to the jungle.

bb

2685. Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:55:43 UTC
From: Bob <none>
Message-ID: <d5cc4b87fce55a73d6193e5a16421709@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 87415

There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation. The conversation started to get worse.

"Why should I care if men having sex with men"

"I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from a sperm bank"

"Two gay men adopting and raising children"

"Sodomy"

Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes later.

They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint with the courts.

Question to all is

Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator violate their 1ST amendment rights

2686. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:56:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402150756.765f159c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87411

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402141511.67cb2364@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>
> > Be nice to the gunnery nurse or he will call you "scum" and "putz"
> > and make you get down and give you ten.
>
> Many here have disagreed with me without the need to resort to
> such adjectives, Lennie...

I have disagreed with you, and you responded insanely. What am I to think?

2687. Re: Question for LEN OVER 21

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 15:59:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402150759.6863ab26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87412

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402141507.25e8589d@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402140632.21476a44@posting.google.com>...
>
> > If you were to send an email to billybeeper it would never get read.
>
> Actually it was yet another "Lennie Did It, So Will I" attempt to
> mask your identity until you, like he, got a bit to proud of your
> "smartness" and signed a "BullyBeeper" post with your own name...Then
> there was no getting the cat back in the bag.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Wrong. I never intended to mask my identity to anyone except the
spammers. Never did I post out of style, and often signed my
initials, "bb."

There is no bag. There is no cat. Just your insanely vivid
imagination.

2688. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 16:00:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EcudnZSdj9MPCrLd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87413

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message

<some snippage>

>>So you now support no testing whatsoever, since the priveliges have no
>>bearing? Glad you finally got serious and admitted it.
>
>
> Sorry Mike, your logic is seriously lacking. My
> stateing the obvious about privileges vs license
> in no way leads to the conclusion that I must, therefore,
> oppose incentive licensing. Even Jim, N2EY has
> acknowledged what I have said regarding privileges
> vs license class based on written test knowledge.

Considering that you support a plan that supposedly gives a huge chunk
of hams a free upgrade, then supposedly makes it harder for hams coming
into the service after this giveaway, I'll take your concerns about my
logic under advisement, and with a huge grain of salt.

>>>>>>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
>>>>>>reduction in the written test requirements for those licenses.
>>>>>
>>>>>Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
>>>>>mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
>>>>>requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
>>>>
>>>>Give me a break, Bill!
>>>>
>>>>Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
>>>
>>>Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
>>>what?
>>
>>You are right Bill. There really is no need for qualification if you
>>don't want there to be.
>>
>>
>>>>>>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time reduction,
>>>>>>but it's still a reduction.
>>>>>
>>>>>It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the reason's
>>>>>to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
>>>>>time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports

>>>>>permanent reductions in requirements.
>>>>
>>>>Are the people qualified?
>>>
>>>YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
>>>unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
>>>they would be unqualified.
>>
>>So why make the tests more difficult after the "one shot" upgrade? If
>>you think a technician is now qualified to be a General, then you should
>>be consistant.
>
>
> The problem, is that there isn't any accepted relationship
> of privileges vs license to apply a truly knoweldege
> based upgrade system that links the additional privileges to actual
> written test knowlede.

Agreed. I've said for a long time that there is no *practical* need for
any test regimen at all. This isn't the old days. If I were so inclined,
I could buy my equipment, pay someone to put up the antenna and put the
station together, and then teach me how to mash the PTT button. Then get
on the air and yak away. No knowledge needed. All the knowledge we look
for in a Ham OP is arbitrary and must be something we decide upon.

>>>>>>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
>>>>>
>>>>>If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
>>>
>>>because
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>no one losses any privileges.
>>>>
>>>>Are they qualified?
>>>
>>>
>>>Broken record here it seems.
>>
>>You notice?
>>
>>
>>>>A few things here.
>>>>
>>>>IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
>>>>reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that you
>>>>are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
>>>>evil Morse code supporters.
>>>
>>>I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
>>>relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive

>>>system as created simply asks for passage of another test
>>>on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
>>>that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
>>>that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
>>>spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
>>>spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
>>>power.
>>>
>>>
>>>>If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
>>>>and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a great
>>>>disservice.
>>>>
>>>>Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
>>>>support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
>>>
>>>The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
>>>novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
>>>power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
>>>
>>
>>The ARRL is being illogical.
>
>
> Then go take it up with ARRL...assuming you are a member.

Why yes I am a member

>>And I see you don't deny my assertion.
>
>
> Not at all...YOU refuse to see the difference
> between ONE-TIME and PERMANENT.

Perhaps my cynicism sees this one time thing as the salesman getting
his foot in the door. It's where I see the disconnect with logic. If a
testing regimen is sufficient for qualification one day, it should be
good enough the day after, unless there is a pressing reason to increase
the qualifications. There will be no compelling need to increase the
qualifications the day after the "one shot" upgrade.

>>>>I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll just
>>>>do this once
>>>
>>>Believe whatever makes you feel good.
>>
>>Doesn't make me feel good at all!
>
>
> Your problem, not mine.

>
>>>>and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
>>>
>>>The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
>>>thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
>>>be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
>>>or Advanced to Extra.
>>
>>You're playing with my words here.
>
>
> No, you are incorrectly stating the aspects of the ARRL
> petition.

All actions have consequences. I know exactly what the aspects of the ARRL petition are. They are allowing another agenda (IMO) to color their thinking on the issue, and are trying to shoehorn their agenda into it, along with giving some lip service to those members that still want Element 1 tested.

<Speculation alert>
Their agenda, if I am correct, is that they want lots more people with HF access. This will have two immediate effects in their view.

Effect 1 is that there is a pretty big divide in the ham radio neighborhood regarding the ARRL. Hams that have only VHF and up access tend not to belong to the league, and hams that do have HF access are more likely to belong. If a ham has hf access, they will be more likely to join perhaps. They look at the possibility of a good size chunk of these 400,000 upgraded hams to join up.

Effect 2 is that these upgrades hams will make a great number to trot out when fighting spectrum threats "Look at all the Hams that will be negatively affected by BPL, etc.". Double that number, and it looks all the more impressive.

<speculation mode off>

But as with all side agendas, people tend to get caught up in the agenda, and lose sight of those consequences. And the consequences here are that a powerful argument is provided to make HF access test requirements at the Technician level permanent. If it was good once, it should continue being good until circumstances force a change. And I don't see any logical way around that.

Will these Tech level people be able to get on HF and work? Of course. Plenty of people are running high power rigs on 11 meters, and they haven't taken one test. So the tech's will have one foot up on them.

As I've said in the past, the service is what we want it to be

>>A person that takes the Technician test, then becomes a General with no
>>further retesting.
>>

>>A person that takes a Technician test, then a General test.
>>
>>Which person has done more? Unless you are suggesting that the future
>>General test is simply the equivalent of the Tech test.
>
>
> I do not dispute there is a one-time difference. That is what happens
> when there is a one-time waiver.
>
>
>>>>I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
>>>>I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
>>>>here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
>>>>to HF. A pattern forms.
>>>
>>>Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
>>>background too.
>>>Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.
>>
>>Yeah I know, lifes a bitch.....
>
>
> By Jove I think he's got it.

Actually I don't, "got it", Bill. That kind of stuff is more a
detriment to your arguments than a help. But hey, if you like that kind
of stuff, have at it!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2689. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 16:04:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402150804.6a96d451@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87414

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214154747.06226.00002940@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402140623.1f7e5486@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >"noise floor of independant thought?"
> >
> >You're a genius. No wonder they hate you.
>
> Independent thought is a no-no in U.S. amateur radio.
>
> ARRL does every ham's thinking for them, outlines the standards
> and practices, tells them what to do, how to do it, how to talk
> about it, what they must like and what they should dislike. It even
> supplies the official radiogram forms that all must use for the
> fabled NTS. They are official.
>
> Morse loving Extras will reinforce that by assuming a parental
> role in "knowing what is good for everyone." They are so because
> they say they are. None may disagree with those gods.
>
> All others are inferior.
>
> LHA / WMD

Did you see the N8IE post in the "Hong Kong Drops Morse Code" thread?

Typical eyes rolled back CW Forever response to the rollback of the
Morse Exam requirement.

2690. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 16:08:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402150808.72913d11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87416

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402E34D0.DAF6B1BF@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040213190545.21955.00000494@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > > In article <1e4e3692.0402120534.153ee6c@posting.google.com>,
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> > >
> > > >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > >news:<402B0A74.A42E74D7@earthlink.net>...
> > > >> Alun wrote:
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Another domino falls
> > > >>
> > > >> Was it the Germans again this time?
>
> > Yes, yes, I'm sure the Nazi's have infiltrated the Danish Ministry of
> > Communications and caused such an important domino to fall into
> > uselessness.
> >
> > Why is it that Dave can mention Nazi agression, but no one else?
>
> Because, sweet William, I didn't accuse anyone of being a Nazi.

Please, my friends call me Billy.

I guess it was the civilian brewers and BMW factory workers that
rolled over Denmark?

> "Aggression". Master it and make it your own.

I'll leave it to the Nazis.

2691. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 16:20:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215112021.25908.00001840@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87417

>Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
>violate their 1ST amendment rights

Doesnt matter, it is his Gear he can do with it what he wants.

2692. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:04:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87418

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>

Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change actually gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the ham community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2693. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:10:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Rc6dnZUfEvFtOrLdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87419

Bob wrote:

> There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
> change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
> appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
> The conversation started to get worse.
>
> "Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
> "I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
> a sperm bank"
>
> "Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
> "Sodomy"
>
> Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
> later.
>
> They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights
> for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
> with the courts.
>
>
> Question to all is
>
> Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
> violate their 1ST amendment rights

Strictly speaking, they did not violate any laws. What you have stated
was not obscene.

However, they were exercising poor judgment on the air. You don't know
who is listening out there, and it just isn't a good subject to have
kids listening to.

Other subjects that fall under the same problem:

religion, politics, anything that is likely to generate a strong
emotional response and controversy.

Nothing is stopping them from talking like this tho'.

But! They have no case. The repeater control op is allowed to shut the
repeater down for whatever reason s/he sees fit. If the control want's
to, they can shut it down every time they hear a callsign starting with

W! They are voluntary things.

Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2694. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:12:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <HLNXb.2564$t16.2155841@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87420

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:%wLXb.5900$hm4.5267@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> The problem, is that there isn't any accepted relationship
> of privileges vs license to apply a truly knoweldege
> based upgrade system that links the additional privileges to actual
> written test knowlede.
>

The concept that privileges granted must have a direct correlation to the test material is a fallacy. The additional privileges are a reward for doing more work in the overall field of amateur radio. Many rewards in life have no direct relationship on the material itself. Starting in the home, some parents give their children money or privileges for getting a good grade. The reward has no relationship whatsoever to the accomplishment. In college, you get your degree after fulfilling ALL the requirements. Some of the requirements are imposed not because they have any relationship to the student's major but are considered appropriate as part of a well rounded education.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2695. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:19:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FSNXb.2565$t16.2157138@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87421

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year we got
about
> 20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many existing
hams as
> the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.
>

And how could the existing ham community possibly elmer these 300,000+ new HF users should they all decide to be active shortly following that free upgrade. I hate to think of the resulting SSB DX pileups as it is pretty bad now. If a free upgrade goes through and significant numbers move to HF within a short period of time, I suspect that we'll see a lot more DX stations "hiding" in CW.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2696. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:21:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <8UNXb.2566$t16.2157387@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87422

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0402150702.4232310@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214154748.06226.00002941@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
> > Seven year old Extras, perfectly "qualified" in radio. Uh, huh...
>
> In THIS case, she IS "more qualified" than YOU, Lennie...She's
> LICNESED!
>
> uh HUH!
>
> Maybe you can get her to act as control operator for you,
> Lennie...Then there'd be TWO people there requiring adult supervision!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Actually by the FCC rules the licensed 7 year old doesn't require adult
supervision.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2697. Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:26:38 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0402150926.3bf1416e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87423

I understand why the ARRL proposes free upgrades from Technician to General. The assumptions:
1. The restructuring has to limit the number of license classes to 3. Thus, the Advanced license and either the Novice license or Technician license must be eliminated.
2. The restructuring must produce no downgrades.
3. The closing of the Novice class in the restructuring of 2000 was a major loss. So the Technician license should be eliminated but the Novice license should be reopened.
4. The only way to eliminate the Technician class without downgrading the existing Technicians is to automatically upgrade all Technicians to General.

I still disagree with the ARRL's proposal, though I can now see the reasoning behind it. I think the flawed assumption is #3. If the closing of the Novice class was such a major loss, then why was the No-Code Technician license so much more popular than the Novice license during the years when both entry-level licenses were available? The FCC closed the Novice license for the same reason General Motors closed Oldsmobile - not enough takers.

I'd prefer to see all Novices and Technicians merged into a new Technician class and be granted Tech Plus privileges. This would be compatible with a 3-license system. Nobody would lose privileges, but all automatic upgrades would be modest.

As many have suggested, I think the ARRL proposal may have been a PR move. Although changing the rules is the FCC's job and not the ARRL's, anything that the ARRL could have proposed would have generated a firestorm of controversy. The ARRL had to propose the retention of the Morse Code exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license to appeal to the proponents of Morse Code testing. To appeal to the No Code Technicians feeling intimidated by the Morse Code exam requirement, the ARRL proposed upgrading them to General.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet A T jasonhsu.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ee.html
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/eeham/
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/resume_hyperinflation_fighters/
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gmu-ece-control/

2698. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 17:26:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xZNXb.2568$t16.2157289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87424

"Bob" <none> wrote in message
news:d5cc4b87fce55a73d6193e5a16421709@news.teranews.com...
> There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
> change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
> appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
> The conversation started to get worse.
>
> "Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
> "I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
> a sperm bank"
>
> "Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
> "Sodomy"
>
> Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
> later.
>
> They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights
> for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
> with the courts.
>
>
> Question to all is
>
> Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
> violate their 1ST amendment rights

Their first amendment rights were not violated as they could have gone to simplex to continue. The repeater owner or control operator has every right to shut it down if he/she doesn't like the way in which the repeater was being used. Repeaters are PRIVATELY owned by individuals or clubs. They are NOT public venues. As such the owner or control op has every right to shut it down.

I doubt that it was a violation of part 97 but that would be open to interpretation. A lot would depend on the language used in the discussion.

While the 1st amendment protects free speech, it does NOT give the speaker a right to force anyone to listen to it. On a repeater they are essentially trying to do just that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2699. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 18:30:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215133020.11022.00004128@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 87425

In article <3HAXb.181306$U%5.897774@attbi_s03>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>> It is VERY important to use PROPER PROCEDURE in all ham activity.
>
>Sort of like driving in the right lane so as to maximize everyone's
>enjoyment .... reduce frustration etc.

I was thinking more of driving the "correct" vehicle in the "correct" way
using a vehicle of the "correct" year and "correct" options with the
"correct" attitude...or having the driving license removed by the
the "community of other drivers" using "correct" procedure. :-)

>> When hacking Western Union on the NTS, one MUST use the official
>> authorized radiogram forms. Net users may lose their jobs if the
>> official proper form is not used. All five of them.
>
>Whatever floats one's boat ...again not my call on what I define as
>enjoyment. Passing traffic ... not for me personally.

Some newsgroupies in here say they do that, one even claiming he
is an asset to Homeland Security for doing so...

>> Never at any time may other radio services' jargon, expressions, or any
>> other words except as officially permitted by league guides be used on
>> or off the air by devout amateurs. "Roger that" and "ten-four" phrases
>> are punishable by excommunication of any communication. The normal
>> penance is 100 Hail-Hirams and "sin no more" exhortations.
>
>Better watch it Len ...Hiram is listening ...

The humming sound you here is T.O.M. doing some axial RPMs...

>> Proper civil courtesy on the air is to give everyone a "599" report,
>even
>
>.....during contests where all signals are 599 due to the ruler of the
>ionosphere making it so ...could never figure out this one ...but again I
>could never figure out contests but again whatever floats one's boat ...have
>a good time.

Contests are "radiosport" that aging desk-sitters equate to 10 KM
running, hammer throwing, high jumping...etc. Doesn't lower HDL.
Increases income of ARRL.

>> if asking for repeats due to local noise. On 'phone all have superb
>> diction and are perfectly understandable...always.

>
>Len ...I have to get the receiver you are using and that DSP mode for
>diction control ...from what I have heard ..we could sure use it .

It's a mere $401 million (shipping charges extra), quantity one.
It can be built in sizes smaller than a Tuna Tin. QEX will feature
it in a special April issue in 2005.

>> All amateur radios operate by laws of the league, not the laws of
physics.
>> Correct procedure is to always consult a Handbook, never any textbook
>> about other radio services' equipment. Amateur radios do not work by
>> such non-applicable laws. Only league books have official information.
>
>Ah Len com'on ...thats a stretch even tounge in cheekedly ...besides how do
>you expect the league to make money?

I thought they were a non-profit org, altruism on a stick?

>BTW are you a Diamond Club member yet
>... for a couple grand you can get a discount on all league publications.
>That should pay for itself in a millenium or 2.

I can't wait...

>> The "amateur community" always rules on dedication and committment
>> of all. Except for the Extras who are above criticsm and gods of radio.
>
>Len you need to talk to my wife ...she dosen't think so. I have heard her
>use a phrase containing God in reference to my radio as in get off that ***
>**** radio and do some work around here.

Clean language? Cleanliness is next to Godliness.

Watch it or somebody will write [expletive deleted] too many times.

>> All amateurs not expressing love, honor, and obeyance of morse code
>> are bottom-feeding slime and shall always be treated as inferior trash
>> not even worthy of contempt.
>
>Naa not really ... but they are missing out on one tool in the box of ham
>radio.

Sears Craftsman line now features hum radio? Again? :-)

>> There, I guess this sums it up fairly well... :-)
>
>eehhh ..... maybe

Gotta leave...have to attend a ham's wake...he's operating maritime
mobile.

LHA / WMD

2700. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 18:46:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <X7PXb.5714$W74.4628@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87426

"Bob" <none> wrote in message
news:d5cc4b87fce55a73d6193e5a16421709@news.teranews.com...
> There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
> change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
> appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
> The conversation started to get worse.
>
> "Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
> "I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
> a sperm bank"
>
> "Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
> "Sodomy"
>
> Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
> later.
>
> They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights
> for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
> with the courts.
>
> Question to all is
>
> Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
> violate their 1ST amendment rights

The control operator sets the rules for his/her repeater.
The 1st amendment ONLY protects limitations
imposed by government. If I want to prohibit
disussions of (any subject whatsoever) at a party
I host, I have every right to do so. If someone
decides to violate my prohibition and I, therefore,
kick him out of my party, he has NO 1st amendment
issue with me at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2701. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 18:46:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Y7PXb.5715$W74.4184@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87427

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
>
> Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change actually
> gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the ham
> community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?

Do you really believe for a second that if the upgrades take
place that there will suddenly be 300K people "on-the-air"
in HF that haven't been? If yes, I have a nice bridge in
Brooklyn I'd like to sell you.

Reality check...
1. How many Techs now own an HF rig at all?
2. How many, if upgraded will buy an HF rig?
3. How many Techs are spouses or family members
of an existing ham who is already General, Advanced or Extra?
4. How many of existing 300K techs are SK or otherwise
inactive anyway?

As for "elmering" those that would become Generals, I'm
sure many of us are willing to help anyone that asks for help.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2702. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:28:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <VLPXb.5767$W74.5301@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87428

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040214130732.25815.00006658@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >> In article <UrrXb.4517$W74.3752@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20040210050154.08626.00003053@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <prSdnVD4r6Rk1bXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:20040208202155.12501.00006091@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> >> >> In article <iFidneUsvppKVrvdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> >> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >> >news:20040207165454.11022.00003990@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >> >> >> >> In article
<hkURb.470$jH6.318@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >> >"Bill
> >> >> >Sohl"
> >> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >[snip]
>
> >> >> Let's get this clear right now.
>
> >> >> ARRL proposes that all current Techs and Tech Pluses get a free
upgrade
> >> >> to General with no additional testing.
>
> >> >> They also propose that all current Advanceds get a free upgrade to
> >> >> Extra with no additional testing.
> >> >>
> >> >> Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> >> >

> >> >I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> >>
> >> I (N2EY) don't support it.
> >>
> >> Why is it OK because it's a one-time thing?
> >
> >Because there's no real harm to anyone...
>
> I say there *is* real harm to the ARS.
>
> However, let's explore your claim for a bit and see where it leads.
>
> You say that the free upgrades are OK "Because there's no real harm to
> anyone...". I've also seen it justified by "the difference between the
Tech and
> General written tests is not that large".
>
> If that's true, then what would be the harm is simply dumping the General
class
> question pool completely and using the Technician pool in its place, with
> slight modifications to include General HF privs?
>
> Who would be harmed by such a change?

IF that is what you think must be the only way this can be implemented
then YOU file your coments as such or file your own petition.

> By the same token, we could resurrect the old Advanced written and use it
in
> place of the Extra.

Ditto my last comment.

> >and if you want an
> >incentive licensing scheme to be retained, this does it
>
> I disagree! It works as a disincentive. Why should anyone study for an
upgrade
> if there's a chance for a freebie? Would you you pay $500 for a new
computer if
> you knew that next month it would go on sale for $300?

The above is ONLY a prospect for the period of time between when
the FCC announces their decisin and the actual implementation
date for free upgrades. Might someone today look at what the
ARRL proposes and now, on the hope the proposal goes through,
decide to do nothing towards upgrade? Well I'm sure some will
do exactly that. For now, the proposal is in the public arena and
that is just the way things are.

> >plus it simplifies licensing and regs for the FCC and does it in one
> >snapshot of time.

>
> ARRL proposed similar freebies before and FCC said no, even though it
would
> simplify the licensing and regs.

So what. Are you saying the ARRL should not have made the
proposal because it rejected a former upgrade proposal?

Ultimately the FCC will decide. I may hazard a guess as to how the FCC
will rule, but that's all it would be...a guess. Until the FCC
sings on this proposal, none of us know for sure.

> >> >> If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
reduction
> >> >> in the written test requirements for those licenses.
> >> >
> >> >Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> >> >mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> >> >requirements.
> >>
> >> That's a good point. The reduction affects only those who have certain
> >> licenses on a certain date.
> >>
> >> But it's still a reduction for a very large number of hams.
> >
> >Agreed.
> >
> And that's the point: Folks like Carl who said they'd NEVER support ANY
> reduction are now supporting a reduction because it's a one-time thing.
And
> ignoring the fact that it affects a huge number of hams.

Neither Carl nor I are ignoring the numbers involved. We fully
acknowledge the numbers you have posted...which anyone can get
from several database and web site sources anyway. Both Carl
and I support the ONE-TIME upgrades with full knowledge of
the numbers.

> Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year we got
about
> 20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many existing
hams as
> the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.

Agreed. You aren't telling me anything I don't know.

> >> >THAT is the critical difference.
> >> >
> >> And it raises a critical question: Why is it OK as a one-time thing but
> >> not as a permanent change?
> >
> >Because it harms no one to get to the simplified scheme AND

> >it then continues with the incentive system as before.
>
> I say it does harm people.

Yet you offer no specific "harm(s)."

> But if it harms no one to get the simplified scheme, why not make it
permanent?

Yawn...do YOU want an incentive licensing system or don't you?

> >> >> Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time
reduction,
> >> >> but it's still a reduction.
> >> >
> >> >It is a ONE time reduction.
> >>
> >> Agreed - but it's still a reduction. And Carl said he would not support
> >> any
> >> reductions in written testing. Now, all of a sudden it's OK because
it's a
> >> one time thing.
> >
> >Time and situations change and people change.
> >
> IOW, Carl's "never" didn't mean "never", it just meant "until I change my
> mind".

The reality is that words like always and never are usually (I almost
said never :-) too restrictive and subject to critisism when other
factors come into play that one might not have considered before.
I try to avoid use of always/never, but have, I'm sure used them
without thinking about it at the time.

> >> >You and I can disagree about the reason's
> >> >to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> >> >time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> >> >permanent reductions in requirements.
> >>
> >> True.
> >
> >Thank you!
>
> Time and situations change and people change. Next week or next year....

You got it.

> >> But why is a one-time reduction OK, and not a permanent one?
> >
> >See prior coments on the same thing.
>
> Who would be harmed by a permanent reduction?

It would then, truly lower requirments on a permanent basis.
Neither Carl, you nor I want that. Or have you changed your mind?

> >> >> And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> >
> >> >If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.
>
> >> That's what they said 40 years about incentive licensing.
> >
> >Big difference. Every General that lost privileges still understands
> >that loss.
>
> I lost privileges as an Advanced. And I had to wait 2 years to even try
the
> Extra, even though I could have passed it the day I lost privileges.

You made my point.

> >With this, no one losses anything.
>
> If the existing classes are not given free upgrades, nobody loses anything
> either.

True, but it doesn't "clean-up" the myriad of different licenses that
exist and would continue to exist for decades more. Clearly you
disagree as to the need to "clean-up" the licensing and, I'd guess you
will file comments stating it as such. For now, you and I simply
disagree on the need. I'm not going to waste time
trying to change your mind. The ARRL petition is quite
clear on the why.

> >> >Why, because no one losses any privileges.
> >>
> >> Maybe. Or maybe not.
> >
> >If maybe not, please point to what privileges will
> >be lost by which license holders.
>
> >> >> >>Yet now I see that same person
> >> >> >> supporting free upgrades that involve not even having to take
> >> >> >> *written* tests...
> >> >> >
> >> >> >As Ed pointed out, the difference between the Tech and General
written
> >> >> >tests is not that large - it's a one-shot deal to "make things
right"
> >i
> >> >> >a way where nobody loses privs, and as Bill pointed out, those
> >> >> > Techs are already
> >> >> >authorized 1500W at frequencies that the FCC and anyone with any
> >> >> >knowledge of RF safety knows are more "risky" than HF.
> >> >>
> >> >> Then why should *anyone* have to take the General test? If the Tech

> >> >> written is
> >> >> adequate for General HF privs for some, why not for all? Why not
simply
> >> >> dump the General question pools into the Extra, and use the
> >> >> current Tech pool for General?
> >> >
> >> >If that's what YOU want, then file comments supporting that yourself.
> >>
> >> No, it's not what I want.
> >>
> >> But how do we argue against those who want it?
> >
> >YOU are assuming someone will file another petition to do that.
>
> You're assuming they won't.

And I am also assuming IF someone did, the FCC would reject it
anyway. I'll worry about it if and when it happens.

> >I'll worry about reacting/commenting on that...if and when it happens.
>
> And what will you say to them? How will you argue against making the
one-time
> freebie permanent?
>
> After all, they can quote you and Ed and Carl saying "no one will be
harmed"
> and "the difference between the Tech and General written tests is not
that
> large"
>
> What counterarguments can be used against those quotes?

IF the FCC goes with the ARRL proposal, there is sufficient arguments
there to counter argue.

> >> >Bottom line, 2 years from now no one will care.
> >>
> >> How do you know?
> >
> >SWAG applied with common sense.
>
> They said the same thing in 1969. I was there.

I have learned the folllowing basic instincts regarding how people
react....take something away from someone and they resent it
just about forever. Give something to someone but not someone else
and the one that didn't get the freebie rarely cares or thinks about
it for long. That's grass roots political reality 101.

> >> In the past 12 months, FCC issued over 20,000 new ham licenses. Most
> >> of those were Techs. Why is it OK for them to get General privileges

> >> based on having passed the 35 question Tech test, and having less than
> >> 1 year experience, but not OK for future hams?
> >
> >As above, because it will be a one time situation.
> >
> Sorry, that dog won't hunt.

It doesn't have to hunt for you.
The FCC is the only place that dog needs to hunt.

> >> >> >> >> >Like all those Advanced are on the air now. Give me a break.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> If they're not on the air, there's no reason to give them
> >upgrades,
> >> >> >> >> is there?
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >They'll get upgrades, even if they're SKs whose family hasn't
> >> >> >> >sent in their license for cancellation - so what?
> >> >
> >> >I'd expect the FCC will NOT reissue anyone that gets a free upgrade
> >> >a new license at all. There's no need to.
> >>
> >> So they keep their old licenses. And the database still has their old
> >> license class.
> >
> >The database could be updated overnight by replacing all licenses with
their
> >upgraded license. Doing that does not require an actual new paper
> >license to be issued if Part 97 contains the following statement:
> >
> > Any license holder whos paper license is Tech is now recognized to be
> > General and (ditto for Advanced to Ectra).
>
> Then why wasn't it done in 2000?

We'll never know will we?

> >> >> >> Why not upgrade all existing hams except Novices to Extra, then?
>
> >> >> >Because that doesn't comport with either the FCC's or the ARRL's
> >> >> >(or my) desire to have some reason for folks to learn more to
upgrade.
> >> >> >
> >> >> How do you know what FCC wants?
> >> >
> >> >How do you?
> >>
> >> I don't claim to. The person who wrote that something "doesn't comport"
is
> >> claiming to know what FCC wants.
> >

> >Take it as a best quess then.
>
> OK. My best guess is that FCC doesn't care.

Fair enough.

> >> >Ultimately the FCC will decide.
> >>
> >> Just like BPL. Should we not oppose BPL?
> >
> >Different subject for a different thread.
> >
> Not at all! You're saying we should just trust FCC. BPL shows what can
happen..

Good grief. I never said that at all. The reality is,
in the end, the FCC makes the final decision. I didn't
say you should not oppose any aspect of the ARRL
petition you want. You can continue to
oppose and file whatever you want with the FCC
if it (FCC) decides to implement free upgrades.
It is a free country, express your opinions all you
want.

> >> >> >> >I (personally, not as NCI)
> >> >> >> >think it makes the best sense as a one-shot deal as a way
forward
> >> >> >> >to a license/priv structure that makes sense for the future.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> Even though it means a one-shot reduction in written test
> >> >> >> requirements for over 400,000 hams.
> >> >> >> That's almost 60% of those licensed today.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Again, the differences are not that great (in content - I know you
> >> >> >have a BIG hangup about the number of questions on the test ...)
> >> >>
> >> >> I don;t have any hangups about the tests. I'm all for them.
> >> >>
> >> >> If the difference isn't so great, why require the General test at
all?
> >> >
> >> >If YOU accept that, then file comments as such with the FCC.
> >>
> >> I'll file comments to do the opposite. Maybe a proposal, too.
> >
> >As is your right to do so.
>
> let's see....3 classes of license, no free upgrades, imporved writtens...

The balls in your court. Shoot or pass.

> >> >> >> So someone without a license could just take the Tech before the
> >> >> >> changes take place, and then ride the free upgrade bus to
General.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Give me a break ...
> >> >>
> >> >> What do you mean? That's exactly what a lot of people will do.
> >> >>
> >> >> Those with no license or an existing Novice will have an incentive
> >> >> to get a Tech before the rules change and ride the free upgrade
> >> >> bus to General.
> >> >
> >> >If "lots" of non-hams suddenly became hams by that process I'll
> >> >be truly surprised.
> >>
> >> 20,000 in the past 12 months.

20K is only about 3% of all hams. Not a very big
number in that perspective.

> >We'll likly lose that many to attrition this year alone. Look at
> >the future expirations per Joe Speroni's web site. There's one
> >month alone that has (I think) over 10,000 expirations.
>
> And how many will renew in the grace period? You have to look longterm.

Just look at the declining Novice and Advanced numbers.
Speroni data doesn't show any significant percent of "grace period"
renewals.

> >> >As for the existing novices...that is now
> >> >down to about 30,000...assuming everyone of them did what you
> >> >suggest.
> >>
> >> 34,000 or so.
> >
> >minor difference in the scope of this conversation.
> >
> >> >> Those with Tech will have a *disincentive* to
> >> >> actually take (or study for) the General.
> >> >
> >> >Life's a
> >>
> >> [expletive deleted]
> >
> >> > and then we die.
> >> >
> >> Apply that philosophy to accepting the code test.
> >
> >God grant us the wisdom to...
> >Accept the things we cannot change, change those
> >we can and hopefully have the wisdom to know the difference.

>
> Right. So why not just accept 5 wpm and the existing classes?

Because God gave me the wisdom to change those
I can.

> >> >> Same for Advanceds and the Extra.
> >> >
> >> >The rate at which advaceds have been upgrading is pathetically
> >> >low already.
> >>
> >> 17% in 4 years. Gotta wonder why. Maybe the code test wasn't a problem
> >> after all....
> >
> >No one said it was the only roadblock to all
> >Advanced hams going to Extra.
> >
> It has been touted as the boogieman for years. Now we see that it wasn't.

I speak only for myself. Lots of other people have
said lots of other things.

> And let's suppose FCC enacts the ARRL proposal, and even dumps Element 1
for
> Extra as well. And suppose we don't get a huge increase in the number of
new
> hams, just as we didn't after 2000.
>
> You watch - there will be more proposals to further water down the
writtens.

If the "new" NOVICE doesn't work, then some probably
will. I can't know or be aware of everyone that is
or wants to be a ham. BUT, until it does, this is
just an academic discussion to which my participation
will be limited.

> >> >> >your arguments are just plain lame
> >> >>
> >> >> How? Do you think people won't do this?
> >> >
> >> >Some will, but it won't be significant.
> >>
> >> How do you know?
> >
> >SWAG and common sense. Do you see a floodgate opening
> >of new hams rushing to become techs before the FCC
> >implements free upgrades on a certain date?
>
> Yep. Plus a huge drop in upgrades. Why not? "We're having a one-time
sale - get
> 'em now!"

The ONLY drop in upgrades that would benefit anyone
is the Techs from a new ham perspective. We already see
only a negligiable amount of Novices upgrading to
Tech or Advanced upgrading to Extra.

> Back in 1951, there was a similar one-time sale. FCC announced that they
were
> closing out the Advanced/class A and replacing it with the much harder to
get
> Extra at the end of 1952. But existing Class A/Advanceds would have the
same
> privs as Extras. There was a flood of folks upgrading to beat the price
> increase.

Understood, but if we only look at already licensed hams,
the ONLY group that could quickly upgrade to benefit from
a free upgrade later is the existing Novice group...34K
by your numbers at most...or about 5% of all hams.

> >> >> >and your "someone might
> >> >> >get privs without taking a test with the same number of questions
as I
> >> >> >took" is REALLY showing.
> >> >>
> >> >> Nobody today can even take the tests I took. You couldn't
> >> >> pass the tests I took, Carl.
> >> >
> >> >Translation, I did it, so should everyone else.
> >>
> >> Nope. Not at all.
> >>
> >> It means that I met different qualifications. And I've seen the
> >> qualifications, both written and code, slowly reduced for over a
quarter
> >> century. And that's not a good thing.
> >
> >And if that is your true meaning, why would you state
> >that "You (Carl) couldn't pass the tests I (Jim) took, Carl."
> >Do you really think Carl would be unable to pass the same
> >written tests if he had to?
>
> If he had to, maybe. But he didn't have to.

So in reality, you have no clue as to Carl's ability
or not to pass similar tests that you once did. If correct,
why make such a personal statement you can't
back-up?

> And he couldn't pass the other tests I had to take.
>
> And he didn't do it at 16 years of age, with no professional background. I
did.

Who gives a damn how old you or I was when we passed
certain tests? And as to whatever other tests you are talking
about, you realy have no knowledge of Carl's competence
and/or technical expertise in the field of radio and making the
statement: "And he couldn't pass the other tests I had to take."
is just inflamatory rhetoric.

> >> >> The tests I took are not the issue.
> >> >> Free upgrades and reduction in written
> >> >> test requirements are the issue.
> >> >
> >> >The issue is ONE time free upgrades only. No effort is being made to
> >> >lower the General or Extra requirements.
> >>
> >> Not yet. But a one-time upgrade is one more step. And it paves the way.
> >
> >As you have said.
> >
> >> >Cheers...and add Hong Kong to the list of countries dropping ALL code
> >tests.
> >> >
> >> That makes what - a dozen countries?
> >
> >I believe so.
> >
> >> I wonder what HK's written test requirements are.....
> >
> >I don't really care.
>
> bwaahaahaa!

Sorry to have upset you. Now back to the Daytona 500.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2703. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:29:15 UTC
From: Nancy Young <lifeteime@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.

PJ

"Rileygotcha" <rileygotcha@ridemamocycle.org> wrote in message
news:c0nsng$u20$0@pita.alt.net...
> lookin for BC-610. got truble with some local CBs
> an needing to see if the bc-610 can clear the channul
> up a bit.......bc-610 put out maybe 700 watt A.M.
> i think but anyway it going really clear the channul
> up! where can i get a bc-610 ?????
>
> Rileygotcha
>
>
>

2704. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:32:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <xPPXb.5772$W74.4639@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87430

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:FSNXb.2565$t16.2157138@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year we
got
> about
> > 20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many existing
> hams as
> > the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.
> >
>
> And how could the existing ham community possibly elmer these 300,000+ new
> HF users should they all decide to be active shortly following that free
> upgrade. I hate to think of the resulting SSB DX pileups as it is pretty
> bad now. If a free upgrade goes through and significant numbers move to
HF
> within a short period of time, I suspect that we'll see a lot more DX
> stations "hiding" in CW.

Which would, I think, foster more hams to learn and use morse code
if they really want that hot DX. And if more hams didn't learn
morse to work those DX stations, that'd give more opportunity
to work them via DX to current code capable hams. In either
case it sounds like something the code enthusiasts should be real
happy about.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2705. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:39:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215143937.25815.00006695@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87433

In article <5c01b95b.0402141511.67cb2364@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>
>> Be nice to the gunnery nurse or he will call you "scum" and "putz"
>> and make you get down and give you ten.
>
> Many here have disagreed with me without the need to resort to
>such adjectives, Lennie...

Tsk, tsk, tsk, were YOU referred to specifically? :-)

It's okay for you to call others "scum" and "putz" in civil discourse?

Ah...good old double standard of Extras again! :-)

> It's just that YOUR conduct, lying and other anti-social
>behaviour EARNED you the endearments..."You Reap What You Sew", etc
>etc etc...

I sew what I rip. Please get the order correct.

> Embrace them, Your Scumminess...You earned them...They're yours
>to keep. I am sure you're proud of them.

A happy St. Valentine's Day (belated) to Dr. Killgore and Nessie,
the LICNESS Monster. :-)

LHA / WMD

2706. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:39:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215143938.25815.00006696@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87431

In article <8UNXb.2566$t16.2157387@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Actually by the FCC rules the licensed 7 year old doesn't require adult >supervision.

Also by FCC regulations, amateurs cannot operate outside their allocated bands.

Let's hear it for the seven-year-old Extras rewarded for doing good work for the amateur community! :-)

LHA / WMD

2707. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:39:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215143938.25815.00006697@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87432

In article <RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change actually
>gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the ham
>community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?

Put it all on a W1AW bulletin. Will take less than 15 minutes to
describe at 20 WPM in a broadcast. :-)

LHA / WMD

2708. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:43:14 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mZPXb.314182$I06.3179773@attbi_s01>
Source record: 87434

>
> By taking this tack, even a licenced Amateur would not be able to get a
> "real feel" as it is just about 100% certain that they will have different
> interests and priorities than you.

As well it should be ... the hobby-service-what ever has a wealth of deversity to offer but in the context of amateur radio. Any thing else for the non-professional radio affecionado unless he has a ticket would by defination not be amateur radio. Am I "dissing" those who don't have the exalted ticket? Nope .. I knew a fellow who could copy 45 WPM and never had a ticket but loved to listen to high speed CW on the ham bands. He said he would rather be a SWLer ..and this guy never was a military or commercial op.

>
> I take a less metaphysical approach to "real feel". I mean it is relatively
> easy to determine what Amateurs do

Not really ...not that is is such a big deal but I find you are falling into the trap that a lot of our "expert" hams out there fall into ....that is one of projection of one's knowledge to another. I really read with a chuckle those who say the test is too easy .. a give away. Again prospective. The guy or gal who is just starting out with no basis is overwhelmed and needs support with the simple things. I see this time and time again with our club's yearly no-code classes.

and there are plenty of related things
> (CB & marine radio, electronics kits, regulations, chat rooms, phones, etc)
> so that a person could reasonably be expected to be about to judge whether
> this would be interesting - before they went to the effort of getting a
> licence.

But they have choosen the unique experience of amateur radio.

>
> As it should be, but that does not prevent unlicenced people from knowing
> what the hobby is about. Whether they would enjoy those activities is a
> matter of personality, not of holding a licence.

Maybe knowing "about" but really knowing with some sort of "real feeling" .....doubtful . Mater of personality ... boy have I known some personalitie s in "hamdom" ... I can't say that there is a dominate personality ham type.

Take care Mark ...73 Tom Popovic KI3R

2709. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:56:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ht3rg90.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87435

On Mon, 09 Feb 2004 12:25:38 GMT, Leo wrote:

>Which seems like a pretty cumbersome process - I wonder why the
>citizenship rules were placed in the US/Canada agreement? One would
>think that the licence would be sufficient to prove competence, and
>residency to prove QTH...

Th4 U S cannot enter into a treaty that gives citizens of a third
country privileges irregardless of whether they are permanent US
residents or not. The treaty affects citizens of the two countries
alone, CEPT notwithstanding.

Become a US citizen and the problem goes away.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2710. Re: Difference between ARRL and a WHORE House

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 19:57:05 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <laQXb.325337$na.479201@attbi_s04>
Source record: 87436

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040215101936.21785.00002213@mb-m14.aol.com...
> At least when you go to a WHORE House you know your going to get SCREWED

A man gets into a cab at the airport after his first flight into Boston ...
He wants to savor the cusine and asks the cabbie where he could get scrod in
Boston. The cabbie turns and tells the fellow ...I have heard it described
in many forms but never in the pluperfect subjunctive before.

73 All ... and lighten up .... in a hundred years this won't mean a thing...

Tom KI3R

2711. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 20:14:52 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a999d47b64e1fc0989731@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 87437

In article <d5cc4b87fce55a73d6193e5a16421709@news.teranews.com>, Bob
<none> says...
> There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
> change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
> appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
> The conversation started to get worse.
>
> "Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
> "I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
> a sperm bank"
>
> "Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
> "Sodomy"
>
> Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
> later.
>
> They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights
> for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
> with the courts.
>
>
> Question to all is
>
> Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
> violate their 1ST amendment rights
>

It's not obscene by any stretch of the imagination. 1st amendment rights
don't really apply under Part 97 but if you look at it. All the words
used are low in value to offend per se, but high in emotional offense
values.

2712. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 20:42:23 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <PQQXb.325804$na.479610@attbi_s04>
Source record: 87438

> > And how could the existing ham community possibly elmer these 300,000+
new
> > HF users should they all decide to be active shortly following that free
> > upgrade.

My advise is to to buy up ALL the used rigs you can afford and try to
corner the market. The give away price of new equipment will soar with
demand.

I hate to think of the resulting SSB DX pileups as it is pretty
> > bad now. If a free upgrade goes through and significant numbers move to
> HF
> > within a short period of time, I suspect that we'll see a lot more DX
> > stations "hiding" in CW.

Can't hide for long ....how long before it will be wall to wall "fone"????

> Which would, I think, foster more hams to learn and use morse code

Nope Bill .... it will foster a concerted movement to turn the CW subbands
into SSBville. The mode will die or at best be put into a historical
preserve ...maybe like the bottom 20 kcs of the 30 meter band.

> if they really want that hot DX. And if more hams didn't learn
> morse to work those DX stations, that'd give more opportunity
> to work them via DX to current code capable hams. In either

Bill I wish you were right ...I say IF they were interested in CW DX they
would be there now not waiting for the tooth fairy to leave them the freeby
under the pillow at night

> case it sounds like something the code enthusiasts should be real
> happy about.

Oh yes Bill I am REAL happy about it ...I can't wait to see the subbands go
the route of "gentleman's" agreement and not defined regulation. The idea
of novice enhancement should have occured years ago with the novices gaining
all CW subbands. But nope the "experts" out there kept them in the ghettos
as 4th class citizens. Attempts years ago to even try to improve this was
met with derision from the establishment. What!!! 5WPM on my belovid bottom
25 kcs. Never ... I will never share this DX with anyone save my speed
peers. What would Hiram say?? So guys don't blame the "foneists" totally
for your troubles as we missed out bigtime in strengthening our ranks and
mode.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

73 Bill ....Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2713. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 20:53:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <IZOdneh2pobdQbLdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87439

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change actually
> gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the ham
> community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?

Don't have to Dee. They are already qualified! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2714. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 20:56:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <IZOdnet2poZ7QbLdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87440

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
>>In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>
> Sohl"
>
>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year we got
>
> about
>
>>20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many existing
>
> hams as
>
>>the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.
>>
>
>
> And how could the existing ham community possibly elmer these 300,000+ new
> HF users should they all decide to be active shortly following that free
> upgrade. I hate to think of the resulting SSB DX pileups as it is pretty
> bad now. If a free upgrade goes through and significant numbers move to HF
> within a short period of time, I suspect that we'll see a lot more DX
> stations "hiding" in CW.

Of course they won't all become active. I suspect a sizable percentage
will remain on VHF where they are now (tech's).

And if it goes through, since the F.C.C. and the ARRL have decided that
they are qualified, they will need no help.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2715. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 21:05:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aPudnRF4DciSQrLdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87441

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change actually
>>gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the ham
>>community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?
>
>
> Do you really believe for a second that if the upgrades take
> place that there will suddenly be 300K people "on-the-air"
> in HF that haven't been? If yes, I have a nice bridge in
> Brooklyn I'd like to sell you.
>
> Reality check...
> 1. How many Techs now own an HF rig at all?
> 2. How many, if upgraded will buy an HF rig?
> 3. How many Techs are spouses or family members
> of an existing ham who is already General, Advanced or Extra?
> 4. How many of existing 300K techs are SK or otherwise
> inactive anyway?

>
> As for "elmering" those that would become Generals, I'm
> sure many of us are willing to help anyone that asks for help.

Of course! One thing I can't stand is the p**sy attitude of some OF's
toward newcomers. I'll be happy to Elmer these folk.

I'll probably point them toward one of the General Study guides, or
even the old General Question pool for one thing. Operation of a station
will be another thing, and hopefully we can get them off to a good
start. IMO they would be at some handicap at the beginning.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2716. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 21:55:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402151355.de3a4b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87442

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402C51B9.7C99EC26@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> I can only hope that someone recorded that banquet talk. Of course most
> of Shepherd's stuff was that entertaining. That voice we hearing
> narrating "A Christmas Story" is his.
>
> He and Jack Fulmer W4HAV (later W4YF) opened a Volkswagen dealership way
> too soon after the war.

Yeah,Yanks were nowhere near accepting sub-compacts in that timeframe.
Nor were they very anxious to do biz with the Huns.

> People weren't quite ready for the car. The
> place was on the Kentucky shore opposite Cincinnati, where Jean was
> working at WLW.

I'm fairly familiar with that area, been in and out of the airport any
number of times on biz in Cincinnati and in KY. Where is WLW vs. the
airport?

USAir provided me with another of their "adventure flights" going in
one afternoon. Unbelievable summer downpour, incoming flights were
kept circling. Maybe 45 minutes after the left seat announced that we
were going to be on hold "for a few minutes" he announced that we "had
a fuel problem" and that he was on final ready or not. Splash. Looked
at first like he landed in the river. That was the afternoon the
Weather Service measured three inches of rain in one hour at the
Cincinnati airport.

> A nice bit of nostalgia! Most of the catalog houses had at least some
> ham gear. It is interesting to note that famed industrial designer
> Raymond Loewy designed the S-40 cabinetry.

Note that Sears, Hallicrafters and Loewy were all based in Chicago.

> He is the fellow who brought
> us the '47 Studebaker Starlight Coupe and '53 Starliner Coupe, the '61
> Avanti,
> the S-1 steam locomotive (Pennsylvania RR), that sharp-looking fifties
> Coca-Cola dispenser that we'd see in diners and drug stores, and all
> sorts of products from pencil sharpeners to refrigerators.

Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.

http://prrsteam.pennsyrr.com/prrt1.html

Raymond Loewy, Dad and me . . .

Dad . . at sixtysomething he decided he'd had enough "family cars" and announced that he was gonna buy a Corvette. Only over Mom's dead body he was gonna buy a Corvette. Back to the drawing board. "OK, I'll buy a Studebaker GT Hawk". 1963. Mom didn't bark as much at that one so he ordered the Hawk. But with a twist. He also bought a monster Packard V8 engine with two four-barrel pots. The Hawk and the engine arrived at the Stude dealer and Dad delivered 'em to the Three Js speed shop in Wilmington DE. Mom being unaware of what was going on of course. They did some engine, exhaust system and suspension mods then shoehorned the engine into the Hawk. "The rest is history . . " The thing ate Corvettes for breakfast . . It still exists in a barn near Coatesville.

Loewy was one of my idols when I was a kid. I had some talent along those lines and was bound and determined to go to the Chicago School of Design and study under him. Going into 9th grade Dad told me I had to decide what I was going to do with my life and tossed the Sunday Inquirer help wanted classified ads section at me. No ads for artists. No ads for industrial designers. No ads for illustrators. Four pages of ads for engineers. End of.

And the gene lives on. I have a young niece who recently graduated from the Pratt Institute industrial design program. She's unbelievable. Two weeks into her first summer student internship she came up with a compartment latch for some Volkswagen bus which her employer's ID group had been wrestling with for months. They faxed her sketch to VW, a VW functionary called back immediately and told 'em "Yeah, that's it, run with it!" They slapped patent papers on it and put it into production.

> I bought an S-40A from W7LR a few years back.

Still have it?

> The design is still
> stunning.

I'm not sure if I was ever aware of Loewy's role in the S-40 or not. But I am now. It's definitely a "coherent" design. That was his trick, integrate form and function. Not much of a rcvr though.

> W4JBP willed me his 1937 Hallicrafters Sky Challenger years back.

. . . there's a gooder . . . get it yet?

> He
> bought it new from Steinberg's appliance store on Vine Street in
> Cincinnati. Steinberg's sold ham gear through the end of 1968

That surprising, that was pretty late in the game. We didn't have any appliance stores selling ham gear that I know of but a lot of the electronics parts distributors which catered to the radio & TV service and industrial sectors had "ham corners". The last of those also

closed in the 1968 timeframe. I have an HRO a half hour from here in tax-free DE, makes life a lot easier. Except I'm still stuck with Radio Slack for parts locally.

> K8CFT, who administered my Novice exam, had a Globe King 500-C in his
> shack. I've always wanted one but they are bloody expensive these days.

Boat anchors are going for insane prices. N2EY recently told me about an unbuilt still-in-the-box Heath AT-1 which sold for $5,100 for God's sake. Ya can buy a complete pristine meatball S-Line including a 30L1 amp with $5,100 and have a *pile* of change left over. Or an Orion and most of a Centurion amp.

> Cass is Hugh Cassidy WA6AUD. His "West Coast DX Bulletin" was tops.
> Cass had a flair for writing and brought us the Old Timer living on top
> of the hill; the local QRPer, full of questions (often rhetorical) for
> the Old Timer; Red-Eyed Louie, always doing the dawn patrol looking for
> rare DX and the Palos Verdes Sundancers. There are numerous other
> characters. When Cass retired, his mailing list went to the fellows at
> Madison Electronics in Texas. Bill Kennamer K5FUV edited their "QRZ DX"
> for a number of years before going to the DXCC desk in Newington to
> replace Don Search.

If/when I ever make it your place you'll have to let read some of 'em. These days there's no point to publications like DX bulletins, it's all out on the web in almost real time. But the websites are no where near as much fun to read.

> > Then there was the Ham Trader yellow sheets . . I moved a *lotta* gear
> > in and out with those.
>
> I subscribed to the "Yellow Sheets" as well and had Alton's "Ham
> Equipment Buyer's Guide" volumes too.

Never heard of that one either. I musta led a sheltered life.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2717. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:05:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b3SXb.6153$W74.1708@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87443

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:aPudnRF4DciSQrLdRVn-vg@adelphia.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> >>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >>news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >>Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change
actually
> >>gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the
ham
> >>community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?
> >
> >
> > Do you really believe for a second that if the upgrades take
> > place that there will suddenly be 300K people "on-the-air"
> > in HF that haven't been? If yes, I have a nice bridge in
> > Brooklyn I'd like to sell you.
> >
> > Reality check...
> > 1. How many Techs now own an HF rig at all?
> > 2. How many, if upgraded will buy an HF rig?
> > 3. How many Techs are spouses or family members
> > of an existing ham who is already General, Advanced or Extra?
> > 4. How many of existing 300K techs are SK or otherwise
> > inactive anyway?
>
>
> >
> > As for "elmering" those that would become Generals, I'm
> > sure many of us are willing to help anyone that asks for help.
>
> Of course! One thing I can't stand is the p**sy attitude of some OF's
> toward newcomers. I'll be happy to Elmer these folk.
>
> I'll probably point them toward one of the General Study guides, or
> even the old General Question pool for one thing. Operation of a station
> will be another thing, and hopefully we can get them off to a good
> start. IMO they would be at some handicap at the beginning.

I think there are plenty of folks that have worked DX on VHF
and will fit right in. Those that venture into HF that have only
repeater experience will, as you note, probably need some
helpful direction. I'm with you as to being ready and willing
to help anyone.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2718. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:09:46 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <6f75g1-pif.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87444

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0402150659.622aa47@posting.google.com...
> "Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little> wrote in message
news:<5cj3g1-jnb.ln1@little.id.au>...
>
> > I'm not under FCC regulations so it's a real shame that I appear to know
> > more about them that you do.
>
> Awwww...fer Geezus Sakes...yet another know-it-all
> "I'm-Better-Than-You" antagonist who thinks that his cut-and-paste
> skills replace those of practical experience in the radio service he
> would seek to troll through.

Not the slightest comment about the original attempt at an insult which was based on ignorance of the facts, but, wow, when there happens to be a return barb pointing out that ignorance, THAT deserves the full righteous indignation treatment. Amusing hyprocisy, but nothing more.

> > > You can bet there are and if you've read many of Leonard H. Anderson's
> > > posts over the years, you'll find that he doesn't see them.
> >
> > I didn't agree with him. I disagreed with you. His thoughts, past or
> > otherwise, right or wrong, aren't relevant.
>
> Since that was what Dave was addressing, I'd say it was VERY
> relevant.

Hardly, since I don't agree with a lot of what Mr Anderson said either. Disagreeing with someone is not the same as agreeing with his opponent, although I suspect that may be a difficult concept for some in this NG.

> You have a ".au" address...What's your VK call?

Is this for an "Hah! He isn't even an Amateur!" sort of thing? Since you have already deemed me a troll, I doubt that you would believe it if I told you.

Since I'm sure that you will look up the database to check if I'm lying, you can take the effort to find it in the first place. My initials are MR, not MJ. Of course, I could be lying about that as well. ;-)

Or have I misjudged you and you are just looking for a sked?

I'll trust your answer, because I don't think everyone who disagrees with what I think is just a troll. ;-)

Mark

2719. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:24:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215172454.21955.00000528@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87445

In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Nancy Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:

>I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
>
>PJ

Been vacationing in outer space?

Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in the early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move to Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International" but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It all ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.

The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.

LHA / WMD

2720. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:28:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402151428.7ca90fc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87446

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<402EA4F3.6050404@ix.netcom.com>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
> >dropping code testing.
> >
> >
> >
> I thought that Hong Kong is now ruled by communist China.

Hey, hey! Not supposed to know anything about their rules.

> So HK is not a country.

Only the ARRL DXCC desk can make that determination.

bb

2721. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:43:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5CSXb.2658$t16.2205080@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87448

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Y7PXb.5715$W74.4184@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> >
> > Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change
actually
> > gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the
ham
> > community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?
>
> Do you really believe for a second that if the upgrades take
> place that there will suddenly be 300K people "on-the-air"
> in HF that haven't been? If yes, I have a nice bridge in
> Brooklyn I'd like to sell you.
>
> Reality check...
> 1. How many Techs now own an HF rig at all?
> 2. How many, if upgraded will buy an HF rig?
> 3. How many Techs are spouses or family members
> of an existing ham who is already General, Advanced or Extra?
> 4. How many of existing 300K techs are SK or otherwise
> inactive anyway?
>
> As for "elmering" those that would become Generals, I'm
> sure many of us are willing to help anyone that asks for help.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

It was partially a hypothetical question. Some Techs are inactive anyway so there's probably a signficant portion there. However if even just a third of them get on the air, that's still a big enough increase, even if spread over months, since some will be buying rigs, that it could be a problem for a while. If even 10% of the current Techs get on the HF bands within a relatively short period of time, it will be chaotic for a period of time.

But answer this. If they are not going to get on the air, what is the point of the free upgrade??? It is senseless to give people something they are not going to use.

Let's take a look at the points 1 to 3.

1. Most Techs that I personally know have an HF+2m rig at home as they are planning to upgrade anyway. Or they have it for all-mode VHF/UHF capability or satellite work. All these people will be in a position to go on the air instantly if free upgrades are instituted.

2. Among the active Techs, a very high percentage can be expected to buy an HF rig as soon as they could afford one.

3. If they are a family member of a higher class licensee and are actually interested in radio for its own sake, they will go on the air immediately.

2722. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:45:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402151445.62abed0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87447

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214154747.06226.00002940@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402140623.1f7e5486@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >"noise floor of independant thought?"
> >
> >You're a genius. No wonder they hate you.
>
> Independent thought is a no-no in U.S. amateur radio.

Did you know that we're not even allowed to know the operating privs
of hams in other countries???

> ARRL does every ham's thinking for them, outlines the standards
> and practices, tells them what to do, how to do it, how to talk
> about it, what they must like and what they should dislike.

I know, I know. For example, we're supposed to think that Alaska and
Hawaii are different countries from the USA.

It even
> supplies the official radiogram forms that all must use for the
> fabled NTS. They are official.

No fable. It's real.

> Morse loving Extras will reinforce that by assuming a parental
> role in "knowing what is good for everyone."

Or even as spiritual leaders, such as TAFKA Rev. Jim.

They are so because
> they say they are. None may disagree with those gods.
>
> All others are inferior.
>
> LHA / WMD

2723. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 22:45:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <wESXb.2660$t16.2205419@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87449

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:xPPXb.5772$W74.4639@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:FSNXb.2565$t16.2157138@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > > In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> > Sohl"
> > > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year we
> got
> > about
> > > 20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many
existing
> > hams as
> > > the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.
> > >
> >
> > And how could the existing ham community possibly elmer these 300,000+
new
> > HF users should they all decide to be active shortly following that free
> > upgrade. I hate to think of the resulting SSB DX pileups as it is
pretty
> > bad now. If a free upgrade goes through and significant numbers move to
> HF
> > within a short period of time, I suspect that we'll see a lot more DX
> > stations "hiding" in CW.
>
> Which would, I think, foster more hams to learn and use morse code
> if they really want that hot DX. And if more hams didn't learn
> morse to work those DX stations, that'd give more opportunity
> to work them via DX to current code capable hams. In either
> case it sounds like something the code enthusiasts should be real
> happy about.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

While that could be a supposed "bright spot", I don't think that is a reason
for supporting codeless licenses and free upgrades.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2724. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 23:06:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87450

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402C51B9.7C99EC26@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > I can only hope that someone recorded that banquet talk. Of course most
> > of Shepherd's stuff was that entertaining. That voice we hearing
> > narrating "A Christmas Story" is his.
> >
> > He and Jack Fulmer W4HAV (later W4YF) opened a Volkswagen dealership way
> > too soon after the war.
>
> Yeah,Yanks were nowhere near accepting sub-compacts in that timeframe.
> Nor were they very anxious to do biz with the Huns.

Jean and Jack were SURE that they'd stumbled on a good thing. If they'd
only waited five or six years...

> > People weren't quite ready for the car. The
> > place was on the Kentucky shore opposite Cincinnati, where Jean was
> > working at WLW.
>
> I'm fairly familiar with that area, been in and out of the airport any
> number of times on biz in Cincinnati and in KY. Where is WLW vs. the
> airport?

The studios are downtown. The transmitter is up north of the city near
Mason, Ohio in the same general area as the VOA relay station was
located.

> USAir provided me with another of their "adventure flights" going in
> one afternoon. Unbelievable summer downpour, incoming flights were
> kept circling. Maybe 45 minutes after the left seat announced that we
> were going to be on hold "for a few minutes" he announced that we "had
> a fuel problem" and that he was on final ready or not. Splash. Looked
> at first like he landed in the river. That was the afternoon the
> Weather Service measured three inches of rain in one hour at the
> Cincinnati airport.

I've known folks who've transited Greater Cincinnati and who really
believed that they'd landed in Ohio, heh heh.

> > A nice bit of nostalgia! Most of the catalog houses had at least some
> > ham gear. It is interesting to note that famed industrial designer
> > Raymond Loewy designed the S-40 cabinetry.

>
> Note that Sears, Hallicrafters and Loewy were all based in Chicago.
>
> > He is the fellow who brought
> > us the '47 Studebaker Starlight Coupe and '53 Starliner Coupe, the '61
> > Avanti,
> > the S-1 steam locomotive (Pennsylvania RR), that sharp-looking fifties
> > Coca-Cola dispenser that we'd see in diners and drug stores, and all
> > sorts of products from pencil sharpeners to refrigerators.
>
> Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
> than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
>
> http://prrsteam.pennsyrr.com/prrt1.html
>
> Raymond Loewy, Dad and me . . .
>
> Dad . . at sixtysomething he decided he'd had enough "family cars" and
> announced that he was gonna buy a Corvette. Only over Mom's dead body
> he was gonna buy a Corvette. Back to the drawing board. "OK, I'll buy
> a Studebaker GT Hawk". 1963. Mom didn't bark as much at that one so he
> ordered the Hawk. But with a twist. He also bought a monster Packard
> V8 engine with two four-barrel pots. The Hawk and the engine arrived
> at the Stude dealer and Dad delivered 'em to the Three Js speed shop
> in Wilmington DE. Mom being unaware of what was going on of course.
> They did some engine, exhaust system and suspension mods then
> shoehorned the engine into the Hawk. "The rest is history . . " The
> thing ate Corvettes for breakfast . . It still exists in a barn near
> Coatesville.

Neat story. We were at the other end of the automotive spectrum. Dad
owned a '51 Pontiac and one day, one of the plugs unscrewed itself and
put a pretty good dent in the hood. Pop traded it for a decidedly
unglamorous '60 AMC wagon.

> Loewy was one of my idols when I was a kid. I had some talent along
> those lines and was bound and determined to go to the Chicago School
> of Design and study under him. Going into 9th grade Dad told me I had
> to decide what I was going to do with my life and tossed the Sunday
> Inquirer help wanted classified ads section at me. No ads for artists.
> No ads for industrial designers. No ads for illustrators. Four pages
> of ads for engineers. End of.

Engineers are generally the guys who make things work. Designers are
those who make them nice to look at. We all know of the exceptions.

> And the gene lives on. I have a young niece who recently graduated
> from the Pratt Institute industrial design program. She's
> unbelievable. Two weeks into her first summer student internship she
> came up with a compartment latch for some Volkswagen bus which her
> employer's ID group had been wrestling with for months. They faxed her

> sketch to VW, a VW functionary called back immediately and told 'em
> "Yeah, that's it, run with it!" They slapped patent papers on it and
> put it into production.

It does sound as if it runs in the family.

> > I bought an S-40A from W7LR a few years back.
>
> Still have it?

Oh yes, fully restored and sitting on a shelf to my right.

> > The design is still
> > stunning.
>
> I'm not sure if I was ever aware of Loewy's role in the S-40 or not.
> But I am now. It's definitely a "coherent" design. That was his trick,
> integrate form and function. Not much of a rcvr though.

No, not at all. Hallicrafters (and many other firms) were still building
the same basic receivers in a variety of cabinets through the decades
with few innovations or variations.

> > W4JBP willed me his 1937 Hallicrafters Sky Challenger years back.
>
> . . . there's a gooder . . . get it yet?

Sure do. It sits next to the S-40A. The engraved German silver dial is
super looking.

> > He
> > bought it new from Steinberg's appliance store on Vine Street in
> > Cincinnati. Steinberg's sold ham gear through the end of 1968
>
> That surprising, that was pretty late in the game. We didn't have any
> appliance stores selling ham gear that I know of but a lot of the
> electronics parts distributors which catered to the radio & TV service
> and industrial sectors had "ham corners". The last of those also
> closed in the 1968 timeframe. I have an HRO a half hour from here in
> tax-free DE, makes life a lot easier. Except I'm still stuck with
> Radio Slack for parts locally.

So many of the ham radio dealers and parts houses have gone out of
business or have been bought by larger firms. West Virginia had
Chemcity Electronics back when I first got on the air. They had several
locations throughout the state and they sold amateur radio gear as well
as parts. This end of the state had a Cameradio shop.

Cincinnati had a number of places selling amateur gear. There was
Coston's. The "Saturday Night at Coston's" gathering of hams is the
stuff of legend. Queen City Electronics was run by John Dine WA8DFD.
R&L Electronics started in a garage in Hamilton, Ohio. In Dayton, there
was SREPCO. Cincinnati had a number of parts houses including Holub's,

Hughes-Peters, Mytronics, United Radio and the surplus house, Lapirow Brothers.

> > K8CFT, who administered my Novice exam, had a Globe King 500-C in his
> > shack. I've always wanted one but they are bloody expensive these days.
>
> Boat anchors are going for insane prices. N2EY recently told me about
> an unbuilt still-in-the-box Heath AT-1 which sold for $5,100 for God's
> sake. Ya can buy a complete pristine meatball S-Line including a 30L1
> amp with $5,100 and have a *pile* of change left over. Or an Orion and
> most of a Centurion amp.

I've noted Globe King 500-C's going for $3,000+. I was amazed to get $775 for a 51J-4 the year before last. One of the big differences between the modern marvels and the vintage gear is that one can still obtain tubes and parts for the vintage rigs. I doubt that any of the current stuff will be operational or repairable in fifty years. The lack of a replacement switch, an LSI or an LCD display will doom them to the scrap heap.

> > Cass is Hugh Cassidy WA6AUD. His "West Coast DX Bulletin" was tops.
> > Cass had a flair for writing and brought us the Old Timer living on top
> > of the hill; the local QRPer, full of questions (often rhetorical) for
> > the Old Timer; Red-Eyed Louie, always doing the dawn patrol looking for
> > rare DX and the Palos Verdes Sundancers. There are numerous other
> > characters. When Cass retired, his mailing list went to the fellows at
> > Madison Electronics in Texas. Bill Kennamer K5FUV edited their "QRZ DX"
> > for a number of years before going to the DXCC desk in Newington to
> > replace Don Search.
>
> If/when I ever make it your place you'll have to let read some of 'em.

Once you start, there's no stopping. Allow me to whet your interest with the following from 1977:

"There were some local QRPers up the hill last week, the group including one of those serious types. His beady eyes were everywhere, questioning and checking. And the QRPers got to talking of Red Eye and the Palo Verdes bunch, and Slim and the Hero of Mafeking. So we had to tell them about the JA who in all seriousness had asked that alongside the obscure jokes we place an explanation of what we meant. Perhaps we should have kept the file sealed. 'Jokes?', says this serious one. 'Obscure jokes? Where are they? Why, I've been reading the bulletin for some years now and while there are things that sometimes I do not understand, I have not noticed any jokes.' Son of a Gun!! What does one do in a situation like that? The sky was blue, the day was warm and there had been a slow joy in the group as they talked. But we realized that like a lot of things, humor and DX and home cooking, that most things are relative and sometimes more so. So we told the beady-eyed one that we would underline them in his copy from now on, a service that perhaps others might want and use. And for $14.00 a year, the enigmas of DX will comeyour way in inscrutable prose, tangled, twisted and tortured...and

maybe stretched a bit. $18.00 will fling it at you by first-class mail
to the U.S./VE areas. $20.00 will fly it far down the moonpath to
Mexico and all the lands below the Tropic of Cancer and beyond the
meridians. Someday we may get the message...someday someone might get
the message to us."

> These days there's no point to publications like DX bulletins, it's
> all out on the web in almost real time. But the websites are no where
> near as much fun to read.

They could easily be...but they aren't.

> > > Then there was the Ham Trader yellow sheets . . I moved a *lotta* gear
> > > in and out with those.
> >
> > I subscribed to the "Yellow Sheets" as well and had Alton's "Ham
> > Equipment Buyer's Guide" volumes too.
>
> Never heard of that one either. I musta led a sheltered life.

Alton Brand, the fellow who published the yellow sheets put them out.
They offered a description of the equipment, original price and a photo
of same. The initial book showed gear produced from the end of WWII
though about 1973. Supplements for later years followed.

I don't support the ARRL's "gimme" for tens of thousands. Now Len can't
accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
some obscure reason.

Dave K8MN

2725. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 23:10:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87551

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Nancy
> Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
> >
> >PJ
>
> Been vacationing in outer space?
>
> Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in the
> early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox
> was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got
> rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move to
> Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International"
> but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It all
> ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.
>
> The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in
> 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily
> spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.

Set the hook now. Steady!

Ziiiiiiiiing!

Okay, now let him run with it. Try and tire him out, then reel him in.

You can haul him down to the taxidermy shop in the morning and have him
mounted. Get a little brass plate reading "Pisces Maximus Anderson".

Dave K8MN

2726. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 23:47:21 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9490BF03FF5FEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87552

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:xnfcneeyarg.ht3rg90.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On Mon, 09 Feb 2004 12:25:38 GMT, Leo wrote:
>
>>Which seems like a pretty cumbersome process - I wonder why the
>>citizenship rules were placed in the US/Canada agreement? One would
>>think that the licence would be sufficient to prove competence, and
>>residency to prove QTH...
>
> Th4 U S cannot enter into a treaty that gives citizens of a third
> country privileges irregardless of whether they are permanent US
> residents or not. The treaty affects citizens of the two countries
> alone, CEPT notwithstanding.
>
> Become a US citizen and the problem goes away.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

That's odd, Phil, because a licence issued in another CEPT country will be valid anywhere but the US, conditional only not being a resident of the country you are in, and on it being in the CEPT agreement, regardless of what your citizenship is. As in many things, the US viewpoint is in a minority of one. Strange that.

It's no problem, though. All I have to do is get my G licence re-issued, and unlike the US there is no 2-year time limit to worry about.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2727. Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-15 23:51:58 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9490BFCCBC62Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87553

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in
news:f7d9a152.0402150926.3bf1416e@posting.google.com:

> I understand why the ARRL proposes free upgrades from Technician to
> General. The assumptions:
> 1. The restructuring has to limit the number of license classes to 3.
> Thus, the Advanced license and either the Novice license or
> Technician license must be eliminated.
> 2. The restructuring must produce no downgrades.
> 3. The closing of the Novice class in the restructuring of 2000 was a
> major loss. So the Technician license should be eliminated but the
> Novice license should be reopened.
> 4. The only way to eliminate the Technician class without downgrading
> the existing Technicians is to automatically upgrade all Technicians
> to General.
>
> I still disagree with the ARRL's proposal, though I can now see the
> reasoning behind it. I think the flawed assumption is #3. If the
> closing of the Novice class was such a major loss, then why was the
> No-Code Technician license so much more popular than the Novice
> license during the years when both entry-level licenses were
> available? The FCC closed the Novice license for the same reason
> General Motors closed Oldsmobile - not enough takers.
>
> I'd prefer to see all Novices and Technicians merged into a new
> Technician class and be granted Tech Plus privileges. This would be
> compatible with a 3-license system. Nobody would lose privileges, but
> all automatic upgrades would be modest.
>
> As many have suggested, I think the ARRL proposal may have been a PR
> move. Although changing the rules is the FCC's job and not the
> ARRL's, anything that the ARRL could have proposed would have
> generated a firestorm of controversy. The ARRL had to propose the
> retention of the Morse Code exam requirement for the Amateur Extra
> license to appeal to the proponents of Morse Code testing. To appeal
> to the No Code Technicians feeling intimidated by the Morse Code exam
> requirement, the ARRL proposed upgrading them to General.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet A T jasonhsu.com
> http://www.jasonhsu.com/ee.html
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/eeham/
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/resume_hyperinflation_fighters/
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gmu-ece-control/

>

I agree. Beleive it or not, there are quite a few peope who don't want HF, although they are less numerous than they were. The re-vamped Novice sounds more like a Tech Plus Lite!

2728. Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 00:00:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215190019.06226.00002959@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87554

In article <f7d9a152.0402150926.3bf1416e@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>I understand why the ARRL proposes free upgrades from Technician to
>General. The assumptions

Assumptions by ARRL, you mean...
:
>1. The restructuring has to limit the number of license classes to 3.
> Thus, the Advanced license and either the Novice license or
>Technician license must be eliminated.
>2. The restructuring must produce no downgrades.
>3. The closing of the Novice class in the restructuring of 2000 was a
>major loss. So the Technician license should be eliminated but the
>Novice license should be reopened.
>4. The only way to eliminate the Technician class without downgrading
>the existing Technicians is to automatically upgrade all Technicians
>to General.
>
>I still disagree with the ARRL's proposal, though I can now see the
>reasoning behind it.

I think your analysis is very accurate, Jason, except for 3)

> I think the flawed assumption is #3.

Consider replacing your 3) with this one:

"3) The entry-level license class should be more balanced between HF and
VHF/UHF than the Tech is toady. The Tech gives all VHF-UHF, but no HF/MF, and
even if the code test is passed, all that you get is tiny slices of HF and two
modes. The ARS would be better off with an entry level license class that has a
better sampling of HF-VHF-UHF privileges, yet doesn't require a more stringent
written test"

>If the closing of the Novice class was such a major loss, then why was the
>No-Code Technician license so much more popular than the Novice
>license during the years when both entry-level licenses were
>available?

See above. It's not that the old Novice was a great loss - it's that the Tech
isn;t the best we can do for an entry-level license. At least, that's the ARRL
BoD thinking.

>The FCC closed the Novice license for the same reason
>General Motors closed Oldsmobile - not enough takers.
>

Exactly!

In reality, what is being proposed is more of a whole new entry level class than a reopening of the old Novice. They would do better to give it a different name - I suggest "Basic". Then you'd have Basic, General, Extra.

>I'd prefer to see all Novices and Technicians merged into a new
>Technician class and be granted Tech Plus privileges. This would be
>compatible with a 3-license system. Nobody would lose privileges, but
>all automatic upgrades would be modest.

Problem is, the license class would still be VHF/UHF heavy and HF light.
>
>As many have suggested, I think the ARRL proposal may have been a PR
>move. Although changing the rules is the FCC's job and not the
>ARRL's, anything that the ARRL could have proposed would have
>generated a firestorm of controversy.

Bingo!

But somebody has to propose things, and if ARRL proposed nothing they'd be criticized for that too.

>The ARRL had to propose the
>retention of the Morse Code exam requirement for the Amateur Extra
>license to appeal to the proponents of Morse Code testing.

Yep, a compromise.

>To appeal
>to the No Code Technicians feeling intimidated by the Morse Code exam
>requirement, the ARRL proposed upgrading them to General.

Not really. The ARRL proposal would drop the code test for General, so all that any Tech or Plus would have to do to get a General is to pass the 35 question General test.

The main reason for the free upgrade is to eliminate license classes that newcomers will not be able to get anymore. The BoD thinks that is a very high priority, even though there don't seem to be any problems with having almost 120,000 hams in closed-off license classes (Novice and Advanced) for the past 4 years.

There may also be hope that the free upgrades will spur activity among inactive or rarely active Techs and Tech Pluses. Whether this will happen is questionable, given the ease with which those hams can upgrade to General.

73 de Jim N2EY

2729. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 01:44:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgVXb.6406$W74.5824@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87555

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:5CSXb.2658$t16.2205080@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Y7PXb.5715$W74.4184@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:RENXb.2562$t16.2154595@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ZwLXb.5899$hm4.883@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > >
> > > Supposing that the ARRL petition is the form in which the change
> actually
> > > gets made and that all the newly upgraded people get on HF, how is the
> ham
> > > community supposed to "elmer" 300,000+ new HF users all at once?
> >
> > Do you really believe for a second that if the upgrades take
> > place that there will suddenly be 300K people "on-the-air"
> > in HF that haven't been? If yes, I have a nice bridge in
> > Brooklyn I'd like to sell you.
> >
> > Reality check...
> > 1. How many Techs now own an HF rig at all?
> > 2. How many, if upgraded will buy an HF rig?
> > 3. How many Techs are spouses or family members
> > of an existing ham who is already General, Advanced or Extra?
> > 4. How many of existing 300K techs are SK or otherwise
> > inactive anyway?
> >
> > As for "elmering" those that would become Generals, I'm
> > sure many of us are willing to help anyone that asks for help.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> It was partially a hypothetical question. Some Techs are inactive anyway
so
> there's probably a signficant portion there. However if even just a third
of
> them get on the air, that's still a big enough increase, even if spread
over

> months, since some will be buying rigs, that it could be a problem for a
> while. If even 10% of the current Techs get on the HF bands within a
> relatively short period of time, it will be chaotic for a period of time.
>
> But answer this. If they are not going to get on the air, what is the
point
> of the free upgrade??? It is senseless to give people something they are
> not going to use.

I can turn that around in a heart-beat. If they are not going to
get on the air on HF, why would YOU care? Bottom line,
none of us know how many will "get into" HF and how many
won't.

> Let's take a look at the points 1 to 3.
>
> 1. Most Techs that I personally know have an HF+2m rig at home as they
are
> planning to upgrade anyway. Or they have it for all-mode VHF/UHF
capability
> or satellite work. All these people will be in a position to go on the
air
> instantly if free upgrades are instituted.

Do they have an antenna for HF transmitting too?

> 2. Among the active Techs, a very high percentage can be expected to buy
an
> HF rig as soon as they could afford one.

And you base that on what logic or facts?

> 3. If they are a family member of a higher class licensee and are
actually
> interested in radio for its own sake, they will go on the air immediately.

Fine, but they can't be on the same time as their other family
member with the HF license.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2730. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 01:47:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <oiVXb.6407$W74.514@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87556

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:wESXb.2660$t16.2205419@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:xPPXb.5772$W74.4639@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:FSNXb.2565$t16.2157138@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040215100017.25517.00004309@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > > > In article <qnvXb.5411$hm4.2580@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Bill
> > > Sohl"
> > > > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > > >
> > > > Free upgrades for Techs would affect about 322,000 hams. Last year
we
> > got
> > > about
> > > > 20,000 new Techs, so the proposed freebie would affect as many
> existing
> > > hams as
> > > > the new ones we might get in the next 10-15 years.
> > > >
> > >
> > > And how could the existing ham community possibly elmer these 300,000+
> new
> > > HF users should they all decide to be active shortly following that
free
> > > upgrade. I hate to think of the resulting SSB DX pileups as it is
> pretty
> > > bad now. If a free upgrade goes through and significant numbers move
to
> > HF
> > > within a short period of time, I suspect that we'll see a lot more DX
> > > stations "hiding" in CW.
> >
> > Which would, I think, foster more hams to learn and use morse code
> > if they really want that hot DX. And if more hams didn't learn
> > morse to work those DX stations, that'd give more opportunity
> > to work them via DX to current code capable hams. In either
> > case it sounds like something the code enthusiasts should be real
> > happy about.

> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> While that could be a supposed "bright spot", I don't think that is a
reason
> for supporting codeless licenses and free upgrades.

That is certainly your perogative.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2731. Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 01:56:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <N_idnQW0B8D4vq3dRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87557

Alun wrote:

> I agree. Beleive it or not, there are quite a few peope who don't want HF,
> although they are less numerous than they were. The re-vamped Novice sounds
> more like a Tech Plus Lite!

Hehhe< I like it!

- Mike KB3EIA

2732. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 02:41:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <efb47bac950edb6a72368d3f24a82bab@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 87558

(snippage)
> However, they were exercising poor judgment on the air. You don't know
> who is listening out there, and it just isn't a good subject to have
> kids listening to.

But obviously it is perfectly okay to have the same stuff aired (and sometimes even more graphic) on national networks etc???? (Obviously more hear that than on a simple little ham repeater frequency.

>
> Other subjects that fall under the same problem:
>
> religion, politics, anything that is likely to generate a strong
> emotional response and controversy.

Excuse me??? There's exactly what I was referring to a couple of months ago. Controlling speech! I will discuss any damned thing I chose to discuss with others on the air..... only difference is that I am intelligent enough to keep it on a even keel even if I still feel strong about the subject.

>
> Nothing is stopping them from talking like this tho'.
>
> But! They have no case. The repeater control op is allowed to shut the
> repeater down for whatever reason s/he sees fit. If the control want's
> to, they can shut it down every time they hear a callsign starting with
> W! They are voluntary things.
>
> Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.
>

Overall, that sounds like a much better option.... on a couple of different levels. Not only would a discussion of religion, politics etc. be somewhat strong in feelings for the debaters, usually those also seem to take alot of time, and tieing up a repeater for that long is not necessary. There's tons of simplex frequencies to choose from.

Ryan KC8PMX

2733. ARRL Proposal----What should happen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 02:59:08 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <4c2c4239eb00afa954360a5969177e32@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 87559

The proposal that the arrl should be working on is increasing the membership ranks instead of trying to change the system of licensure that has been discussed to death here. What, theres like around 25% of all hams that are members?? If the arrl is "sooooo good" then they should be working towards increasing the membership.

Not only would this actually help to lower the cost of membership by spreading the costs of doing business over a bigger spread, but also give more strength and credibility to the organization. With a good percentage of the members being in the 55+ range there seems to be a good need to come up with new people to add to the membership ranks.

How about this for a marketing idea?? If the arrl recieves 200,000 new subscriptions for 2004 then they rebate some of the cost of the subscription rate as it is now? (Thats 200,000 over the existing memberships)

Again, the license class/testing situation as it stands now is just fine and does not need any more changes for a while. Work on promotion and building from within before trying to recruit more.

Ryan KC8PMX

2734. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 03:11:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xaCdnQ_0fMFWqa3dRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87560

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> (snippage)
>
>>However, they were exercising poor judgment on the air. You don't know
>>who is listening out there, and it just isn't a good subject to have
>>kids listening to.
>
>
> But obviously it is perfectly okay to have the same stuff aired (and
> sometimes even more graphic) on national networks etc???? (Obviously more
> hear that than on a simple little ham repeater frequency.

If I'm on a repeater, I'm using the owners rules.

>
>>Other subjects that fall under the same problem:
>>
>>religion, politics, anything that is likely to generate a strong
>>emotional response and controversy.
>
>
> Excuse me??? There's exactly what I was referring to a couple of months ago.
> Controlling speech!

Who is controlling anyones speech? Just because you have an opinion
doesn't mean you are obligated to spout it everywhere. It's called
discretion

>I will discuss any damned thing I chose to discuss with
> others on the air..... only difference is that I am intelligent enough to
> keep it on a even keel even if I still feel strong about the subject.

Perhaps you are, but not everyone is.

Here is my example that turned me off of Echolink:

I heard one ham talking to another one day at lunchtime. He was telling
the other ham how much he liked umm, certain body parts of other males.
After repeating that little bit of free speech a time or two, he went on
to describe in pretty sickening detail what he wanted to do to the
other ham. Fortunately the repeater owner shut the repeater off. But
there was at least a minute of that dreck before the person's free
speech was "violated".

>
>>Nothing is stopping them from talking like this tho'.
>>

>>But! They have no case. The repeater control op is allowed to shut the
>>repeater down for whatever reason s/he sees fit. If the control want's
>>to, they can shut it down every time they hear a callsign starting with
>>W! They are voluntary things.
>>
>>Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.
>>
>
>
> Overall, that sounds like a much better option.... on a couple of different
> levels. Not only would a discussion of religion, politics etc. be somewhat
> strong in feelings for the debaters, usually those also seem to take alot of
> time, and tieing up a repeater for that long is not necessary. There's tons
> of simplex frequencies to choose from.

Yup!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2735. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 03:39:53 UTC
From: Paul <flowerfarts3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <7e284$40303fe4$d8536fd5$19988@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 87562

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040215094252.25867.00001269@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >Not a
> >bad deal really and it's cheaper and likely more
> >useful than a subscription to QST... ;)
>
> A trip to Mcdonalds is more useful than QST

Do you mean to say that reading QST gives one
a bad case of the shi+s just as well as eating the
stuff in buns allegedly sold as "food" at McDonalds ?

Wonders never cease! :) :) :)

2736. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 03:55:05 UTC
From: manitoumagic@aol.commuter
Message-ID: <20040215225505.21890.00001795@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87561

>
>Question to all is
>
>Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
>violate their 1ST amendment rights?

In short, neither... (if your quotes are accurate)
A Control Op or Repeater owner can ban ANY user, even if he just dislikes you... it's his perogitive and is backed by FCC rulings in the past. He decides what subject/material is allowed on his machine.

2737. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 04:07:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ht5isk7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87564

On 15 Feb 2004 13:55:43 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
>than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.

The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

--
Phil Kane - K2ASP -- Beaverton, Oregon
PNW Milepost 754 -- Tillamook District

2738. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 04:07:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ht5kak8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87563

On 15 Feb 2004 23:47:21 GMT, Alun wrote:

>> Th4 U S cannot enter into a treaty that gives citizens of a third
>> country privileges irregardless of whether they are permanent US
>> residents or not. The treaty affects citizens of the two countries
>> alone, CEPT notwithstanding.
>>
>> Become a US citizen and the problem goes away.
>
>That's odd, Phil, because a licence issued in another CEPT country will be
>valid anywhere but the US, conditional only not being a resident of the
>country you are in, and on it being in the CEPT agreement, regardless of
>what your citizenship is.

The US is not a CEPT country - it recognizes the ham licenses issued
by CEPT countries the same way that it recognizes any other ham
license offered for reciprocal operation - the license has to be
from the country of citizenship. This is to avoid the "flag of
convenience" problem. We had a guy living in California who had a
Hong Kong license (isn't it nice to know the right people) who
operated in the US on a reciprocal basis with the exotic call sign
until the FCC ruled that one must be a citizen of the licensing
country or get a U S license - turned out that he was not a Hong
Kong citizen. He eventually got a US license.

>As in many things, the US viewpoint is in a minority of one. Strange that.

>It's no problem, though. All I have to do is get my G licence re-issued,
>and unlike the US there is no 2-year time limit to worry about.

I can't get my Israeli license reinstated unless I immigrate either
as an extended temporary or permanent resident or apply for
citizenship, even though I have a valid Israeli address that is my
family's home. At least I know that I can get my old call sign back
if I do. If I go there as a tourist or on a temporary visa
(business or short-term resident) I have to use the my US call on a
reciprocal basis (K2ASP/4X) even though I have a can-be-reactivated
Israeli call sign.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2739. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 04:22:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040215232256.23456.00000081@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 87565

>Do you mean to say that reading QST gives one
>a bad case of the shi+s just as well as eating the
>stuff in buns allegedly sold as "food" at McDonalds ?

No I think Qst will cause more serious problems than that. But I have found some good uses for QST, it makes some what decent toilet paper.

2740. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 04:30:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402152030.7b284cb5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87566

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402150756.765f159c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402141511.67cb2364@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >
> > > Be nice to the gunnery nurse or he will call you "scum" and "putz"
> > > and make you get down and give you ten.
> >
> > Many here have disagreed with me without the need to resort to
> > such adjectives, Lennie...
>
> I have disagreed with you, and you responded insanely. What am I to think?

I have never responded "insanely" to you, unless responding IN
KIND is "insane" to you.

I >>HAVE<< demanded certain validation of assertions you've made
here, Brain...validations you've either been unwillin or unable to
provide.

As for what "you" >think<, well, I can't help that...

Steve, K4YZ

2741. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 04:34:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402152034.734b36d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87567

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040215143937.25815.00006695@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> It's okay for you to call others "scum" and "putz" in civil discourse?

Not "others", Lennie...You.

> Ah...good old double standard of Extras again!

No double standard. YOU set the rules. YOU set the example. I
am just following your lead since facts, evidence and results seem to
evade you.

> > It's just that YOUR conduct, lying and other anti-social
> >behaviour EARNED you the endearments..."You Reap What You Sew", etc
> >etc etc...
>
> I sew what I rip. Please get the order correct.

No doubt the seat of your pants from trying to get them on over
your head....Sine it DOES appear YOU have an "order" problem...Like
manipulating Amateur Radio without being a part of it...

Steve, K4YZ

2742. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 05:06:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <QZadnQ3jt5SlzK3dRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87568

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>
> Excuse me??? There's exactly what I was referring to a couple of months ago.
> Controlling speech! I will discuss any damned thing I chose to discuss with
> others on the air......

Not on someone's private repeater if they don't want you to. The
repeater owner isn't keeping you from discussing anything you want, but
he can keep you from using his repeater to do it and perfectly within
his right to do so.

2743. Re: Reciprocal (Was Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 05:16:03 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9491299B48E5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.17>
Source record: 87569

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:xnfcneeyarg.ht5kak8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On 15 Feb 2004 23:47:21 GMT, Alun wrote:
>
>>> Th4 U S cannot enter into a treaty that gives citizens of a third
>>> country privileges irregardless of whether they are permanent US
>>> residents or not. The treaty affects citizens of the two countries
>>> alone, CEPT notwithstanding.
>>>
>>> Become a US citizen and the problem goes away.
>>
>>That's odd, Phil, because a licence issued in another CEPT country will
>>be valid anywhere but the US, conditional only not being a resident of
>>the country you are in, and on it being in the CEPT agreement,
>>regardless of what your citizenship is.
>
> The US is not a CEPT country - it recognizes the ham licenses issued
> by CEPT countries the same way that it recognizes any other ham
> license offered for reciprocal operation - the license has to be
> from the country of citizenship.

Correct. However, the question is why they require US citizenship in the
other direction? The CEPT doesn't make them do this. I can get around it. I
just find it odd.

> This is to avoid the "flag of
> convenience" problem. We had a guy living in California who had a
> Hong Kong license (isn't it nice to know the right people) who
> operated in the US on a reciprocal basis with the exotic call sign
> until the FCC ruled that one must be a citizen of the licensing
> country or get a U S license - turned out that he was not a Hong
> Kong citizen. He eventually got a US license.
>

Yes. CEPT has a different solution to this problem, though. The agreement
only permits you to operate in a given country under CEPT if you are _not_
a resident. This would have prevented the particular example you mentioned,
as the guy was a US resident, and thus could never operate in the US under
CEPT, irregardless of citizenship. Of course, Hong Kong is not a CEPT
country, so you would have to substitute one that was to make this example
work.

>>As in many things, the US viewpoint is in a minority of one. Strange
>>that.
>

>>It's no problem, though. All I have to do is get my G licence
>>re-issued, and unlike the US there is no 2-year time limit to worry
>>about.
>
> I can't get my Israeli license reinstated unless I immigrate either
> as an extended temporary or permanent resident or apply for
> citizenship, even though I have a valid Israeli address that is my
> family's home. At least I know that I can get my old call sign back
> if I do. If I go there as a tourist or on a temporary visa
> (business or short-term resident) I have to use the my US call on a
> reciprocal basis (K2ASP/4X) even though I have a can-be-reactivated
> Israeli call sign.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

That's a pity. In the UK it hinges only on having a UK address. If you can't get someone to act as a mailing address, then you can only get a 6 month temporary licence without a UK call, e.g. you have to operate as M0/foreign call, but if you can, then you can get a normal licence with a standard call.

Either way, a US General or above gets you the highest grade of licence, recently re-named Advanced. Unfortunately, anything less than a General gets you nothing, but a US citizen with a Tech licence or above should also be able to operate under CEPT with Advanced privileges, that citizenship limitation being imposed at the US end. My XYL is British and has a Tech licence, so right now she can't get a licence to operate in the UK atall.

In my case I should definitely be able to get one of my old G calls re-issued. Either one would now be an Advanced licence, although they were originally different classes. They are never re-issued to someone else, except with the licencee's permission or after their death, and even then only to an immediate family member or to a club. I held two UK calls at one time, and I could allow the 'spare' one to be issued to a family member if they qualified for a UK licence, i.e. for example if my XYL got her General.

73 de Alun, N3KIP (Ex-G8VUK, G0VUK)

2744. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 05:43:44 UTC
From: KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <7lm03055ognlflq2uott32d2cdghdea844@4ax.com>
Source record: 87570

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004 15:55:43 GMT, Bob <none> wrote:

>There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
>change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
>appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
>The conversation started to get worse.
>
>"Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
>"I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
>a sperm bank"
>
>"Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
>"Sodomy"
>
>Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
>later.
>
>They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights
>for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
>with the courts.
>
>
>Question to all is
>
>Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
>violate their 1ST amendment rights

They were not violating part 97 of FCC regulations, AND the control
operator did NOT violate 1st Amendment rights. Only the Government
can be in violation of 1st Amendment rights. Private citizens are not
bound by the 1st Amendment.
Raymond Sirois KU2S
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

2745. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 06:54:22 UTC
From: Jack Hamilton <jfh@acm.org>
Message-ID: <s9o030p4rmadq7updfub50226e9hvfla52@4ax.com>
Source record: 87571

KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net> wrote:

>They were not violating part 97 of FCC regulations, AND the control
>operator did NOT violate 1st Amendment rights. Only the Government
>can be in violation of 1st Amendment rights. Private citizens are not
>bound by the 1st Amendment.

In Pruneyard Shopping Center vs. Robins, Pruneyard Shopping Center was required to allow a group of high school students to circulate petitions on shopping center property. The decision was based on free speech rights in the state constitution, not on US Constitution. According to a discussion entitled "Why Can Shopping Malls Limit Free Speech?" at <http://slate.msn.com/id/2079885/>, only California, New Jersey, Colorado, Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, and Pennsylvania have such constitutional provisions.

Someone could try to make a case for this rule applying to the use of an amateur radio repeater located in one of those seven states, especially if the repeater equipment had been purchased or subsidized by a government agency.

Note: I'm not a lawyer, so if you want to bring such a case, don't ask me for help. A repeater does not serve the same function in society as a shopping center, and there is no federal preemption controlling shopping centers as there is for the amateur radio service generally, so I suspect that the case would be dismissed quickly. But anyone can sue anyone over anything, and as I said, I'm not a lawyer.

==
Jack Hamilton
jfh@acm.org

==
In the end, more than they wanted freedom, they wanted comfort and security.
And in the end, they lost it all - freedom, comfort and security.
Edward Gibbons

2746. Another Challenge For Lennie the Loser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 09:02:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402160102.68ee1630@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87572

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214154746.06226.00002939@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <30pXb.2360$t16.1953873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"Maximus" <nomail@here.com> wrote in message
> >news:ZRhXb.3389$WW3.1211@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> It may work, but I question how well. One reason for granting permission is
> >> to extend internet to rural areas that can't be served by conventinal means.
> >>
> >Serving the rural areas happens to be the biggest marketing lie in the whole
> >mess. It won't be econmically feasible in the rural areas. There simply
> >are not enough customers per square mile to justify the amount of equipment
> >(e.g. signal boosters and transformer bypasses) that will have to be
> >installed.
>
> You "know" all those technical things from experience and learning
> how to twiddle a morse key in amateur radio?

Morse Code has WHAT to do with rural economics, Your Putziness?
Dee made no such analogy.

The points Dee made are the VERY SAME ones that sway countless
other economic decisions in rural areas, including phone/DSL
distribution, public utilities, and even the placement of hospitals,
police and fire fighting assets.

Unless YOU can prove diffrently?

> Please point to a trade-technical press with detailed technical
> information on any of the proposed BPL systems. Detailed
> descriptions including signal levels, not computer simulations
> based on assumptions.

What assumptions have to be made, Your Scumminess? Distribution
and relay support for BPL signals WILL have to be made. Again...YOU
can prove differently? BPL can be distributed from ONE source WITHOUT
adequate relay facilities to ensure network patency?

Have at it, Mr Professional...YOU show us how BPL can be deployed
WITHOUT distribution and relay facilities...

We're waiting...

Steve, K4YZ

2747. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 10:05:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402160205.59cf0658@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87573

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Nancy
> > Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> > >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
> > >
> > >PJ
> >
> > Been vacationing in outer space?
> >
> > Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in the
> > early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox
> > was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got
> > rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move to
> > Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International"
> > but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It all
> > ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.
> >
> > The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in
> > 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily
> > spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.
>
> Set the hook now. Steady!
>
> Ziiiiiiiiing!
>
> Okay, now let him run with it. Try and tire him out, then reel him in.
>
> You can haul him down to the taxidermy shop in the morning and have him
> mounted. Get a little brass plate reading "Pisces Maximus Anderson".

Hysterical, it don't get NO better than this, Nancy got us the new
record Putzian faux pas.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2748. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 10:32:05 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161036210.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87574

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004, radio123 wrote:
> Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS radio
> under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.

Unless you have a transverter to change the output from 462/467MHz to an amateur band, you need a GMRS license.

2749. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 10:48:38 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161041390.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87575

...And this is a problem why?

If only you have heard some of the things discussed out here in the Los Angeles area on 147.435, you wouldn't be asking such a relatively stupid question! :-)

Seriously, as long as it's not a forbidden topic (i.e. violates the rules), I don't see a problem. There was no violation by the discussion participants. I would only see that run afoul of the rules if they were actively managing some sort of political action on the issue....

As for the actions of the control operator (or trustee), since they have the right to permit or deny any conversation (or other use) that passes through their equipment (cf. 47 CFR 97.205(e) - "... limiting the use to only certain user stations ...."), I don't see a problem there either. Similarly, just because someone has a particular view doesn't mean that the local newspaper MUST publish it.

There's no constitutional violation here. There's no RIGHT to use a repeater.

Now, since there was no rules violation and if the repeater were coordinated as "open," at best there might be a complaint to the local coordinating authority as to their status of "open" when they kill the box for no violation nor have notified any of the parties that they are "disinvited" from use of the system. That's the only thing I see as "actionable" in any way. As for what that complaint would get you - probably a change in the coordination to "closed" or "private" (if there's even a distinction in your area).

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004, it was written:
> There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
> change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
> appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
> The conversation started to get worse.
>
> "Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
> "I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
> a sperm bank"
>
> "Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
> "Sodomy"
>
> Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
> later.
>
> They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights

> for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
> with the courts.
>
> Question to all is
>
> Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
> violate their 1ST amendment rights

2750. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 10:59:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161056470.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87576

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004, Jack Hamilton wrote:
> KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> >They were not violating part 97 of FCC regulations, AND the control
> >operator did NOT violate 1st Amendment rights. Only the Government
> >can be in violation of 1st Amendment rights. Private citizens are not
> >bound by the 1st Amendment.
>
> In Pruneyard Shopping Center vs. Robins, Pruneyard Shopping Center was
> required to allow a group of high school students to circulate petitions
> on shopping center property. The decision was based on free speech
> rights in the state constitution, not on US Constitution. According to
> a discussion entitled "Why Can Shopping Malls Limit Free Speech?" at
> <http://slate.msn.com/id/2079885/>, only California, New Jersey,
> Colorado, Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, and Pennsylvania have such
> constitutional provisions.

Note that in Missouri, there have been cases "in shopping malls" where
[state] government agencies have offices, and that state has a law that allows
a petition zone in front of government property. The issue, as a criminal case,
was whether or not the person circulating the petition had a right to do so
because of the government agency's presence, or was it considered trespassing as
the mall was otherwise privately owned. I don't recall how this turned out as I
am not in Missouri and don't really care, but I believe that the first round
(the case is on appeal) went to the mall as private property, and the second
round (state appelate court) reversed. The federal courts are now looking at it
- as the ability to circulate a petition seems to fall under the "redress of
grievance" clause of the First Amendment (as a lawful procedure and alternative
to suing in the courts). I noted the cases (there are two, involving the same
petition circulator) because the accused has a variation of my surname (and is
thus probably a 10-20th cousin or such).

> Someone could try to make a case for this rule applying to the use of an
> amateur radio repeater located in one of those seven states, especially
> if the repeater equipment had been purchased or subsidized by a
> government agency.
>
> Note: I'm not a lawyer, so if you want to bring such a case, don't ask
> me for help. A repeater does not serve the same function in society as
> a shopping center, and there is no federal preemption controlling
> shopping centers as there is for the amateur radio service generally, so
> I suspect that the case would be dismissed quickly. But anyone can sue
> anyone over anything, and as I said, I'm not a lawyer.

Suing is one thing. Succeeding is another! :-)

2751. Alternative Proposal - was Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 11:20:05 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161105200.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87577

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004, Jason Hsu wrote:
> I understand why the ARRL proposes free upgrades from Technician to
> General. The assumptions:
> 1. The restructuring has to limit the number of license classes to 3.
> Thus, the Advanced license and either the Novice license or
> Technician license must be eliminated.
> 2. The restructuring must produce no downgrades.
> 3. The closing of the Novice class in the restructuring of 2000 was a
> major loss. So the Technician license should be eliminated but the
> Novice license should be reopened.
> 4. The only way to eliminate the Technician class without downgrading
> the existing Technicians is to automatically upgrade all Technicians
> to General.
>
> I still disagree with the ARRL's proposal, though I can now see the
> reasoning behind it. I think the flawed assumption is #3. If the
> closing of the Novice class was such a major loss, then why was the
> No-Code Technician license so much more popular than the Novice
> license during the years when both entry-level licenses were
> available? The FCC closed the Novice license for the same reason
> General Motors closed Oldsmobile - not enough takers.

I agree that #3 is flawed. However, what the ARRL fails to realize is that since 1990 for the most part, the [no-code] technician license IS the entry level license even though it was not intended to be.

We HAVE a three license class structure now: Technician, General, and Extra. With regard to that, NOTHING need be done. Nothing new needs to be created. Nothing old needs to be eliminated.

If one wants to "restructure" and still have three classes, there is an alternative that the ARRL is too stuck-up to even suggest:

1) Class "A" - 30 MHz and up. (VHF, UHF, and microwave through light ....)
2) Class "B" - 30 Mhz and below. (HF, MF, to VLF or DC) Code not required.

One can hold BOTH an "A" and "B" license. Perhaps a power limit less than 1500w.

3) Class "C" - More than just a combination of "A" and "B" - intended to be held by those who want to do the "most advanced" aspects: Put up satellites or be volunteer examiners. Code (5WPM) probably required, at least for a while. Maximum power limit.

This way, those who want to do only HF don't have to worry about the VHF and above crap. Those who want to do only VHF/UHF don't have to worry about HF.

Conversion:
Novice -> B
Technician -> A
Technician w/HF -> A+B
General -> A+B
Advanced -> A+B (if this should grant "C" instead, I leave open)
Extra -> C

All those becomming "B" (including "A+B") would have credit for code towards any class "C" requirement for code. Class C would have code credit too (but that's not really needed in the upgrade schedule unless expired licenses give credit).

For the HF bands, there would be no need for any license class based subband restrictions; all would be equal. => Simplified HF bandplans.

> I'd prefer to see all Novices and Technicians merged into a new
> Technician class and be granted Tech Plus privileges. This would be
> compatible with a 3-license system. Nobody would lose privileges, but
> all automatic upgrades would be modest.

I disagree. That gives novices privileges in places they really weren't tested for.

> As many have suggested, I think the ARRL proposal may have been a PR
> move. Although changing the rules is the FCC's job and not the
> ARRL's, anything that the ARRL could have proposed would have
> generated a firestorm of controversy. The ARRL had to propose the
> retention of the Morse Code exam requirement for the Amateur Extra
> license to appeal to the proponents of Morse Code testing. To appeal
> to the No Code Technicians feeling intimidated by the Morse Code exam
> requirement, the ARRL proposed upgrading them to General.

That gives technicians privileges in places they weren't tested for.

2752. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 14:03:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040216090312.13174.00001683@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87578

>Unless you have a transverter to change the output from 462/467MHz to an
>amateur
>band, you need a GMRS license.
>
>
>

We dont need no STINKIN LICENSES

2753. Re: Don't Shirk Morsemanship...EMBRACE IT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 14:10:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402160610.745e5b58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87579

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402152030.7b284cb5@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402150756.765f159c@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402141511.67cb2364@posting.google.com>...
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >
> > > > Be nice to the gunnery nurse or he will call you "scum" and "putz"
> > > > and make you get down and give you ten.
> > >
> > > Many here have disagreed with me without the need to resort to
> > > such adjectives, Lennie...
> >
> > I have disagreed with you, and you responded insanely. What am I to think?
>
> I have never responded "insanely" to you, unless responding IN
> KIND is "insane" to you.
>
> I >>HAVE<< demanded certain validation of assertions you've made
> here, Brain...validations you've either been unwillin or unable to
> provide.
>
> As for what "you" >think<, well, I can't help that...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I >think< you're nuts. You can help that. bb

2754. Re: who can use GMRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 14:19:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402160619.2eca7cb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87580

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402150716.640a88d6@posting.google.com>...
> "radio123" <test@test.com> wrote in message
news:<ElEXb.7160$wD5.1608@nwrddc03.gnilink.net>...

> > One license per family ?
>
> Same household...Not everyone in the same DNA strain.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Could get complicated in those hills and hollers of eastern Tennessee.
The FCC just wanted to simplify things w/o getting involved in fambly
fueds.

2755. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 14:30:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4030D408.60103@psu.edu>
Source record: 87581

N8IE wrote:
> Who cares?
> The ARRL is a joke.
> The hobby is a joke.
>
> Ham Radio is dead, RIP.

Well, at least you kept your good attitude! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2756. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 16:33:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <xh6Yb.6831$hm4.2285@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87582

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Strictly speaking, they did not violate
> any laws. What you have stated was
> not obscene. (snip)

Agreed.

> However, they were exercising poor
> judgment on the air. You don't know
> who is listening out there, and it just
> isn't a good subject to have kids
> listening to.

With more and more kids being introduced to homosexually in early school grades today, it's not that poor of a subject for kids to overhear others talking about.

> Other subjects that fall under the same
> problem:
> religion, politics, anything that is likely to
> generate a strong emotional response
> and controversy. (snip)

The same with these subjects - all commonly found in schools. I would not like to think something children can discuss in school, even in earlier grades, would be described as a "problem" when discussed on the radio. The "problem" is those who can't discuss these issues without exhibiting strong emotional responses. These should be removed from radio, not the discussion.

> But! They have no case. The repeater control
> op is allowed to shut the repeater down for
> whatever reason s/he sees fit. If the control
> want's to, they can shut it down every time
> they hear a callsign starting with W! They are
> voluntary things.

Agreed again. The control operator has no obligation whatsoever to allow anyone to discuss anything using his private property.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2757. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 18:44:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040216134445.21457.00004026@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87583

In article <bgVXb.6406$W74.5824@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Fine, but they can't be on the same time as their other family
>member with the HF license.

They can with electronic break-in, Bill. One of the pastors in here
showed how to do it in an old issue of Electric Radio.

In the spaces between sending dots and dashes, he can listen for
other signals. He can do it, therefore others can.

beep, boop

LHA / WMD

2758. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 18:44:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040216134445.21457.00004027@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87585

In article <wESXb.2660$t16.2205419@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>While that could be a supposed "bright spot", I don't think that is a reason >for supporting codeless licenses and free upgrades.

Right...U.S. amateur radio is all about radiotelegraphy.

beep, beep

LHA / WMD

2759. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 18:44:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040216134446.21457.00004028@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87584

In article <d22b54c3.0402160205.59cf0658@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Nancy
>> > Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >
>> > >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
>> > >
>> > >PJ
>> >
>> > Been vacationing in outer space?
>> >
>> > Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in
the
>> > early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox
>> > was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got
>> > rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move
to
>> > Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International"
>> > but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It
all
>> > ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.
>> >
>> > The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in
>> > 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily
>> > spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.

>Hysterical, it don't get NO better than this, Nancy got us the new
>record Putzian faux pas.

Quite true, whether it be "Nancy" or "PJ" or whatever...living in the past seems to be a "qualification" for olde-tyme hammes of the morse persuasion.

There hasn't been a new BC-610 made for a half century or so, yet all IMAGINE they are still being made in Chicago and anyone can write a non-existant corporation for "information." Countless radio yachts are moored by such boat anchors and many olde-tymers love to scrape off the barnacles and tell many a tale of love and affection for those raddios that glow in the dark (much as the eyes of the olde-tymers glow in the dark when describing their wonderous adventures of expertise).

"Expertise" as equated by the mental and emotional stability of seven-year-old Extras that all must emulate to "be as good as them." :-)

Must be that all that radiotelegraphy rots the brain...

LHA / WMD

2760. Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 19:40:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40311CB9.2000603@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87586

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>
>I agree. Beleive it or not, there are quite a few peope who don't want HF,
>although they are less numerous than they were.
>
Well, they don't have to *use* the HF privledges if they don't want to.
But when I got
my "extra lite" back on Restructuring Day, I found HF to be fun to
operate. I used to
have an old fashioned tech plus from 1976 (5wpm, general written). It's
not like having
HF priviledges costs any more for the license...

If the FCC ever should consider creating a "Super-Extra" license, they
should allocate
new ham spectrum for them, leaving the existing extras access to all of
the old ham
spectrum. That's what they should have done back in the 60's when they
did incentive
licensing. And it doesn't have to be new HF spectrum, maybe new
microwave freqs,
LF or whatever. But as I understand it, HF isn't so much in demand as
VHF, UHF and
microwave is for commercial users today vs 40 years ago. So new HF is
more likely...
Though odds are very long even on that.

2761. Re: Alternative Proposal - was Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 19:47:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40311E3B.6070100@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87587

>
>
>
>One can hold BOTH an "A" and "B" license. Perhaps a power limit less than
>1500w.
>
>
>
There actually was a time when you could not have a novice *and* a tech
license
at the same time. Tech required 5wpm then, and general written. And
presumidly
novice written. So Tech would have been a superset of novice, but if
you upgraded
from novice to tech then, you gave up your old HF privs to get on above
50MHz.
This was more likely a brearucratic screw up than actual desired policy.
Like today's
lifetime credit for passing a 5 wpm test but none for 13 or 20.

2762. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 19:52:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40311F94.9060403@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87588

JJ wrote:

>
>
> Not on someone's private repeater if they don't want you to. The
> repeater owner isn't keeping you from discussing anything you want,
> but he can keep you from using his repeater to do it and perfectly
> within his right to do so.
>
Take it simplex. An analogy is that "freedom of the press" doesn't mean
that, if I own a
printing press plant, that you can make me print up copies of your
message. It means that
you can go out and build your own printing press plant and print
whatever you want to
say. So get your own repeater. No allocations left? Buy out an
existing repeater system.

2763. Re: Asshole N4CND loses wife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 21:20:57 UTC
From: edo <nobody@cryptorebels.net>
Message-ID: <84130c07f0dd814b5c85e94c874c399b@cryptorebels.net>
Source record: 87589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

```
In article <c0i27f$g4j$0@pita.alt.net>
"LOST HIS WIFE Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> whined:
>
>
>
> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote in message
> news:BWEWb.38359$8a5.6746@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> Those chaps look faggot to me! Maybe Suzy Rottencrotch caught him
> blowing porkbutt!
>
> edo wrote:
>
> > In article <R8tVb.26928$qK3.15478@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
> > "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@liberalz.com> wrote:
> > >
> >>
> >>http://profiles.yahoo.com/dr_oris
> > >
> > >
> > > Poor WHORASS, I guess his hag of a wife got fed up with him
> > > sexually abusing Shelby and Michelle........
> > >
>
> Maybe, just maybe if he had hit her in the face with a Pepsi bottle he could
> have shown her how much he loved her. Pepsi bottles work wonders, do they
> not?

Yeah, why'd your wife leave you, WHORASS?
```

2764. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 22:31:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402161431.20deea73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87590

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402160205.59cf0658@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Nancy
> > > Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
> > > >
> > > >PJ
> > >
> > > Been vacationing in outer space?
> > >
> > > Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in the
> > > early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox
> > > was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got
> > > rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move to
> > > Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International"
> > > but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It all
> > > ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.
> > >
> > > The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in
> > > 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily
> > > spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.
> >
> > Set the hook now. Steady!
> >
> > Ziiiiiiiiing!
> >
> > Okay, now let him run with it. Try and tire him out, then reel him in.
> >
> > You can haul him down to the taxidermy shop in the morning and have him
> > mounted. Get a little brass plate reading "Pisces Maximus Anderson".
>
> Hysterical, it don't get NO better than this, Nancy got us the new
> record Putzian faux pas.

And did it with just one 10 word sentence.

Fun facts:

- The BC-610/HT-4 family only went up to 18 MHz.
- Versions were made from 1939 to 1955, ending with the BC-610I.
- The companion BC-939 tuner was designed and made by Upper Darby's own B&W, which is still in business.
- Complete manual available free-for-the-download from the KG7BZ website

73 de Jim, N2EY

2765. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 23:06:38 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87591

Hello, Jim

Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them? I'm not talking cb radios, I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc. That was in the early 60s as I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in them).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0402161431.20deea73@posting.google.com...
>
> And did it with just one 10 word sentence.
>
> ----
>
> Fun facts:
>
> - The BC-610/HT-4 family only went up to 18 MHz.
> - Versions were made from 1939 to 1955, ending with the BC-610I.
> - The companion BC-939 tuner was designed and made by Upper Darby's own
B&W,
> which is still in business.
> - Complete manual available free-for-the-download from the KG7BZ website
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.590 / Virus Database: 373 - Release Date: 2/16/04

2766. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 23:11:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <l6cYb.7218$hm4.7110@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87592

"Jack Hamilton" <jfh@acm.org> wrote in message
news:s9o030p4rmadq7updfub50226e9hvfla52@4ax.com...
> KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> >They were not violating part 97 of FCC regulations, AND the control
> >operator did NOT violate 1st Amendment rights. Only the Government
> >can be in violation of 1st Amendment rights. Private citizens are not
> >bound by the 1st Amendment.
>
> In Pruneyard Shopping Center vs. Robins, Pruneyard Shopping Center was
> required to allow a group of high school students to circulate petitions
> on shopping center property. The decision was based on free speech
> rights in the state constitution, not on US Constitution. According to
> a discussion entitled "Why Can Shopping Malls Limit Free Speech?" at
> <http://slate.msn.com/id/2079885/>, only California, New Jersey,
> Colorado, Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, and Pennsylvania have such
> constitutional provisions.

State rules don't apply to federally licensed amateur stations.
And...the state constitution treats shopping centers as essentially
a public place. The same thing happened in NJ. BUT, that doesn't
make ALL private property such as my home, my backyard,
my repeater subject to the state saying I must allow anyone to
say whatever they want "on" my property.

> Someone could try to make a case for this rule applying to the use of an
> amateur radio repeater located in one of those seven states, especially
> if the repeater equipment had been purchased or subsidized by a
> government agency.

It isn't a state matter just because it is in a state. The state
can't excersize control over aircraft just because they come
and go in an airport in that state.

> Note: I'm not a lawyer, so if you want to bring such a case, don't ask
> me for help. A repeater does not serve the same function in society as
> a shopping center, and there is no federal preemption controlling
> shopping centers as there is for the amateur radio service generally, so
> I suspect that the case would be dismissed quickly.

Exactly!

> But anyone can sue
> anyone over anything, and as I said, I'm not a lawyer.

True, but it hasn't yet...and if it did I'd donate to the defense
fund of the repeater owner...and I think so would many others
as well as ARRL,

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2767. Re: Alternative Proposal - was Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 23:40:04 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <oxcYb.6$x71.3@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87593

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40311E3B.6070100@ix.netcom.com...

> There actually was a time when you could not have a novice *and* a tech
license
> at the same time. Tech required 5wpm then, and general written. And
> presumidly
> novice written. So Tech would have been a superset of novice, but if
> you upgraded
> from novice to tech then, you gave up your old HF privs to get on above
> 50MHz.
> This was more likely a brearucratic screw up than actual desired policy.
> Like today's
> lifetime credit for passing a 5 wpm test but none for 13 or 20.

This is true. When I had my novice, in 1962, it was a 1 year non-renewable license. I failed the 13 wpm test twice and it wasn't until 1964 that I obtained my general. I didn't want the tech as I figured I'd be stuck at 5 along with the tech license for eternity. In 1966 I obtained my extra (along with commercial telegraph license).

The lifetime credit for a 5 word per minute test makes some sense as anyone who could never copy more than perhaps 10 words per minute would, over the years, likely forget it. I was last active on cw in 1969 and let my licenses expire. I never practiced nor studied until I showed up for a test in 1993. Yes, I could still pass 20 words per minute (and just checked off some answers in the theory exam as I didn't want to waste time extracting square roots by hand as I didn't bring a calculator - you don't need 100% to pass). Anyone who passed 13 wpm or greater doesn't need a free pass; they can simply take the 5 word per minute exam and pass. You can bet the folks that need that free pass would be hard pressed to actually take the test and pass - or they wouldn't be so preoccupied with finding proof that they had a license once upon a time.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.590 / Virus Database: 373 - Release Date: 2/16/04

2768. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-16 23:40:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402161540.9ca9f12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87594

Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net> wrote in message
news:<4029c5d5$0$99190$45beb828@newscene.com>...
> In <20040203205637.05539.00004128@mb-m16.aol.com> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
This is Part Two - previous stuff removed to save space)

> >>>>You might argue that not every existing ham has obtained the same degree
> >>>>of experience, or even a minimum necessary level of experience to be
> >>>>given a free upgrade. That would be true, but ultimately would be
> >>>>self-limiting, as experience would correlate with participation. An
> >>>>inactive ham using no privileges today would be using no more privileges
> >>>>if the FCC gave him a free upgrade tomorrow. Free upgrades are not a
> >>>>perfect solution, ideal in all cases, but are a good solution overall.
> >
> >>>I disagree. What's wrong with simply allowing Techs, Tech Pluses and
> >>>Advanceds to upgrade in their own time?
> >
> >>>What is the sudden need to eliminate those license classes? The Novice and
> >>>Advanced have been closed off to new issues for almost 4 years, and their
> >>>numbers have declined. And from 1953 to 1967, no new Advanceds were issued.
> >>>Did any of that cause problems?
> >
> >>>What's the rush?
> >
> >>>Are the written tests too hard?
> >
> >Well? The current Extra was recently earned by a bright seven year old - can
> >we really say that it's unreasonable to expect others to do what she did for
> >the same privileges?
> >
> As others have pointed out in other threads, the 7-year old Extra is a
> statistical outlier, one of a handful in amateur radio history, and not
> a typical example.

It's true that there have only been a few hams younger than about 10
years of age. And in most cases these young hams were in somewhat
exceptional circumstances.

Add a few years, however, and the numbers explode. Tens of thousands,
if not hundreds of thousands of present-day hams started as preteens
or young teenagers, often with no other hams in the family and no real
parental support other than "don't electrocute yourself or burn the
house down". So we still have the nagging question of why it's
unreasonable to expect others to do what they did for the same
privileges?

> The more typical, and meaningful, example of an
> entry-level ham would be one who was high school or college-age.

Why?

I got my first ham license at the beginning of 7th grade. What is now
middle school. No other hams in my family or neighborhood. There were
many like me,
limited mostly by lack of money and transportation.

> The
> greater numbers of these typical entry-level hams would mean that they
> would have a more profound impact on the shaping of the future of
> amateur radio, anyway.

Agreed! But note this: When the ARRL paid READEX to do a survey back
in 1996, the most strongly procodetest age group was the *youngest*
group - 15 and under. 85% were in support of code testing, only 15%
opposed. Time after time, when Morse code is demonstrated to young
prospective hams, they *like* it and are eager to learn it. The idea
that a 5 wpm code test is somehow a barrier to young people is not
borne out by actual experience.

> >>>Why do the Advanced class subbands have to be "refarmed" at all? Who or what
> >>>would they be "refarmed" to? What's the longterm plan?
> >>>>
> >>>>If you do agree that the Advanced phone bands should be refarmed at some
> >>>>point in the future, at what point would you have it done? Would you
> >>>>leave it to Extras, give it to Generals, or would you otherwise split it
> >>>>up in some way?
>
> >>>Why does it need to be done at all? Is the Extra written that hard?
>
> >Why do you avoid these simple questions?
>
> Because sometimes simple questions are loaded with built-in assumptions

Mine aren't.

> (e.g., "Why won't you join me in voting to ban COP-KILLER bullets?" or
> even the classic, "Have you stopped beating your wife?").

I am simply asking why it is so urgent to get rid of closed-off
license classes. Where is the "loading" in such a question?

> Furthermore, you see simplicity where I see complication, and vice-versa.

I don't see what the problem is with simply keeping the Advanced and
Tech. Allow those who hold them to upgrade in their own time.
>
> >>
> >>So you would argue that any refarming would be done at some asymptotic
> >>point in the far future, indistinguishable at present between "decades"
> >>and "never."

>
> >I'm *asking* what the problem is with leaving some things alone.
>
> The question has been asked and answered, though I have given you an
> answer you disagree with. Asking the question repeatedly will not
> result in a different answer from me. Put away the rhetorical bludgeon.

All I see is the answer that "we need to simplify!" but not *why* that
simplification is so needed right now, when it wasn't needed 4 years
ago.

> >>>>>>Alternatively, avoids opening up the
> >>>>>>Advanced class phone bands to General-class hams (an effective downgrade
> >>>>>>in privileges for Advanced, and crowding out DX users with more
> >>>>>>U.S. hams in those bands) or opening up the Extra class phone bands to
> >>>>>>Advanced-class hams (which would be a "free upgrade" in all but name).
>
> >>>>>Again, why not just leave those subbands as they are now?
> >>>>
> >>>>In this day and age, regulatory agencies seem more eager to simplify
> >>>>regulations. Removing regulations that are obsolete, or cover too small
> >>>>an intended audience to be justified on a cost basis, is likely a top
> >>>>priority for such agencies. Again, what is your timeline for change?
> >>>>Decades in the future, or never?
>
> >>>I don't see any reason to "refarm" them at all. Not at this time, anyway.
>
> >>>Note that in 4 years, the number of Advanceds has dropped by only about 16%.
>
> >>>Seems to be a pretty popular license even today.
> >>
> >Note also that several Advanceds have said they *don't* want an upgrade, free
> >or not.
> >I don't understand why, but that's what they've said.
>
> >>>It sounds to me like you want all Advanceds to become Extras so that the
> >>>Advanced subbands can become General bandspace. That's not part of the ARRL
> >>>proposal, though.
> >>
> >>No, I never said that.
>
> >No, you didn't. That's why I wrote "sounds to me".
>
> My first draft of my reply said, "No I never said nor implied that." I
> edited it to achieve economy of words, because even if I somehow implied
> that I supported the entire ARRL proposal, adoption of that proposal
> would not giving the entire Advanced phone subbands to the Generals.

The word "refarmed" was used, which is a euphemism for "reallocated".

If all Advanceds get Extras, but Generals get no more bandspace, then
what is actually "refarmed"?
>
> >>I would combine Advanced and Extra phone bands
> >>into just Extra phone bands, and leave the General bands as they are.
>
> >That's the status quo! It's not "refarming" at all.
>
> It still removes one color bar from the frequency allocation charts (for
> Advanced), so is not strictly a "status quo" solution like you have
> advocated.

The point is that by using the word "refarming", you implied that
Generals would get more bandspace.
>
> I suppose a definition of refarming is necessary for this context. Even
> the ITU seems to struggle with the meaning of this word (search for
> "definition of refarming" on Google). A commonly-accepted definition
> is:
>
> "Moving one service out to make way for another that would use the
> spectrum more optimally."
>
> So, really, neither of us are using the word entirely according to this
> definition. Even if we substitute "class" for "service" above, no
> General, Advanced, or Extra is being moved out to make way for anyone
> else under the two alternatives offered in this discussion (mine, and
> the ARRL's). Even Novice and Tech Plus hams only face a "lose some, but
> gain a lot more" prospect under the ARRL proposal. You would define
> refarming as making different license classes within the same service
> either gain or lose spectrum. I would agree that this would constitute
> one kind of refarming. I would also assert that the elimination of
> license classes within a service to simplify spectrum allocation is
> another kind of refarming.
>
I say it would be clearer to avoid such euphemistic words and be more
direct. "Reallocate" or, better yet, "widen the phone bands". Because
that's what it comes down to.

> >>That doesn't mean that I wouldn't support frequency shifting, such as
> >>that proposed to make 40 meters a primary amateur allocation, or part of
> >>Novice band refarming. Just that I would keep the proportional amounts
> >>roughly the same. I realize that the current ARRL proposal splits up
> >>the Advanced phone bands, giving proportionally more to the General than
> >>the Extra phone bands on 80 and 40 meters, and proportionally less on 15
> >>meters (no changes on 20 meters). I do not strongly support that, but
> >>even that proposal isn't giving the entire Advanced phone bandwidth to
> >>the Generals.
>
> >And if nothing at all is done, the results are almost the same as what you
> >propose.
>

> Emphasis on "almost." One of my motivations in this extended discussion
> is to determine our agreements and disagreements, what are hard-and-fast
> beliefs, and what might be open to compromise.

Good idea.

> In case you haven't
> figured it out, I'm gathering verbage for a draft of my comments on any
> future NPRM. You seem to be alternating between active opposition to,
> and fatalistic acceptance of, the possibility that Element 1 will be
> deleted.

That's one way to look at it.

The fact is that there are more issues to be addressed than just the 5
wpm code test. It's important to not lose sight of the fact that
whether the code test stays or goes, those other issues should not be
forgotten.

> Perhaps you want to "go down fighting" on this issue with the
> ARRL and the FCC.

Why not? If those of us who support code testing don't ask, we'll
never get.

Is the current 5 wpm test, with all its accomodations, *really* too
much to
ask of new hams? The ARRL proposal writeups wax nostalgic about the
old Novice license, but carefully avoid mentioning that
part-and-parcel of the old Novice was the 5 wpm code test.

> Your ideal-world position of no changes allows me to
> rebut with the continued complications that it implies.

My ideal-world position isn't one of no changes. I've outlined it here
before, and can dig it up again if you want to see it.

> On the other
> hand, I too believe that Element 1 being dropped is likely, but I also
> believe that changes to license classes and band allocations are still
> very much up in the air at this point. Because of this, I will happily
> play "what-if" with the various scenarios (as the FCC might do them in
> any combination) while also indicating which ones that I favor.
>
> So that there is no further confusion about what I favor, I support
> dropping Element 1 (which would merge Technician with Technician-Plus),

For all license classes or just Tech Plus?

> giving present Advanced-class licensees a "free upgrade" to Extra, and
> keeping General and Extra-class phone bands substantially and
> proportionately the same (save for some small shifting/resizing for
> Novice-band refarming and making all of 40 meters a primary amateur
> radio allocation).

So the Tech would remain the entry level license?
>
> >>>>>>Also avoids having to accommodate a license class (Tech Plus) that isn't
> >>>>>>even carried in the FCC database anymore, which is a records/
> >>>>>>enforcement problem for the FCC, and requires the licensee to keep
> >>>>>>documentation forever.
>
> >>>>>If the current rules are left alone, all Tech Pluses will be Techs in six
> >>>>>years, two months and 20 days or so.
> >>>>
> >>>>If by saying, "If the current rules are left alone..." you really meant
> >>>>leaving alone everything *except* the 5 WPM Morse code requirement
> >>>>(which would be eliminated for these General and below under the ARRL
> >>>>proposal), then, and only then, Technician-class hams will assume the
> >>>>HF privileges of Technician-Plus.
>
> >>>Whatever. I don't see why the 5 wpm code test is such a big deal as a
> >>>requirement.
> >>
> >>Does your "Whatever" answer above mean that you support 5 WPM Morse code
> >>for all HF license classes, or just for Extra?
>
> >I support a code test for all amateur licenses, period. I think the dropping of
> >the
> >code test for the Tech back in 1991 was a mistake. I argued and commented
> >against it then, and much of what I said would happen has come to pass.
>
> The FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System (EFCS) only goes back to 1992
> and your callsign doesn't appear in Google Groups until 1997. Would you
> mind elaborating on what you thought would happen, and what you think
> has come to pass?

OK, here's the short list:

First off, dropping the code test from the Tech in 1991 re-created a
ham license that was VHF-UHF centric. New hams were funneled to start
off on VHF/UHF FM phone with new manufactured equipment, rather than
HF CW, where homebrew, kit and used equipment were more prevalent.
This created a divide between those hams who had some or all HF and
those who had none, centered around the code test. Such divisions are
not a good thing. The resulting division has diverted attention from
other, more important issues such as publicity, antenna restrictions,
and limits to growth.

Second, the change brought about a surge in new hams (good) but not
sustained growth (bad).

Third, one of the things promised back in 1991 was that there would be
more and more "technical people" becoming hams if the code test were
dropped for VHF/UHF. Did not happen.

Most of all, the continual tinkering with the license system has
perpetuated and expanded the myth that the license tests are "too

hard", and that all will be well if we just make this change or that change. Yet history tells a very different story. Look at the growth in US ham radio from 1991 to the present, and compare it to an identical length of time before 1991. Was there a big, sustained increase in the number of new hams because of the Tech losing its code test?

Look at the growth since April 2000. Mostly existing hams getting upgrades, but not a huge jump in the number of new hams.

And the issue isn't just code tests. The *written* tests have been reduced in number, size and complexity, too. Is that really a good thing?

> >>If the former, then
> >>there is a very real distinction that will continue to exist in the
> >>license ladder whether or not it continues to be recorded in the
> >>database. If so, then the expiring of Tech-Plus license in 6 years is
> >>not a simplification, it is a complication.
> >>
> >>>>That's still a long time in FCC
> >>>>enforcement (and VEC administration) years.
>
> >>>Why? It's been almost 4 years since the last restructuring took effect. Look
> >>>at the enforcement letters - Techs without code masquerading as Tech Pluses
> >>>isn't a big problem, from what I see.
> >>
> >>You argue that it's not an enforcement problem because few or none have
> >>been caught. I would argue that it is an enforcement problem because it
> >>would be very hard to catch someone, especially if confirming who has
> >>what privileges requires documentation that is no longer in the FCC
> >>database, and might no longer be retained by hams or VEC's. The FCC's
> >>limited staff time is probably being aimed at big fish, such as Advanced
> >>and Extra-class scofflaws engaging in power and interference violations.
>
> >You might want to read the letters. They're pretty evenly distributed, license
> >clas wise, except for Novices.
>
> I have read them. Even if they are evenly distributed in numbers, they
> are not evenly distributed according to number of licensees in each
> class. If they were, then there would be approximately one Extra-class
> violator for every three Tech/Tech-Plus violators, or every 1.5
> General-class violators. I stand by my original argument.
> Specifically, that the FCC's enforcement agenda is mostly aimed at
> high-yield (easier to catch/more serious punishment, aka "big fish")
> violations "such as" (i.e., not limited to) power and interference
> violations at higher classes of license. Such licensees are being
> subject to proportionately more enforcement scrutiny than other classes
> of license.

What about the new ham who was found transmitting false distress calls on a marine VHF frequency using a modified ham rig? As I recall, intentional false distress is one of the most serious infractions possible.

There is also the factor of enforcement being complaint-driven. Someone who acts up on a 2 meter repeater can be heard over a radius of perhaps a few dozen miles, and the repeater control ops can shut down the machine. But on HF, a single bad apple can be heard for hundreds or thousands of miles, and there's no way to "shut down the machine".

Please note, too, that the enforcement actions for on-air behavior are almost entirely directed against those using voice modes. Enforcement actions against hams using Morse code in the CW/data parts of the bands are almost nonexistent. The disparity is far more than can be explained by the relative popularity of the modes.

Out of time again. More to come in Part Three

73 de Jim, N2EY

2769. K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 00:14:25 UTC
From: k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com
Message-ID: <e1b5119f.0402161614.20345342@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87595
Cross-posted to: alt.bible,rec.radio.cb,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Here is a post to misc.transport.trucking the resident weirdo Chuck Adkins made...When you look at all of these posts you will see what a lying hypocritical mentally deranged idiot he is.
Also, don't neglect a visit to his personal website, loaded with cool info about Chukkee...here's the link!

http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html

And here is the first post...read with interest...hehhehehehehehe

Hi guys,

I am looking for some work, badly.... I've got bills up the butt and I need some work...

here's my story...

I have a CLASS A CDL with Hazmat and Doubles.

I graduated from W.C.C.C.D. in Belleville, Michigan in March of 2003

I thought I'd be smart and get a local job.

Well, needless to say, I had a accident. No one was hurt. but I did get a ticket. Only damage was to a city street light. turning out of parking lots onto narrow streets with tandems not all the way up, can downright stink! :-) Drive way was a WHOLE lot narrower than I thought... Oooops!

Anyhow, I'm studying to be a Ordained Minister. (or Pastor, if you prefer...I'm a Pentecostal... if you like Titles like that... I prefer just a member of the Body of Christ, Myself...) and I really cannot go OTR... I am wondering, are the ANY small companies or maybe bigger companies that read this newsgroup and would be willing to work with someone with 1 accident and 4 points on my license?? (2 were from accident, other 2 were from a speeding ticket in my personal car...) Anyhow, I have NO DUI's, and never been a in jail... I am a very dependable person, I'm looking for a local dirt or gravel or something along those lines, kind of a job, if you wanted to put me in a tri-axle pup truck, I wouldn't hold it against you... :-) I just need some work...

If you can help...

Drop me a line at k8cpa@NOSPAMcomcast.net <--- remove NOSPAM from address for it go though...

Thanks a Bunch and God Bless you..

Pastor Chuck Adkins

PASTOR??? Right...NOW...look at this post he made on Feb 16, 2004 on a
Yahoo newsgroup...
---

16 Feb 2004 20:06:37 -0000
Received: from unknown (HELO sccrmhc12.comcast.net) (204.127.202.56)
by mta2.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 16 Feb 2004 20:06:37 -0000
Received: from weirdoj443bz6j
(pcp03574919pcs.wodhvn01.mi.comcast.net[68.42.234.79]) by comcast.net
(sccrmhc12) with SMTP id <20040216200635012000pertee>; Mon, 16 Feb 2004
20:06:35 +0000
Message-ID: <000801c3f4c8$600a2520$0301a8c0@weirdoj443bz6j>
To: cbtricks@yahoogroups.com
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
X-eGroups-Remote-IP: 204.127.202.56
From: "chuck" <k8cpa@comcast.net> Add to Address Book
X-Yahoo-Profile: thor6883
MIME-Version: 1.0
Mailing-List: list cbtricks@yahoogroups.com; contact
cbtricks-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list cbtricks@yahoogroups.com
Precedence: bulk
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:cbtricks-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Mon, 16 Feb 2004 15:06:32 -0500
Subject: [cbtricks] To TROLL FREE and Gay Boy Dave
Reply-to: cbtricks@yahoogroups.com
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="leU-iURmEWFcLwLP2IcwZ5Ic8Oqak2Iqg5ao1SA"
Content-Length: 1121

2 words you two jerk offs...

GET SCREWED JACKASS!

and I remember when I worked you Dave on PSK31 and you were nothing
but nice to me. NOW you Talk your crap... Nothing but a flippin'
useless P.O.S.

Now stick that in your crack pipe and smoke it, Bitch Boy!

You know who...

Bunch of cum burpin' Bastards!

and as far as you go TROLL FREE, I've forgotten more about radio, than
you'll ever know, and you'd better watch what you say, or I'll have
SPEED BUGGY come clean your clock, like he did last time! and yes, I

do know about that.

Don't you flippin dorks know I could make a telephone call and drop
the dime on you cheeseheads and you'd all be outta business?

Watch what you say, because, I know people. and I could make ALL of
your life's, very misarable.

have a nice day...

-Chuck K8CPA

NOW, look at the threats he has made to others....

From: k8cpa@arrl.net (chuck)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.swap
Subject: Re: wrong!
Organization: none
Reply-To: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3d1d4afc.2608024@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
References: <adm4omoip9@woodrow.ucdavis.edu>
<aenmpv$c4t$1@woodrow.ucdavis.edu>
<9jRQ8.74723$Hn4.2644092@news1.east.cox.net>
<af7i7ndbp1@woodrow.ucdavis.edu>
<5c35b3ab.0206241648.738377fe@posting.google.com>
<3D18F4A6.8026D20B@lucent.com>
<oRXS8.654$Ur3.349664@newssrv26.news.prodigy.com>
<3d1c5d68.1461114@news.cet.com>
<WYZS8.118543$zh2.25786911@twister.neo.rr.com>
<Uy1T8.493004$Oa1.33154298@bin8.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
<lG1T8.118613$zh2.25936586@twister.neo.rr.com>
<8e19f630.0206281551.347d8657@posting.google.com>
<3d1d175d$0$1423$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.21/32.243
X-GC-Trace: gv1-4R28uWpzwz+wgFM2+yC8oGZDOGTY7Bni6ZiHw==
Lines: 22
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 29 Jun 2002 00:54:33 CDT
X-Trace: sv3-tuIUKL3CoMccCF0TcnVLv5hzgXies5DLqX40pdHJyHSKCIOI/53lBeECvoo6KGIyCKUShpzxJNY0+
UB!7tlMTpuggM2V9yVBI5yYQu1EwO2jTf0xRxnERoiXlPauZFUrQx68VyOG/KAbheHR/IuZc8OyVJIu!E2K//l+Gvp
l3FuvxmbEOlA==
X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
X-Abuse-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
X-Abuse-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your complaint
properly
Date: Sat, 29 Jun 2002 05:54:33 GMT

On 29 Jun 2002 02:11:41 GMT, John P Vassel <john@vassel.net> wrote:

>> Dr. Detroit = George Busch WA3MOJ = Moron Nope, its Chukkee K8CPA
>>

>
>Bruces son is still wandering about?
>
>--
>John Vassel
>KC8SKE
>RTFD Volunteer Firefighter

Fuck you asshole... and if I ever fucking see you face to face bitch,
I'll kick your ass. If face, I might come to Mulliken and stomp your
ass...

Bruces son, you're lucky you don't live down here...

And again here...

<!--StartFragment-->From: Yeahrightman
<yougottabekidding@nothardly.com>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: SEPT. 1, 2002 ANTIBOYS STILL OWN THE NG.
Organization: yeah, Sure...
Reply-To: Notonyourbestdayman@yougottabekidding.com
Message-ID: <u5i4nu0dso6qb9lrs91kakq443tgafneb5@4ax.com>
References: <50f7cd4f.0208311809.7544533b@posting.google.com>
<YGhc9.178783$Yd.7905862@twister.austin.rr.com>
X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.92/32.572 trialware
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-GC-Trace: gv1-NCTMrtnWWRBEN3NunVB9K6TaKboByviSDzkoA==
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 01 Sep 2002 12:08:53 CDT
Lines: 14
X-Trace: sv3-YfOrbKKnjjnXX0Zpm7CDjw3mIeYYMTUtvTM1m7ZZIQRl8//aV36wIag4V9XUcGVPmG5JYpxcPKAhb
56!noM5247AFkDhB7D0DcCqhZvkIY0k87SioDE2QkNV3ZKsALmjleh9Pbr08kBk+Utfksc5tB//XeEL!hkTEO/ZC20
JrZOw4Uw==
X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your
complaint properly
X-Postfilter: 1.1
Date: Sun, 01 Sep 2002 17:08:53 GMT

Agreed.

I am now using my filters on agent... no more anti-keytrolls.... I'm
gonna be at findley hamfest, with a friend... I hope one those pussies
comes up to me at that Hamfest. LIKE THEY SAID THEY WERE GOING TO AT
TOLEDO! FUCKING PUSSIES! NEVER EVEN SHOWED UP... ATTENTION KEYCLOWNS,

I WILL HAVE A TABLE AT FINDLEY HAMFEST. AND I PERSONALLY CHALLENGE YOU
TO COME TO MY TABLE AND MAKE YOUR PRESENCE KNOWN!!! AND SEE WHAT
HAPPENS! WHEN I'M DONE STOMPING YOUR ASSES... I MIGHT LET YOU LEAVE!
MUAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!

From: The Antikeyclowns are PUSSIES!
<AntiKeyclownsSPANKED@antikeyclownsarechumps.com>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: SHOWDOWN!
Organization: Anti-Keyclowns are SPANKED BY DA MAN!
Reply-To: Seeyouinfindlayohiomotherfucker@bringitonbitchboyz.com
Message-ID: <ddi7nuki9c7g2e7er1qpgcab94visjkhs8@4ax.com>
X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.92/32.572 trialware
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-GC-Trace: gv1-QJOJAeavfle5eEGLhzYh4Pt93aAcdpE8/WK0A==
NNTP-Posting-Date: Mon, 02 Sep 2002 15:30:11 CDT
Lines: 17
X-Trace: sv3-7kQb3d15GvLCiCs0jBLfVx8QRCMxZBfXTVMF3qzetcawy7jeOzEjFExDugSXltJYZ1VtS/VdVOYh/
LQ!DN9xe0y0QgsVUjjl+kLFYjXiezZqNSnZtOPLmH5jeDegCVHN9oyo7mZf4tFeqBdCg3cIswUdif6X!u8X/CB2Qos
e0Cnpz7g==
X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your
complaint properly
X-Postfilter: 1.1
Date: Mon, 02 Sep 2002 20:30:11 GMT

http://www.bright.net/~kanga/w8ft/hamfest.html

SHOWDOWN BETWEEN THE ANTI-KEYCLOWNS AND K8CPA WILL TAKE PLACE AT THIS
HAMFEST...

BE THERE OR BE SQUARE!

This is where the talking stops and the B.S. walks... and the action
starts....

I gotta run, time to polish the 9MM...

this ain't no joke... this is the real deal....

time to roll...

BELOW ARE SOME EARLIER THREATS MADE BY THIS INDIVIDUAL

From: superswangthang@yahoo.com (Swangthangman)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: Info on N8WWM

Message-ID: <3a329d79.5525349@netnews.att.net>
References: <25t43t403pivrp7k1sujraiag45he780sa@4ax.com>
<20001209135105.19901.00000005@ng-fw1.aol.com>
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.2/32.242
Lines: 18
Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 21:01:01 GMT
NNTP-Posting-Host: 12.76.65.92
X-Complaints-To: abuse@worldnet.att.net
X-Trace: bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net 976395661 12.76.65.92
(Sat, 09 Dec 2000 21:01:01 GMT)
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 21:01:01 GMT
Organization: AT&T Worldnet

On 09 Dec 2000 18:51:05 GMT, n8wwm@aol.comnospam (N8wwm) wrote:

>Like I am worried. As I said before, come on over and set down, and
extra plate
>at the table aint no trouble.
>
>Anytime you want fellas.

Nah we'll just pull a drive by and shoot yer house up or while your at
work, we'll rape yer ol' lady, fuck yer daughter and shoot yer dawg.

I have friends in Toledo, so watch it.

Oh! It Don't mean a THANG.,if it ain't got that SWANG!

http://www.geocities.com/superswangthang/

From: k8cpa@arrl.net (chuck)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: fucking rip off......
Organization: Amateur Station - K8CPA - Lincoln Park, Michigan
Reply-To: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <39a33bd4.19732735@netnews.att.net>
References: <8nlbb8vkm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
<QPBo5.13627$d4.57112@typhoon.hawaii.rr.com>
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.2/32.242
Lines: 47
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 03:03:04 GMT
NNTP-Posting-Host: 12.76.70.50
X-Complaints-To: abuse@worldnet.att.net
X-Trace: bgtnsc07-news.ops.worldnet.att.net 966999784 12.76.70.50
(Wed, 23 Aug 2000 03:03:04 GMT)
NNTP-Posting-Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 03:03:04 GMT

On Tue, 22 Aug 2000 20:58:24 GMT, "MODSQUAD" <modsquad@hawaii.rr.com>
wrote:

>The box will be shipped as soon has i get the updated address just
thought i
>let you all know.
> Aloha; Modsquad Honolulu
>
>
>
><bubblepuppy73@my-deja.com> wrote in message
>news:8nlbb8vkm1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>> Here is the address of a fucking rip off mother fucker:
>>
>> John D Begonia, Jr.
>> 91 - 1217 Pohahawai St.
>> Ewa Beach, Hawaii 96706

Hi Modsquad and All,

I remember a few years back here in The Motor City here, there was a dude, the *supposedly* bought a "box" from a local dude here that was building them, he would go around and start running said guy in the ground, giving out his real name, address, ect.... trying to say he sold him a bad unit ect.... anyways, one fine day, he got tired of it, the guy got a friendly visit from the local chapter of the IRON COFFINS at his house, beat him and his 21 year old punk ass kid to bloody pulp, had thier way with his woman, and as they were leaving, they said, "this is for running your mouth!"

My point?

Sometimes it's best not to be the loose cannon, cause you never know who knows who, and who's friends with whom....

73

-Chuck K8CPA

Talk around the world....LEGALLY!
http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html

How do you get your ham Ticket?
http://www.arrl.org/fastrak.html

From: "chuck K8CPA" <k8cpa@arrl.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
References: <3c86977b.1071941@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
<ff41621.0203090648.1a4edb06@posting.google.com>
Subject: Re: Chuckee won't be at Toledo Hamfest! afarid of N8's
wife!!
Lines: 407
Organization: Doug's worst nightmare!
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary"---- NextPart 000 0025 01C1C79C.99213340"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
Message-ID: <Mnxi8.163844$pN4.8597284@bin8.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 09 Mar 2002 18:01:48 CST
X-Trace: sv3-MvouEIoLEddk3rX2A0vMGvEXBU4S6bmnVZ9Qf61KW2rvhrOls315R+edEecOhxkgVrdSQs4q5yoEo
9n!/yrZQLzHrdRNrgeM6CWzuDblxekchSzZYPsdzYCfG47ICgiHc107iYfhDYc+Zkj+Q3nK2+SE/cFy!lBlpK14
X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
X-DMCA-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
X-Abuse-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
X-Abuse-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your complaint
properly
Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 00:01:48 GMT

Welp.... Guys, I normally DON'T acknowledge this type of nonsense, but
what the heck, seeing I'm flavor of the week to these dumb idiotic,
ignorant people... what the heck.

"K8CPA Is Retarded" <chuckeezasukker@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ff41621.0203090648.1a4edb06@posting.google.com...
> Yeah, Chuckee...you won't be there. That's because all you can do is
> threaten violence and rape to women and children from behind a
> keyboard.

Number one. Did *ANYONE* in here, see ANYTHING posted by me,
threatening
to rape dougie's daughter or wife? With Chuck K8CPA in the headers????
I
saw something a LONG time ago, posted by some troll to you in this NG,
something also to do with Riley Hollingsworth as well, I thought it
was
quite funny. Figured some troll was having a bit of fun, I also
noticed
the troll was on AT&T Worldnet, as I was at the time too... and I
kinda
thought in the back of my mind, Whoa boy, I'm gonna be blamed for it,
and sure enough I was. but, I kept to myself about it. you say, you
traced the IP address to me, Bullshit! Dial-up Modems are assigned
static IP addresses, and it came from a dial up connection in the
Detroit area, Big FUCKING deal! you know how many HAM'S and or CB'ers
in
Detroit and surrounding area there area? Thousands! Someone was having
the time of thier lives at YOUR expense dougie, and you friggin fell
for
it, hook line and fucking sinker! ....and of course, *I* was
blamed
for the whole thing. like I figured I would be. In fact, I *Think* I
may
know who it was.... not 100% for sure, but do YOU honestly think I am

going to tell your dumb ass who I *think* it might be, HELL NO! for
one,
becuase I quite honestly could be wrong and for two, I personally
think
your an moronic, pencel-necked , no-code, CB dumb ass, wanna be Ham!
and
I'm glad the guy PISSED YOU OFF!

>When a man calls your chump self on it you have to run.

Shit boy, from what I hear, I could kick your fucking ass with ONE
hand
tied behind my back! and remember, I have friends too and what I
cannot
handle, they could and would be more than happy too help out... ever
heard of the Iron Coffins Dougie????????? They make the fucking Hell's
angels look like fucking boy scouts!

>You
> are a fat cowardly piece of human garbage, and you can't do diddley
> squat to anyone. >

Neither Can you.

>In an earlier post you said your fatboy loser
> criminal self would be there. You also said you fear "no one".
> I think you lie. You are shaking in your pink tennis shoes over the
> very prospect of coming face to face with someone you made a physical
> threat to.

hahahahahahahahahahaha.....TOO FUNNY!

You are so DUMB!

You forget, Dougie, I know where 504 Euclid Ave is in Toledo. I might
just come right to your fucking house tonight bitch and drag you out
in
the fucking street and kick your ass... wanna try me???

Go for it!

> Publicly apologize on the NG and it is all forgiven.
>

Like I said, Dougie, you ain't smart enough or bad enough to get
ANYTHING out of this mother fucker...

> Also, for those who read the post a while back where Chuckee said he
> had a concealed weapon permit: The fat chump lied. The Michigan State
> Police provided this information for free. He does not and never did
> have one.
>

who said it was registered. and besides, I don't need a fucking gun,
asswipe, I'll kick your sorry ass WITH MY FUCKING BARE HANDS!

> So, there you are, keyclowns. One of your own. Proven to be a fat
> chump coward and a liar. A disgrace to amateur radio, a typical
> keyclown, a putrid hunk of turd with arms and legs. A coward. A
> threatener of women and children.
>

and you? a sorry assed mother fucker, who got the fucking BALLS to
post
with REAL Name and e-mail address!

> COMING UP NEXT:
> K8CPA's criminal record!!
> I mailed away to the state capital for that. Soon enough I will have
> it and will post it on a website.
>
>

This will be quite boring as I'm clean as a whistle, except for a
traffic ticket that I got like 4 years ago and it's off MY record.

73's to you Dougie!

-Chuck K8CPA

...-.- ..

From: "chuck K8CPA" <k8cpa@arrl.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
References: <3c86977b.1071941@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
<ff41621.0203090648.1a4edb06@posting.google.com>
<3c8a9968.2460199@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
<ff41621.0203091954.3194702d@posting.google.com>
Subject: Re: Chuckee won't be at Toledo Hamfest! afarid of N8's
wife!!
Lines: 205
Organization: Doug's worst nightmare!
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary"---- NextPart 000 000E 01C1C7F8.BB74DEE0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
Message-ID: <A%Gi8.21694$hO6.1928481@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 04:58:40 CST
X-Trace: sv3-lyvIJ8/zJFElKObYRYd7LHn/oE9LlG/wUyvknau8X0eqYIPMx6+mNxybOacVjpX93JCwFR/vyAEYD
FD!AAQfUEjMgsCfhaUjozfqbce524ScMoCkTM+acdO6j8Chif4geY/eOcj9zTCujnRTTBFgwFBupK7Q!rNSb0g
X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
X-DMCA-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com

X-Abuse-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
X-Abuse-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your complaint
properly
Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 10:58:40 GMT

"K8CPA Is Retarded" <chuckeezasukker@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ff41621.0203091954.3194702d@posting.google.com...
> k8cpa@arrl.net (me) wrote in message
news:<3c8a9968.2460199@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>...
> > you know, i WONDER if buckeye cable is aware that this guy is
abusing
> > thier system?
>
> 1. Thier is an incorrect spelling. Their is correct. You are welcome.
>

Oh, so, now you go from wanting to hurt me to wanting to be a teacher,
sounds like a change in tone to me.

> 2. I suggest you contact the cable company and complain. That's all
you can do,
> except make threats of violence to women, children and pets.
>

Well, the fact is, *I* have *YOUR* IP address and I traced it to your
location in Toledo, and I E-mailed the system admin at *YOUR* ISP with
all the threats of personal harm to myself via e-mail, which BTW could
have you brought up on Federal Charges. So,we'll see who has the last
laugh here and BTW, if the Toledo branch of the FBI does call me and
ask
if I want to press charges, I will be saying yes.

> 3. Do you see any threats? You amuse me Chuckee...whining like this.
>

> 4. Why don't you tell us all about the CCW permit. You know, the one
you lied
> and said you have.
>

Like I said, Who said it was registered. and fact is asshole, I don't
need a gun, I'll take you out with my bare hands!

> 5. Your implied threat of having a bike gang back you up against a
person whose
> family you threatened with violence shows what a fat sissy coward
you are.
>

Like I said, give some SOLID DIRECT Proof that I did any such thing
and
I'll get off this crap, otherwise, hit the damn road...and for the
record, I know serveral Iron Coffins, and what I cannot or will not

handle, they will.

-Chuck K8CPA

> 6. I'm done now. Hope to see your face sometime. Sissy boy.

From: chuck@chucks2way.com
Subject: Re: check it out
Date: 1999/01/20
Message-ID: <785o7j$5js$1@nnrp1.dejanews.com>
References: <36a36dc4.535673@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
<7833ji$rr7$1@nnrp1.dejanews.com>
<36a542e6.99537801@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
X-Http-Proxy: 1.1 x1.dejanews.com:80 (Squid/1.1.22) for client
209.117.148.194
Organization: Deja News - The Leader in Internet Discussion
X-Article-Creation-Date: Wed Jan 20 23:18:22 1999 GMT
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
X-Http-User-Agent: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 4.01; Windows 95)

In article <36a542e6.99537801@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net (WildCat from RT Electronics) wrote:
>
>
> In article <36a36dc4.535673@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
>
> > WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net (WildCat from RT Electronics) wrote:
> >> come on in and check us out
> >>
> >> www.angelfire.com/mi/WILDCATRADIOS
> >> thank you
> >> -WildCat
> >>
> >> RT Electronics
> >> MailTo:WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net
> >> Phone: 1-313-291-1345
> >>
> >> "The Home of the Wildcat Radio!"
> >>
> >
> >
> >You know, I wasn't gonna bring this up in this newsgroup, but after I went
> >out to this mans shop and set him up with a newsgroup reader, outta kindness
> >to him. this jerk now has the nads to accuse me, of getting him website, (a
> >lame one at that, I could made something alot better!) and leaving nasty
> >comments and hacking the website, Not only was this uncalled for, but pure
> >BULLSH!T. Why would I after being at someones shop, which I never had plans
> >on ever returning there, but this guys starts e-mailing me wanting to be
> >freinds again.... anyhow, I mentioned to his live in girlfreind about the
> >entry and she starts accusing me of doing it!

> >
> >My point?
> >
> >Wildcat, you're a okay guy, But when you're woman opens her mouth, she
forgets
> >to engage her brain.... Not a good thing to do, if you wanna keep freinds
> >around.
> >
> >have a Nice life, and just remember, everytime you send out a message.
> >remember who put that newsgroup reader in and made that Sig file for you, it
> >was ME! MY WORK! Not yours! but mine!
> >
> >have a nice day, Jerkoff
> >
> >A very upset...
> >
> >P.S. You'd think I have enough troubles, I hurt my back at work last nite and
> >I'll be off for a week. I'm a lot of pain, and now this shit.
> >
> >what a day!
> >
> >
> >-Chuck
> >Chuck's 2 Way Radio Service and C.B Radio Sales
> >E-Mail: MailTo:chuck@chucks2way.com
> >WebPage: Http://www.chucks2way.com
> >
> >----------== Posted via Deja News, The Discussion Network ==----------
> >http://www.dejanews.com/ Search, Read, Discuss, or Start Your Own
>
> well buddy you were the only one standing over the girl that was
> doing the work and got the passwords to get in not even the best
> hacker could not get in that fast and you me and tony were the only
> ones that knew about u getting fired so keep digging yourself deeper
> chuck and when i get that cookie traced by whoever did it and that
> was a big mistake on there part what a dumb bell , stupid , jerk
> some one never taught them to cover there own tracks when doing
> something stupid like that what a moran that person is , but i
> willfind out real soon.. and i hope to god it was not you , but
> if it was chuck i will see you in hell big boy ,because pay backs are
> hell.and be sides when my old lady first talked to you about it you
> jumped to the guns by saying it was not me how dumb. and then you
> started giving excuses about this and that not a smart move .
> chuck you must look before you jump my friend.
> and i don't care about your so called lawers you will need
> mr u.s.a big lawer washington d.c lawer mr star when i get to you
> so go to bed and pray i dont find out where that cookie came from
>

Well, FATBOY, that shows how STUPID you are, When someone enters a password
into a website, it usually echo's back dots... (you know... like ****) and I
don't have that great of a memory...

And futher more... I would NO interest in HACKING your LAME ASS web site,
anyhow, Remember YOU posted an AD for in this NEWSGROUP, and ANYONE that reads
this Newsgroup could have seen the ad, and went there and hacked it, Just
because I came to your HOLE IN THE WALL shop and set you up with a newsgroup
reader that makes ME a suspect?? You need HELP, MORON! And besides that, You
get out in this newsgroup acting like your the shit, Motherfucker, Let ME be
the first to tell you, YOU AIN'T SHIT!!!! And if you think COONDOG was a
problem wait'll you tangle with me, ASSHOLE, I'm a card carrying MEMBER of the
Latin COUNTS, I'm friends with the CASH FLOW POSSE, and I also have friends in
the IRON COFFINS, So, now do you really wanna fuck with me??? Think about it.

And Besides that, Scotty's Tech Does ALL your fucking WORK ANYHOW!

Chceck this out, this Idiot got ahold of one of these NEW TEXAS STAR Amps, and
the fucking moron tried to convert it! HE BLEW IT UP!! and SCOTTYS Tech HAD TO
FIX IT! BLAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!

And this guy tries to tell everyone he cn fix radios????

Yeah, Right!

Have a nice day, LOSER!

> signed wildcat 248 world wide getting up.
> -WildCat
>
> RT Electronics
> MailTo:WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net
> Phone: 1-313-291-1345
>
> "The Home of the Wildcat Radio!"
>

-Chuck
Chuck's 2 Way Radio Service and C.B Radio Sales
E-Mail: MailTo:chuck@chucks2way.com

WebPage: Http://www.chucks2way.com

And here's some more on rec.radio.cb

From: thor6883@yahoo.com (Pirate Operators of RRCB UNITE! NOW!)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: CHUKEESUCKEE YOUR NAME IS MUD
Date: 17 Oct 2003 21:56:21 -0700
Organization: http://groups.google.com
Lines: 92
Message-ID: <971a42a7.0310172056.6f891221@posting.google.com>
References: <17b206c0.0310171103.6d17791c@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 68.43.45.80
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1066452981 21952 127.0.0.1 (18 Oct 2003
04:56:21 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 18 Oct 2003 04:56:21 +0000 (UTC)

Dougie.. you ain't Shit, Ain't never been SHIT and never going to be
SHIT!

All you do is talk bullshit out your ass, dickhead...

as I remember, you were pretty fucking friendly at Finley!

so, go suck off your AKC fag boy friends and have a nice day, asshole.

-Chuck

And even another...where he tries the Jesus style in
misc.transport.trucking

NNTP-Posting-Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 08:49:57 -0600
From: Chuck in Detroit <thor6883@yahoo.com>
Newsgroups: misc.transport.trucking
Subject: Re: Looking for a job....
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 09:50:05 -0500
Organization: Yeah, Sure! uh-huh!
Reply-To: NoSPAMpleaseK8CPA@NOSPAMPLEASEcomcast.netSPAMGUARD
Message-ID: <8vtrsvotsgo3i51418hm8mus0uplor0sjr@4ax.com>
References: <6pepsv4hu0bu0kek0r12hn4q7i92omtu8g@4ax.com>
<H_WdnVBExbeDfVCiRVn-iw@wideopenwest.com>
X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.92/32.572
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Lines: 82
NNTP-Posting-Host: 68.43.45.80

X-Trace: sv3-bv0FLlwEm2K+TIH2J9StyzdGFGd5JlaOjbqqn+OfiuoxKI6piaHO1ygiKAnJPt6ubG1qDCSlWg6we
UN!m2qbuA99UJ3/Fai89fxgoaEkzjsViUPITX4pRa2+nlIyDkfmM0pR0+jaKMkNmAfVdxBUSA==
X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.net
X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your
complaint properly
X-Postfilter: 1.1

Paul,

I never ever give up. I keep my eyes on Jesus and He always gets me
through...

God Bless You,

-Chuck

2770. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 00:42:30 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <WrdYb.80$vX1.60@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87596

I hate to say it, but I'll probably put up a 10 meter beacon. Of course, FCC rules state using the minimum amount of power necessary for communications. This means searching out folks on the internet that are perhaps 40 miles away and you'd need some 'reasonable' power on 10 meters. Best to use a horizontal dipole. A vertical will reduce BPL interference in both directions and a yagi would reduce your horizontal signal spread (as well as aid communications). 100 watts or so ... I wonder what would be most effective? AM/SSB/FM? Again, you simply increase power on the mode selected to obtain decent communications. You also happen to choose a mode that would tend to disrupt BPL. Of course, if the power companies do happen to filter to protect amateur bands, they also will protect themselves from signal ingress. Obviously, they are smart enough to stay away from the commercial FM band, but I'd bet there will be problems in fringe areas for channel 2 and 3 television. It will be interesting to see how it plays out.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040214000948.11422.00002145@mb-m05.aol.com...
> Well the way I look at it is, that if it makes the spectrum useless, then
I
> will use my gear for nothing more than a 24 Hour Beacon. Which in turn
should
> make BPL pretty much useless. Not worried about the neighbors, the will
never
> know whats causing there service to fail, and sooner than latter they will
drop
> the Service.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.590 / Virus Database: 373 - Release Date: 2/16/04

2771. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 02:19:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040216211951.01019.00000492@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87597

In article <UGrXb.4535$W74.321@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
>dropping code testing.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

So...what? Is there some point here? The USA will do so as well, all
in good time. The incline of the slippery slope of our country's descent
into intellectual and ultimately economic poverty is increasing, and we're
picking up speed on our drop into the abyss. Hong Kong, Denmark, and
all the rest of the dumbed-down "No-Code" countries just got there before
us, that's all.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2772. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 02:19:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040216211952.01019.00000493@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87598

In article <d5cc4b87fce55a73d6193e5a16421709@news.teranews.com>, Bob <none>
writes:

>There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
>change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
>appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
>The conversation started to get worse.
>
>"Why should I care if men having sex with men"
>
>"I know a lesbian couple who raising children and they are got sperm from
>a sperm bank"
>
>"Two gay men adopting and raising children"
>
>"Sodomy"
>
>Repeater was shut down by control operator after he found out 45 minutes
>later.
>
>They want to go to the ACLU because they say their 1st amendments rights
>for free speech were violated and they are going to also file complaint
>with the courts.
>
>
>Question to all is
>
>Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
>violate their 1ST amendment rights

Bob:

Based entirely on the information you have provided, it does not seem to
me that any violation of Part 97 had occurred. The discussion was not
patently offensive in and of itself. However, it could have been depending
on how much detail you've left out. Had there been any discussion of
specific sexual acts, then there would, of course, have been adequate
cause for the control operator to put a stop to it. Even so, he/she may
have simply been acting based on personal or organizational (repeater
association) standards, which he/she would have been entirely within
their right to do.

OTOH, even if the discussion were not patently offensive, there was no
violation of the repeater users' First Amendment rights per se. A repeater
system is not a democracy; it is controlled by individuals who have a

responsibility to ensure that it is not abused, and such judgment is left entirely up to the guy holding the switch. I am a repeater control operator, and have been for almost the entirety of my career as a radio amateur. The only time I've ever had to intervene based on things being said was when a bunch of elementary-school kids, who were the children of other hams, had all just passed their No-Code Technician class en masse, and were proceeding to take liberties with the "third party" rule allowing their unlicensed friends use their HT's and starting to use language which was totally unacceptable. They found themselves talking into dead air right quick (I didn't shut down the repeater, I just turned the PL on), and their parents got phone calls from the local OO that very evening.

In the situation you described above, I doubt that I would have shut down the machine, unless I knew for a fact that there were some members of the homosexual community listening who would have been offended by the discussion. However, even so, I still may not have shut it down, since the Constitution does not protect us from being offended, especially when listening to a device with an "OFF" switch or the ability to change frequencies. Such protections come about as the result of the establishment of local standards, as opposed to the imposition of specific, universally applied restrictions.

I strongly doubt that this case will ever see a court of law, unless those who wish to pursue a lawsuit are very sure that a 1st Amendment violation had actually occurred (which I doubt) and they have the financial resources to both acquire legal counsel and pay for the consequences of losing the case. The best they could do is get the repeater's Trustee a NOA from the FCC as a result; there would be no money anywhere for a big settlement or damage award, unless the repeater was owned by some large corporation which had it's own amateur radio club. In that case, I'm sure the corporation would have protected itself by making the club a separate, non-profit corporation, as many radio clubs do to protect their members from liability issues.

BTW, the only reason why I even suggest that this case could result in a lawsuit is because I don't know exactly what was said, only the information given. Based entirely on that, there is definitely no violation of Part 97 and no 1st Amendment issue whatsoever. I doubt that even the Amalgamated Crazy Lunatics Union would stay on the phone for more than two minutes with someone making this complaint.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2773. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 02:49:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ht7b0t3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87599

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004 22:54:22 -0800, Jack Hamilton wrote:

>KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net> wrote:
>
>>They were not violating part 97 of FCC regulations, AND the control
>>operator did NOT violate 1st Amendment rights. Only the Government
>>can be in violation of 1st Amendment rights. Private citizens are not
>>bound by the 1st Amendment.
>
>In Pruneyard Shopping Center vs. Robins, Pruneyard Shopping Center was
>required to allow a group of high school students to circulate petitions
>on shopping center property. The decision was based on free speech
>rights in the state constitution, not on US Constitution. According to
>a discussion entitled "Why Can Shopping Malls Limit Free Speech?" at
><http://slate.msn.com/id/2079885/>, only California, New Jersey,
>Colorado, Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, and Pennsylvania have such
>constitutional provisions.
>
>Someone could try to make a case for this rule applying to the use of an
>amateur radio repeater located in one of those seven states, especially
>if the repeater equipment had been purchased or subsidized by a
>government agency.
>
>Note: I'm not a lawyer,

That is obvious if you are relying on _Pruneyard_. The U S
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (which covers
California as well as 7 other Western states) held in _Howard
v City of Burlingame_ that there are NO First Amendment rights
granted by the amateur license. No, none, nada.

Much as I don't like the rest of that decision, it is clear.

>so if you want to bring such a case, don't ask me for help.

I am an attorney who handles amateur radio cases, and I wouldn't
take such a case because I do not want to appear a fool in the eyes
of my peers or future clients.

Now back to The Morse Wars.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

2774. Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 03:31:00 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0402161931.68ad1466@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87600

>
> >I'd prefer to see all Novices and Technicians merged into a new
> >Technician class and be granted Tech Plus privileges. This would be
> >compatible with a 3-license system. Nobody would lose privileges, but
> >all automatic upgrades would be modest.
>
> Problem is, the license class would still be VHF/UHF heavy and HF light.

So what? I thought the idea of the Tech Plus license is to offer a
taste of HF but still leave a strong incentive to upgrade. Perhaps
the Tech Plus HF privileges should be expanded. Upgrades to Tech Plus
and an expansion of the Tech Plus privileges would be a much more
reasonable alternative to upgrades to General.

I'm not against free upgrades - I just think free upgrades should be
modest and reasonable. For example, upgrading Advanced licensees to
Amateur Extra is reasonable considering that most of the new Amateur
Extra exam questions were old Advanced exam questions.

As I said before, I think the ARRL proposal goes too far in upgrading
Technicians and not far enough in ending the Morse Code testing
requirement. Then again, the directors might have made the proposal
as a PR move and don't seriously expect the FCC to adopt much of it.
>
> The main reason for the free upgrade is to eliminate license classes that
> newcomers will not be able to get anymore. The BoD thinks that is a very high
> priority, even though there don't seem to be any problems with having almost
> 120,000 hams in closed-off license classes (Novice and Advanced) for the past > 4 years.
>
Why do the ARRL and FCC consider this a high priority? Anyone? Is it
that much work to maintain these closed-off classes?

As I see it, there are trade-offs. In my opinion, having a 3-class
system that includes a Novice license just isn't a good idea since
that means eliminating the Technician license, and that means
upgrading the Technicians to Generals in order to avoid downgrading
anyone's privileges. Either the Technician class should be kept (and
the Novice class eliminated and upgraded to Tech Plus), or there
should be a 4-class system.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ee.html
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/eeham
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/resume_hyperinflation_fighters

2775. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 05:32:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402162132.43036e50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87451

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>...
> Hello, Jim
>
> Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them? I'm not talking
> cb radios, I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc. That was in the early 60s as
> I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in
> them).

I went on the air as a Novice with a Hallicrafters S-40B I bought from
Sears in the 1952 timeframe. I passed on the BC-610 though, used an
80M ARC-5.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

w3rv

>
>
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0402161431.20deea73@posting.google.com...
> >
> > And did it with just one 10 word sentence.
> >
> > ----
> >
> > Fun facts:
> >
> > - The BC-610/HT-4 family only went up to 18 MHz.
> > - Versions were made from 1939 to 1955, ending with the BC-610I.
> > - The companion BC-939 tuner was designed and made by Upper Darby's own
> B&W,
> > which is still in business.
> > - Complete manual available free-for-the-download from the KG7BZ website
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.590 / Virus Database: 373 - Release Date: 2/16/04

2776. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 05:36:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217003616.12501.00006228@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87452

In article <t5s230huek124qvvt4adeigr63jqv47lam@4ax.com>, Barry OGrady
<god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> writes:

>On 16 Feb 2004 18:44:45 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <bgVXb.6406$W74.5824@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>>Fine, but they can't be on the same time as their other family
>>>member with the HF license.
>>
>> They can with electronic break-in, Bill. One of the pastors in here
>> showed how to do it in an old issue of Electric Radio.
>>
>> In the spaces between sending dots and dashes, he can listen for
>> other signals. He can do it, therefore others can.
>
>Maybe not. Don't pastors have magic powers?

No. Amateur Extras of the morse persuasion do. They are supermen,
able to leap tall pileups at a single knob twirl, are faster than an
electronic QSL, have X-ray vision to see the "real agendas" of the FCC
and conspiracies against morse code behind every burning bush.

They have superhearing, giving all cue-soes "599" signal reports.
They have supertaste, always picking the best in ham gear, trying
to make all envious of their superwallets..

They also need supervision. Parental supervision. Some are
emotionally seven years old! :-)

LHA / WMD

2777. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 05:36:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217003617.12501.00006229@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87453

In article <22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
writes:

>Hello, Jim
>
>Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them? I'm not talking
>cb radios, I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc. That was in the early 60s as
>I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in
>them).

I don't remember that in southern California where I started buying from
local Sears stores beginning 1957...while working for Hughes Aircraft
El Segundo Division...or from 1963 when I got a Sears catalog plus
supplements to check out several ways to improve this house that I'd
just moved into.

Must be a different "Sears." :-)

Glad that Jimmie is all enthused. He travels back in time often and
I think he really lives back then. It's good that he has some "radio
stores" to hang out in... :-)

The Class C and D CB didn't get started until 1958 but Henry Radio
had a bunch of different CBs for sale in 1959. Was there, bought
an E.F. Johnson transceiver. Still have it on the shelf.

Why did you ask? :-)

LHA / WMD

2778. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 05:51:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217005120.21457.00004036@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87454

In article <d22b54c3.0402162132.43036e50@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:<22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>...
>> Hello, Jim
>>
>> Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them? I'm not talking
>> cb radios, I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc. That was in the early 60s
>as
>> I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in
>> them).
>
>I went on the air as a Novice with a Hallicrafters S-40B I bought from
>Sears in the 1952 timeframe. I passed on the BC-610 though, used an
>80M ARC-5.
>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>
>w3rv

Hmmm...1952...just beginning ham ops...that was when you left your hormone-infused prom date bereft of smooches on her front porch in order to rush home and operate with your new license?

That was even better than the Tales of the South Pacific when you were shooting bears for naval intelligence!

Love those old radio tales! :-)

LHA / WMD

2779. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 09:31:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217043119.15923.00003812@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 87455

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 15, 2004:

Novice - 32,541 (decrease of 16,788)
Technician - 260,212 (increase of 54,818)
Technician Plus - 61,993 (decrease of 66,867)
General - 141,124 (increase of 28,447)
Advanced - 81,565 (decrease of 18,217)
Extra - 104,978 (increase of 26,228)
Total - 682,413 (increase of 7,621)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2780. Re: Alternative Proposal - was Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 10:00:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217050015.21457.00004043@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 87456

In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161105200.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

> That gives novices privileges in places they really weren't tested
>for.

>That gives technicians privileges in places they weren't tested for.

Well, the same can be said for free upgrades of Advanceds, too.

But consider this:

Back in 1970 when I took the Extra, 30, 17 and 12 meters weren't ham bands.
Neither was 903 MHz. 160 was all chopped up with LORAN. Etc.

Yet when those new bands came along, I didn't have to take a new test to use
'em.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2781. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 13:10:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <DpoYb.8436$W74.71@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87457

Jim.

Thought you said there were 34,000 Novices the other day?

Also, take a look at the upcoming expirations in the next
6 months...some pretty hefty numbers of hams with
expirations coming up. I expect at least a 10K overall
reduction of licensed hams by end of 2004 based on
SK, lack of interest, etc. based on past renewal rates.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040217043119.15923.00003812@mb-m12.aol.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of February 15, 2004:
>
> Novice - 32,541 (decrease of 16,788)
> Technician - 260,212 (increase of 54,818)
> Technician Plus - 61,993 (decrease of 66,867)
> General - 141,124 (increase of 28,447)
> Advanced - 81,565 (decrease of 18,217)
> Extra - 104,978 (increase of 26,228)
> Total - 682,413 (increase of 7,621)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2782. Re: Why the ARRL proposed upgrading Technicians to General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 13:46:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40321B41.5080402@psu.edu>
Source record: 87458

Jason Hsu wrote:
>>>I'd prefer to see all Novices and Technicians merged into a new
>>>Technician class and be granted Tech Plus privileges. This would be
>>>compatible with a 3-license system. Nobody would lose privileges, but
>>>all automatic upgrades would be modest.
>>
>>Problem is, the license class would still be VHF/UHF heavy and HF light.
>
>
> So what? I thought the idea of the Tech Plus license is to offer a
> taste of HF but still leave a strong incentive to upgrade. Perhaps
> the Tech Plus HF privileges should be expanded. Upgrades to Tech Plus
> and an expansion of the Tech Plus privileges would be a much more
> reasonable alternative to upgrades to General.
>
> I'm not against free upgrades - I just think free upgrades should be
> modest and reasonable. For example, upgrading Advanced licensees to
> Amateur Extra is reasonable considering that most of the new Amateur
> Extra exam questions were old Advanced exam questions.
>
> As I said before, I think the ARRL proposal goes too far in upgrading
> Technicians and not far enough in ending the Morse Code testing
> requirement. Then again, the directors might have made the proposal
> as a PR move and don't seriously expect the FCC to adopt much of it.
>
>>The main reason for the free upgrade is to eliminate license classes that
>>newcomers will not be able to get anymore. The BoD thinks that is a very high
>>priority, even though there don't seem to be any problems with having almost
>>120,000 hams in closed-off license classes (Novice and Advanced) for the past > 4 years.
>>
>
> Why do the ARRL and FCC consider this a high priority? Anyone? Is it
> that much work to maintain these closed-off classes?

I don't think that the F.C.C. cares one way or the other, but I'm
pretty convinced that the ARRL wants more HF qualified Hams as a bolster
against spectrum threat (not a bad thing) and they want more members, as
there is a divide between members and non-members privilege wise.

They dismiss at least the second agenda on their website, but that is
the way things go these days. Pick all your reasons for doing something
and dismiss them right up front. Get it out of the way quickly, so to speak.

> As I see it, there are trade-offs. In my opinion, having a 3-class
> system that includes a Novice license just isn't a good idea since

> that means eliminating the Technician license, and that means
> upgrading the Technicians to Generals in order to avoid downgrading
> anyone's privileges. Either the Technician class should be kept (and
> the Novice class eliminated and upgraded to Tech Plus), or there
> should be a 4-class system.

Agreed! I don't know if you saw my proposal in the group, but it really just allows things to stay very close to what they are right now, the changes are the deletion of the Morse code test, and tailoring the testing regimen to the license class. That is to say Technicians would receive some pretty comprehensive RF and HV safety testing, and General's would have an HF focus, while Amateur Extra would go more into the theory and electronic testing. The license classes that are orphans would retain their privileges such as they are now.

Simple, and we know it would work. It doesn't anger anyone that doesn't have anger issues already, and no one loses or gains.

BTW, even though my proposal does not include a Element 1 test, I am a PCTA. How do I reconcile this?

Even though I want, and will argue for the retention of the Morse code test for HF access, I believe that it is very likely to go away. I don't like it, but it is probably going to happen. So instead of pinning all my hopes on something that isn't likely, I believe there should be a position we can fall back on.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2783. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 13:59:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402170559.7d72af5c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87459

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040216134446.21457.00004028@mb-m10.aol.com>...

> Must be that all that radiotelegraphy rots the brain...

Then what's YOUR excuse?

Steve, K4YZ

2784. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 14:01:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402170601.133a60ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87460

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message

> The Class C and D CB didn't get started until 1958 but Henry Radio
> had a bunch of different CBs for sale in 1959. Was there, bought
> an E.F. Johnson transceiver. Still have it on the shelf.

Darn shame it's still the only radio transmitter you can legally use, too...

Seve, K4YZ

2785. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 15:39:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87461

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.ht5isk7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 15 Feb 2004 13:55:43 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
> >than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
>
> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

They were magnificent beasts, no question about that and they're probably the most memorable of the PRR power roster. Unfortuantely they "didn't get around" all that much because of the limited amount of PRR electrified mileage.

I was raised and still live in the heart of GG-1 country, I got GG-1 stories . . ! The best visual I ever had of one was when I was a young kid. We have a neighborhood electrified PRR commuter and freight branch line on which, back then, they normally ran those early 1900s junker MU car commuter rattletraps. But every time TWU 234 struck and the city transit company shut down the commuter mobs had to switch from the stranded suburban trolleys to the PRR to get to their downtown jobs. That's when the Pennsy rolled up it's sleeves and put real trains on the West Chester line. Watching an inbound GG-1 pulling a long string of 80 foot smoothside coaches glide into Clifton-Aldan station was like a religious experience . .

Much later in life I did a good bit of business with the electric car shops in Wilmington DE which is where the Pennsy based it's GG-1 fleet and where Amtrak still headquarters it's electrics. More GG-1 tales: I don't know where it is now but during that timeframe the shops completely tore down an reassembled a museum-quality GG-1. Ya could use the paint as a mirror . . I saw the GG-1 they cut in half and converted into a brush-burner, the GG-1/2. And the GG-1 they turned into a monster snow blower.

http://www.spikesys.com/GG1/

http://www.rrmuseumpa.org/about/roster/gg1.htm

One of 'em might run again somewhere some day. It's been my ongoing understanding that the overhead power system had been switched from 25 Hz 11Kv to 60Hz but that's apparently not the case, the changeover never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is not as toxic.

w3rv

2786. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 15:48:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402170748.7577a4f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87462

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402C51B9.7C99EC26@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > > I can only hope that someone recorded that banquet talk. Of course most
> > > of Shepherd's stuff was that entertaining. That voice we hearing
> > > narrating "A Christmas Story" is his.

Also the sequel, "Olly Hopnoodle's Haven Of Bliss". James B. Sikking
(best know for Hill Street Blues) plays Dad and Shep makes a cameo
appearance.
>
> > > A nice bit of nostalgia! Most of the catalog houses had at least some
> > > ham gear. It is interesting to note that famed industrial designer
> > > Raymond Loewy designed the S-40 cabinetry.
> >
> > Note that Sears, Hallicrafters and Loewy were all based in Chicago.

Also Frank Lloyd Wright, for at least some of his career.
> >
> > > He is the fellow who brought
> > > us the '47 Studebaker Starlight Coupe and '53 Starliner Coupe, the '61
> > > Avanti,
> > > the S-1 steam locomotive (Pennsylvania RR), that sharp-looking fifties
> > > Coca-Cola dispenser that we'd see in diners and drug stores, and all
> > > sorts of products from pencil sharpeners to refrigerators.
> >
> > Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
> > than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
> >
> > http://prrsteam.pennsyrr.com/prrt1.html

As K2ASP sez, the GG-1 is the top of that pyramid.

For streamlined steam engines, the special J-3 Hudsons used on the New
York Central's Twentieth Century Limited are the most impressive.

> > Raymond Loewy, Dad and me . . .
> >
> > Dad . . at sixtysomething he decided he'd had enough "family cars" and
> > announced that he was gonna buy a Corvette. Only over Mom's dead body
> > he was gonna buy a Corvette. Back to the drawing board. "OK, I'll buy
> > a Studebaker GT Hawk". 1963. Mom didn't bark as much at that one so he

> > ordered the Hawk. But with a twist. He also bought a monster Packard
> > V8 engine with two four-barrel pots. The Hawk and the engine arrived
> > at the Stude dealer and Dad delivered 'em to the Three Js speed shop
> > in Wilmington DE. Mom being unaware of what was going on of course.
> > They did some engine, exhaust system and suspension mods then
> > shoehorned the engine into the Hawk. "The rest is history . . " The
> > thing ate Corvettes for breakfast . . It still exists in a barn near
> > Coatesville.

bwaahaahaa...
>
> > Loewy was one of my idols when I was a kid. I had some talent along
> > those lines and was bound and determined to go to the Chicago School
> > of Design and study under him. Going into 9th grade Dad told me I had
> > to decide what I was going to do with my life and tossed the Sunday
> > Inquirer help wanted classified ads section at me. No ads for artists.
> > No ads for industrial designers. No ads for illustrators. Four pages
> > of ads for engineers. End of.

Yup. All my dad did was take us to work with him in the company
business. All his kids have at least a bachelor's degree....
>
> Engineers are generally the guys who make things work. Designers are
> those who make them nice to look at. We all know of the exceptions.

"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them"
>
> > And the gene lives on. I have a young niece who recently graduated
> > from the Pratt Institute industrial design program. She's
> > unbelievable. Two weeks into her first summer student internship she
> > came up with a compartment latch for some Volkswagen bus which her
> > employer's ID group had been wrestling with for months. They faxed her
> > sketch to VW, a VW functionary called back immediately and told 'em
> > "Yeah, that's it, run with it!" They slapped patent papers on it and
> > put it into production.
>
> It does sound as if it runs in the family.

Ayup.

> > > I bought an S-40A from W7LR a few years back.
> >
> > Still have it?
>
> Oh yes, fully restored and sitting on a shelf to my right.
>
> > > The design is still
> > > stunning.
> >
> > I'm not sure if I was ever aware of Loewy's role in the S-40 or not.
> > But I am now. It's definitely a "coherent" design. That was his trick,
> > integrate form and function. Not much of a rcvr though.

>
> No, not at all. Hallicrafters (and many other firms) were still building
> the same basic receivers in a variety of cabinets through the decades
> with few innovations or variations.
>
The insides of the S-40 were only slightly changed to make the
S-85/SX-99 and finally the SX-122.

The Loewy cabinet, with variations, showed up in the S-40, SX-42,
SX-43 and S-76. There may be others, too.

> > > W4JBP willed me his 1937 Hallicrafters Sky Challenger years back.
> > >
> > . . . there's a gooder . . . get it yet?
>
> Sure do. It sits next to the S-40A. The engraved German silver dial is
> super looking.

I'll bet!
>
> > > K8CFT, who administered my Novice exam, had a Globe King 500-C in his
> > > shack. I've always wanted one but they are bloody expensive these days.

I'd rather have an EFJ 500 or some such. Nothing quite like having a
big Johnson.
> >
> > Boat anchors are going for insane prices. N2EY recently told me about
> > an unbuilt still-in-the-box Heath AT-1 which sold for $5,100 for God's
> > sake. Ya can buy a complete pristine meatball S-Line including a 30L1
> > amp with $5,100 and have a *pile* of change left over. Or an Orion and
> > most of a Centurion amp.

Yup. There was also an SX-88 at $7,151 that beat the previous one at
$6000.

And a recent auction sold an *unbuilt* Heath SB-303 for about $1300.
Adjusted for inflation, that's about what they cost new. But the '303
isn't much of a receiver - not even up to the level of the earlier
SB-301, and defintitely not in the same class as the Drake R4 family
or any Collins, A or S.
>
> I've noted Globe King 500-C's going for $3,000+.

I saw an ad for someone *making* new Globe Kings...

> I was amazed to get
> $775 for a 51J-4 the year before last. One of the big differences
> between the modern marvels and the vintage gear is that one can still
> obtain tubes and parts for the vintage rigs.

And information, most of all.

A few years back I sold a Kenyon T-656 plate transformer to a ham in
Ohio. But it turned out he was just helping out a friend in one of the
Scandinavian countries who was restoring a rare old prewar Harvey
Wells rig. My old transformer is now running the old Harvey Wells, and
I got a nice thankyou on the website. (search on "Kenyon T-656")..

> I doubt that any of the
> current stuff will be operational or repairable in fifty years. The
> lack of a replacement switch, an LSI or an LCD display will doom them to
> the scrap heap.

50? Try 20! Some older transceiver models are falling prey to the fact
that certain custom components are failing and there are no
replacements except
from junkers. If you can find a junker that has the part still good,
that is.
>
> > > Cass is Hugh Cassidy WA6AUD. His "West Coast DX Bulletin" was tops.
> > > Cass had a flair for writing and brought us the Old Timer living on top
> > > of the hill; the local QRPer, full of questions (often rhetorical) for
> > > the Old Timer; Red-Eyed Louie, always doing the dawn patrol looking for
> > > rare DX and the Palos Verdes Sundancers. There are numerous other
> > > characters. When Cass retired, his mailing list went to the fellows at
> > > Madison Electronics in Texas. Bill Kennamer K5FUV edited their "QRZ DX"
> > > for a number of years before going to the DXCC desk in Newington to
> > > replace Don Search.
> >
> > If/when I ever make it your place you'll have to let read some of 'em.

Road trip!
>
> Once you start, there's no stopping. Allow me to whet your interest with
> the following from 1977:
>
> "There were some local QRPers up the hill last week, the group including
> one of those serious types. His beady eyes were everywhere, questioning
> and checking. And the QRPers got to talking of Red Eye and the Palo
> Verdes bunch, and Slim and the Hero of Mafeking. So we had to tell them
> about the JA who in all seriousness had asked that alongside the obscure
> jokes we place an explanation of what we meant. Perhaps we should have
> kept the file sealed. 'Jokes?', says this serious one. 'Obscure jokes?
> Where are they? Why, I've been reading the bulletin for some years now
> and while there are things that sometimes I do not understand, I have
> not noticed any jokes.' Son of a Gun!! What does one do in a situation
> like that? The sky was blue, the day was warm and there had been a slow
> joy in the group as they talked. But we realized that like a lot of
> things, humor and DX and home cooking, that most things are relative and
> sometimes more so. So we told the beady-eyed one that we would
> underline them in his copy from now on, a service that perhaps others
> might want and use. And for $14.00 a year, the enigmas of DX will
> comeyour way in inscrutable prose, tangled, twisted and tortured...and
> maybe stretched a bit. $18.00 will fling it at you by first-class mail

> to the U.S./VE areas. $20.00 will fly it far down the moonpath to
> Mexico and all the lands below the Tropic of Cancer and beyond the
> meridians. Someday we may get the message...someday someone might get
> the message to us."
>
For those who understand, no explanation is necessary. For those who
don't...

> > These days there's no point to publications like DX bulletins, it's
> > all out on the web in almost real time. But the websites are no where
> > near as much fun to read.
>
> They could easily be...but they aren't.

Writing is easy, writing well isn't.
]>
> I don't support the ARRL's "gimme" for tens of thousands.

Hundreds of thousands, Dave. See "ARS License Numbers". Add up the
Techs,Tech Pluses and Advanceds and it's over 400,000.

> Now Len can't
> accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
> some obscure reason.
>
Len who?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2787. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 17:30:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402170930.2fbc859d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87463

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040217005120.21457.00004036@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402162132.43036e50@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> >news:<22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>...
> >> Hello, Jim
> >>
> >> Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them? I'm not talking
> >> cb radios, I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc. That was in the early 60s
> as
> >> I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in
> >> them).
> >>
> >I went on the air as a Novice with a Hallicrafters S-40B I bought from
> >Sears in the 1952 timeframe. I passed on the BC-610 though, used an
> >80M ARC-5.
> >
> >> 73 from Rochester, NY
> >> Jim AA2QA
> >>
> >w3rv
>
> Hmmm...1952...just beginning ham ops...that was when you left your
> hormone-infused prom date bereft of smooches on her front porch in
> order to rush home and operate with your new license?
>
> That was even better than the Tales of the South Pacific when you
> were shooting bears for naval intelligence!
>
> Love those old radio tales! :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Was that a 6, 12, or 24 volt radio?

2788. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 17:34:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402170934.33854b35@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87464

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<WrdYb.80$vX1.60@news01.roc.ny>...
> I hate to say it, but I'll probably put up a 10 meter beacon. Of course,
> FCC rules state using the minimum amount of power necessary for
> communications. This means searching out folks on the internet that are
> perhaps 40 miles away and you'd need some 'reasonable' power on 10 meters.
> Best to use a horizontal dipole. A vertical will reduce BPL interference in
> both directions and a yagi would reduce your horizontal signal spread (as
> well as aid communications). 100 watts or so ... I wonder what would be
> most effective? AM/SSB/FM? Again, you simply increase power on the mode
> selected to obtain decent communications. You also happen to choose a mode
> that would tend to disrupt BPL. Of course, if the power companies do happen
> to filter to protect amateur bands, they also will protect themselves from
> signal ingress. Obviously, they are smart enough to stay away from the
> commercial FM band, but I'd bet there will be problems in fringe areas for
> channel 2 and 3 television. It will be interesting to see how it plays out.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

But, but, but...

Jim, all you need is a wet noodle and you can work the world on the "kiddie band."

2789. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 17:44:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217124430.00545.00004398@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87466

In article <c2356669.0402170748.7577a4f5@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<402C51B9.7C99EC26@earthlink.net>...
>> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> > > I can only hope that someone recorded that banquet talk. Of course
>most
>> > > of Shepherd's stuff was that entertaining. That voice we hearing
>> > > narrating "A Christmas Story" is his.
>
>Also the sequel, "Olly Hopnoodle's Haven Of Bliss". James B. Sikking
>(best know for Hill Street Blues) plays Dad and Shep makes a cameo
>appearance.

Do you need a SAG website address?

Do they have a subliminal morse message in the recording?

Do they QSL?

>> > Note that Sears, Hallicrafters and Loewy were all based in Chicago.
>
>Also Frank Lloyd Wright, for at least some of his career.

Architects have to test for morsemanship?

>> > > He is the fellow who brought
>> > > us the '47 Studebaker Starlight Coupe and '53 Starliner Coupe, the '61
>> > > Avanti,
>> > > the S-1 steam locomotive (Pennsylvania RR), that sharp-looking fifties
>> > > Coca-Cola dispenser that we'd see in diners and drug stores, and all
>> > > sorts of products from pencil sharpeners to refrigerators.
>> >
>> > Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
>> > than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
>> >
>> > http://prrsteam.pennsyrr.com/prrt1.html
>
>As K2ASP sez, the GG-1 is the top of that pyramid.
>

>For streamlined steam engines, the special J-3 Hudsons used on the New
>York Central's Twentieth Century Limited are the most impressive.

Yup. Good ole raddio tawk on hum radio policy...

>> > Raymond Loewy, Dad and me . . .
>> >
>> > Dad . . at sixtysomething he decided he'd had enough "family cars" and
>> > announced that he was gonna buy a Corvette. Only over Mom's dead body
>> > he was gonna buy a Corvette. Back to the drawing board. "OK, I'll buy
>> > a Studebaker GT Hawk". 1963. Mom didn't bark as much at that one so he
>> > ordered the Hawk. But with a twist. He also bought a monster Packard
>> > V8 engine with two four-barrel pots. The Hawk and the engine arrived
>> > at the Stude dealer and Dad delivered 'em to the Three Js speed shop
>> > in Wilmington DE. Mom being unaware of what was going on of course.
>> > They did some engine, exhaust system and suspension mods then
>> > shoehorned the engine into the Hawk. "The rest is history . . " The
>> > thing ate Corvettes for breakfast . . It still exists in a barn near
>> > Coatesville.

>bwaahaahaa...

Outfitted for mobile radio? Doing morse while eating vettes?

Strange group there.

>> > Loewy was one of my idols when I was a kid. I had some talent along
>> > those lines and was bound and determined to go to the Chicago School
>> > of Design and study under him. Going into 9th grade Dad told me I had
>> > to decide what I was going to do with my life and tossed the Sunday
>> > Inquirer help wanted classified ads section at me. No ads for artists.
>> > No ads for industrial designers. No ads for illustrators. Four pages
>> > of ads for engineers. End of.
>
>Yup. All my dad did was take us to work with him in the company
>business. All his kids have at least a bachelor's degree....

Have any of them married?

>> It does sound as if it runs in the family.
>
>Ayup.

That's been said about the Jukes...

>A few years back I sold a Kenyon T-656 plate transformer to a ham in
>Ohio. But it turned out he was just helping out a friend in one of the
>Scandinavian countries who was restoring a rare old prewar Harvey
>Wells rig. My old transformer is now running the old Harvey Wells, and
>I got a nice thankyou on the website. (search on "Kenyon T-656")..

Oy, such a nice boy! :-)

>For those who understand, no explanation is necessary. For those who
>don't...

Strange...most of us think this newsgroup is about amateur radio
policy matters, not SAG or AFTRA personalities, olde trolleys and
choo-choos, architects, family lineages, and autos hidden in barns.

Apparently it has expanded to cover anything the olde-tyme hammes
(and extra super special morsemen) want.

Chat room. Ho hum.

LHA / WMA

2790. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 17:44:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217124432.00545.00004399@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87465

In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<xnfcneeyarg.ht5isk7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> On 15 Feb 2004 13:55:43 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> >Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
>> >than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
>>
>> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
>
>They were magnificent beasts, no question about that and they're
>probably the most memorable of the PRR power roster. Unfortuantely
>they "didn't get around" all that much because of the limited amount
>of PRR electrified mileage.

Old ham "spark" transmitters? Using on-off keying [expletive deleted}?

:-)

>I was raised and still live in the heart of GG-1 country, I got GG-1
>stories . . ! The best visual I ever had of one was when I was a young
>kid. We have a neighborhood electrified PRR commuter and freight
>branch line on which, back then, they normally ran those early 1900s
>junker MU car commuter rattletraps. But every time TWU 234 struck and
>the city transit company shut down the commuter mobs had to switch
>from the stranded suburban trolleys to the PRR to get to their
>downtown jobs. That's when the Pennsy rolled up it's sleeves and put
>real trains on the West Chester line. Watching an inbound GG-1 pulling
>a long string of 80 foot smoothside coaches glide into Clifton-Aldan
>station was like a religious experience . .

Anything like shooting bears for naval intelligence?

>Much later in life I did a good bit of business with the electric car
>shops in Wilmington DE which is where the Pennsy based it's GG-1 fleet
>and where Amtrak still headquarters it's electrics. More GG-1 tales: I
>don't know where it is now but during that timeframe the shops
>completely tore down an reassembled a museum-quality GG-1. Ya could
>use the paint as a mirror . . I saw the GG-1 they cut in half and
>converted into a brush-burner, the GG-1/2. And the GG-1 they turned
>into a monster snow blower.

Oh! This is all about trolley and loco choo-choos!

For a minute there I thought you might be tawkin ole raddio tawk.

>One of 'em might run again somewhere some day. It's been my ongoing
>understanding that the overhead power system had been switched from 25
>Hz 11Kv to 60Hz but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>not as toxic.

Safety first. Wear rubber gloves when keying them old, old trolleys.

Gotta love all this old, old raddio tawk.

LHA / WMD

2791. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 18:14:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217131432.01019.00000505@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87467

In article <1e4e3692.0402170934.33854b35@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:<WrdYb.80$vX1.60@news01.roc.ny>...
>> I hate to say it, but I'll probably put up a 10 meter beacon. Of course,
>> FCC rules state using the minimum amount of power necessary for
>> communications. This means searching out folks on the internet that are
>> perhaps 40 miles away and you'd need some 'reasonable' power on 10 meters.
>> Best to use a horizontal dipole. A vertical will reduce BPL interference
>in
>> both directions and a yagi would reduce your horizontal signal spread (as
>> well as aid communications). 100 watts or so ... I wonder what would be
>> most effective? AM/SSB/FM? Again, you simply increase power on the mode
>> selected to obtain decent communications. You also happen to choose a mode
>> that would tend to disrupt BPL. Of course, if the power companies do
>happen
>> to filter to protect amateur bands, they also will protect themselves from
>> signal ingress. Obviously, they are smart enough to stay away from the
>> commercial FM band, but I'd bet there will be problems in fringe areas for
>> channel 2 and 3 television. It will be interesting to see how it plays out.
>>
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>
>But, but, but...
>
>Jim, all you need is a wet noodle and you can work the world on the "kiddie
>band."

Wet noodle IN a tuna tin, Brian. Using on-off keyed [expletive deleted]
above all. The latter is important!

Real Hams use on-off keyed trolley cars, working DX with spark from
25 cycle overhead lines.

LHA / WMD

2792. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 18:14:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217131433.01019.00000506@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 87468

In article <1e4e3692.0402170930.2fbc859d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040217005120.21457.00004036@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402162132.43036e50@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>...
>> >> Hello, Jim
>> >>
>> >> Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them? I'm not
>talking
>> >> cb radios, I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc. That was in the early
>60s
>> as
>> >> I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in
>> >> them).
>> >
>> >I went on the air as a Novice with a Hallicrafters S-40B I bought from
>> >Sears in the 1952 timeframe. I passed on the BC-610 though, used an
>> >80M ARC-5.
>> >
>> >> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> >> Jim AA2QA
>> >
>> >w3rv
>>
>> Hmmm...1952...just beginning ham ops...that was when you left your
>> hormone-infused prom date bereft of smooches on her front porch in
>> order to rush home and operate with your new license?
>>
>> That was even better than the Tales of the South Pacific when you
>> were shooting bears for naval intelligence!
>>
>> Love those old radio tales! :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Was that a 6, 12, or 24 volt radio?

The E.F.Johnson Viking Messenger CB? 12 VDC and 115 VAC, take
your pick. :-)

It wouldn't work after one catapult shot and on front porches only with a long set of jumper cables. It did use a vibrator, though I don't think it would be suitable for [expletive deleted]. I guess it was moisture and fungus proof enough to use in the south Pacific. Have no idea if naval intelligence used them.

All of this is in line with the NON-policy discussions in here involving choo-choos and trolleys, 25 Hz AC, architects, family lineages, SAG and AFTRA personalities, and vette-eating muscle cars now languishing in barns. [one has to act like a native morseman in here nowadays...]

I'll have to look in on the ARRL website to see if they have some important amateur radio information regarding old choo-choos and trolleys, family lineages, architects, and muscle cars. Important policy stuff that they might use for justifying the morse test forever.

Wonder if "Electric Radio" fanzine will turn into "Eclectic Radio?" Any day now in this chat room. :-)

LHA / WMD

2793. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 18:18:13 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <676ce33.0402171018.59170743@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87469
Cross-posted to: alt.bible,rec.radio.cb,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.policy

To Whom it may concern... The person posting this, Douglas Adair, of
Toledo, Ohio. has been doing this to me for over 2 years. All of this
is being forwarded to my lawyer, Levon King, who is also the Mayor of
Allen Park, Michigan. Levon is going to contact the local Mayor of
Toledo, ohio and see if a complaint can be filed against Mr. adair for
his actions. Mr. Adair, I would seriously advise you, if you don't
want to end up in a court of law for harrashment charges, and a
lawsuit for slander, I would advise you to cease and desist.
otherwise, I will get a court order against you.

I do have a lawyer. and I will use him, if need be.

-Chuck K8CPA

P.S. You're picking the wrong fight.

k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote in message
news:<e1b5119f.0402161614.20345342@posting.google.com>...
> Here is a post to misc.transport.trucking the resident weirdo Chuck
> Adkins made...When you look at all of these posts you will see what a
> lying hypocritical mentally deranged idiot he is.
> Also, don't neglect a visit to his personal website, loaded with cool
> info about Chukkee...here's the link!
>
> http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
> And here is the first post...read with interest...hehhehehehehehe
>
> Hi guys,
>
> I am looking for some work, badly.... I've got bills up the butt and I
> need some work...
>
> here's my story...
>
> I have a CLASS A CDL with Hazmat and Doubles.
>
> I graduated from W.C.C.C.D. in Belleville, Michigan in March of 2003
>
> I thought I'd be smart and get a local job.
>
> Well, needless to say, I had a accident. No one was hurt. but I did
> get a ticket. Only damage was to a city street light. turning out of

> parking lots onto narrow streets with tandems not all the way up, can
> downright stink! :-) Drive way was a WHOLE lot narrower than I
> thought... Oooops!
>
> Anyhow, I'm studying to be a Ordained Minister. (or Pastor, if you
> prefer...I'm a Pentecostal... if you like Titles like that... I prefer
> just a member of the Body of Christ, Myself...) and I really cannot go
> OTR... I am wondering, are the ANY small companies or maybe bigger
> companies that read this newsgroup and would be willing to work with
> someone with 1 accident and 4 points on my license?? (2 were from
> accident, other 2 were from a speeding ticket in my personal car...)
> Anyhow, I have NO DUI's, and never been a in jail... I am a very
> dependable person, I'm looking for a local dirt or gravel or something
> along those lines, kind of a job, if you wanted to put me in a
> tri-axle pup truck, I wouldn't hold it against you... :-) I just need
> some work...
>
> If you can help...
>
> Drop me a line at k8cpa@NOSPAMcomcast.net <--- remove NOSPAM from
> address for it go though...
>
> Thanks a Bunch and God Bless you..
>
> Pastor Chuck Adkins
> ---
> PASTOR??? Right...NOW...look at this post he made on Feb 16, 2004 on a
> Yahoo newsgroup...
> ---
>
> 16 Feb 2004 20:06:37 -0000
> Received: from unknown (HELO sccrmhc12.comcast.net) (204.127.202.56)
> by mta2.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 16 Feb 2004 20:06:37 -0000
> Received: from weirdoj443bz6j
> (pcp03574919pcs.wodhvn01.mi.comcast.net[68.42.234.79]) by comcast.net
> (sccrmhc12) with SMTP id <20040216200635012000pertee>; Mon, 16 Feb 2004
> 20:06:35 +0000
> Message-ID: <000801c3f4c8$600a2520$0301a8c0@weirdoj443bz6j>
> To: cbtricks@yahoogroups.com
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> X-eGroups-Remote-IP: 204.127.202.56
> From: "chuck" <k8cpa@comcast.net> Add to Address Book
> X-Yahoo-Profile: thor6883
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Mailing-List: list cbtricks@yahoogroups.com; contact
> cbtricks-owner@yahoogroups.com
> Delivered-To: mailing list cbtricks@yahoogroups.com

> Precedence: bulk
> List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:cbtricks-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
> Date: Mon, 16 Feb 2004 15:06:32 -0500
> Subject: [cbtricks] To TROLL FREE and Gay Boy Dave
> Reply-to: cbtricks@yahoogroups.com
> Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> boundary="leU-iURmEWFcLwLP2IcwZ5Ic8Oqak2Iqg5ao1SA"
> Content-Length: 1121
>
> 2 words you two jerk offs...
>
> GET SCREWED JACKASS!
>
> and I remember when I worked you Dave on PSK31 and you were nothing
> but nice to me. NOW you Talk your crap... Nothing but a flippin'
> useless P.O.S.
>
> Now stick that in your crack pipe and smoke it, Bitch Boy!
>
> You know who...
>
> Bunch of cum burpin' Bastards!
>
> and as far as you go TROLL FREE, I've forgotten more about radio, than
> you'll ever know, and you'd better watch what you say, or I'll have
> SPEED BUGGY come clean your clock, like he did last time! and yes, I
> do know about that.
>
> Don't you flippin dorks know I could make a telephone call and drop
> the dime on you cheeseheads and you'd all be outta business?
>
> Watch what you say, because, I know people. and I could make ALL of
> your life's, very misarable.
>
> have a nice day...
>
> -Chuck K8CPA
>
> ---
> NOW, look at the threats he has made to others....
> ---
>
> From: k8cpa@arrl.net (chuck)
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.swap
> Subject: Re: wrong!
> Organization: none
> Reply-To: k8cpa@arrl.net
> Message-ID: <3d1d4afc.2608024@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
> References: <adm4omoip9@woodrow.ucdavis.edu>
> <aenmpv$c4t$1@woodrow.ucdavis.edu>

> <9jRQ8.74723$Hn4.2644092@news1.east.cox.net>
> <af7i7ndbp1@woodrow.ucdavis.edu>
> <5c35b3ab.0206241648.738377fe@posting.google.com>
> <3D18F4A6.8026D20B@lucent.com>
> <oRXS8.654$Ur3.349664@newssrv26.news.prodigy.com>
> <3d1c5d68.1461114@news.cet.com>
> <WYZS8.118543$zh2.25786911@twister.neo.rr.com>
> <Uy1T8.493004$Oa1.33154298@bin8.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
> <lG1T8.118613$zh2.25936586@twister.neo.rr.com>
> <8e19f630.0206281551.347d8657@posting.google.com>
> <3d1d175d$0$1423$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
> X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.21/32.243
> X-GC-Trace: gv1-4R28uWpzwz+wgFM2+yC8oGZDOGTY7Bni6ZiHw==
> Lines: 22
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 29 Jun 2002 00:54:33 CDT
> X-Trace: sv3-tuIUKL3CoMccCF0TcnVLv5hzgXies5DLqX40pdHJyHSKCIOI/53lBeECvoo6KGIyCKUShpzxJNY
0+UB!7tlMTpuggM2V9yVBI5yYQu1EwO2jTf0xRxnERoiXlPauZFUrQx68VyOG/KAbheHR/IuZc8OyVJIu!E2K//l+G
vpl3FuvxmbEOlA==
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
> X-Abuse-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
> X-Abuse-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your complaint
> properly
> Date: Sat, 29 Jun 2002 05:54:33 GMT
>
>
> On 29 Jun 2002 02:11:41 GMT, John P Vassel <john@vassel.net> wrote:
>
>
> >> Dr. Detroit = George Busch WA3MOJ = Moron Nope, its Chukkee K8CPA
> >>
> >
> >Bruces son is still wandering about?
> >
> >--
> >John Vassel
> >KC8SKE
> >RTFD Volunteer Firefighter
>
>
> Fuck you asshole... and if I ever fucking see you face to face bitch,
> I'll kick your ass. If face, I might come to Mulliken and stomp your
> ass...
>
> Bruces son, you're lucky you don't live down here...
>
> --
> And again here...
> --
>

> --
> <!--StartFragment-->From: Yeahrightman
> <yougottabekidding@nothardly.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Subject: Re: SEPT. 1, 2002 ANTIBOYS STILL OWN THE NG.
> Organization: yeah, Sure...
> Reply-To: Notonyourbestdayman@yougottabekidding.com
> Message-ID: <u5i4nu0dso6qb9lrs91kakq443tgafneb5@4ax.com>
> References: <50f7cd4f.0208311809.7544533b@posting.google.com>
> <YGhc9.178783$Yd.7905862@twister.austin.rr.com>
> X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.92/32.572 trialware
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> X-GC-Trace: gv1-NCTMrtnWWRBEN3NunVB9K6TaKboByviSDzkoA==
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 01 Sep 2002 12:08:53 CDT
> Lines: 14
> X-Trace: sv3-YfOrbKKnjjnXX0Zpm7CDjw3mIeYYMTUtvTM1m7ZZIQRl8//aV36wIag4V9XUcGVPmG5JYpxcPKA
hb56!noM5247AFkDhB7D0DcCqhZvkIY0k87SioDE2QkNV3ZKsALmjleh9Pbr08kBk+Utfksc5tB//XeEL!hkTEO/ZC
20JrZOw4Uw==
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
> X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
> X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your
> complaint properly
> X-Postfilter: 1.1
> Date: Sun, 01 Sep 2002 17:08:53 GMT
>
>
> Agreed.
>
> I am now using my filters on agent... no more anti-keytrolls.... I'm
> gonna be at findley hamfest, with a friend... I hope one those pussies
> comes up to me at that Hamfest. LIKE THEY SAID THEY WERE GOING TO AT
> TOLEDO! FUCKING PUSSIES! NEVER EVEN SHOWED UP... ATTENTION KEYCLOWNS,
> I WILL HAVE A TABLE AT FINDLEY HAMFEST. AND I PERSONALLY CHALLENGE YOU
> TO COME TO MY TABLE AND MAKE YOUR PRESENCE KNOWN!!! AND SEE WHAT
> HAPPENS! WHEN I'M DONE STOMPING YOUR ASSES... I MIGHT LET YOU LEAVE!
> MUAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
>
> --
> From: The Antikeyclowns are PUSSIES!
> <AntiKeyclownsSPANKED@antikeyclownsarechumps.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Subject: SHOWDOWN!
> Organization: Anti-Keyclowns are SPANKED BY DA MAN!
> Reply-To: Seeyouinfindlayohiomotherfucker@bringitonbitchboyz.com
> Message-ID: <ddi7nuki9c7g2e7er1qpgcab94visjkhs8@4ax.com>
> X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.92/32.572 trialware
> MIME-Version: 1.0

> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> X-GC-Trace: gv1-QJOJAeavfle5eEGLhzYh4Pt93aAcdpE8/WK0A==
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Mon, 02 Sep 2002 15:30:11 CDT
> Lines: 17
> X-Trace: sv3-7kQb3d15GvLCiCs0jBLfVx8QRCMxZBfXTVMF3qzetcawy7jeOzEjFExDugSXltJYZ1VtS/VdVOY
h/LQ!DN9xe0y0QgsVUjjl+kLFYjXiezZqNSnZtOPLmH5jeDegCVHN9oyo7mZf4tFeqBdCg3cIswUdif6X!u8X/CB2Q
ose0Cnpz7g==
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
> X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
> X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your
> complaint properly
> X-Postfilter: 1.1
> Date: Mon, 02 Sep 2002 20:30:11 GMT
>
>
> http://www.bright.net/~kanga/w8ft/hamfest.html
>
> SHOWDOWN BETWEEN THE ANTI-KEYCLOWNS AND K8CPA WILL TAKE PLACE AT THIS
> HAMFEST...
>
> BE THERE OR BE SQUARE!
>
> This is where the talking stops and the B.S. walks... and the action
> starts....
>
> I gotta run, time to polish the 9MM...
>
> this ain't no joke... this is the real deal....
>
> time to roll...
> --
>
> BELOW ARE SOME EARLIER THREATS MADE BY THIS INDIVIDUAL
> --
> From: superswangthang@yahoo.com (Swangthangman)
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Subject: Re: Info on N8WWM
> Message-ID: <3a329d79.5525349@netnews.att.net>
> References: <25t43t403pivrp7k1sujraiag45he780sa@4ax.com>
> <20001209135105.19901.00000005@ng-fw1.aol.com>
> X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.2/32.242
> Lines: 18
> Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 21:01:01 GMT
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 12.76.65.92
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@worldnet.att.net
> X-Trace: bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net 976395661 12.76.65.92
> (Sat, 09 Dec 2000 21:01:01 GMT)
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 21:01:01 GMT

> Organization: AT&T Worldnet
>
>
> On 09 Dec 2000 18:51:05 GMT, n8wwm@aol.comnospam (N8wwm) wrote:
>
> >Like I am worried. As I said before, come on over and set down, and
> extra plate
> >at the table aint no trouble.
> >
> >Anytime you want fellas.
>
> Nah we'll just pull a drive by and shoot yer house up or while your at
> work, we'll rape yer ol' lady, fuck yer daughter and shoot yer dawg.
>
> I have friends in Toledo, so watch it.
>
>
>
> Oh! It Don't mean a THANG.,if it ain't got that SWANG!
>
> http://www.geocities.com/superswangthang/
>
> --
>
> From: k8cpa@arrl.net (chuck)
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Subject: Re: fucking rip off......
> Organization: Amateur Station - K8CPA - Lincoln Park, Michigan
> Reply-To: k8cpa@arrl.net
> Message-ID: <39a33bd4.19732735@netnews.att.net>
> References: <8nlbb8vkm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
> <QPBo5.13627$d4.57112@typhoon.hawaii.rr.com>
> X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.2/32.242
> Lines: 47
> Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 03:03:04 GMT
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 12.76.70.50
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@worldnet.att.net
> X-Trace: bgtnsc07-news.ops.worldnet.att.net 966999784 12.76.70.50
> (Wed, 23 Aug 2000 03:03:04 GMT)
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 03:03:04 GMT
>
>
> On Tue, 22 Aug 2000 20:58:24 GMT, "MODSQUAD" <modsquad@hawaii.rr.com>
> wrote:
>
> >The box will be shipped as soon has i get the updated address just
> thought i
> >let you all know.
> > Aloha; Modsquad Honolulu
> >

> >
> >
> ><bubblepuppy73@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> >news:8nlbb8vkm1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> >> Here is the address of a fucking rip off mother fucker:
> >>
> >> John D Begonia, Jr.
> >> 91 - 1217 Pohahawai St.
> >> Ewa Beach, Hawaii 96706
>
>
> Hi Modsquad and All,
>
>
> I remember a few years back here in The Motor City here, there was a
> dude, the *supposedly* bought a "box" from a local dude here that was
> building them, he would go around and start running said guy in the
> ground, giving out his real name, address, ect.... trying to say he
> sold him a bad unit ect.... anyways, one fine day, he got tired of it,
> the guy got a friendly visit from the local chapter of the IRON
> COFFINS at his house, beat him and his 21 year old punk ass kid to
> bloody pulp, had thier way with his woman, and as they were leaving,
> they said, "this is for running your mouth!"
>
> My point?
>
> Sometimes it's best not to be the loose cannon, cause you never know
> who knows who, and who's friends with whom....
>
>
> 73
>
>
> -Chuck K8CPA
>
> Talk around the world....LEGALLY!
> http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html
>
> How do you get your ham Ticket?
> http://www.arrl.org/fastrak.html
>
>
> --
>
> From: "chuck K8CPA" <k8cpa@arrl.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> References: <3c86977b.1071941@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
> <ff41621.0203090648.1a4edb06@posting.google.com>
> Subject: Re: Chuckee won't be at Toledo Hamfest! afarid of N8's
> wife!!

> Lines: 407
> Organization: Doug's worst nightmare!
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> boundary"---- NextPart 000 0025 01C1C79C.99213340"
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
> Message-ID: <Mnxi8.163844$pN4.8597284@bin8.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 09 Mar 2002 18:01:48 CST
> X-Trace: sv3-MvouEIoLEddk3rX2A0vMGvEXBU4S6bmnVZ9Qf61KW2rvhrOls315R+edEecOhxkgVrdSQs4q5yo
Eo9n!/yrZQLzHrdRNrgeM6CWzuDblxekchSzZYPsdzYCfG47ICgiHc107iYfhDYc+Zkj+Q3nK2+SE/cFy!lBlpK14
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-DMCA-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-Abuse-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
> X-Abuse-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your complaint
> properly
> Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 00:01:48 GMT
>
>
> Welp.... Guys, I normally DON'T acknowledge this type of nonsense, but
> what the heck, seeing I'm flavor of the week to these dumb idiotic,
> ignorant people... what the heck.
>
>
>
>
>
> "K8CPA Is Retarded" <chuckeezasukker@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:ff41621.0203090648.1a4edb06@posting.google.com...
> > Yeah, Chuckee...you won't be there. That's because all you can do is
> > threaten violence and rape to women and children from behind a
> > keyboard.
>
> Number one. Did *ANYONE* in here, see ANYTHING posted by me,
> threatening
> to rape dougie's daughter or wife? With Chuck K8CPA in the headers????
> I
> saw something a LONG time ago, posted by some troll to you in this NG,
> something also to do with Riley Hollingsworth as well, I thought it
> was
> quite funny. Figured some troll was having a bit of fun, I also
> noticed
> the troll was on AT&T Worldnet, as I was at the time too... and I
> kinda
> thought in the back of my mind, Whoa boy, I'm gonna be blamed for it,
> and sure enough I was. but, I kept to myself about it. you say, you
> traced the IP address to me, Bullshit! Dial-up Modems are assigned
> static IP addresses, and it came from a dial up connection in the

> Detroit area, Big FUCKING deal! you know how many HAM'S and or CB'ers
> in
> Detroit and surrounding area there area? Thousands! Someone was having
> the time of thier lives at YOUR expense dougie, and you friggin fell
> for
> it, hook line and fucking sinker! .....and of course, *I* was
> blamed
> for the whole thing. like I figured I would be. In fact, I *Think* I
> may
> know who it was.... not 100% for sure, but do YOU honestly think I am
> going to tell your dumb ass who I *think* it might be, HELL NO! for
> one,
> becuase I quite honestly could be wrong and for two, I personally
> think
> your an moronic, pencel-necked , no-code, CB dumb ass, wanna be Ham!
> and
> I'm glad the guy PISSED YOU OFF!
>
>
>
>
>
> >When a man calls your chump self on it you have to run.
>
> Shit boy, from what I hear, I could kick your fucking ass with ONE
> hand
> tied behind my back! and remember, I have friends too and what I
> cannot
> handle, they could and would be more than happy too help out... ever
> heard of the Iron Coffins Dougie????????? They make the fucking Hell's
> angels look like fucking boy scouts!
>
>
>
>
> >You
> > are a fat cowardly piece of human garbage, and you can't do diddley
> > squat to anyone. >
>
> Neither Can you.
>
>
>
>
>
> >In an earlier post you said your fatboy loser
> > criminal self would be there. You also said you fear "no one".
> > I think you lie. You are shaking in your pink tennis shoes over the
> > very prospect of coming face to face with someone you made a physical
> > threat to.
>

> hahahahahahahahahaha.....TOO FUNNY!
>
> You are so DUMB!
>
> You forget, Dougie, I know where 504 Euclid Ave is in Toledo. I might
> just come right to your fucking house tonight bitch and drag you out
> in
> the fucking street and kick your ass... wanna try me???
>
> Go for it!
>
>
>
>
> > Publicly apologize on the NG and it is all forgiven.
> >
>
>
> Like I said, Dougie, you ain't smart enough or bad enough to get
> *ANYTHING* out of this mother fucker...
>
>
> > Also, for those who read the post a while back where Chuckee said he
> > had a concealed weapon permit: The fat chump lied. The Michigan State
> > Police provided this information for free. He does not and never did
> > have one.
> >
>
>
> who said it was registered. and besides, I don't need a fucking gun,
> asswipe, I'll kick your sorry ass WITH MY FUCKING BARE HANDS!
>
>
> > So, there you are, keyclowns. One of your own. Proven to be a fat
> > chump coward and a liar. A disgrace to amateur radio, a typical
> > keyclown, a putrid hunk of turd with arms and legs. A coward. A
> > threatener of women and children.
> >
>
>
>
>
> and you? a sorry assed mother fucker, who got the fucking BALLS to
> post
> with REAL Name and e-mail address!
>
>
> > COMING UP NEXT:
> > K8CPA's criminal record!!
> > I mailed away to the state capital for that. Soon enough I will have

> > it and will post it on a website.
> >
> >
>
>
> This will be quite boring as I'm clean as a whistle, except for a
> traffic ticket that I got like 4 years ago and it's off MY record.
>
>
> 73's to you Dougie!
>
> -Chuck K8CPA
>
> ...-.- ..
>
> ---
>
> From: "chuck K8CPA" <k8cpa@arrl.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> References: <3c86977b.1071941@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
> <ff41621.0203090648.1a4edb06@posting.google.com>
> <3c8a9968.2460199@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
> <ff41621.0203091954.3194702d@posting.google.com>
> Subject: Re: Chuckee won't be at Toledo Hamfest! afarid of N8's
> wife!!
> Lines: 205
> Organization: Doug's worst nightmare!
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
> boundary"---- NextPart 000 000E 01C1C7F8.BB74DEE0"
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
> X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
> Message-ID: <A%Gi8.21694$hO6.1928481@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 04:58:40 CST
> X-Trace: sv3-lyvIJ8/zJFElKObYRYd7LHn/oE9LlG/wUyvknau8X0eqYIPMx6+mNxybOacVjpX93JCwFR/vyAE
YDFD!AAQfUEjMgsCfhaUjozfqbce524ScMoCkTM+acdO6j8Chif4geY/eOcj9zTCujnRTTBFgwFBupK7Q!rNSb0g
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-DMCA-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.com
> X-Abuse-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
> X-Abuse-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your complaint
> properly
> Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 10:58:40 GMT
>
>
>
> "K8CPA Is Retarded" <chuckeezasukker@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:ff41621.0203091954.3194702d@posting.google.com...
> > k8cpa@arrl.net (me) wrote in message

> news:<3c8a9968.2460199@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>...
> > > you know, i WONDER if buckeye cable is aware that this guy is
> abusing
> > > thier system?
> >
> > 1. Thier is an incorrect spelling. Their is correct. You are welcome.
> >
>
>
> Oh, so, now you go from wanting to hurt me to wanting to be a teacher,
> sounds like a change in tone to me.
>
>
>
> > 2. I suggest you contact the cable company and complain. That's all
> you can do,
> > except make threats of violence to women, children and pets.
> >
>
>
> Well, the fact is, *I* have *YOUR* IP address and I traced it to your
> location in Toledo, and I E-mailed the system admin at *YOUR* ISP with
> all the threats of personal harm to myself via e-mail, which BTW could
> have you brought up on Federal Charges. So,we'll see who has the last
> laugh here and BTW, if the Toledo branch of the FBI does call me and
> ask
> if I want to press charges, I will be saying yes.
>
>
> > 3. Do you see any threats? You amuse me Chuckee...whining like this.
> >
>
>
> > 4. Why don't you tell us all about the CCW permit. You know, the one
> you lied
> > and said you have.
> >
>
>
> Like I said, Who said it was registered. and fact is asshole, I don't
> need a gun, I'll take you out with my bare hands!
>
> > 5. Your implied threat of having a bike gang back you up against a
> person whose
> > family you threatened with violence shows what a fat sissy coward
> you are.
> >
>
>
> Like I said, give some SOLID DIRECT Proof that I did any such thing

> and
> I'll get off this crap, otherwise, hit the damn road...and for the
> record, I know serveral Iron Coffins, and what I cannot or will not
> handle, they will.
>
>
>
> -Chuck K8CPA
>
>
> > 6. I'm done now. Hope to see your face sometime. Sissy boy.
>
> ----------
>
> From: chuck@chucks2way.com
> Subject: Re: check it out
> Date: 1999/01/20
> Message-ID: <785o7j$5js$1@nnrp1.dejanews.com>
> References: <36a36dc4.535673@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
> <7833ji$rr7$1@nnrp1.dejanews.com>
> <36a542e6.99537801@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
> X-Http-Proxy: 1.1 x1.dejanews.com:80 (Squid/1.1.22) for client
> 209.117.148.194
> Organization: Deja News - The Leader in Internet Discussion
> X-Article-Creation-Date: Wed Jan 20 23:18:22 1999 GMT
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> X-Http-User-Agent: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 4.01; Windows 95)
>
>
> In article <36a542e6.99537801@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
> WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net (WildCat from RT Electronics) wrote:
> >
> >
> > In article <36a36dc4.535673@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
> >
> > > WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net (WildCat from RT Electronics) wrote:
> > >> come on in and check us out
> > >>
> > >> www.angelfire.com/mi/WILDCATRADIOS
> > >> thank you
> > >> -WildCat
> > >>
> > >> RT Electronics
> > >> MailTo:WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net
> > >> Phone: 1-313-291-1345
> > >>
> > >> "The Home of the Wildcat Radio!"
> > >>
> > >
> > >

> > >You know, I wasn't gonna bring this up in this newsgroup, but after I went
> > >out to this mans shop and set him up with a newsgroup reader, outta kindness
> > >to him. this jerk now has the nads to accuse me, of getting him website, (a
> > >lame one at that, I could made something alot better!) and leaving nasty
> > >comments and hacking the website, Not only was this uncalled for, but pure
> > >BULLSH!T. Why would I after being at someones shop, which I never had plans
> > >on ever returning there, but this guys starts e-mailing me wanting to be
> > >freinds again.... anyhow, I mentioned to his live in girlfreind about the
> > >entry and she starts accusing me of doing it!
> > >
> > >My point?
> > >
> > >Wildcat, you're a okay guy, But when you're woman opens her mouth, she
> forgets
> > >to engage her brain.... Not a good thing to do, if you wanna keep freinds
> > >around.
> > >
> > >have a Nice life, and just remember, everytime you send out a message.
> > >remember who put that newsgroup reader in and made that Sig file for you, it
> > >was ME! MY WORK! Not yours! but mine!
> > >
> > >have a nice day, Jerkoff
> > >
> > >A very upset...
> > >
> > >P.S. You'd think I have enough troubles, I hurt my back at work last nite and
> > >I'll be off for a week. I'm a lot of pain, and now this shit.
> > >
> > >what a day!
> > >
> > >
> > >-Chuck
> > >Chuck's 2 Way Radio Service and C.B Radio Sales
> > >E-Mail: MailTo:chuck@chucks2way.com
> > >WebPage: Http://www.chucks2way.com
> > >
> > >-----------== Posted via Deja News, The Discussion Network ==----------
> > >http://www.dejanews.com/ Search, Read, Discuss, or Start Your Own
> >
> > well buddy you were the only one standing over the girl that was
> > doing the work and got the passwords to get in not even the best
> > hacker could not get in that fast and you me and tony were the only
> > ones that knew about u getting fired so keep digging yourself deeper
> > chuck and when i get that cookie traced by whoever did it and that
> > was a big mistake on there part what a dumb bell , stupid , jerk
> > some one never taught them to cover there own tracks when doing
> > something stupid like that what a moran that person is , but i
> > willfind out real soon.. and i hope to god it was not you , but
> > if it was chuck i will see you in hell big boy ,because pay backs are
> > hell.and be sides when my old lady first talked to you about it you

> > jumped to the guns by saying it was not me how dumb. and then you
> > started giving excuses about this and that not a smart move .
> > chuck you must look before you jump my friend.
> > and i don't care about your so called lawers you will need
> > mr u.s.a big lawer washington d.c lawer mr star when i get to you
> > so go to bed and pray i dont find out where that cookie came from
> >
>
>
> Well, FATBOY, that shows how STUPID you are, When someone enters a
> password
> into a website, it usually echo's back dots... (you know... like ****)
> and I
> don't have that great of a memory...
>
> And futher more... I would NO interest in HACKING your LAME ASS web
> site,
> anyhow, Remember YOU posted an AD for in this NEWSGROUP, and ANYONE
> that reads
> this Newsgroup could have seen the ad, and went there and hacked it,
> Just
> because I came to your HOLE IN THE WALL shop and set you up with a
> newsgroup
> reader that makes ME a suspect?? You need HELP, MORON! And besides
> that, You
> get out in this newsgroup acting like your the shit, Motherfucker, Let
> ME be
> the first to tell you, YOU AIN'T SHIT!!!! And if you think COONDOG was
> a
> problem wait'll you tangle with me, ASSHOLE, I'm a card carrying
> MEMBER of the
> Latin COUNTS, I'm friends with the CASH FLOW POSSE, and I also have
> friends in
> the IRON COFFINS, So, now do you really wanna fuck with me??? Think
> about it.
>
> And Besides that, Scotty's Tech Does ALL your fucking WORK ANYHOW!
>
> Chceck this out, this Idiot got ahold of one of these NEW TEXAS STAR
> Amps, and
> the fucking moron tried to convert it! HE BLEW IT UP!! and SCOTTYS
> Tech HAD TO
> FIX IT! BLAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
>
> And this guy tries to tell everyone he cn fix radios????
>
>
> Yeah, Right!
>
> Have a nice day, LOSER!

>
>
>
> > signed wildcat 248 world wide getting up.
> > -WildCat
> >
> > RT Electronics
> > MailTo:WILDCATRADIOS@worldnet.att.net
> > Phone: 1-313-291-1345
> >
> > "The Home of the Wildcat Radio!"
> >
>
> -Chuck
> Chuck's 2 Way Radio Service and C.B Radio Sales
> E-Mail: MailTo:chuck@chucks2way.com
> WebPage: Http://www.chucks2way.com
>
> ---
> And here's some more on rec.radio.cb
> ---
>
> From: thor6883@yahoo.com (Pirate Operators of RRCB UNITE! NOW!)
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Subject: Re: CHUKEESUCKEE YOUR NAME IS MUD
> Date: 17 Oct 2003 21:56:21 -0700
> Organization: http://groups.google.com
> Lines: 92
> Message-ID: <971a42a7.0310172056.6f891221@posting.google.com>
> References: <17b206c0.0310171103.6d17791c@posting.google.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 68.43.45.80
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
> X-Trace: posting.google.com 1066452981 21952 127.0.0.1 (18 Oct 2003
> 04:56:21 GMT)
> X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Sat, 18 Oct 2003 04:56:21 +0000 (UTC)
>
> Dougie.. you ain't Shit, Ain't never been SHIT and never going to be
> SHIT!
>
> All you do is talk bullshit out your ass, dickhead...
>
> as I remember, you were pretty fucking friendly at Finley!
>
> so, go suck off your AKC fag boy friends and have a nice day, asshole.
>
> -Chuck
>
> ---

> And even another...where he tries the Jesus style in
> misc.transport.trucking
> ---
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 08:49:57 -0600
> From: Chuck in Detroit <thor6883@yahoo.com>
> Newsgroups: misc.transport.trucking
> Subject: Re: Looking for a job....
> Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 09:50:05 -0500
> Organization: Yeah, Sure! uh-huh!
> Reply-To: NoSPAMPleaseK8CPA@NOSPAMPLEASEcomcast.netSPAMGUARD
> Message-ID: <8vtrsvotsgo3i51418hm8mus0uplor0sjr@4ax.com>
> References: <6pepsv4hu0bu0kek0r12hn4q7i92omtu8g@4ax.com>
> <H_WdnVBExbeDfVCiRVn-iw@wideopenwest.com>
> X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.92/32.572
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> Lines: 82
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 68.43.45.80
> X-Trace: sv3-bv0FLlwEm2K+TIH2J9StyzdGFGd5JlaOjbqqn+OfiuoxKI6piaHO1ygiKAnJPt6ubG1qDCSlWg6
weUN!m2qbuA99UJ3/Fai89fxgoaEkzjsViUPITX4pRa2+nlIyDkfmM0pR0+jaKMkNmAfVdxBUSA==
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@comcast.net
> X-DMCA-Complaints-To: dmca@comcast.net
> X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Please be sure to forward a copy of ALL headers
> X-Abuse-and-DMCA-Info: Otherwise we will be unable to process your
> complaint properly
> X-Postfilter: 1.1
>
> Paul,
>
> I never ever give up. I keep my eyes on Jesus and He always gets me
> through...
>
> God Bless You,
>
> -Chuck

2794. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 20:28:49 UTC
From: kc8qjp@juno.com
Message-ID: <3da6768.0402171228.581c0ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87470
Cross-posted to: alt.bible,rec.radio.cb,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.policy

k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote in message news:<e1b5119f.0402161614.20345342@posting.google.com>...

I AM CRISCO KATHY,TAX SEASON IS ALMOST UPON US. I CAN GET YOU THE BEST RETURN. IT MIGHT BE A LITTLE BIT ILLEGAL.BUT WHAT THE HECK,THE GOVERMENT TAKES TO MUCH OF OUR MONEY. BE SURE AND BRING A BIG CAN OF CRISCO WITH YOU. I WORK BEST ON MY KNEES WHILE SOMEONE SLATHERS MY FAT ASS WITH CRISCO. BRING A BIG CAN, I HAVE A VERY LARGE ASS.

HEHEHEHEHEHEHE

2795. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 22:58:35 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bd4b832c48e65a94ac1311b6fdcd7b27@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 87472

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:xaCdnQ_0fMFWqa3dRVn-sw@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > (snippage)
> >
> >>However, they were exercising poor judgment on the air. You don't know
> >>who is listening out there, and it just isn't a good subject to have
> >>kids listening to.
> >
> >
> > But obviously it is perfectly okay to have the same stuff aired (and
> > sometimes even more graphic) on national networks etc???? (Obviously
more
> > hear that than on a simple little ham repeater frequency.
>
> If I'm on a repeater, I'm using the owners rules.

Yeah, I clearly understand that... but a slightly different twist, what
about a club owned repeater? I still want to emphasize my original question
on this.... so, it is still okay then for all the stuff that is being aired
on the various broadcast sources?? Come on, if we are gonna be a prude, at
least be consistent.

>
> >
> >>Other subjects that fall under the same problem:
> >>
> >>religion, politics, anything that is likely to generate a strong
> >>emotional response and controversy.
> >
> >
> > Excuse me??? There's exactly what I was referring to a couple of months
ago.
> > Controlling speech!
>
> Who is controlling anyones speech? Just because you have an opinion
> doesn't mean you are obligated to spout it everywhere. It's called
> discretion

That would be true if one was merely stating whatever it was to anyone in
general, i.e. one-way communications. If one is intelligent enough, they
can discuss a wide variety of topics and still keep it decent. Just because
some bleeding-heart type can't deal with certain types of subjects, that is

their problem not mine. Develop a thicker skin and some debating skills
would be my suggestion.

>
> >I will discuss any damned thing I chose to discuss with
> > others on the air..... only difference is that I am intelligent enough
to
> > keep it on a even keel even if I still feel strong about the subject.
>
> Perhaps you are, but not everyone is.

For some reason you and a few others here are as well I believe. Then there
are the few village idiots of course..... :) :)

>
>
> Here is my example that turned me off of Echolink:
>
> I heard one ham talking to another one day at lunchtime. He was telling
> the other ham how much he liked umm, certain body parts of other males.
> After repeating that little bit of free speech a time or two, he went on
> to describe in pretty sickening detail what he wanted to do to the
> other ham. Fortunately the repeater owner shut the repeater off. But
> there was at least a minute of that dreck before the person's free
> speech was "violated".

Now that is something a quite a bit different. Now discussion of the
situation of what is going on in Massachusetts (sp.?) can be dealt with
without referring to the sexual function related to that group. There is a
clear difference.

>
>
> >
> >>Nothing is stopping them from talking like this tho'.
> >>
> >>But! They have no case. The repeater control op is allowed to shut the
> >>repeater down for whatever reason s/he sees fit. If the control want's
> >>to, they can shut it down every time they hear a callsign starting with
> >>W! They are voluntary things.
> >>
> >>Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Overall, that sounds like a much better option.... on a couple of
different
> > levels. Not only would a discussion of religion, politics etc. be
somewhat
> > strong in feelings for the debaters, usually those also seem to take
alot of
> > time, and tieing up a repeater for that long is not necessary. There's

tons
> > of simplex frequencies to choose from.
>
> Yup!
>

An example of what I am referring to as far as what bothers me and concerns me..... Gee, it seems perfectly okay to "promote" a religion for example (and it is usually only one in particular... ooohhhh it's so bad to discuss any others!!!) but any discussion/debate of religion is bad?? A little hypocritical to me and a prime example of "controlling" speech. Otherwise, if no religious discussion/debate is allowed, then promotion should out as well..... Even to the point of saying "god bless anything" etc.

Ryan

2796. New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 23:08:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40329EFF.3070105@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87471

In today's paper (Star Ledger) it said that the ITU established
a new code symbol for "@". It is the letters A and C run together.
Larry take note.

2797. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-17 23:59:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217185953.02537.00003023@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87473

In article <22cYb.2$IN.0@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
writes:

>Hello, Jim
>
>Remember when even the Sears catalogue had radios in them?

Vaguely!

>I'm not talking cb radios,

Ugh.

> I mean Hallicrafters receivers etc.

That's back when it was "Sears & Roebuck"

>That was in the early 60s as
>I recall (probably earlier too - but that was before I got interested in
>them).
>
I wonder how much of what was in the catalog was actually in stock, and how
much was drop-shipped.....

In any event, that catalog was quite a wishbook!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2798. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 00:30:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4032B223.1040107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87474

Bob wrote:

>There was a round table talking about the Massachusetts constitution
>change regarding gay marriage. They were asked by a listener if it was
>appropriate for amateur radio? They said they were not in any violation.
>The conversation started to get worse.
>
>
>
The control op doesn't know where this is heading, as it is live and not
a pre recorded
program that he could screen before transmitting. So I'd dump it to
cover my ass....

2799. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 00:59:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87475

In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<xnfcneeyarg.ht5isk7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> On 15 Feb 2004 13:55:43 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> >Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
>> >than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
>>
>> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
>
>They were magnificent beasts, no question about that and they're
>probably the most memorable of the PRR power roster.

230 tons, 79-1/2 feet long, 4620 continuous horsepower, over 8000 hp short term. In revenue service for almost 50 years.

>Unfortuantely
>they "didn't get around" all that much because of the limited amount
>of PRR electrified mileage.
>
2677 track miles, give or take. Washington Union Station to New York Penn Station, also Philadelphia to Harrisburg, several freight lines and numerous commuter lines around Philly.

Oddly enough, it was the New Haven which pioneered AC electrification, and eventually the GG-1s went all the way to New Haven under NH wires.

>I was raised and still live in the heart of GG-1 country, I got GG-1
>stories . . ! The best visual I ever had of one was when I was a young
>kid. We have a neighborhood electrified PRR commuter and freight
>branch line on which, back then, they normally ran those early 1900s
>junker MU car commuter rattletraps.

MP-54 cars.

>But every time TWU 234 struck and
>the city transit company shut down the commuter mobs had to switch
>from the stranded suburban trolleys to the PRR to get to their
>downtown jobs. That's when the Pennsy rolled up it's sleeves and put
>real trains on the West Chester line. Watching an inbound GG-1 pulling
>a long string of 80 foot smoothside coaches glide into Clifton-Aldan
>station was like a religious experience . .

On 100 pound rail, no less...

I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at Penn, and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1 pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the train as it went overhead...

>Much later in life I did a good bit of business with the electric car
>shops in Wilmington DE which is where the Pennsy based it's GG-1 fleet
>and where Amtrak still headquarters it's electrics. More GG-1 tales: I
>don't know where it is now but during that timeframe the shops
>completely tore down an reassembled a museum-quality GG-1. Ya could
>use the paint as a mirror . .

That was 1977, GG-1 4935, repainted in the classic Brunswick Green livery. I think it is now in Strasburg. Raymond Loewy, (born in Paris in 1893), was on hand for the intial run of the restored 4935 (May 15, 1977).

4877 was repainted Tuscan red and wound up with NJT (New Jersey Transit). 4859 was also redone and last time I saw it was under the shed in Harrisburg station.

There are others in museums but those are the best known.

>I saw the GG-1 they cut in half and
>converted into a brush-burner, the GG-1/2.

Actually a G-1 - the term "GG" comes from the wheel arrangement, two G arrangements back to back. "G" meaning two leading/trailing axles and three powered axles.

>And the GG-1 they turned
>into a monster snow blower.

4846 was cut in half, you may be thinking of one and the same unit.
>
>http://www.spikesys.com/GG1/
>
>http://www.rrmuseumpa.org/about/roster/gg1.htm
>
>One of 'em might run again somewhere some day. It's been my ongoing
>understanding that the overhead power system had been switched from 25
>Hz 11Kv to 60Hz

In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25 Hz catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC traction motors would have been impractical.

However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz back around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to 25 kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and tunnel, changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of every existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.

By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of 100+ MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do over 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.

Another headache was that the newer passenger cars were HEP (Head End Power) equipped, rather than powered by the steam line, and to pull the new cars the GG-1s had to have a specially built power car for the passenger consist. Hardly a flexible arrangement. The newer locos had HEP capability built in.

When electrification was extended from New Haven to Boston a few years ago, it was done at 25 kV 60 Hz, since it was all new work anyway. No tunnels and few overpasses. The trains now in use can handle either type of power.

>but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>not as toxic.

Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers removed for the obvious reason. The biggest problem would be getting a custom made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA at 25 Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even "professional" radio.

It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.

ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...

btw, the PRR was a pioneer in the use of radio for railroad communications, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2800. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 02:13:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040217211329.29660.00002961@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87476

In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161041390.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>Seriously, as long as it's not a forbidden topic (i.e. violates the rules), I
>don't see a problem. There was no violation by the discussion participants.
>I
>would only see that run afoul of the rules if they were actively managing
>some
>sort of political action on the issue....

Dieter:

I'm not sure that "actively managing some sort of political action" would
be a violation of Part 97, either. The only firm restriction is against using
amateur radio in direct support of commercial interests -- i.e. direct
"business" use of amateur radio communications to facilitate revenue-
generating activities by a business. So, it would seem to me, that
organizing "political action" for or against gay marriage on amateur radio
would be OK, as long as the trustee(s) of the repeater(s) so used were in
agreement. You just couldn't use the same repeater(s) to advertise the
sale of rings, tuxedos, and wedding dresses to the betrothed gays.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2801. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 02:13:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040217211330.29660.00002962@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87477

In article <l6cYb.7218$hm4.7110@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>True, but it hasn't yet...and if it did I'd donate to the defense
>fund of the repeater owner...and I think so would many others
>as well as ARRL,
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

I hereby pledge to match your donation to the dollar. However, I'm sure
our money is safe, because this "case" will never happen.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2802. Re: ARRL Proposal----What should happen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 02:13:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040217211331.29660.00002963@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87478

In article <4c2c4239eb00afa954360a5969177e32@news.teranews.com>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>The proposal that the arrl should be working on is increasing the membership
>ranks instead of trying to change the system of licensure that has been
>discussed to death here. What, theres like around 25% of all hams that are
>members?? If the arrl is "sooooo good" then they should be working towards
>increasing the membership.
>
>Not only would this actually help to lower the cost of membership by
>spreading the costs of doing business over a bigger spread, but also give
>more strength and credibility to the organization. With a good percentage
>of the members being in the 55+ range there seems to be a good need to come
>up with new people to add to the membership ranks.
>
>How about this for a marketing idea?? If the arrl recieves 200,000 new
>subscriptions for 2004 then they rebate some of the cost of the subscription
>rate as it is now? (Thats 200,000 over the existing memberships)
>
>Again, the license class/testing situation as it stands now is just fine and
>does not need any more changes for a while. Work on promotion and building
>from within before trying to recruit more.
>
>Ryan KC8PMX

Ryan:

The licensing system we had prior to April 15, 2000 was just fine, and
did not need any changes whatsoever. The ARRL (always capitalized,
BTW) is trying to increase it's membership by supporting ever declining
licensing standards. It hasn't worked yet, and I doubt that it ever will.
Too bad, because I see the League as a force for good in Amateur Radio,
particularly in these times when we faces serious challenges to our
hobby/service such as BPL, restrictive antenna ordinances, spectrum
re-allocation, and declining activity on the bands due to the Internet.
The League's failure to support the status quo in strong licensing
requirements, including Morse code testing at speeds up to 20 WPM,
has only served to polarize their membership and cause them to lose
the support of longtime members in good standing who know the
value of licensing requirements based on a firm grounding in technical
knowledge and practical operational skills.

The ARRL is digging it's own grave, and they're using progressively larger
shovels every year. If we get No-code HF licensing, you're going to see
a backhoe being delivered to 225 Main St, Newington.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2803. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 02:21:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040217212129.29660.00002964@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87479

In article <O7zXb.22556$1S1.6506@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>, "radio123"
<test@test.com> writes:

>Can an Amateur radio operator with a Tech Plus licenses use the GMRS radio
>under his HAM license or must a separate $ 75 GMRS licenses be obtained.

No. Yes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2804. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 02:42:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040217214245.29660.00002965@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87480

In article <40329EFF.3070105@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>In today's paper (Star Ledger) it said that the ITU established
>a new code symbol for "@". It is the letters A and C run together.
>Larry take note.

I saw that myself. The new character (the first since the WWII era) is
called the "commat." Weird name; I would assume a character so named
was a combination of the Morse characters for a "comma" and the letter
"t." However, the "commat" is a combination of the letters "a" and "c."
Why don't they call it the "atsign," which is what it is supposed to represent?

For anyone who missed it, here's the story:

http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/nationworld/bal-te.morse16feb16,0,2782636
.story

73 de Larry, K3LT

2805. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 02:42:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040217214245.29660.00002966@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87481

In article <20040217211330.29660.00002962@mb-m24.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>
>>True, but it hasn't yet...and if it did I'd donate to the defense
>>fund of the repeater owner...and I think so would many others
>>as well as ARRL,
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>Bill:
>
>I hereby pledge to match your donation to the dollar. However, I'm sure
>our money is safe, because this "case" will never happen.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Bill:

I hereby withdraw this pledge. It just occurred to me that your genorosity could
exceed mine by a significant margin.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2806. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 03:00:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217220008.01632.00000800@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 87482

In article <DpoYb.8436$W74.71@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Thought you said there were 34,000 Novices the other day?

"The other day" there were! ;-)
>
>Also, take a look at the upcoming expirations in the next
>6 months...some pretty hefty numbers of hams with
>expirations coming up.

All that means is that the dates when today's hams got their licenses are not evenly distributed. Renewal dates are driven by things like rules changes and vanity gates.

Once upon a time, FCC would renew a license whenever you modified (upgrade, address change), if you asked them to.

Then all of a sudden the rules changed and you can only renew two ways: either wait until the license is within 90 days of expiring, or get a new vanity call.

>I expect at least a 10K overall
>reduction of licensed hams by end of 2004 based on
>SK, lack of interest, etc. based on past renewal rates.
>
Another WAG, Bill? Note that even if a license is due to expire in, say, June 2004, there is a 27 month window during which it can be renewed. How do we capture all of that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2807. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 03:19:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040217221947.22081.00004112@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87483

In article <20040217214245.29660.00002965@mb-m24.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/nationworld/bal-te.morse16feb16,0,2782636>.story

It was also a story on NPR's "All Things Considered":

http://www.npr.org/rundowns/rundown.php?prgDate=17-Feb-2004&prgId=2

Also, this weekend there were two interesting stories on "Next Big Thing" - one about a Victorian-era novel about romance by telegraph ("Love On The Wire"), and the other about Morse code use by hams:

http://www.nextbigthing.org/

scroll down and click to hear streaming audio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2808. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 03:58:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net>
Message-ID: <z8WdnQdBQpeffq_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87484

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:xaCdnQ_0fMFWqa3dRVn-sw@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>>(snippage)
>>>
>>>
>>>>However, they were exercising poor judgment on the air. You don't know
>>>>who is listening out there, and it just isn't a good subject to have
>>>>kids listening to.
>>>
>>>
>>>But obviously it is perfectly okay to have the same stuff aired (and
>>>sometimes even more graphic) on national networks etc???? (Obviously
>
> more
>
>>>hear that than on a simple little ham repeater frequency.
>>
>>If I'm on a repeater, I'm using the owners rules.
>
>
> Yeah, I clearly understand that... but a slightly different twist, what
> about a club owned repeater? I still want to emphasize my original question
> on this.... so, it is still okay then for all the stuff that is being aired
> on the various broadcast sources?? Come on, if we are gonna be a prude, at
> least be consistent.

Ahh, on the last part we differ! I'm a firm believer in there being a time and a place for things. How I talk when I'm playing hockey and how I talk when I'm on the air are two radically different things, and I'm happy to keep them separated I can have a perfectly good QSO without getting into controversial subjects. But under private circumstances, I'm happy to discuss.

And as for what is aired on broadcast stations, I'm a firm believer that the place for the more sensitive stuff is later at night.

>>>>Other subjects that fall under the same problem:
>>>>
>>>>religion, politics, anything that is likely to generate a strong
>>>>emotional response and controversy.

>>>
>>>
>>>Excuse me??? There's exactly what I was referring to a couple of months
>
> ago.
>
>>>Controlling speech!
>>
>>Who is controlling anyones speech? Just because you have an opinion
>>doesn't mean you are obligated to spout it everywhere. It's called
>>discretion
>
>
> That would be true if one was merely stating whatever it was to anyone in
> general, i.e. one-way communications. If one is intelligent enough, they
> can discuss a wide variety of topics and still keep it decent. Just because
> some bleeding-heart type can't deal with certain types of subjects, that is
> their problem not mine. Develop a thicker skin and some debating skills
> would be my suggestion.

Actually the people who are the traditional "bleeding hearts aren't the
ones with the problems with this sort of stuff

>>>I will discuss any damned thing I chose to discuss with
>>>others on the air..... only difference is that I am intelligent enough
>>> to keep it on a even keel even if I still feel strong about the subject.
>>
>>Perhaps you are, but not everyone is.
>
>
> For some reason you and a few others here are as well I believe. Then there
> are the few village idiots of course..... :) :)

I like to try to. Of course there are the occasional weak moments!!

>>Here is my example that turned me off of Echolink:
>>
>>I heard one ham talking to another one day at lunchtime. He was telling
>>the other ham how much he liked umm, certain body parts of other males.
>>After repeating that little bit of free speech a time or two, he went on
>>to describe in pretty sickening detail what he wanted to do to the
>>other ham. Fortunately the repeater owner shut the repeater off. But
>>there was at least a minute of that dreck before the person's free
>>speech was "violated".
>
>
> Now that is something a quite a bit different. Now discussion of the
> situation of what is going on in Massachusetts (sp.?) can be dealt with
> without referring to the sexual function related to that group. There is a
> clear difference.

Point made>

>>>>Nothing is stopping them from talking like this tho'.
>>>>
>>>>But! They have no case. The repeater control op is allowed to shut the
>>>>repeater down for whatever reason s/he sees fit. If the control want's
>>>>to, they can shut it down every time they hear a callsign starting with
>>>>W! They are voluntary things.
>>>>
>>>>Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Overall, that sounds like a much better option.... on a couple of
>
> different
>
>>>levels. Not only would a discussion of religion, politics etc. be
>
> somewhat
>
>>>strong in feelings for the debaters, usually those also seem to take
>
> alot of
>
>>>time, and tieing up a repeater for that long is not necessary. There's
>
> tons
>
>>>of simplex frequencies to choose from.
>>
>>Yup!
>>
> An example of what I am referring to as far as what bothers me and concerns
> me..... Gee, it seems perfectly okay to "promote" a religion for example
> (and it is usually only one in particular... ooohhhh it's so bad to discuss
> any others!!!) but any discussion/debate of religion is bad?? A little
> hypocritical to me and a prime example of "controlling" speech. Otherwise,
> if no religious discussion/debate is allowed, then promotion should out as
> well..... Even to the point of saying "god bless anything" etc.

Ack, Religion!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2809. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 05:11:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218001116.02537.00003026@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87485

In article <40329EFF.3070105@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>In today's paper (Star Ledger) it said that the ITU established
>a new code symbol for "@". It is the letters A and C run together.

Such wonderful news for all the olde-tyme morosemen out
there! No doubt will be of tremendous help in alleviating
communications carrier grid lock!

So...really, Bob, how did you manage to plant that story? :-)

LHA / WMD

2810. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 05:24:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <pGCYb.9603$hm4.924@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87486

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040217220008.01632.00000800@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <DpoYb.8436$W74.71@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Thought you said there were 34,000 Novices the other day?
>
> "The other day" there were! ;-)

Speroni's data doesn't reflect 34K for the last few months.

> >Also, take a look at the upcoming expirations in the next
> >6 months...some pretty hefty numbers of hams with
> >expirations coming up.
>
> All that means is that the dates when today's hams got their licenses are
not
> evenly distributed. Renewal dates are driven by things like rules changes
and
> vanity gates.

True, but if the non-renewal rate is the same then I predict a total drop of
all hams by something on the order of 10K by year's end.

> >I expect at least a 10K overall
> >reduction of licensed hams by end of 2004 based on
> >SK, lack of interest, etc. based on past renewal rates.
> >
> Another WAG, Bill?

SWAG!

> Note that even if a license is due to expire in, say, June
> 2004, there is a 27 month window during which it can be renewed. How do we
> capture all of that?

True, but...
Look at Speroni's grace period renewals for the last few
years. No big numbers there.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2811. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 05:37:04 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a9cc414a16c39f298974b@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 87487

In article <20040218001116.02537.00003026@mb-m23.aol.com>, lenover21
@aol.com says...
> In article <40329EFF.3070105@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >In today's paper (Star Ledger) it said that the ITU established
> >a new code symbol for "@". It is the letters A and C run together.
>
> Such wonderful news for all the olde-tyme morosemen out
> there! No doubt will be of tremendous help in alleviating
> communications carrier grid lock!
>

Hey - at least now it'll be easy to pass an email address for QSL
purposes.

2812. Re: Photos of China shortwave radios (and more!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 05:37:05 UTC
From: Copperplate <djonsaen70081@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c4325$4032fa55$d8536f5a$19699@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 87488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I just made a VERY VERY curious discovery on the URL
I posted in the original thread.

It seems that a company
in Hong Kong called Maxima Communication Ltd
is actually the OEM for several brands of Icom, AOR,
Kenwood and Alinco ham radio products !!!

(Among these are the Icom IC756-PRO and the Yaesu FT-1000MP !!)

I am sure all you hams reading this who paid BIG BUCKS for
a "Japanese made" Icom or Yaesu actually paid for a radio
that was made by Maxima in Hong Kong.....!

(as soon as it gets an Icom or a Yaseu Japanese
name on it, plus made-in-japan, the price is
inflated BIG TIME ???)

Check it out 4 yourself boys!

http://www.maximahk.com/fpage.html

PROOF HERE! http://www.maximahk.com/pframe.html

....and all this time I bey you thought U were
gettin a "genuine" Jap radio! You hams been paying
Toyota and Subaru prices for a Kia and a Hyundai
all this time !

"Copperplate" <djonsaen70081@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:31aa9$4085f0c0$d8056f5a$19303@yahoo.allthenewsgroups.com...
> A nifty site that lets you see photos of future shortwave
> radios from China w/specs and factory details!
>
> Step 1 - Click on the URL below
>
> http://www.globalsources.com/gsol/HOMEPAGES/GSOL/GSHOME.jsp
>
> Step 2 - Do a PRODUCT search on the Keyword "Shortwave"
>
> Step 3 - Click on the highlighted "Multiband Radios"
>
> VERY INTERESTING stuff.
>
>

2813. Re: Photos of China shortwave radios (and more!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 05:59:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Fs-dnebQrJO9mK7d4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87490
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Copperplate wrote:
>
> I am sure all you hams reading this who paid BIG BUCKS for
> a "Japanese made" Icom or Yaesu actually paid for a radio
> that was made by Maxima in Hong Kong.....!
>
> (as soon as it gets an Icom or a Yaseu Japanese
> name on it, plus made-in-japan, the price is
> inflated BIG TIME ???)

> ....and all this time I bey you thought U were
> gettin a "genuine" Jap radio! You hams been paying
> Toyota and Subaru prices for a Kia and a Hyundai
> all this time !

Anytime you pay more than $10 for that cb junk you cbers buy you are
getting shafted.

2814. Re: Photos of China shortwave radios (and more!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 06:08:38 UTC
From: dplatt@radagast.org
Message-ID: <10360b66n8me43b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 87489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <c4325$4032fa55$d8536f5a$19699@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
Copperplate <djonsaen70081@yahoo.com> wrote:

>I just made a VERY VERY curious discovery on the URL
>I posted in the original thread.
>
>It seems that a company
>in Hong Kong called Maxima Communication Ltd
>is actually the OEM for several brands of Icom, AOR,
>Kenwood and Alinco ham radio products !!!

#snip#

The Maxima Communications pages describe themselves as a "distributor"
for the lines you mention, and a bunch of others. I don't see any
specific information which indicates that they are actually the
manufacturer.

I grant you, it's quite possible that many of today's amateur radios
have some of their board assembly done in China, or in some cases even
the entire radio manufacture done there - this is common enough in
most fields of consumer electronics. However, I don't see reason to
believe that Maxima Communications is the factory or OEM, based on the
site whose URL you posted.

--
Dave Platt <dplatt@radagast.org> AE6EO
Hosting the Jade Warrior home page: http://www.radagast.org/jade-warrior
I do _not_ wish to receive unsolicited commercial email, and I will
boycott any company which has the gall to send me such ads!

2815. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 11:00:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218060007.23171.00004174@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87491

In article <pGCYb.9603$hm4.924@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >Also, take a look at the upcoming expirations in the next
>> >6 months...some pretty hefty numbers of hams with
>> >expirations coming up.
>>
>> All that means is that the dates when today's hams got their licenses are
>> not
>> evenly distributed. Renewal dates are driven by things like rules changes
>> and vanity gates.
>
>True, but if the non-renewal rate is the same then I predict a total drop of
>all hams by something on the order of 10K by year's end.

Perhaps. But where are your numbers, Bill? How many licenses were due to expire in, say, 2003, vs. how many were renewed? (IOW, what % were renewed?)

I did some quick figuring and found that for 2003, for every 11 license renewed, 1 was renewed in the grace period.

>
>> >I expect at least a 10K overall
>> >reduction of licensed hams by end of 2004 based on
>> >SK, lack of interest, etc. based on past renewal rates.
>> >
>> Another WAG, Bill?
>
>SWAG!

How about some numbers to back it up?

>> Note that even if a license is due to expire in, say, June
>> 2004, there is a 27 month window during which it can be renewed. How do we
>> capture all of that?
>
>True, but...
>Look at Speroni's grace period renewals for the last few
>years. No big numbers there.

For every 11 renewals there was 1 in the grace period.

Note also that despite huge numbers of actual expirations there have not been big decreases in license totals.

Will any of the proposed rules changes make a difference in these trends?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2816. Re: janet jackson to get ham license [deleted]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 11:59:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218065946.05957.00000490@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87493

In article <4027DD15.5060605@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>In article <4026F665.6030301@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>One of the male nuns was going to hit my hand with the blackboard
>>>pointer. I was
>>>to hold out my hand, but I pulled it away by instinct to avoid getting
>>>hit. He broke it
>>>on the floor. He just let it go at that, as I think he may have thought
>>>he went a hair
>>>too far with this stuff. Not that he dialed it back much.... No he didn't
>>>make me buy another pointer.

>>Typical. Parochial school did more to create millions of excatholics....
>>
>There may have been this side effect that, after school I split the
>joint as fast as I
>could.

Me too.

>Never saw any molestation (don't know if my particular school
>had any of that, but I wasn't at any risk of that).
>
How could you have not been at risk?

>Then there were the yearly school plays. You had two choices: be in it,
>or buy a
>50 cent ticket to the play. It was a no brainer: I paid the 50 cents
>rather than have
>to memorize lines and acts and spending more time at the school.

We didn't have those until high school. Some were pretty good, and were done in
cooperation with the girls' high school next door. Good way to meet 'em...

>>Had several nuns whose idea of "teaching" was to simply have a kid read from
>>the textbook. At any moment, Sister Mary Elephant would call out another
>>kid's
>>name and if the kid didn't pick up on the very next word, he'd get a
>>beating.
>>We became quite good at following along and daydreaming at the same time.
>>
>That's how history class got done. And memorizing names and dates.

> Good for playing
>"Jeopardy" but otherwise meaningless. It seemed that kings in Europe
>would get bored
>sitting around their castles and decide to have wars for fun every so
>often. Football not
>having been developed yet....
>
ALL subjects were done that way by the nuns I had. No real teaching involved.
We learned on our own.

>>>They did have some good stuff. There was this thing called "SRA".

>>I remember that! By 5th grade they'd run out of levels for me. I'd do 3 or 4
>>in
>>the time it took most of the rest of the kids to do one. And since you could
>>look back and check you answers, it was a cinch.
>>
>"What was Mr Honey Bunny's wife's name?" I had a bad memory, but being
>able to go back and look made it easy.

Exactly! Even though I had a good memory I wouldn't trust it, I'd just
double-check to be sure.
>
>There were a few kids whose mother tongue was probably not English, and had
>difficulty. I though that they were just brain damaged or something, as
>I had no
>concept that there were other languages than English until I was about
>ten. Never
>heard anything other than English in real life or on radio or TV...
>
Didn't you hear Latin at mass? They had all of us learn it from first grade.
Not what the words meant, just to blindly repeat the responses in Latin with no
understanding of what any of it meant.

>>Another trick was that you never wanted your folks to find out when you got
>>beaten at school, because they'd give you more of the same at home, and a
>>lecture about how those blessed nuns had sacrificed their lives to teach you
>>ungrateful kids, etc. Well, we never asked 'em to.
>>
>Didn't have that problem. Actually, my parents might have sued if they
>knew, but I didn't know that at the time.
>
Nobody I knew would have dreamed of suing.

>Some nuns may have been teenage girls afraid of sex....
>
None of the ones I saw were anywhere near teenagers!
>>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2817. Re: ARRL Proposal----What should happen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 11:59:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218065948.05957.00000491@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87492

In article <4c2c4239eb00afa954360a5969177e32@news.teranews.com>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>The proposal that the arrl should be working on is increasing the membership
>ranks instead of trying to change the system of licensure that has been
>discussed to death here. What, theres like around 25% of all hams that are
>members??

True - but what percentage of active hams are members? I think you'll find it's a lot higher than 25%.

>If the arrl is "sooooo good" then they should be working towards
>increasing the membership.

They are! Note that the license proposal offers a free upgrade of license class to 57% of licensed US hams....
>
>Not only would this actually help to lower the cost of membership by
>spreading the costs of doing business over a bigger spread, but also give
>more strength and credibility to the organization.

Sure! Now, how can ARRL increase membership?

>With a good percentage
>of the members being in the 55+ range there seems to be a good need to come
>up with new people to add to the membership ranks.

Age alone is not really a major factor because people are living longer, and many newer hams are from the ranks of the retired and near-retired. One of the *big* reasons you don't see many 20-, 30-, and 40-somethings at hamfests is that they're too busy working and raising familes these days.

>How about this for a marketing idea?? If the arrl recieves 200,000 new
>subscriptions for 2004 then they rebate some of the cost of the subscription
>rate as it is now? (Thats 200,000 over the existing memberships)

It would have to be structred in such a way that existing members would get the benefit, too.

Maybe it could work like this: If membership grows by a certain number, every member gets a rebate coupon worth a certain amount, good towards any ARRL publication or membership.
>
>Again, the license class/testing situation as it stands now is just fine and
>does not need any more changes for a while.

I disagree slightly. I think the entry-level license should be more balanced between HF and VHF-UHF. But that's about it.

More important, what's all the rush?

73 de Jim, N2EY

Work on promotion and building
>from within before trying to recruit more.
>

2818. Re: ARRL Proposal----What should happen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 13:45:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40336C69.9010504@psu.edu>
Source record: 87494

N2EY wrote:
> In article <4c2c4239eb00afa954360a5969177e32@news.teranews.com>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
>
>>The proposal that the arrl should be working on is increasing the membership
>>ranks instead of trying to change the system of licensure that has been
>>discussed to death here. What, theres like around 25% of all hams that are
>>members??
>
>
> True - but what percentage of active hams are members? I think you'll find it's
> a lot higher than 25%.

True. Is there anyone out there that has any idea how many hams out of
the total number licensed ARE active? I suspect that its something that
would be hard to find, since the ARRL is likely more interested in the
larger total number licensed.

I know most of the hams I associate with and know are active are members.

>>If the arrl is "sooooo good" then they should be working towards
>>increasing the membership.
>
>
> They are! Note that the license proposal offers a free upgrade of license class
> to 57% of licensed US hams....

Imagine if 25 percent of the ~400K new HF access hams join the ARRL? Of
course some of us think that might be the wrong way to go about it....

>>Not only would this actually help to lower the cost of membership by
>>spreading the costs of doing business over a bigger spread, but also give
>>more strength and credibility to the organization.
>
>
> Sure! Now, how can ARRL increase membership?

Their new Elmering program is a good start. That it is on the internet
is a good idea too. New hams will be coming into the service as much by
the internet as by the more traditional methods.

Here are two things that are a little tricky that they need to work on.
IMO, they need to convey spectrum threat as a serious thing without
getting too shrill about it. I think they do a pretty good job now, but
there always seems to be a few people out there that get panicky. Not a

good way to get introduced to Ham radio when a prospective amateur gets
to think that maybe there is no reason to get a license when s/he won't
be able to operate because of (name the threat)

Second, and I have no idea if this is even possible, is how to propose
anything without alienating a lot of Hams. I'm not sure about this one,
because from what I've seen, a number of Hams will probably be
dissatisfied no matter what the ARRL does. Maybe they are just
dissatisfied in general?

>>With a good percentage
>>of the members being in the 55+ range there seems to be a good need to come
>>up with new people to add to the membership ranks.
>
>
> Age alone is not really a major factor because people are living longer, and
> many newer hams are from the ranks of the retired and near-retired. One of the
> *big* reasons you don't see many 20-, 30-, and 40-somethings at hamfests is
> that they're too busy working and raising familes these days.

Glad to hear that from someone else! New and young Hams are a good
thing, but I think some people get obsessed with the perceived need to
have all these Hams licensed in Jr. high school. More important is new
and active Hams.

As time goes on, I am becoming more and more convinced that the digital
modes are *very* important to attracting new hams to the hobby. The kids
are usually very interested in anything that has to do with a computer,
and many of the older prospects find it fascinating too.

>>How about this for a marketing idea?? If the arrl recieves 200,000 new
>>subscriptions for 2004 then they rebate some of the cost of the subscription
>>rate as it is now? (Thats 200,000 over the existing memberships)
>
>
> It would have to be structred in such a way that existing members would get the
> benefit, too.
>
> Maybe it could work like this: If membership grows by a certain number, every
> member gets a rebate coupon worth a certain amount, good towards any ARRL
> publication or membership.

Why do so many think that league membership is so expensive anyway?
Between the QST subscription and the members access to the webpages, the
ARRL is one of the best bargains around. Oh, and they do other things to
help us too!

>>Again, the license class/testing situation as it stands now is just fine and
>>does not need any more changes for a while.
>
>
> I disagree slightly. I think the entry-level license should be more balanced

> between HF and VHF-UHF. But that's about it.
>
> More important, what's all the rush?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Work on promotion and building
>>from within before trying to recruit more.
>

Did you write that line, Jim? In any event, I think both need to be done at the same time.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2819. Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 18:13:10 UTC
From: Rusty in Louisville <russ@russradioshop.com>
Message-ID: <c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 87495
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I would like to get some opinions about
Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
or more to back order.

Rusty in Louisville

2820. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 18:18:27 UTC
From: Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <4033AC76.77D6@mindspring.com>
Source record: 87496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I generally get stuff there, by mail order, even though it's just down the road from me. I'm not in a hurry very often so haven't noticed what the speed is.

They keep moving the road so I don't bother trying to figure out the day's new traffic patterns. Let UPS figure it out.

I have found them very reliable.
--
Ron Hardin
rhhardin@mindspring.com

On the internet, nobody knows you're a jerk.

2821. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 18:40:50 UTC
From: Burr <pitzpho@earthlinkpanties.net>
Message-ID: <4033B24F.6050303@earthlinkpanties.net>
Source record: 87497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I have used them many times with no problems.

Burr

Rusty in Louisville wrote:
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville
>
>
>

2822. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 18:44:02 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray-87a@cybercoffee.org>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BC590E9200032D411488F480@news.giganews.com>
Source record: 87498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Wed, 18 Feb 2004 12:13:10 -0600, Rusty in Louisville wrote
(in message <c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>):

> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville
>
>
>

I've ordered several small orders from
them and never had any problems.

/gray/

2823. Re: Photos of China shortwave radios (and more!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 19:40:06 UTC
From: garyarnold@aol.com
Message-ID: <fc4afcdc.0402181140.5a194b98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87499
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Copperplate" <djonsaen70081@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<c4325$4032fa55$d8536f5a$19699@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>...
> I just made a VERY VERY curious discovery on the URL
> I posted in the original thread.
>
> It seems that a company
> in Hong Kong called Maxima Communication Ltd
> is actually the OEM for several brands of Icom, AOR,
> Kenwood and Alinco ham radio products !!!
>
> (Among these are the Icom IC756-PRO and the Yaesu FT-1000MP !!)
>
Maxima makes NOTHING. They only DISTRIBUTE products made by other manufacturers.

2824. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 19:42:40 UTC
From: "Mark S. Holden" <mark@bmas.org>
Message-ID: <4033C030.B34632C6@bmas.org>
Source record: 87500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Rusty in Louisville wrote:
>
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville

I've ordered a few things from them and had good luck.

My impression is phone orders get processed faster than on line ones.

All Electronics is another outfit that seems to process phone orders faster than internet ones.

2825. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 20:09:42 UTC
From: Bill <Bill@birchnet.demon.co.uk>
Message-ID: <coMtegFGa8MAFwbv@birchnet.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 87501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In message <4033C030.B34632C6@bmas.org>, Mark S. Holden <mark@bmas.org>
writes
>My impression is phone orders get processed faster than on line ones.
>
I've had the same experience with them, they did say when I phoned them
to chase an online order that they always had a LARGE amount of on line
orders. I was also quoted 30 days but the kit has always arrived much
quicker than that, even taking into account customs at this end.

--
Bill G8IAY

2826. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 20:59:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402181259.4b4465a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87502

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > > He and Jack Fulmer W4HAV (later W4YF) opened a Volkswagen dealership way
> > > too soon after the war.
> >
> > Yeah,Yanks were nowhere near accepting sub-compacts in that timeframe.
> > Nor were they very anxious to do biz with the Huns.
>
> Jean and Jack were SURE that they'd stumbled on a good thing. If they'd
> only waited five or six years...

How many times has this scenario been played out? Little guy sticks
his neck out, goes bust, big guys come along later and feast on it.

> > number of times on biz in Cincinnati and in KY. Where is WLW vs. the
> > airport?
>
> The studios are downtown. The transmitter is up north of the city near
> Mason, Ohio in the same general area as the VOA relay station was
> located.

Dunno where I got the notion it was on the Kentucky side of the crick.

> > They did some engine, exhaust system and suspension mods then
> > shoehorned the engine into the Hawk. "The rest is history . . " The
> > thing ate Corvettes for breakfast . . It still exists in a barn near
> > Coatesville.
>
> Neat story. We were at the other end of the automotive spectrum. Dad
> owned a '51 Pontiac and one day, one of the plugs unscrewed itself and
> put a pretty good dent in the hood. Pop traded it for a decidedly
> unglamorous '60 AMC wagon.

Hey I been there. Had a '64 Rambler American followed by a '72 AMC
Hornet Sportabout wagon. Then I bought my first Honda in '81. New
ballgame.

> > No ads for industrial designers. No ads for illustrators. Four pages
> > of ads for engineers. End of.
>
> Engineers are generally the guys who make things work. Designers are
> those who make them nice to look at. We all know of the exceptions.

Amen. I followed the niece's coursework thru Pratt. The artsy-fartsy
side is the least of it. Either ya already have it or ya don't and if
ya don't ya don't go to Pratt period. What she did get is piles of

courses in materials science, math thru Calculus, a good dose of
applied mecahanics (basic stress & deflection analysis),
manufaucturing engineering, etc. As she put it "Now I can at least
speak your langauge Uncle Brian." And she can too. In the meanwhile
she's up to her ears in computer graphics I can't even start to get
into.

I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .
.

> > sketch to VW, a VW functionary called back immediately and told 'em
> > "Yeah, that's it, run with it!" They slapped patent papers on it and
> > put it into production.
>
> It does sound as if it runs in the family.

Seems like. A cousin made a bloody fortune with his advertsing agency,
"retired" into being the Art Director for the Franklin Mint, was
elected a Fellow in the American Water Color Society and at 86 he
still has one-man shows in NYC twice a month. He's also a train nut, a
Pennsy fan. I have one of his train watercolors, one of his few
whimsical blasts from the past. One of these days I'll cobble together
a website and post it.

> > > I bought an S-40A from W7LR a few years back.
> >
> > Still have it?
>
> Oh yes, fully restored and sitting on a shelf to my right.

Uh-huh . . . Hmmm . .

> > I'm not sure if I was ever aware of Loewy's role in the S-40 or not.
> > But I am now. It's definitely a "coherent" design. That was his trick,
> > integrate form and function. Not much of a rcvr though.
>
> No, not at all. Hallicrafters (and many other firms) were still building
> the same basic receivers in a variety of cabinets through the decades
> with few innovations or variations.

AMC >> Honda. Hallicrafters >> Kenwood.

>
> > > W4JBP willed me his 1937 Hallicrafters Sky Challenger years back.
> >
> > . . . there's a gooder . . . get it yet?
>
> Sure do. It sits next to the S-40A. The engraved German silver dial is
> super looking.

There's some trip bait . . I've always wanted to listen to one of
those '30s rcvrs but never had the oportunity.

> So many of the ham radio dealers and parts houses have gone out of
> business or have been bought by larger firms. West Virginia had
> Chemcity Electronics back when I first got on the air. They had several
> locations throughout the state and they sold amateur radio gear as well
> as parts. This end of the state had a Cameradio shop.
>
> Cincinnati had a number of places selling amateur gear. There was
> Coston's. The "Saturday Night at Coston's" gathering of hams is the
> stuff of legend. Queen City Electronics was run by John Dine WA8DFD.
> R&L Electronics started in a garage in Hamilton, Ohio. In Dayton, there
> was SREPCO. Cincinnati had a number of parts houses including Holub's,
> Hughes-Peters, Mytronics, United Radio and the surplus house, Lapirow
> Brothers.

Different times, different places. I guess there were exceptions but in the '50s the Philly parts & radio distributors were clustered downtown along Arch Street. A whole bunch of surplus joints and the two big parts houses, Almo and Radio Electric Service Company, known as RESCO. Both were family business single-location store front parts, general electronics and ham gear distributors. Wanna a couple resistors, no problem. A Collins rcvr and a "hi-fi" amp or a PA system? Here ya go. Both still exist but in far different forms and none of 'em have had anything to do with ham radio for decades. You might enjoy this link.

http://www.almo.com/corporate/history.asp

Over the years there have been a few ham-only stores but they never did very well and disappered. The parts stores still exist here and there even today but they're few and far between so it's easier to dial up Mouser and let the brown trucks do the running around. The HRO store here has an armlock on hamdom in these parts today. I got stupid and dropped into the store on a Saturday, unbelievable, there were folks there from as far away as NYC and Baltimore, took two hours to get to the cash register. No more "HRO Saturdays" for me!

In the end what matters is today and my view is that when it comes to finding "good stuff" it's all out on the web in volumes the Almos and RESCOS of days of yore never had.

> I've noted Globe King 500-C's going for $3,000+. I was amazed to get
> $775 for a 51J-4 the year before last.

NICE radio!

> One of the big differences
> between the modern marvels and the vintage gear is that one can still
> obtain tubes and parts for the vintage rigs. I doubt that any of the
> current stuff will be operational or repairable in fifty years. The
> lack of a replacement switch, an LSI or an LCD display will doom them to
> the scrap heap.

Tell me, I have a zonked TS-940SAT with all the options except the voice card, it's been updated by the Kenwood factory shop to the final

production design and it's loaded with filters. I love the radio but
it's full of creaky old point-to-point wiring, weird switches,
unmarked ICs, etc. I found a local shop which specializes in 930/940s
and as soon as I get it fixed I'm gonna dump it and run with the money
while it's still worth a few bucks.

> > If/when I ever make it your place you'll have to let read some of 'em.
>
> Once you start, there's no stopping. Allow me to whet your interest with
> the following from 1977:

That's probably why I missed 'em. I was well into in my hiatus from
ham radio in '77.

> "There were some local QRPers up the hill last week, the group including
> one of those serious types. His beady eyes were everywhere, questioning
> and checking. And the QRPers got to talking of Red Eye and the Palo
> Verdes bunch, and Slim and the Hero of Mafeking. So we had to tell them
> about the JA who in all seriousness had asked that alongside the obscure
> jokes we place an explanation of what we meant. Perhaps we should have
> kept the file sealed. 'Jokes?', says this serious one. 'Obscure jokes?
> Where are they? Why, I've been reading the bulletin for some years now
> and while there are things that sometimes I do not understand, I have
> not noticed any jokes.' Son of a Gun!! What does one do in a situation
> like that? The sky was blue, the day was warm and there had been a slow
> joy in the group as they talked. But we realized that like a lot of
> things, humor and DX and home cooking, that most things are relative and
> sometimes more so. So we told the beady-eyed one that we would
> underline them in his copy from now on, a service that perhaps others
> might want and use. And for $14.00 a year, the enigmas of DX will
> comeyour way in inscrutable prose, tangled, twisted and tortured...and
> maybe stretched a bit. $18.00 will fling it at you by first-class mail
> to the U.S./VE areas. $20.00 will fly it far down the moonpath to
> Mexico and all the lands below the Tropic of Cancer and beyond the
> meridians. Someday we may get the message...someday someone might get
> the message to us."

Heh. Yeah, I gotta read some of 'em. We used to needle the clueless,
the innocnet and the gullible with our "secret communications" from
the "Bowling Team Captain's Committee".

> I don't support the ARRL's "gimme" for tens of thousands.

Ham radio has bigger problems than this one.

> Now Len can't
> accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
> some obscure reason.

A Putz is a Putz is a Putz, whatta bore.

<<SNORE>>

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2827. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 21:03:02 UTC
From: snow <dlessard@powerlink.net>
Message-ID: <1037l4n3deqqe53@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 87503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I always had good service from them over the years. No complaints. I bought a Sony SW 100 off their used equipment site once for about $180 and it was spotless.
So they are good company from my experiences.
Rusty in Louisville <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message news:c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net...
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville
>
>
>

2828. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 21:23:25 UTC
From: Steve Wolf <news@w8iz.com>
Message-ID: <1037lvtt8d9iaa8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 87504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

My telephone introduction is, "I'd like to get a price on an item but only if you have it in stock and can ship it immediately". That filters the just-in-time philosophy out of the ordering process.

73,
Steve, W8IZ

2829. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 21:28:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402181328.79ee16dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87505

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0402170748.7577a4f5@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:

> > > Note that Sears, Hallicrafters and Loewy were all based in Chicago.
>
> Also Frank Lloyd Wright, for at least some of his career.

Very early but his big days were in AZ.

> > > Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
> > > than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
> > >
> > > http://prrsteam.pennsyrr.com/prrt1.html
>
> As K2ASP sez, the GG-1 is the top of that pyramid.

Yeah, for you sparkies maybe.

> For streamlined steam engines, the special J-3 Hudsons used on the New
> York Central's Twentieth Century Limited are the most impressive.

> > Engineers are generally the guys who make things work. Designers are
> > those who make them nice to look at. We all know of the exceptions.
>
> "Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them"

A physicist and an engineer standing in bulap bags line up side by
side at one end of a basketball court.

There ia blonde to kill for at the other end of the basketball court.

Whoever gets to the blonde first gets his way with her.

The rule: Each successive hop has to be one half the distance of the
previous hop.

The engineer takes off like a bat outta hell. The Physicist doesn't
move and hollers at the engineer "You silly fool, you'll never get
there!"

The engineer hollers back "Watch me get close enough!"

> And a recent auction sold an *unbuilt* Heath SB-303 for about $1300.
> Adjusted for inflation, that's about what they cost new. But the '303
> isn't much of a receiver - not even up to the level of the earlier

> SB-301, and defintitely not in the same class as the Drake R4 family
> or any Collins, A or S.

And for anywhere from $250 to maybe $500. Goofy.

> > > > Madison Electronics in Texas. Bill Kennamer K5FUV edited their "QRZ DX"
> > > > for a number of years before going to the DXCC desk in Newington to
> > > > replace Don Search.
> > >
> > > If/when I ever make it your place you'll have to let read some of 'em.
>
> Road trip!

Prolly.

> > Now Len can't
> > accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
> > some obscure reason.
> >
> Len who?

Oh you remember him James, the radio genius who needed 40Kw to QSO
W7/W6 from JA.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2830. Re: Another Challenge For Lennie the Loser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 21:33:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402181333.97f92c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87506

Wassa matter, Your Scumminess...?!?!

Not able to answer the question? Too difficult for you? Or are
you UNWILLING to answer the question becasue you already know that the
HONEST answer would unravell yet another LennieRant?

YOU are the ALLEGED electrical engineering "professional"...So
where's the answers?

Don't sweat it...The answer is in your silence.

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402160102.68ee1630@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214154746.06226.00002939@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> > In article <30pXb.2360$t16.1953873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >"Maximus" <nomail@here.com> wrote in message
> > >news:ZRhXb.3389$WW3.1211@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >> It may work, but I question how well. One reason for granting permission is
> > >> to extend internet to rural areas that can't be served by conventinal means.
> > >
> > >Serving the rural areas happens to be the biggest marketing lie in the whole
> > >mess. It won't be econmically feasible in the rural areas. There simply
> > >are not enough customers per square mile to justify the amount of equipment
> > >(e.g. signal boosters and transformer bypasses) that will have to be
> > >installed.
> >
> > You "know" all those technical things from experience and learning
> > how to twiddle a morse key in amateur radio?
>
> Morse Code has WHAT to do with rural economics, Your Putziness?
> Dee made no such analogy.
>
> The points Dee made are the VERY SAME ones that sway countless
> other economic decisions in rural areas, including phone/DSL
> distribution, public utilities, and even the placement of hospitals,
> police and fire fighting assets.
>
> Unless YOU can prove diffrently?
>

> > Please point to a trade-technical press with detailed technical
> > information on any of the proposed BPL systems. Detailed
> > descriptions including signal levels, not computer simulations
> > based on assumptions.
>
> What assumptions have to be made, Your Scumminess? Distribution
> and relay support for BPL signals WILL have to be made. Again...YOU
> can prove differently? BPL can be distributed from ONE source WITHOUT
> adequate relay facilities to ensure network patency?
>
> Have at it, Mr Professional...YOU show us how BPL can be deployed
> WITHOUT distribution and relay facilities...
>
> We're waiting...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

2831. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 22:28:28 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a9d86ebe1208bc9989690@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 87507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>, russ@russradioshop.com says...

> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.

I ordered some filters for an Icom 706 from them last summer.
Prompt, courteous service, only one filter backordered, and it shipped
exactly when they said it would (earlier, come to think of it).

I'd say deal with them with confidence. I've never had a problem,
anyway.

--
Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
"If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped
with surreal ports?"

2832. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 22:40:03 UTC
From: "Mark S. Holden" <mark@bmas.org>
Message-ID: <GJGdnRpkV8V3dK7dRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87508
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Steve Wolf wrote:
> My telephone introduction is, "I'd like to get a price on an item but only
> if you have it in stock and can ship it immediately". That filters the
> just-in-time philosophy out of the ordering process.
>
> 73,
> Steve, W8IZ
>
>

Only if the dealer you call is honest.

2833. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 22:51:45 UTC
From: pm4hire@excite.com
Message-ID: <52a66032.0402181451.6122052a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I bought a new radio from Universal Radio
and got a radio that didn't work and was a
return from a prior sale.

THe people at Universal Radio restock used
radios and sell them as new.

FUCK UNIVERSAL RADIO, I will never do business
with these crooks again.

Tom Welch

2834. Re: ARRL Proposal----What should happen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 23:26:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402181526.367aabe1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87510

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40336C69.9010504@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <4c2c4239eb00afa954360a5969177e32@news.teranews.com>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

> >>The proposal that the arrl should be working on is increasing the membership
> >>ranks instead of trying to change the system of licensure that has been
> >>discussed to death here. What, theres like around 25% of all hams that are
> >>members??

> > True - but what percentage of active hams are members? I think you'll find > > it's a
lot higher than 25%.
>
> True. Is there anyone out there that has any idea how many hams out of
> the total number licensed ARE active? I suspect that its something that
> would be hard to find, since the ARRL is likely more interested in the
> larger total number licensed.

Nobody really knows!

In fact, the first step is to define what is meant by "active". I know hams with little or no equipment whose only activity is showing up at Field Day each year - at which time they do a year's worth of work!

I also know hams with quite elaborate stations who only turn them on a few times a year. And others with modest stations (yes, even "shack on a belt" stations) who are on the air every day. Etc.

And there's various forms of inactivity. Some have truly lost interest (you could say that dying is the ultimate loss of interest) while others would love to be active but are genuinely tied up with other things like jobs and schools and family responsibilities. Or CC&Rs.
>
> I know most of the hams I associate with and know are active are
> members.
>
I find it varies all over the place. Some very inactive folks are members, some very active folks are not, etc.

> >>If the arrl is "sooooo good" then they should be working towards
> >>increasing the membership.

> > They are! Note that the license proposal offers a free upgrade of license
> > class to 57% of licensed US hams....
>
> Imagine if 25 percent of the ~400K new HF access hams join the ARRL?

400K new HF access hams? There are only about 200K Techs who don't
have HF now.

> Of
> course some of us think that might be the wrong way to go about it....
>
The effects may not be as dramatic as some suppose.

> >>Not only would this actually help to lower the cost of membership by
> >>spreading the costs of doing business over a bigger spread, but also give
> >>more strength and credibility to the organization.

> > Sure! Now, how can ARRL increase membership?
>
> Their new Elmering program is a good start. That it is on the internet
> is a good idea too. New hams will be coming into the service as much by
> the internet as by the more traditional methods.

Maybe.

There was a really good article some years back about why people
become hams. I wish I could find it again.

Basically the author identified three types of ham: the operator, the
communicator, and the tinkerer/builder.

The operator becomes a ham to operate radios - just for the heck of
it. DXers and contest ops are probably the best examples of this type.

The communicator becomes a ham to have conversations and exchange
messages. The ragchewer, honeydewer and public service type are
probably the best example.

The tinkerer/builder becomes a ham to do radio technology for fun. The
ham who always has a project going but is rarely on the air is this
type.

Of course most real hams are a combination, with a varying mix.

In the past, there wasn't much competition for these folks, because
for most ordinary people the only electronic communication options
were the telephone and ham radio. A sizable number of people got
licenses primarily to keep in touch with family members, make phone
patches, etc. In a similar fashion, the tinkerer/builders were
attracted by all the homebrewing.

But with the communications developments of the past few decades, ham
radio is no longer the only or even the primary option. Families who
used to all get ham licenses for honeydew purposes now just get cell
phones and/or FRS-GMRS setups. The techno folks have computers. Almost
everyone has email and cheap long distance.

Not so long ago, a phone patch home or a MARS message from a soldier
or sailor was a big deal. Now a lot of that is done by email, direct
from the war zone to home. (Friend of mine has daily emails with SO in

Iraq, for example).

So what's left are those who want to be hams because it offers
something those other services and technologies do not. Talking to
someone half a world away is no big deal anymore - but doing it on
your own personal radio setup with no intermediary network *is* a big
deal for some of us.

> Here are two things that are a little tricky that they need to work on.
> IMO, they need to convey spectrum threat as a serious thing without
> getting too shrill about it. I think they do a pretty good job now, but
> there always seems to be a few people out there that get panicky. Not a
> good way to get introduced to Ham radio when a prospective amateur gets
> to think that maybe there is no reason to get a license when s/he won't
> be able to operate because of (name the threat)

OTOH there's also the "boy who cried wolf" problem.
>
> Second, and I have no idea if this is even possible, is how to propose
> anything without alienating a lot of Hams. I'm not sure about this one,
> because from what I've seen, a number of Hams will probably be
> dissatisfied no matter what the ARRL does. Maybe they are just
> dissatisfied in general?

It's like politics:

There are some people who will vote Democrat no matter what.
There are some people who will vote Republican no matter what.
There are some people who will not vote no matter what.
There are some people who will vote for third parties no matter what.

And there are some people who are open to being convinced. They are
the ones to go after.

>>>a good percentage
> >>of the members being in the 55+ range there seems to be a good need to come
> >>up with new people to add to the membership ranks.
> >
> >
> > Age alone is not really a major factor because people are living longer, and
> > many newer hams are from the ranks of the retired and near-retired. One of the
> > *big* reasons you don't see many 20-, 30-, and 40-somethings at hamfests is
> > that they're too busy working and raising familes these days.
>
> Glad to hear that from someone else!

I have known many, many new hams in the past 20 years who got into ham
radio after age 50, and even 60, because they'd never had the time or
resources before. Great folks, but they do skew the demographics!

> New and young Hams are a good
> thing, but I think some people get obsessed with the perceived need to
> have all these Hams licensed in Jr. high school.

Part of that is the simple fact that we need diversity. Note how most
of the really young hams are girls....

> More important is new and active Hams.

AGREED! What good are big numbers if they're inactive?
>
> As time goes on, I am becoming more and more convinced that the digital
> modes are *very* important to attracting new hams to the hobby. The kids
> are usually very interested in anything that has to do with a computer,
> and many of the older prospects find it fascinating too.

Yup - but also note that they are also fascinated by Morse Code, in
part because to them it is new and unique. They've grown up with
computers but radiotelegraphy is something new, exciting and unique to
them.

> >>How about this for a marketing idea?? If the arrl recieves 200,000 new
> >>subscriptions for 2004 then they rebate some of the cost of the subscription
> >>rate as it is now? (Thats 200,000 over the existing memberships)

> >
> > It would have to be structred in such a way that existing members would get the
> > benefit, too.
> >
> > Maybe it could work like this: If membership grows by a certain number, every
> > member gets a rebate coupon worth a certain amount, good towards any ARRL
> > publication or membership.
>
> Why do so many think that league membership is so expensive anyway?
> Between the QST subscription and the members access to the webpages, the
> ARRL is one of the best bargains around. Oh, and they do other things to
> help us too!

All depends on the perception. $39 all at once seems a lot more than
11 cents a day. If someone views it as just a magazine, it's
expensive. But it's not just a magazine.
>
> >>Again, the license class/testing situation as it stands now is just fine and
> >>does not need any more changes for a while.
> >
> > I disagree slightly. I think the entry-level license should be more balanced
> > between HF and VHF-UHF. But that's about it.
> >
> > More important, what's all the rush?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Work on promotion and building
> >>from within before trying to recruit more.
> >

> Did you write that line, Jim?

Ryan did.

> In any event, I think both need to be done at the same time.

Agreed - in fact, the two can work together.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2835. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-18 23:38:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4033F76F.8F5ACE43@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87511

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:

> > > number of times on biz in Cincinnati and in KY. Where is WLW vs. the
> > > airport?
> >
> > The studios are downtown. The transmitter is up north of the city near
> > Mason, Ohio in the same general area as the VOA relay station was
> > located.
>
> Dunno where I got the notion it was on the Kentucky side of the crick.

You're likely thinking of the old WCKY at 1530 on the dial. It is now
WSAI which was at 1360. Confusing enough for you? WCKY was owned by
L.B. Wilson, a Kentuckian and the call stood for W Covington KentuckY.
Transmitters are on a hilltop overlooking Covington and the studios are
in downtown Cincinnati.

> > > They did some engine, exhaust system and suspension mods then
> > > shoehorned the engine into the Hawk. "The rest is history . . " The
> > > thing ate Corvettes for breakfast . . It still exists in a barn near
> > > Coatesville.
> >
> > Neat story. We were at the other end of the automotive spectrum. Dad
> > owned a '51 Pontiac and one day, one of the plugs unscrewed itself and
> > put a pretty good dent in the hood. Pop traded it for a decidedly
> > unglamorous '60 AMC wagon.
>
> Hey I been there. Had a '64 Rambler American followed by a '72 AMC
> Hornet Sportabout wagon. Then I bought my first Honda in '81. New
> ballgame.

Dad tried a couple of Buicks but has owned a number of Merc Grand
Marquis Limiteds over the last couple of decades. I'm a small car guy.
I'm now on my third Dodge Neon, this one is bright yellow and has a
spoiler.

> I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .
> .

I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.

> > > sketch to VW, a VW functionary called back immediately and told 'em
> > > "Yeah, that's it, run with it!" They slapped patent papers on it and
> > > put it into production.
> >
> > It does sound as if it runs in the family.
>
> Seems like. A cousin made a bloody fortune with his advertsing agency,
> "retired" into being the Art Director for the Franklin Mint, was
> elected a Fellow in the American Water Color Society and at 86 he
> still has one-man shows in NYC twice a month. He's also a train nut, a
> Pennsy fan. I have one of his train watercolors, one of his few
> whimsical blasts from the past. One of these days I'll cobble together
> a website and post it.

Do it!

> > > > I bought an S-40A from W7LR a few years back.
> > > >
> > > Still have it?
> > >
> > Oh yes, fully restored and sitting on a shelf to my right.
>
> Uh-huh . . . Hmmm . .
>
> > > I'm not sure if I was ever aware of Loewy's role in the S-40 or not.
> > > But I am now. It's definitely a "coherent" design. That was his trick,
> > > integrate form and function. Not much of a rcvr though.
> > >
> > No, not at all. Hallicrafters (and many other firms) were still building
> > the same basic receivers in a variety of cabinets through the decades
> > with few innovations or variations.
>
> AMC >> Honda. Hallicrafters >> Kenwood.
>
> >
> > > > W4JBP willed me his 1937 Hallicrafters Sky Challenger years back.
> > > >
> > > . . . there's a gooder . . . get it yet?
> > >
> > Sure do. It sits next to the S-40A. The engraved German silver dial is
> > super looking.
>
> There's some trip bait . . I've always wanted to listen to one of
> those '30s rcvrs but never had the oportunity.

My HRO is the mechanical marvel but for performance, I'd have to say
that the RME-69 has it beat. If we talk about the modern era, I'm
partial to the 75A-3 (modified to A-4 with the Universal Radio product
detector) for the ham bands and the 51S-1 for general coverage.

> You might enjoy this link.
>

> http://www.almo.com/corporate/history.asp

I'll take a look.

> In the end what matters is today and my view is that when it comes to
> finding "good stuff" it's all out on the web in volumes the Almos and
> RESCOS of days of yore never had.
>
> > I've noted Globe King 500-C's going for $3,000+. I was amazed to get
> > $775 for a 51J-4 the year before last.
>
> NICE radio!

It fell into my "if you don't turn it on and use it" category. I found
other uses for the money. I need to reduce the size of my collection of
heavy iron and increase the number of dollars. I can use the dollars
for modern marvels.

> Tell me, I have a zonked TS-940SAT with all the options except the
> voice card, it's been updated by the Kenwood factory shop to the final
> production design and it's loaded with filters. I love the radio but
> it's full of creaky old point-to-point wiring, weird switches,
> unmarked ICs, etc. I found a local shop which specializes in 930/940s
> and as soon as I get it fixed I'm gonna dump it and run with the money
> while it's still worth a few bucks.

Not a bad idea. I think I may have told you that OH7XM was trying to
repair a TS-850 for a fellow in Helsinki. He found that the frequency
display unit is no longer available. That's one of the things which has
kept me away from K'wood.

>
> > "There were some local QRPers up the hill last week, the group including
> > one of those serious types. His beady eyes were everywhere, questioning
> > and checking. And the QRPers got to talking of Red Eye and the Palo
> > Verdes bunch, and Slim and the Hero of Mafeking. So we had to tell them
> > about the JA who in all seriousness had asked that alongside the obscure
> > jokes we place an explanation of what we meant. Perhaps we should have
> > kept the file sealed. 'Jokes?', says this serious one. 'Obscure jokes?
> > Where are they? Why, I've been reading the bulletin for some years now
> > and while there are things that sometimes I do not understand, I have
> > not noticed any jokes.' Son of a Gun!! What does one do in a situation
> > like that? The sky was blue, the day was warm and there had been a slow
> > joy in the group as they talked. But we realized that like a lot of
> > things, humor and DX and home cooking, that most things are relative and
> > sometimes more so. So we told the beady-eyed one that we would
> > underline them in his copy from now on, a service that perhaps others
> > might want and use. And for $14.00 a year, the enigmas of DX will
> > comeyour way in inscrutable prose, tangled, twisted and tortured...and
> > maybe stretched a bit. $18.00 will fling it at you by first-class mail
> > to the U.S./VE areas. $20.00 will fly it far down the moonpath to
> > Mexico and all the lands below the Tropic of Cancer and beyond the

> > meridians. Someday we may get the message...someday someone might get
> > the message to us."
>
> Heh. Yeah, I gotta read some of 'em. We used to needle the clueless,
> the innocnet and the gullible with our "secret communications" from
> the "Bowling Team Captain's Committee".

Not too much changes. After all, we're still needling the clueless, the
innocent and the gullible.

> > I don't support the ARRL's "gimme" for tens of thousands.
>
> Ham radio has bigger problems than this one.

I don't know that they're bigger. They're mostly just "other".

> > Now Len can't
> > accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
> > some obscure reason.
>
> A Putz is a Putz is a Putz, whatta bore.

We're not dealing with ordinary here. This one was in the BIG TIME once
upon a time.

Dave K8MN

2836. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 00:41:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87512

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
> >
> >They were magnificent beasts, no question about that and they're
> >probably the most memorable of the PRR power roster.
>
> 230 tons, 79-1/2 feet long, 4620 continuous horsepower, over 8000 hp short
> term. In revenue service for almost 50 years.
>
> >Unfortuantely
> >they "didn't get around" all that much because of the limited amount
> >of PRR electrified mileage.
> >
> 2677 track miles, give or take. Washington Union Station to New York Penn
> Station, also Philadelphia to Harrisburg, several freight lines and numerous
> commuter lines around Philly.

Like I sed they didn't get around all that much . . .

> Oddly enough, it was the New Haven which pioneered AC electrification, and
> eventually the GG-1s went all the way to New Haven under NH wires.

Yeah, yeah, all the way to New Haven, whoopee. In the meanwhile
steamers had been running close headers from NYC all the way to Boston
in the 1800s on the same roadbed. What was it . . only five years ago
that an electric *finally* made it from NYC to Boston for the first
time? On the taxpayer's dime of course. Bleh!!

> >real trains on the West Chester line. Watching an inbound GG-1 pulling
> >a long string of 80 foot smoothside coaches glide into Clifton-Aldan
> >station was like a religious experience . .
>
> On 100 pound rail, no less...

The GG-1 rail loads were nothin' compared with the daily freights
which hauled ballast outta the quarries in western Delaware County in
those days 100 lb rail be damned. And they're still at it too.

Just a few years ago at some ungodly wee hour I got hungry and went to
the Wawa at Primos Station to dredge up a hoagie. There was an

outbound freight parked at the station, three big Geeps and a line of hoppers that wound out of sight around the Merion Ave. curve. I did a triple take, it was all orange AMTRAK equipment. A trainman had manually opened the Oak Ave. crossing gates and was waving traffic over the crossing while his buddies were tanking up on coffee and eats in the Wawa.

I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong. Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at Penn,
> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
> train as it went overhead...

. . . ya peeping Tom . . !

> >Much later in life I did a good bit of business with the electric car
> >shops in Wilmington DE which is where the Pennsy based it's GG-1 fleet
> >and where Amtrak still headquarters it's electrics. More GG-1 tales: I
> >don't know where it is now but during that timeframe the shops
> >completely tore down an reassembled a museum-quality GG-1. Ya could
> >use the paint as a mirror . .
>
> That was 1977, GG-1 4935, repainted in the classic Brunswick Green livery. I
> think it is now in Strasburg. Raymond Loewy, (born in Paris in 1893), was on
> hand for the intial run of the restored 4935 (May 15, 1977).
>
> 4877 was repainted Tuscan red and wound up with NJT (New Jersey Transit). 4859
> was also redone and last time I saw it was under the shed in Harrisburg
> station.
>
> There are others in museums but those are the best known.

16 of 'em are still out there.

> >I saw the GG-1 they cut in half and
> >converted into a brush-burner, the GG-1/2.
>
> Actually a G-1 - the term "GG" comes from the wheel arrangement, two G
> arrangements back to back. "G" meaning two leading/trailing axles and three
> powered axles.

<groan . . > The brush burner was known as "Old Halfie".

> >And the GG-1 they turned
> >into a monster snow blower.
>
> 4846 was cut in half, you may be thinking of one and the same unit.

Tust me, it wasn't particulary difficult to discern the difference between a half of a GG-1 reworked into a brush burner parked on a

track just west of the main shop and the complete GG-1 snow plow
parked in the field on the west side of the transfer slide. Sheesh . .
!

> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25 Hz
> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
> traction motors would have been impractical.
>
> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz back
> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to 25
> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and tunnel,
> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of every
> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>
> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of 100+
> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do over
> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.

Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
> >not as toxic.
>
> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
> removed for the obvious reason.

But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
might run again.

> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA at 25
> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
> "professional" radio.

WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
xfmrs.

> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any of
> the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.

It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.

> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...

The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue service like I did?

Thought so . .

The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared with the steamers.

Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:

In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails, the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had 424 more built.

K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2837. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 00:53:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <PNTYb.10382$W74.8701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87513

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040218060007.23171.00004174@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <pGCYb.9603$hm4.924@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >Also, take a look at the upcoming expirations in the next
> >> >6 months...some pretty hefty numbers of hams with
> >> >expirations coming up.
> >>
> >> All that means is that the dates when today's hams got their licenses
are
> >> not
> >> evenly distributed. Renewal dates are driven by things like rules
changes
> >> and vanity gates.
> >
> >True, but if the non-renewal rate is the same then I predict a total drop
of
> >all hams by something on the order of 10K by year's end.
>
> Perhaps. But where are your numbers, Bill? How many licenses were due to
expire
> in, say, 2003, vs. how many were renewed? (IOW, what % were renewed?)
>
> I did some quick figuring and found that for 2003, for every 11 license
> renewed, 1 was renewed in the grace period.
> >
> >> >I expect at least a 10K overall
> >> >reduction of licensed hams by end of 2004 based on
> >> >SK, lack of interest, etc. based on past renewal rates.
> >> >
> >> Another WAG, Bill?
> >
> >SWAG!
>
> How about some numbers to back it up?

The reduction in total licenses has been about 3K since
the high point some months back. As for going into any
real number crunching, I ask what for? You must have
more spare time than I do. My prediction is just that...
a prediction based on what I think has been the renewal
situation and the greater number of expirations that

Speroni shows will happen this year.

> >> Note that even if a license is due to expire in, say, June
> >> 2004, there is a 27 month window during which it can be renewed. How do
we
> >> capture all of that?
> >
> >True, but...
> >Look at Speroni's grace period renewals for the last few
> >years. No big numbers there.
>
> For every 11 renewals there was 1 in the grace period.
>
> Note also that despite huge numbers of actual expirations there have not
been
> big decreases in license totals.
>
> Will any of the proposed rules changes make a difference in these trends?

If someone is SK, I doubt it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2838. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 01:06:31 UTC
From: GlennS <GlennVA56@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <nc183050o874e6bcnuupqicpimppo5g5lb@4ax.com>
Source record: 87514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 18 Feb 2004 14:51:45 -0800, pm4hire@excite.com (Tom Welch) wrote:

>I bought a new radio from Universal Radio
>and got a radio that didn't work and was a
>return from a prior sale.
>
>THe people at Universal Radio restock used
>radios and sell them as new.
>
>FUCK UNIVERSAL RADIO, I will never do business
>with these crooks again.
>
>Tom Welch

But would you recommend them to others?

Glenn S.

2839. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:00:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218210017.25815.00006758@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87515

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2840. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:03:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <fQUYb.1974$4E5.1095@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87516

Steve,

Regardless of where anyone stands on the code/no code issue, it appears there are two groups of folks. One group will step up to the plate and do what is necessary to obtain the license if they really want it. The other group simply waits until the requirements are reduced or dropped altogether. Yep, if I had wanted to wait until the code was dropped to 5 words per minute, I'd have waited 40 years. By that time, I'd have forgotten the code and since there was talk about eliminating the code, I'd still be waiting ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:5c01b95b.0402170601.133a60ca@posting.google.com...
> Darn shame it's still the only radio transmitter you can legally use, too...
>
> Seve, K4YZ

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.592 / Virus Database: 375 - Release Date: 2/18/04

2841. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:11:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218211141.02537.00003032@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87517

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2842. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:13:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87518

You miss the point. I'm interested in showing how this BPL is a two-way street.

Beacons are legal on 10 meters. 6 meters would also likely be effective. I'd prefer not using 20 meters for a 40 miles circuit which would require a considerable signal and also cause that signal to be stronger thousands of miles away. I'm interested in a band that isn't open and working someone far enough away to require 50 watts or more. That is how you demonstrate the two-way possibilities of BPL. Ya keep it all legal.

Daytime 160 or 75 meters would also require a fair amount of power for a 60 mile or so circuit, but you wouldn't generate the e-fields which would bother the BPL as much (but, on second thought, those power lines are long and would tend to pick up quite a signal). You have given me another thought here ... :))

You see, if an unlicensed transmitter is going to put some electric field into my receiver, I simply want to return the favor - with interest.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0402170934.33854b35@posting.google.com...
>
> But, but, but...
>
> Jim, all you need is a wet noodle and you can work the world on the
"kiddie band."

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.592 / Virus Database: 375 - Release Date: 2/18/04

2843. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:15:36 UTC
From: Hamguy <hamguy@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <c%UYb.68401$n62.1279@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 87519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Two thumbs up!...and generally cheaper than AES.

"Tom Welch" <pm4hire@excite.com> wrote in message
news:52a66032.0402181451.6122052a@posting.google.com...
> I bought a new radio from Universal Radio
> and got a radio that didn't work and was a
> return from a prior sale.
>
> THe people at Universal Radio restock used
> radios and sell them as new.
>
> FUCK UNIVERSAL RADIO, I will never do business
> with these crooks again.
>
> Tom Welch

2844. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:20:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218212048.02537.00003033@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87520

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2845. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:46:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218214653.08626.00003150@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87521

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2846. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 02:49:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218214912.25517.00004363@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87522

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2847. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 03:18:45 UTC
From: "Eric F. Richards" <efricha@dim.com>
Message-ID: <da7830d1og8rajt6rp5c0trdbek2ri11th@4ax.com>
Source record: 87523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote:

> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>

I've had similar experiences. You are told the product is in stock
until the order is completed, then they tell you the item is
backordered.

I did want to test a Ten-Tec RX-340 there, and when the lady who
answered the phone asked someone else if I could test the radio, she
was told, "hell no, that's a $4000 radio."

So I drove to Ten-Tec and was given free-reign to play with the radio.
I bought one, from Ten-Tec, two months later.

All that said, Universal is kinda the lesser of two evils in the
shortwave supply biz. I look elsewhere when I can, such as Ham Radio
Outlet or one of the myriad national mail-order scanner shops.

--
Eric F. Richards, efricha@dim.com
"Nature abhors a vacuum tube." -- J. R. Pierce, Bell Labs, c. 1940

2848. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 03:21:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218222112.25517.00004364@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87524

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2849. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 03:59:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040218225951.08626.00003153@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 87525

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2850. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 05:47:01 UTC
From: sdl <lyles@erols.com>
Message-ID: <40344e4d$0$3079$61fed72c@news.rcn.com>
Source record: 87526
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Rusty In Lousiville,

I had a negative experience and would *not* recommend Universal Radio.
Alternatively, I *would* recommend C Crane Radio and/or Grove Radio:
I have made satisfactory purchases from both.

Good Luck
From sdl in Maryland.

Eric F. Richards wrote:
> "Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote:
>
>> I would like to get some opinions about
>> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>>
>> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
>> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
>> or more to back order.
>>
>
> I've had similar experiences. You are told the product is in stock
> until the order is completed, then they tell you the item is
> backordered.
>
> I did want to test a Ten-Tec RX-340 there, and when the lady who
> answered the phone asked someone else if I could test the radio, she
> was told, "hell no, that's a $4000 radio."
>
> So I drove to Ten-Tec and was given free-reign to play with the
radio.
> I bought one, from Ten-Tec, two months later.
>
> All that said, Universal is kinda the lesser of two evils in the
> shortwave supply biz. I look elsewhere when I can, such as Ham
Radio
> Outlet or one of the myriad national mail-order scanner shops.

2851. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 05:53:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402182153.3c5e1249@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87527

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040214192433.12501.00006204@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <20040214165542.08626.00003103@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

> >I've been in the heaven of ham radio for almost 37 years now, Helmut. Last
> >night I worked an OK1 on 40 CW and an F5 on 80 CW with my 100W
> >homebrew rig. Got the OK1 on the first buzz but there was quite a pile on
> >the F5.
>
> You didn't answer the question...

Lennie...

YOU have NO BUSINESS chastising ANYONE for not answering any
questions...You have so many unanswered questions addressed to YOU out
there that even if you did start answering them (honestly or
otherwise...), the sun would nova before we got through them all.

> Except in here where "lesser" individuals are considered bottom-
> feeding slime, unworthy of saying anything... :-)

The only "lesser" people "in here" are those who lie, decieve and
antagonize...Such as yourself, for example.

Steve, K4YZ

2852. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 09:12:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402190112.e10d47f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87528

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040218210017.25815.00006758@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> >> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
>
> >I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
> >lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
> >Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.
>
> I coulda told ya THAT!
>
> >> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
> >> Penn,
> >> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
> >> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
> >> train as it went overhead...
> >
> >. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
> >
> Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....
>
>
> >> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
> >
> >16 of 'em are still out there.
>
> Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.
>
> >> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
> Hz
> >> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
> >> traction motors would have been impractical.
> >>
> >> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
> back

> >> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
> 25
> >> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
> tunnel,
> >> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of
> every
> >> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
> >> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
> >> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
> >>
> >> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
> >> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
> 100+
> >> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
> over
> >> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
> >
> >Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
> >sparkies anywhere near the railroads.
>
> Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
> Tubes...
> >
> >> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
> >> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
> >> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
> >> >not as toxic.
> >>
> >> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
> >> removed for the obvious reason.
> >
> >But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
> >might run again.
>
> The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
> now.
> >
> >> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
> >> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
> at 25
> >> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
> >> "professional" radio.
> >
> >WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
> >xfmrs.
>
> No it didn't.
>
> WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.
>

> The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
> powered axles.
> >
> >> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
> >> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
> >> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
> >
> >It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
> >which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
> >
> All that's needed is one near some energized wire.
>
> >> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
> >
> >The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
> >rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.
>
> The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20
> cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level
> Route....
> >
> >When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
> >service like I did?
>
> Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to
> 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy
> colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.
>
> >Thought so . .
>
> When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?
>
> Thought so...
>
> Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than
> the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space
> - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else.
> Low envter of gravity.
> >
> >The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
> >with the steamers.
>
> One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the
> wheels and into the power plant...
> >
> >Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
> >
> >In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
> >be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
> >the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had

> >424 more built.
>
> Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for
> everything.
> >
> >K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
> >the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
> >
> Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping
> water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected
> by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).
>
> Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.
>
> Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive
> trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

. . Jim . . . good heavens . . seven identical posts . . ?

You homebrewed yer own computer right?

2853. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 09:51:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040219045144.02537.00003046@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87529

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2854. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 09:52:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040219045243.02537.00003047@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87530

In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....

>I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.

I coulda told ya THAT!

>> I remember walking between 30th Street station in Philly and classes at
>> Penn,
>> and passing under the elevated freight line west of the station while GG-1
>> pulled trains went overhead. One could look up and see the underside of the
>> train as it went overhead...
>
>. . . ya peeping Tom . . !
>
Got to see all her axles and the quill drive, too.....

>> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
>
>16 of 'em are still out there.

Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

>> In the 1970s there was a lot of talk about converting the original 11 kV 25
>Hz
>> catenary system to 25 kV 60 Hz. Conversion of the older units with their AC
>> traction motors would have been impractical.
>>
>> However, research showed that the NHRR folks who had chosen 11 kV 25 Hz
>back
>> around the turn of the 19th century knew what they were doing. Changing to
>25
>> kV 60 Hz would have meant increasing clearances at every overpass and
>tunnel,
>> changing every single insulator in the catenary structure, replacement of

>every
>> existing substation and installation of at least as many new ones. Plus
>> complete replacement of the signal and electrification system components
>> connected to the track. Simply cost too much and the ROI wasn't there.
>>
>> By the time all this was figured out, the decision to phase out the older
>> equipment had proceeded too far to economically stop. Although capable of
>100+
>> MPH, newer equipment such as the AEM-7 family of rectifier locos could do
>over
>> 125 MPH, and the new Acela trainsets over 150 MPH, so the die was cast.
>
>Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
>sparkies anywhere near the railroads.

Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
Tubes...
>
>> >but that's apparently not the case, the changeover
>> >never happened so operating a GG-1 should still be possible. *IF* they
>> >can replace the original PCB-laced transformer oil to an oil which is
>> >not as toxic.
>>
>> Actually all of the ones that went to museums had their main transformers
>> removed for the obvious reason.
>
>But then they didn't all go to museums did they? Hmmm? One of those
>might run again.

The ones that didn't go to museums were scrapped. Tin cans and house wiring
now.
>
>> The biggest problem would be getting a custom
>> made replacement transformer. Let's see, 4620 x 746 equals about 3500 kVA
>at 25
>> Hz - that's a bit larger than the weenie little things used in radio, even
>> "professional" radio.
>
>WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
>xfmrs.

No it didn't.

WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

The motors on just one axle of a GG-1 do more than that. And there are six
powered axles.
>
>> It is quite possible that a GG-1 that has been kept indoors could get a new
>> transformer and run again. The main problem is that it's doubtful that any
>> of the electrified railroads left would want a one-of-a-kind unit.
>

>It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
>which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
>
All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

>> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
>
>The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
>rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.

The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20 cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level Route....
>
>When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
>service like I did?

Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

>Thought so . .

When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Thought so...

Oddly enough, above the truck level inside a GG-1 there's not much other than the main transformer and the center cab. The slopin ends are mostly empty space - coupla traction motor blowers, and the steam generator, but not much else. Low envter of gravity.
>
>The GG-1 is a great niche piece but that's all it ever was compared
>with the steamers.

One could even say that all any electrics did was move the steam boiler off the wheels and into the power plant...
>
>Snippts by recognized authorities on the subject:
>
>In 1914 the Pennsylvania Railroad built, what many people believe to
>be, one of the most famous Locomotives to have ever roamed the rails,
>the K4 Class 4-6-2 Pacific. It was so successful that the Pennsy had
>424 more built.

Oh yes, no argument, they built 'em in Altoona as I recall and used 'em for everything.
>
>K4s #3678 - This is one of 4 K4s's that was Streamlined in 1940 with
>the help of Industrial Artist Raymond Loewy.
>
Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route, scooping water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected

by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2855. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 10:54:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <2C0Zb.10893$W74.4234@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"GlennS" wrote:
>
> (Tom Welch) wrote:
> > (snip) FUCK UNIVERSAL RADIO, I will
> > never do business with these crooks again.
>
>
> But would you recommend them to others?

LOL. That was pretty good, Glenn.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2856. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 11:01:37 UTC
From: Sanjaya <sanjaya_49@yahooNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <ll0Zb.12$aT1.7@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87532
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Tom Welch" wrote..
> I bought a new radio from Universal Radio
> and got a radio that didn't work and was a
> return from a prior sale.
[snip]

What radio was that???
Not your Kaito KA1102 I hope!

2857. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 11:07:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wN0Zb.10895$W74.847@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87533
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rusty in Louisville" wrote:
>
> I would like to get some opinions
> about Universal Radio, Inc., located
> in Reynoldsburg, Ohio. (snip)

I've had mixed results with Universal Radio - one order went well and another didn't. I've had slightly better results with Burghardt (www.burghardt-amateur.com) and their prices are often better. However, since you added a shortwave newsgroup to your message, I should point out that their primary focus is on Amateur Radio, with very little shortwave equipment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2858. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 11:32:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040219063201.29660.00003002@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87534

In article <d22b54c3.0402190112.e10d47f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>. . Jim . . . good heavens . . seven identical posts . . ?

AOL is messed up somehow. I'm getting multiple copies of everything. I watch the outgoing AutoAOL session and there are no postings being sent, yet I get back copies of stuff posted hours ago.
>
>You homebrewed yer own computer right?

Problem ain't at this end.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2859. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 13:33:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402190533.e664b06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87535

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>...
> You miss the point. I'm interested in showing how this BPL is a two-way
> street.
>
> Beacons are legal on 10 meters. 6 meters would also likely be effective.
> I'd prefer not using 20 meters for a 40 miles circuit

Not a circuit.

which would require a
> considerable signal and also cause that signal to be stronger thousands of
> miles away. I'm interested in a band that isn't open and working someone
> far enough away to require 50 watts or more. That is how you demonstrate
> the two-way possibilities of BPL. Ya keep it all legal.

Your entire response is conspiracy to commit an illegal act:
intentional interference.

> Daytime 160 or 75 meters would also require a fair amount of power for a 60
> mile or so circuit, but you wouldn't generate the e-fields which would
> bother the BPL as much (but, on second thought, those power lines are long
> and would tend to pick up quite a signal). You have given me another
> thought here ... :))

I don't recall mentioning MW.

> You see, if an unlicensed transmitter is going to put some electric field
> into my receiver, I simply want to return the favor - with interest.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

You might want to run it by the ARRL and/or Riley. ;^)

2860. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 13:50:27 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040219085027.731$VI@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87536

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:
> You might want to run it by the ARRL and/or Riley. ;^)
>
Riley and his cronies are part of the problem, not the cure. ;)

--
Go 40 42 12

2861. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 16:23:36 UTC
From: k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com
Message-ID: <e1b5119f.0402190823.5b9b5230@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87537
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW) wrote in message
news:<20040217132606.21817.00002283@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >To Whom it may concern... The person posting this, Douglas Adair, of
> >Toledo, Ohio. has been doing this to me for over 2 years. All of this
> >is being forwarded to my lawyer, Levon King, who is also the Mayor of
> >Allen Park, Michigan. Levon is going to contact the local Mayor of
> >Toledo, ohio and see if a complaint can be filed against Mr. adair for
> >his actions. Mr. Adair, I would seriously advise you, if you don't
> >want to end up in a court of law for harrashment charges, and a
> >lawsuit for slander, I would advise you to cease and desist.
> >otherwise, I will get a court order against you.
> >
> >I do have a lawyer. and I will use him, if need be.
> >
> >-Chuck K8CPA
> >
> >P.S. You're picking the wrong fight.
EAT AN OLD FAT MAN'S DICK, YOU PUNK ASS MOTHERFUCKER! YOU ARE
POWERLESS TO DO A FUCKING THING, YOU CUNT ASS PIECE OF DOGSHIT!!!

HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>
>
>
>
> i agree 100% and chuck if you need me to testify against the jerk you know how
> to get ahold of me i've been watching this bafoon ruin this newsgroup for over
> 3 years and i think its rotten to see this idiot ruin a good group like this. i
> will do my part if i am needed
>
> NIW NIW STANDS FOR "NEVER IN WOMEN"!!! HAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAH
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW!

NIW is Chukkee-Sukkee...and you can shut your faggot assed cum sucking
sperm receptacle. You will never stop the AKC, and since this is not
who you think it is good luck doing a fucking thing.

WHATSAMATTER CHUKKEESUKKEE? LOSE YOUR 9MM PISTOL? THE LATIN COUNTS AND
THE IRON COFFINS NOT TAKING YOUR PHONE CALLS? YOUR MEDICATION SLOWING
YOU DOWN SOME???
YOU AINT SHIT BUT A LITTLE FAGGOT ACTING BAD BEHIND A KEYBOARD!!
Face it Chukkee---your OWN WORDS got you crossposted.
HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
AWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
WHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAW!

LIFE IS GOOD WHEN YOU AREN'T A FAGGOT ASS LIVING AT MOMMY'S HOUSE CUM
RECEPTACLE LIKE CHARLES ADKINS!!!!

2862. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 16:39:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402190839.526c19d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87538

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040218210017.25815.00006758@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> >> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
>
> >> There are others in museums but those are the best known.
> >>
> >16 of 'em are still out there.
>
> Meaning in museums. Which is good, because they're being taken care of.

No they're not all in museums and no they are not all "being taken
care of" either.

> >Further proof of my contention that they never oughta let you damned
> >sparkies anywhere near the railroads.
>
> Without us there'd be no Penn Station, no Grand Central, no subway, no Hudson
> Tubes...

Steamers ran coast to coast for years before there were any of those.

> >WLW ran 500,000 kVA *OUT*. Plus it had 250,000 kVA worth of modulation
> >xfmrs.
>
> No it didn't.
>
> WLW ran 500 kW - 500,000 WATTS, not kilowatts.

Rats: Caught again . . !

> >It ain't the railroads which run the museum pieces, it's the museums
> >which run 'em. Steamtown, etc.
> >
> All that's needed is one near some energized wire.

You're the sparky, volunteer.

> >> ahh, to hear the "duck call" air horn go by at over 100 mph once again...
> >
> >The call of the Ruptured Duck . . Ugliest sound to ever come off the
> >rails until the diesels trumped the GG-1.
>
> The rumble/whine of a pair of SD-45s (each rated 3600 Hp with turbocharged 20
> cylinder diesel) pulling an intermodal at 79 mph along the Water Level
> Route....

That ain't real railroading, that's just more boring-as-hell unit
material handling a la the conveyor lines in the UPS depots.

> >When was the last time YOU heard a steam whistle played in PRR revenue
> >service like I did?
>
> Couple years back when the Strasburg ran an excursion down the Main Line to
> 30th Street and back. Their two steamers are ex-Pennsy, they were in Pennsy
> colors and on Pennsy track. Plus they were hauling revenue passengers.

A Strasburg fan trip ain't Pennsy steam revenue service, not even
close. I dunno how many operable steamers the Starsburg has today but
OK, if it's only two one of 'em ain't from the Pennsy, it's a
fat-boiler job from some other road. The Pennsy only ever had one of
those in modern times, the K29 Pacific which was scrapped decades ago.

REAL Pennsy revenue steam was K4s double-heading a long string thru
Norwood toward Darby at night when ya could see the fireboxes glowing
in the dark from Grandma McHale's front porch . . Had the B&O too with
all it's grade crosssings and ya could hear their steam whistles in
Aldan. Loudly when the wind was blowing in the right direction.

> >Thought so . .
>
> When's the last time you were *inside* a GG-1 - not in a museum?

Wilmington shops. Twice. Once in a good-to-go unit and once in the
restored unit while the work was in progress.

> Thought so...

That's part of yer problem . .

> Still not as cool looking as the J-3 Hudsons on the Water Level Route,
> scooping
> water from the Tivoli pans at 100+ MPH. (Of course water scoops were perfected
> by the PRR and copied by Vanderbilt's little collection of branch lines).

Ah, even the RDG Seashore Line used 'em . .

> Or as ungodly powerful as a UP Big Boy or even a Niagara.

They'll do . . !

> Another thing PRR pioneered was radio on the RRs, starting with the inductive
> trainphone system *before* VHF FM radio was used on the rails...

I question whether that was actually "radio".

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2863. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 16:47:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4034E8A7.2060605@psu.edu>
Source record: 87539

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Steve,
>
> Regardless of where anyone stands on the code/no code issue, it appears
> there are two groups of folks. One group will step up to the plate and do
> what is necessary to obtain the license if they really want it.

There are two kinds of people. Those who divide everything into two
kinds, and those who don't. ;^)

> The other
> group simply waits until the requirements are reduced or dropped altogether.
> Yep, if I had wanted to wait until the code was dropped to 5 words per
> minute, I'd have waited 40 years. By that time, I'd have forgotten the code
> and since there was talk about eliminating the code, I'd still be waiting

And how! I only became interested in the ARS at the time that Morse was
already at 5wpm, but there were those that suggested I might want to
wait. Not a good idea. I'd still be waiting, and if my predictions pan
out, I'd still be waiting a few more years...

- Mike KB3EIA -

2864. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 16:50:41 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@homo.nut>
Message-ID: <c12ph109i4@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 87542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

I enjoy sniffing mens jock straps after they wear them in a frisbee game.

In article <e1b5119f.0402190823.5b9b5230@posting.google.com>, CHUCK ADKINS IS A
HOMO HYPOCRYTE says...
>
>niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW) wrote in message
>news:<20040217132606.21817.00002283@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >To Whom it may concern... The person posting this, Douglas Adair, of
>> >Toledo, Ohio. has been doing this to me for over 2 years. All of this
>> >is being forwarded to my lawyer, Levon King, who is also the Mayor of
>> >Allen Park, Michigan. Levon is going to contact the local Mayor of
>> >Toledo, ohio and see if a complaint can be filed against Mr. adair for
>> >his actions. Mr. Adair, I would seriously advise you, if you don't
>> >want to end up in a court of law for harrashment charges, and a
>> >lawsuit for slander, I would advise you to cease and desist.
>> >otherwise, I will get a court order against you.
>> >
>> >I do have a lawyer. and I will use him, if need be.
>> >
>> >-Chuck K8CPA
>> >
>> >P.S. You're picking the wrong fight.
>EAT AN OLD FAT MAN'S DICK, YOU PUNK ASS MOTHERFUCKER! YOU ARE
>POWERLESS TO DO A FUCKING THING, YOU CUNT ASS PIECE OF DOGSHIT!!!
>
>HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>i agree 100% and chuck if you need me to testify against the jerk you know how
>>to get ahold of me i've been watching this bafoon ruin this newsgroup for over
>>3 years and i think its rotten to see this idiot ruin a good group like this. i
>> will do my part if i am needed
>>
>>NIW NIW STANDS FOR "NEVER IN WOMEN"!!!
>>HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW!

>
>NIW is Chukkee-Sukkee...and you can shut your faggot assed cum sucking
>sperm receptacle. You will never stop the AKC, and since this is not
>who you think it is good luck doing a fucking thing.
>
>WHATSAMATTER CHUKKEESUKKEE? LOSE YOUR 9MM PISTOL? THE LATIN COUNTS AND
>THE IRON COFFINS NOT TAKING YOUR PHONE CALLS? YOUR MEDICATION SLOWING
>YOU DOWN SOME???
>YOU AINT SHIT BUT A LITTLE FAGGOT ACTING BAD BEHIND A KEYBOARD!!
>Face it Chukkee---your OWN WORDS got you crossposted.
>HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>AWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
>WHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
>HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAW!
>
>LIFE IS GOOD WHEN YOU AREN'T A FAGGOT ASS LIVING AT MOMMY'S HOUSE CUM
>RECEPTACLE LIKE CHARLES ADKINS!!!!

You ask w

2865. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 16:52:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402190852.4f96fa5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87540

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040219063201.29660.00003002@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402190112.e10d47f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >. . Jim . . . good heavens . . seven identical posts . . ?
>
> AOL is messed up somehow. I'm getting multiple copies of everything. I watch
> the outgoing AutoAOL session and there are no postings being sent, yet I get
> back copies of stuff posted hours ago.
> >
> >You homebrewed yer own computer right?
>
> Problem ain't at this end.

Giggles are where ya find 'em and AOHell is a great "provider". Q.E.D.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2866. Re: Help Chapwoman get money for drugs!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 16:55:20 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@homo.nut>
Message-ID: <c12ppo0afu@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 87543
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I'll do it for free!!!!!!!!!

In article <e1b5119f.0402190833.5150772d@posting.google.com>, CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE says...
>
>He drinks cum from the men he blows in truckstops to get money for
>crack!
>Randolph W. Chapman
>2701 13TH AV N
>TEXAS CITY, TX 77590
>409-945-2800
>
>Call him when you are in the area, he needs money for crack, so he
>will suck your dick anytime for a low price.

You ask w

2867. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 17:14:38 UTC
From: Otto Von Brassplate <sdonelds400@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1bc11$4034ef02$d1cc4e0e$25945@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 87541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
news:c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net...
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville

I've ordered from them before and never had
any delivery problems.

Backorders are usually a function of the leadtime
from the manufacturer (all of them are in Asia)
and not the dealer. This issue cannot be helped.
It's the nature of supply vs demand.

Of late however, I've been ordering from
Texas Towers http://www.texastowers.com/
for ham related items and also Grove Enterprises
http://www.grove-ent.com/ for SWL items.

Both of these Dealers above were able to get me
a better price on a given item in several cases of
purchase over the quoted price from U.R.

2868. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 18:28:00 UTC
From: Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <5tv930lls77pif39bnilkooh00r14cji13@4ax.com>
Source record: 87544

On 14 Feb 2004 16:10:06 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
>>dropping code testing.
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>>
>
> WHO CARES, HAM RADIO IS NOTHING MORE THAN A GLOIRIFIED CB SERVICE ANYMORE.

Oh stop whining. Move forward into the 21st century or drop dead,
whichever you prefer.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

2869. proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 19:45:23 UTC
From: The Eternal Squire <eternalsquire@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <v56dnVOC06_flqjdRVn-jA@comcast.com>
Source record: 87545

Hi,

So far as I know, FCC regs allow the use of any code which is not intended to obscure the meaning of the message, and that this regulation can be satisfied by the mere publication of the code. This email is intended to publish a telegraphy (Morse) code so that it might be permissible to use.

This might be a fun way for LOTR fans who are also hams to communicate.

I've taken a look at the tengwar structure, and from it determined that the longs should be placed where the bows are, the shorts should be placed where the the strokes are, that shorter characters should have shorter codes, and that mirror image characters would be mirror images of each other. Special sequences are used to resolved conflicts.

Telegraphy per se would not have evolved in Middle-Earth since the technology went toward scientific application of magic by Feanor, but the tengwar could very likely have been adapted for the use of a heliography (mirror-flash) code for communication between Quenya and Sindar mariners. Vowels would never have been transmitted, similar to the style of stone carving.

With this is mind, here is Tengwanor ("sunwriting"): You could probably use machine translation from English to English-Mode Tengwar to Tengwanor for the purpose of computer assisted CW, or if you actually can line up 2 people literate in Quenya or Sindarin try it with a key!

Namarie',

The Eternal Squire

COLUMN 1:

character	sequence
tinco	. _ .
ando	. _ . .
thule	_ _ .
anto	_ _ . .
numen	_ . .
ore	.

COLUMN 2:

parma . _ . _
umbar . _ . . _
formen _ _ . _
ampa _ _ . . _
malta _ . . _
vala _ . _

COLUMN 3:

calma . .
anga . . _ .
harma . _ _
anca . . _ _
noldo . . _
anna . _

COLUMN 4:

quesse _ . _ .
ungwe _ . _ . .
hwesta _ _ _
unque . . . .
nwalme _ _
wilya _

SPECIAL:

romen . . . _
arda . . . . _
harma . _ _ _
alda . _ _ _ _
silme . _ . _ .
silme nuquerna _ . _ . _
aze . . _ . .
aze nuquerna _ _ . _ _
hyarmen . . _ _ _
hwesta sindarina _ _ _ .
yanta . . .
ure _ _ _ _

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.564 / Virus Database: 356 - Release Date: 1/19/04

2870. Oh my

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 20:20:30 UTC
From: Len <len2004@theuminas.com>
Message-ID: <40351a87$1_2@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 87546

Well, first, was it 64 in waltham?

Second, the repeater owner stop anyone for any reason from using the repeater, and he doesn't need to shut it off, he just has to tell them not to. That's the law.

Third, if you think thats bad, just attend a 6th grade health class anwhere in this nation.

Last year we had numerous events where middle school students were expelled for having oral sex in the stairwells, teenage pregancy which was "epedemic" at 1% and was going to be "cured" by sex education (I old enough to remember the bullshit) is now at 50%.

Kids these days are openly being challenged in high school "health" classes "how you know you are not gay if you haven't tried it"? The problem is built into our great educational system that ranks us near the bottom of every western society, even though we pay more than anyone else, but our kids are near the top of the list in perversion.

Frankly, I find this kind of thing disgusting on amateur radio, but if thats what it takes to raise the awareness of people, so they start objecting to the NEA's agenda in our schools, so be it. Frankly, I don't think any of us could have a discussion on anything sexual that would offend any person over 12. I'd bet most of these kids could qualify for sex counselors if there was a test. In fact there probably is - by the 10th grade.

Just hook up your MFJ SSB audio enhancer to your FM radio and catch the lyrics on some of the songs they listen to. The conversation on 2M was tame! Failing that, just catch an evening or two of TV during prime time.

73,
Len
WT6G
PS Dont reply to this email address.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

2871. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 20:32:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87547

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > >
> >> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
>
> >I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
> >lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
> >Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.
>
> I coulda told ya THAT!

Jim,

Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?

Dave K8MN

2872. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 20:35:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40351E15.B45722EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Rusty in Louisville" wrote:
> >
> > I would like to get some opinions
> > about Universal Radio, Inc., located
> > in Reynoldsburg, Ohio. (snip)
>
> I've had mixed results with Universal Radio - one order went well and
> another didn't. I've had slightly better results with Burghardt
> (www.burghardt-amateur.com) and their prices are often better. However,
> since you added a shortwave newsgroup to your message, I should point out
> that their primary focus is on Amateur Radio, with very little shortwave
> equipment.

I've had less than pleasant experiences with Universal. The staff seems
almost surly and almost equally unfamiliar with the equipment they sell.
Prices are higher, by quite a margin, over other dealers. My personal
preference is R&L Electronics in Hamilton, Ohio, just north of
Cincinnati.

Dave K8MN

2873. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 20:38:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40351ED0.8F066BC1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87549

William wrote:
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>...
> > You miss the point. I'm interested in showing how this BPL is a two-way
> > street.
> >
> > Beacons are legal on 10 meters. 6 meters would also likely be effective.
> > I'd prefer not using 20 meters for a 40 miles circuit
>
> Not a circuit.
>
> which would require a
> > considerable signal and also cause that signal to be stronger thousands of
> > miles away. I'm interested in a band that isn't open and working someone
> > far enough away to require 50 watts or more. That is how you demonstrate
> > the two-way possibilities of BPL. Ya keep it all legal.
>
> Your entire response is conspiracy to commit an illegal act:
> intentional interference.

Dear Beeping Bill:

How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?

> > You see, if an unlicensed transmitter is going to put some electric field
> > into my receiver, I simply want to return the favor - with interest.

> You might want to run it by the ARRL and/or Riley. ;^)

You might want to consider that word "unlicensed".
Part 97 = licensed
Part 15 = unlicensed

Dave K8MN

2874. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 20:54:28 UTC
From: Dave Stadt <dhstadt@ameritech.net>
Message-ID: <7o9Zb.11358$PY.1135@newssvr26.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
news:c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net...
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville

Had significant trouble with an R8B order. They did not ship as they promised and the worst part was they lied to me. The office manager was exceptionally surly when I called and asked what had happened. I doubt they know the first thing about good customer service.

2875. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 22:20:20 UTC
From: k8cpa@comcast.net
Message-ID: <8f4d3576.0402191420.8239d08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE)
wrote in:

Welp, A little investigation reveals that.. this idiot is at:

OrgName: Verio, Inc.
OrgID: VRIO
Address: 8005 South Chester Street
Address: Suite 200
City: Englewood
StateProv: CO
PostalCode: 80112
Country: US

ReferralServer: rwhois://rwhois.verio.net:4321/

NetRange: 168.143.0.0 - 168.143.255.255
CIDR: 168.143.0.0/16
NetName: VRIO-168-143
NetHandle: NET-168-143-0-0-1
Parent: NET-168-0-0-0-0
NetType: Direct Allocation
NameServer: NS0.VERIO.NET
NameServer: NS1.VERIO.NET
NameServer: NS2.VERIO.NET
NameServer: NS3.VERIO.NET
NameServer: NS4.VERIO.NET
Comment: **
Comment: Reassignment information for this block is
Comment: available at rwhois.verio.net port 4321
Comment: **
RegDate: 2000-08-25
Updated: 2003-08-27

TechHandle: VIA4-ORG-ARIN
TechName: Verio, Inc.
TechPhone: +1-303-645-1900
TechEmail: vipar@verio.net

OrgAbuseHandle: VAC5-ARIN
OrgAbuseName: Verio Abuse Contact
OrgAbusePhone: +1-800-551-1630
OrgAbuseEmail: abuse@verio.net

OrgNOCHandle: VSC-ARIN
OrgNOCName: Verio Support Contact
OrgNOCPhone: +1-800-551-1630
OrgNOCEmail: support@verio.net

OrgTechHandle: VIA4-ORG-ARIN
OrgTechName: Verio, Inc.
OrgTechPhone: +1-303-645-1900
OrgTechEmail: vipar@verio.net

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2004-02-18 19:15
Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

If contact information is out of date or incorrect, please contact
hostmaster@arin.net. Include all relevant information in your e-mail
and

So, report being sent to abuse@verio.net

Kiss this account goodbye, idiot.

-Chuck

2876. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 22:32:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1QaZb.2312$2z1.2282@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87602

Dave,

You are correct, of course. Also, using 20 meters for a 40 mile away contact would not sit favourably with many folks and might be looked upon unfavourably by the FCC. Certainly neither I nor many folks would intentionally interfere with anyone. The unlicensed devices are not protected and must put up with any interference. Although there exist some filters to protect amateurs (and likely other users of rf spectrum), they are not overly efficient. They would tend (I would think) to distort the BPL somewhat - and the higher the speed, the less distortion the modems can put up with.

I probably shouldn't even have posted. These were indeed my thoughts, but the reality is that much of the posting (certainly much of mine) is not really related to policy. BPL would be related, but most of the posts are intended to inflame rather than discuss.

Your point, Dave, is well made and is, in fact, current policy with the FCC. I'd like to think this stuff could coexist with various HF/VHF communications, but have *severe* reservations about it; especially after W1RFI and others went through areas with BPL and put the video on the net.

Actually, the BPL question should cause many folks to try and reach some kind of agreement rather than the constant flames. BPL will affect amateurs who have passed code exams, amateurs who have not taken a code exam, CBers, SWL enthusiasts and others.

Certainly there will be 'attacks' (if you will) on some of the UHF/SHF amateur bands. Some accomodations will have to be made, hopefully with some spectrum replacement. Pagers and cellphones require bandwidth and now we have cellphones that take (and transmit) pictures. Wireless cameras will pass information over the air. The cameras will, most likely, be very low power and not a concern. Cellphones and similar devices, along with many other users (hey, digital tv has arrived) will make some demands. Hopefully, the FCC will try and accomodate everyone as much as possible (however, don't hold your breath on any government agency - both Republicans and Democrats are beholden to various, albeit often different, special interest groups).

What amazes me is that this *one* interest (the power companies with BPL) may well be allowed to wreck havoc with many (far more than just amateur, which is what some folks think) users. I'm not even sure how inexpensively BPL could be rolled out in a rural area. They would either need some kind of boosters or run a *lot* of rf power at the source. Maybe I'm wrong, but my thinking is that BPL would likely be targeted at suburbs where many might live too far away for DSL, but the distribution costs for BPL might not be

too much.

In any case, thanks for your input, Dave.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40351ED0.8F066BC1@earthlink.net...
> William wrote:
> > Your entire response is conspiracy to commit an illegal act:
> > intentional interference.
>
> Dear Beeping Bill:
>
> How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?
>
> You might want to consider that word "unlicensed".
> Part 97 = licensed
> Part 15 = unlicensed
>
>
> Dave K8MN

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.592 / Virus Database: 375 - Release Date: 2/18/04

2877. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 22:36:12 UTC
From: k8cpa@comcast.net
Message-ID: <8f4d3576.0402191436.5cb4867@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87603
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote in:

Following is the report sent to abuse@verio.net:

Dear Sirs,

Someone who has an account on your system is using the system to make
statements reguarding yours truly, and is using your service to harrass
others in a Usenet Newsgroup, this is in Direct Volation of your Terms of
Service agreement. See Below:

The IP address in question is 168.143.113.150...

Here is a sampling of this persons postings in rec.radio.cb

From: k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE)
Newsgroups:
rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking
Subject: Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women,
obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!
Date: 19 Feb 2004 08:23:36 -0800
Organization: http://groups.google.com
Lines: 47
Message-ID: <e1b5119f.0402190823.5b9b5230@posting.google.com>
References: <676ce33.0402171018.59170743@posting.google.com>
<20040217132606.21817.00002283@mb-m06.aol.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 168.143.113.150
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1077207816 30119 127.0.0.1 (19 Feb 2004
16:23:36 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2004 16:23:36 +0000 (UTC)

niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW) wrote in message
news:<20040217132606.21817.00002283@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >To Whom it may concern... The person posting this, Douglas Adair, of
> >Toledo, Ohio. has been doing this to me for over 2 years. All of this
> >is being forwarded to my lawyer, Levon King, who is also the Mayor of
> >Allen Park, Michigan. Levon is going to contact the local Mayor of
> >Toledo, ohio and see if a complaint can be filed against Mr. adair for
> >his actions. Mr. Adair, I would seriously advise you, if you don't
> >want to end up in a court of law for harrashment charges, and a
> >lawsuit for slander, I would advise you to cease and desist.

> >otherwise, I will get a court order against you.
> >
> >I do have a lawyer. and I will use him, if need be.
> >
> >-Chuck K8CPA
> >
> >P.S. You're picking the wrong fight.
EAT AN OLD FAT MAN'S DICK, YOU PUNK ASS MOTHERFUCKER! YOU ARE
POWERLESS TO DO A FUCKING THING, YOU CUNT ASS PIECE OF DOGSHIT!!!

HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW!

NIW is Chukkee-Sukkee...and you can shut your faggot assed cum sucking
sperm receptacle. You will never stop the AKC, and since this is not
who you think it is good luck doing a fucking thing.

WHATSAMATTER CHUKKEESUKKEE? LOSE YOUR 9MM PISTOL? THE LATIN COUNTS AND
THE IRON COFFINS NOT TAKING YOUR PHONE CALLS? YOUR MEDICATION SLOWING
YOU DOWN SOME???
YOU AINT SHIT BUT A LITTLE FAGGOT ACTING BAD BEHIND A KEYBOARD!!
Face it Chukkee---your OWN WORDS got you crossposted.
HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
AWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHA

WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAH
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
WHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHW
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
AHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWH
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW!

LIFE IS GOOD WHEN YOU AREN'T A FAGGOT ASS LIVING AT MOMMY'S HOUSE CUM
RECEPTACLE LIKE CHARLES ADKINS!!!!

and more...

From: k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: It isnt twistydave, it is twistyjerry
Date: 19 Feb 2004 09:17:06 -0800
Organization: http://groups.google.com
Lines: 21
Message-ID: <e1b5119f.0402190917.6054fe2a@posting.google.com>
References: <e1b5119f.0402161619.17618e68@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 168.143.113.150
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1077211027 1529 127.0.0.1 (19 Feb 2004 17:17:07
GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2004 17:17:07 +0000 (UTC)

Jerry Strahan

And...lets not forget faggotboy Randy Chapman

Randy drinks cum from the men he blows in truckstops to get money for
crack!
Randolph W. Chapman
2701 13TH AV N
TEXAS CITY, TX 77590
409-945-2800

Call him when you are in the area, he needs money for crack, so he
will suck your dick anytime for a low price.

k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote in
message news:<e1b5119f.0402161619.17618e68@posting.google.com>...
> hehehe
>
> http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html

and ....

Randy drinks cum from the men he blows in truckstops to get money for crack!
Randolph W. Chapman
2701 13TH AV N
TEXAS CITY, TX 77590
409-945-2800

Call him when you are in the area, he needs money for crack, so he will suck your dick anytime for a low price.

====

here are the direct links...

http://groups.google.com/groups?dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&group=rec.radio.cb&selm=e1b5119f.0402190914.200fded7%40posting.google.com

http://groups.google.com/groups?dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&threadm=c12ph109i4%40drn.newsguy.com&prev=/groups%3Fhl%3Den%26lr%3D%26ie%3DUTF-8%26group%3Drec.radio.cb

http://groups.google.com/groups?dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&threadm=e1b5119f.0402190845.b24f51c%40posting.google.com&prev=/groups%3Fhl%3Den%26lr%3D%26ie%3DUTF-8%26group%3Drec.radio.cb

==========

I would highly suggest your company REVOKE this persons access to your network, otherwise, I may have to contact my attorney and have him file a defamation of character lawsuit in court and get an order for you to release the name, address, and telephone number of the person doing the posting.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

-Chuck Adkins
Lincoln Park, Michigan

I urge others to do the same....

73 de K8CPA

-Chuck

2878. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 23:01:30 UTC
From: pm4hire@excite.com
Message-ID: <52a66032.0402191501.49fa67ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87604
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Sanjaya_49:

I bought the Kaito 1102 from Grove
Enterprises, I bought this radio
http://www.universal-radio.com/catalog/wx/4489.html
from Universal Radio. The packaging
had been tampered with. THe radio
was restock and a return from a
previous sale.

Universal Radio sells used and/or broken
radio gear as new, FUCK THEM!!!!!!!

Tom Welch

2879. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 23:12:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XpbZb.3829$t16.2901181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87605

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0402190533.e664b06@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>...
> > You miss the point. I'm interested in showing how this BPL is a two-way
> > street.
> >
> > Beacons are legal on 10 meters. 6 meters would also likely be
effective.
> > I'd prefer not using 20 meters for a 40 miles circuit
>
> Not a circuit.
>
> which would require a
> > considerable signal and also cause that signal to be stronger thousands
of
> > miles away. I'm interested in a band that isn't open and working
someone
> > far enough away to require 50 watts or more. That is how you
demonstrate
> > the two-way possibilities of BPL. Ya keep it all legal.
>
> Your entire response is conspiracy to commit an illegal act:
> intentional interference.

Interfering with a Part 15 device doesn't happen to be illegal.

Part 15 devices are not allowed to interfere with any licensed radio service
and must accept (i.e. tolerate) interference from any licensed radio
service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2880. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 23:16:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <otbZb.3831$t16.2901611@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87606

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4034E8A7.2060605@psu.edu...
>
> And how! I only became interested in the ARS at the time that Morse was
> already at 5wpm, but there were those that suggested I might want to
> wait. Not a good idea. I'd still be waiting, and if my predictions pan
> out, I'd still be waiting a few more years...
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Basically that's what I tell my students. Regardless of their opinions on code testing, they should take control of their amateur radio participation by passing the current requirements and get on the air. At best they've avoided waiting and been able to enjoy HF for that period of time. At worst, they've spent a few hours to learn a useful skill that they may or may not decide to actually use on the air.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2881. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 23:22:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mzbZb.3833$t16.2902497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87607

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:1QaZb.2312$2z1.2282@news01.roc.ny...
> Dave,
>
> What amazes me is that this *one* interest (the power companies with BPL)
> may well be allowed to wreck havoc with many (far more than just amateur,
> which is what some folks think) users. I'm not even sure how
inexpensively
> BPL could be rolled out in a rural area. They would either need some kind
> of boosters or run a *lot* of rf power at the source. Maybe I'm wrong,
but
> my thinking is that BPL would likely be targeted at suburbs where many
might
> live too far away for DSL, but the distribution costs for BPL might not be
> too much.

The marketing hype is cheap broadband for the rural areas. Economic reality is that it will probably never be extended into the rural areas even if some suburban areas do go for it. Every single transformer between the injection point of the signal and the end user must be bypassed with the BPL signal for that signal to work. If you only have one user every few miles, it will never pay off. And of course you've mentioned the power and/or signal boosters required. Periodic boosters all along the line will be needed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2882. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-19 23:37:22 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <SMbZb.4631$J84.2795@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 87608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

"Chuck in the Motor City" <k8cpa@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:8f4d3576.0402191436.5cb4867@posting.google.com...
> k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote
in:
>
> Following is the report sent to abuse@verio.net:
>
> Dear Sirs,
>
> Someone who has an account on your system is using the system to make
> statements reguarding yours truly, and is using your service to harrass
> others in a Usenet Newsgroup, this is in Direct Volation of your Terms of
> Service agreement. See Below:
>
> The IP address in question is 168.143.113.150...
>
> Here is a sampling of this persons postings in rec.radio.cb
>
> From: k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE)
> Newsgroups:
> rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking
> Subject: Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women,
> obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!
> Date: 19 Feb 2004 08:23:36 -0800
> Organization: http://groups.google.com
> Lines: 47
> Message-ID: <e1b5119f.0402190823.5b9b5230@posting.google.com>
> References: <676ce33.0402171018.59170743@posting.google.com>
> <20040217132606.21817.00002283@mb-m06.aol.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 168.143.113.150
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
> X-Trace: posting.google.com 1077207816 30119 127.0.0.1 (19 Feb 2004
> 16:23:36 GMT)
> X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2004 16:23:36 +0000 (UTC)
>
>
> niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW) wrote in message
> news:<20040217132606.21817.00002283@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >To Whom it may concern... The person posting this, Douglas Adair, of
> > >Toledo, Ohio. has been doing this to me for over 2 years. All of this

> > >is being forwarded to my lawyer, Levon King, who is also the Mayor of
> > >Allen Park, Michigan. Levon is going to contact the local Mayor of
> > >Toledo, ohio and see if a complaint can be filed against Mr. adair for
> > >his actions. Mr. Adair, I would seriously advise you, if you don't
> > >want to end up in a court of law for harrashment charges, and a
> > >lawsuit for slander, I would advise you to cease and desist.
> > >otherwise, I will get a court order against you.
> > >
> > >I do have a lawyer. and I will use him, if need be.
> > >
> > >-Chuck K8CPA
> > >
> > >P.S. You're picking the wrong fight.
> EAT AN OLD FAT MAN'S DICK, YOU PUNK ASS MOTHERFUCKER! YOU ARE
> POWERLESS TO DO A FUCKING THING, YOU CUNT ASS PIECE OF DOGSHIT!!!
>
>
HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWH
>
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>
HAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWH
>
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
> HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > i agree 100% and chuck if you need me to testify against the jerk you
> know how
> > to get ahold of me i've been watching this bafoon ruin this newsgroup
for
> over
> > 3 years and i think its rotten to see this idiot ruin a good group like
> this. i
> > will do my part if i am needed
> >
> > NIW NIW STANDS FOR "NEVER IN WOMEN"!!!
>
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
>
HWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAW
>
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
> WHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW!
>
> NIW is Chukkee-Sukkee...and you can shut your faggot assed cum sucking
> sperm receptacle. You will never stop the AKC, and since this is not
> who you think it is good luck doing a fucking thing.

>
> WHATSAMATTER CHUKKEESUKKEE? LOSE YOUR 9MM PISTOL? THE LATIN COUNTS AND
> THE IRON COFFINS NOT TAKING YOUR PHONE CALLS? YOUR MEDICATION SLOWING
> YOU DOWN SOME???
> YOU AINT SHIT BUT A LITTLE FAGGOT ACTING BAD BEHIND A KEYBOARD!!
> Face it Chukkee---your OWN WORDS got you crossposted.
>
HAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWH
>
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>
HAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWH
>
AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWH
> AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW
>
AWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHA
>
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
>
AWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHA
>
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
>
AWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAH
> WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
>
WHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAW
>
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
>
WHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHW
>
HAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
>
WHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWH
> AHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHA
>
HAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAHWH
> AWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW!
>
> LIFE IS GOOD WHEN YOU AREN'T A FAGGOT ASS LIVING AT MOMMY'S HOUSE CUM
> RECEPTACLE LIKE CHARLES ADKINS!!!!
>
>
> and more...
>
> From: k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE)

> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Subject: Re: It isnt twistydave, it is twistyjerry
> Date: 19 Feb 2004 09:17:06 -0800
> Organization: http://groups.google.com
> Lines: 21
> Message-ID: <e1b5119f.0402190917.6054fe2a@posting.google.com>
> References: <e1b5119f.0402161619.17618e68@posting.google.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Host: 168.143.113.150
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
> X-Trace: posting.google.com 1077211027 1529 127.0.0.1 (19 Feb 2004
17:17:07
> GMT)
> X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
> NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2004 17:17:07 +0000 (UTC)
>
>
> Jerry Strahan
>
> And...lets not forget faggotboy Randy Chapman
>
> Randy drinks cum from the men he blows in truckstops to get money for
> crack!
> Randolph W. Chapman
> 2701 13TH AV N
> TEXAS CITY, TX 77590
> 409-945-2800
>
> Call him when you are in the area, he needs money for crack, so he
> will suck your dick anytime for a low price.
>
>
>
>
> k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote
in
> message news:<e1b5119f.0402161619.17618e68@posting.google.com>...
> > hehehe
> >
> > http://www.geocities.com/wimpasschukkee/gayboy_ChukkeeSukkee.html
>
>
> and ....
>
>
> Randy drinks cum from the men he blows in truckstops to get money for
> crack!
> Randolph W. Chapman
> 2701 13TH AV N
> TEXAS CITY, TX 77590

> 409-945-2800
>
> Call him when you are in the area, he needs money for crack, so he
> will suck your dick anytime for a low price.
>
>
> ====
>
> here are the direct links...
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&group=rec.radio.cb&se
> lm=e1b5119f.0402190914.200fded7%40posting.google.com
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&threadm=c12ph109i4%40
>
drn.newsguy.com&prev=/groups%3Fhl%3Den%26lr%3D%26ie%3DUTF-8%26group%3Drec.ra
> dio.cb
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&threadm=e1b5119f.0402
>
190845.b24f51c%40posting.google.com&prev=/groups%3Fhl%3Den%26lr%3D%26ie%3DUT
> F-8%26group%3Drec.radio.cb
>
> ==========
>
> I would highly suggest your company REVOKE this persons access to your
> network, otherwise, I may have to contact my attorney and have him file a
> defamation of character lawsuit in court and get an order for you to
> release the name, address, and telephone number of the person doing the
> posting.
>
> Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.
>
> -Chuck Adkins
> Lincoln Park, Michigan
>
>
>
> I urge others to do the same....
>
> 73 de K8CPA
>
> -Chuck

Yes, doug is on the road to ruin.

2883. N8WWM is a newsgroup troll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 00:00:02 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040219190002.218$Nw_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87609
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

> Yes, doug is on the road to ruin.
>
Who could argue?

--
Go 40 42 12

2884. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 00:04:59 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040219190459.797$SU@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

k8cpa@comcast.net (Chuck in the Motor City) wrote:
> k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE) wrote
> in:
>
> Following is the report sent to abuse@verio.net:
>
> Dear Sirs,
>
Fuck you, chuckie.

--
Go 40 42 12

2885. Re: K8CPA-Chuck Adkins, False Christian, threatener of women, obscene retarded PIG, queerboy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 00:05:42 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040219190542.855$zH@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87611
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

k8cpa@comcast.net (Chuck in the Motor City) wrote:
> k8cpa_eats_sperm@dickmysuck.com (CHUCK ADKINS IS A HOMO HYPOCRYTE)
> wrote in:
>
> Welp, A little investigation reveals that.. this idiot is at:
>
Fuck you, chuckie.

--
Go 40 42 12

2886. N8WWM Problem?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 00:17:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040219191749.110$YX_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 87612
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.amateur.policy

zeeeeeeee3@aol.com (Zeeeeeeee3) wrote:
> How is this an illegal radio?
>
Google n8wwm. There's lots of illegal activity from the douche
bag who is flaming this board with his gay shit, again.

Doug is the anti/radio faggot. (he jams the repeaters too)

--
Go 40 42 12

2887. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 02:12:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040219211223.00545.00004448@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87613

In article <d22b54c3.0402181328.79ee16dd@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0402170748.7577a4f5@posting.google.com>...
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<402FFB62.7ACD1300@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian Kelly wrote:

>> > > Note that Sears, Hallicrafters and Loewy were all based in Chicago.

>> Also Frank Lloyd Wright, for at least some of his career.
>
>Very early but his big days were in AZ.

Taliesin West.

Guy had quite a life, full of both triumph and tragedy. More of an artist than an engineer, though, many of his best-known buildings are real headaches to keep in shape.

But if he had a dollar for every corenr window in Wynnewood...
>
>> > > Whew. You hit some more buttons with this one. I like the T1 better
>> > > than the S1. But the K4 is the ultimate classic PRR power.
>> > >
>> > > http://prrsteam.pennsyrr.com/prrt1.html
>>
>> As K2ASP sez, the GG-1 is the top of that pyramid.
>
>Yeah, for you sparkies maybe.

In many ways a G is actually closer to a steamer than to a modern diesel electric. Particularly in the cab.

>> For streamlined steam engines, the special J-3 Hudsons used on the New
>> York Central's Twentieth Century Limited are the most impressive.

961 miles from Grand Central Terminal to Chicago Union Station in 960 minutes. With steam engines most of the way, on jointed rail. With stops at most major cities, speed restrictions on some curves and bridges, and engine changes at Harmon and for the stop at Cleveland. (The steamer would cut off outside Cleveland and an electric pulled the train into and out of the station. While the station stop was being made, the steamer would run around the station, get coal and water, and meet the electric on the other side). Oversized tender and scooping water meant the only coal stops were at Wayneport (NY) and Cleveland.
>

>> > Engineers are generally the guys who make things work. Designers are
>> > those who make them nice to look at. We all know of the exceptions.
>>
>> "Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them"
>
>A physicist and an engineer standing in bulap bags line up side by
>side at one end of a basketball court.

Old joke but still on target.

>The engineer hollers back "Watch me get close enough!"

HAWW!!!!
>
>> And a recent auction sold an *unbuilt* Heath SB-303 for about $1300.
>> Adjusted for inflation, that's about what they cost new. But the '303
>> isn't much of a receiver - not even up to the level of the earlier
>> SB-301, and defintitely not in the same class as the Drake R4 family
>> or any Collins, A or S.
>
>And for anywhere from $250 to maybe $500. Goofy.

'zactly. The 301/401 were the peak of Heath, and that's not saying too much.
Their main advantage is that they *are* decent enough, easy to work on, and can
be kept going pretty much indefinitely if you collect junkers. Which cannot be
said for the various Yaecomwoods...

>> Road trip!
>
>Prolly.
>
>> > Now Len can't
>> > accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
>> > some obscure reason.
>> >
>> Len who?
>
>Oh you remember him James, the radio genius who needed 40Kw to QSO
>W7/W6 from JA.

I've done that much distance with 4 watts.

What's his callsign? What ham bands is he on?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2888. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 02:12:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040219211225.00545.00004449@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87614

In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> >
>> >> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
>>
>> >I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
>> >lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
>> >Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.
>>
>> I coulda told ya THAT!
>
>Jim,
>
>Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
>
Who or what is an "LHA"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2889. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 02:28:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <RZednYZfGMx876jdRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87615

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>
> Interfering with a Part 15 device doesn't happen to be illegal.
>
> Part 15 devices are not allowed to interfere with any licensed radio service
> and must accept (i.e. tolerate) interference from any licensed radio
> service.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
If/when BPL gets rolling and big bucks start rolling in to the BPL
folks, you don't really think it will remain under Part 15 rules do you?

2890. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 03:03:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040219220302.12501.00006303@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87616

In article <1037lvtt8d9iaa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Steve Wolf" <news@w8iz.com>
writes:

>My telephone introduction is, "I'd like to get a price on an item but only
>if you have it in stock and can ship it immediately". That filters the
>just-in-time philosophy out of the ordering process.
>
>73,
>Steve, W8IZ

Steve:

Good one, I'll have to remember that! I've got a project in the planning
stages
and will be ordering a lot of stuff soon.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2891. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 03:34:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040219223443.12501.00006304@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87617

In article <1037lvtt8d9iaa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Steve Wolf" <news@w8iz.com>
writes:

>My telephone introduction is, "I'd like to get a price on an item but only
>if you have it in stock and can ship it immediately". That filters the
>just-in-time philosophy out of the ordering process.
>
>73,
>Steve, W8IZ

Steve:

Good one, I'll have to remember that! I've got a project in the planning
stages
and will be ordering a lot of stuff soon.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2892. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 04:37:01 UTC
From: starman <starman@tech.net>
Message-ID: <40358EED.F877E125@tech.net>
Source record: 87618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

sdl wrote:
>
> I had a negative experience and would *not* recommend Universal Radio.
> Alternatively, I *would* recommend C Crane Radio and/or Grove Radio:
> I have made satisfactory purchases from both.

I agree about Grove Enterprizes. They have an especially good return
policy and rarely charge a restocking fee if all the literature and
packing materials are included in the return.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

2893. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 05:24:52 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray-87a@cybercoffee.org>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BC5AF644007598EA1488F230@news.giganews.com>
Source record: 87619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Thu, 19 Feb 2004 22:37:01 -0600, starman wrote
(in message <40358EED.F877E125@tech.net>):

> sdl wrote:
>>
>> I had a negative experience and would *not* recommend Universal Radio.
>> Alternatively, I *would* recommend C Crane Radio and/or Grove Radio:
>> I have made satisfactory purchases from both.
>
> I agree about Grove Enterprizes. They have an especially good return
> policy and rarely charge a restocking fee if all the literature and
> packing materials are included in the return.
>

And I'll agree about CCrane. I had a problem with an used radio I bought from them (and the problem was not very great) and they went so far out of their way to make sure I was satisfied that it embarassed me!

I tried to talk them into taking some money ($25?) and they just wouldn't let me give it to them.

If CCrane has something I want, I'll buy it from them without comparison shopping - I could care less if they charge more; I don't mind paying for quality.

And just wait 'til I tell y'all about their battery charger!

Gray Shockley

DX-392 DX-398
RX-320 DX-399
CCradio+ w/RS Loop
Justice AM Antenna
Torus Tuner (3-13 MHz)
Select-A-Tenna

Vicksburg, MS US

2894. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 06:18:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4035A6BB.44FEC4B9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87620

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402181641.6f8c2618@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040217195957.25517.00004340@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <d22b54c3.0402170739.9a5952@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >> >
> >> >> >> The ultimate class is the GG-1. Someday one will run again.....
> >> >>
> >> >> >I went up the guy and asked him if they'd lost their map of the AMTRAK
> >> >> >lines or what, Primos is *not* hardly AMTRAK country, right?. Wrong.
> >> >> >Daily wee-hours AMTRAK Ballast train.
> >> >>
> >> >> I coulda told ya THAT!
> >> >
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
> >> >
> >> Who or what is an "LHA"?

Best I can determine, it is similar to a WMD. According to the
"LHA/WMD" sig I've noted, the two may be used interchangeably.

Dave K8MN

2895. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 11:35:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402200335.164d7c18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87621

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40351ED0.8F066BC1@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>...
> > > You miss the point. I'm interested in showing how this BPL is a two-way
> > > street.
> > >
> > > Beacons are legal on 10 meters. 6 meters would also likely be effective.
> > > I'd prefer not using 20 meters for a 40 miles circuit
> >
> > Not a circuit.
> >
> > which would require a
> > > considerable signal and also cause that signal to be stronger thousands of
> > > miles away. I'm interested in a band that isn't open and working someone
> > > far enough away to require 50 watts or more. That is how you demonstrate
> > > the two-way possibilities of BPL. Ya keep it all legal.
> >
> > Your entire response is conspiracy to commit an illegal act:
> > intentional interference.
>
> Dear Beeping Bill:
>
> How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?

Why an NOI and now an NPRM for such a Part 15 device?

The rules will change.

2896. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 11:43:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402200343.727446dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87622

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<1QaZb.2312$2z1.2282@news01.roc.ny>...
> Dave,
>
> You are correct, of course. Also, using 20 meters for a 40 mile away
> contact would not sit favourably with many folks and might be looked upon
> unfavourably by the FCC. Certainly neither I nor many folks would
> intentionally interfere with anyone. The unlicensed devices are not
> protected and must put up with any interference. Although there exist some
> filters to protect amateurs (and likely other users of rf spectrum), they
> are not overly efficient. They would tend (I would think) to distort the
> BPL somewhat - and the higher the speed, the less distortion the modems can
> put up with.
>
> I probably shouldn't even have posted. These were indeed my thoughts, but
> the reality is that much of the posting (certainly much of mine) is not
> really related to policy. BPL would be related, but most of the posts are
> intended to inflame rather than discuss.
>
> Your point, Dave, is well made and is, in fact, current policy with the FCC.
> I'd like to think this stuff could coexist with various HF/VHF
> communications, but have *severe* reservations about it; especially after
> W1RFI and others went through areas with BPL and put the video on the net.
>
> Actually, the BPL question should cause many folks to try and reach some
> kind of argreement rather than the constant flames. BPL will affect
> amateurs who have passed code exams, amateurs who have not taken a code
> exam, CBers, SWL enthusiasts and others.
>
> Certainly there will be 'attacks' (if you will) on some of the UHF/SHF
> amateur bands. Some accomodations will have to be made, hopefully with some
> spectrum replacement. Pagers and cellphones require bandwidth and now we
> have cellphones that take (and transmit) pictures. Wireless cameras will
> pass information over the air. The cameras will, most likely, be very low
> power and not a concern. Cellphones and similar devices, along with many
> other users (hey, digital tv has arrived) will make some demands.
> Hopefully, the FCC will try and accomodate everyone as much as possible
> (however, don't hold your breath on any government agency - both Republicans
> and Democrats are beholden to various, albeit often different, special
> interest groups).
>
> What amazes me is that this *one* interest (the power companies with BPL)
> may well be allowed to wreck havoc with many (far more than just amateur,
> which is what some folks think) users. I'm not even sure how inexpensively

> BPL could be rolled out in a rural area. They would either need some kind
> of boosters or run a *lot* of rf power at the source. Maybe I'm wrong, but
> my thinking is that BPL would likely be targeted at suburbs where many might
> live too far away for DSL, but the distribution costs for BPL might not be
> too much.
>
> In any case, thanks for your input, Dave.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Glad you found an ally in your scheme to interfere. But you should
take it off-line to work out the details. Public postings of
stupidity of such magnitude really won't endear y/our cause to the
FCC. Best of luck.

2897. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 11:49:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402200349.2e1787b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87623

"The Eternal Squire" <eternalsquire@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<v56dnVOC06_flqjdRVn-jA@comcast.com>...
> Hi,
>
> So far as I know, FCC regs allow the use of any code which is not intended
> to obscure the meaning of
> the message, and that this regulation can be satisfied by the mere
> publication of the code. This email
> is intended to publish a telegraphy (Morse) code so that it might be
> permissible to use.
>
> This might be a fun way for LOTR fans who are also hams to communicate.
>
> I've taken a look at the tengwar structure, and from it determined that the
> longs should be placed where
> the bows are, the shorts should be placed where the the strokes are, that
> shorter characters should have
> shorter codes, and that mirror image characters would be mirror images of
> each other. Special sequences
> are used to resolved conflicts.
>
> Telegraphy per se would not have evolved in Middle-Earth since the
> technology went toward scientific
> application of magic by Feanor, but the tengwar could very likely have been
> adapted for the use of a
> heliography (mirror-flash) code for communication between Quenya and Sindar
> mariners. Vowels would
> never have been transmitted, similar to the style of stone carving.
>
> With this is mind, here is Tengwanor ("sunwriting"): You could probably
> use machine translation from
> English to English-Mode Tengwar to Tengwanor for the purpose of computer
> assisted CW, or if you actually
> can line up 2 people literate in Quenya or Sindarin try it with a key!
>
> Namarie',
>
> The Eternal Squire
>
>
> COLUMN 1:
>
> character sequence
> ---------- ----------

> tinco . _ .
> ando . _ . .
> thule _ _ .
> anto _ _ . .
> numen _ . .
> ore .
>
> COLUMN 2:
>
> parma . _ . _
> umbar . _ . . _
> formen _ _ . _
> ampa _ _ . . _
> malta _ . . _
> vala _ . _
>
> COLUMN 3:
>
> calma . .
> anga . . _ .
> harma . _ _
> anca . . _ _
> noldo . . _
> anna . _
>
> COLUMN 4:
>
> quesse _ . _ .
> ungwe _ . _ . .
> hwesta _ _ _
> unque . . . .
> nwalme _ _
> wilya _
>
> SPECIAL:
>
> romen . . . _
> arda . . . . _
> harma . _ _ _
> alda . _ _ _ _
> silme . _ . _ .
> silme nuquerna _ . _ . _
> aze . . _ . .
> aze nuquerna _ _ . _ _
> hyarmen . . _ _ _
> hwesta sindarina _ _ _ .
> yanta . . .
> ure _ _ _ _

TAFKA Rev. Jim says a Morse Code exam is a disincentive to the use of CW on HF. If they won't learn Morse Code, why do you think they'll learn this?

2898. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 13:13:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FJnZb.12140$W74.2937@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87624

"The Eternal Squire" wrote:
>
> So far as I know, FCC regs allow the
> use of any code which is not intended
> to obscure the meaning of the message,
> and that this regulation can be satisfied
> by the mere publication of the code.
> This email is intended to publish a
> telegraphy (Morse) code so that it might
> be permissible to use. (snip)

You might want to contact the FCC for specific requirements before proceeding. I sincerely doubt this newsgroup is "publication" to the extent expected by the FCC. Wider publication will likely be needed, such as in a major radio-related magazine or book.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2899. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 15:42:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40362AB6.BB81D750@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87625

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40351ED0.8F066BC1@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>...
> > > > You miss the point. I'm interested in showing how this BPL is a two-way
> > > > street.
> > > >
> > > > Beacons are legal on 10 meters. 6 meters would also likely be effective.
> > > > I'd prefer not using 20 meters for a 40 miles circuit
> > >
> > > Not a circuit.
> > >
> > > which would require a
> > > > considerable signal and also cause that signal to be stronger thousands of
> > > > miles away. I'm interested in a band that isn't open and working someone
> > > > far enough away to require 50 watts or more. That is how you demonstrate
> > > > the two-way possibilities of BPL. Ya keep it all legal.
> > >
> > > Your entire response is conspiracy to commit an illegal act:
> > > intentional interference.
> >
> > Dear Beeping Bill:
> >
> > How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?
>
> Why an NOI and now an NPRM for such a Part 15 device?

Read them and the answers will become clear.

> The rules will change.

Have you seen anything in the notices indicating that BPL is about to
become part of a licensed service?

The question put to you was: How can a licensed user intentionally
interfere with an unlicensed user?

I'll add: 1) Is a Part 15 user required to stop interfering with
a licensed operation in any service?

2) Is a Part 15 user required to accept interference from
a licensed operation?

Have fun with these and see if you can get your rant back on track.

Dave K8MN

2900. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 15:48:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40362C44.F9B7E06@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87626

William wrote:
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<1QaZb.2312$2z1.2282@news01.roc.ny>...
> > Dave,
> >
> > You are correct, of course. Also, using 20 meters for a 40 mile away
> > contact would not sit favourably with many folks and might be looked upon
> > unfavourably by the FCC. Certainly neither I nor many folks would
> > intentionally interfere with anyone. The unlicensed devices are not
> > protected and must put up with any interference. Although there exist some
> > filters to protect amateurs (and likely other users of rf spectrum), they
> > are not overly efficient. They would tend (I would think) to distort the
> > BPL somewhat - and the higher the speed, the less distortion the modems can
> > put up with.
> >
> > I probably shouldn't even have posted. These were indeed my thoughts, but
> > the reality is that much of the posting (certainly much of mine) is not
> > really related to policy. BPL would be related, but most of the posts are
> > intended to inflame rather than discuss.
> >
> > Your point, Dave, is well made and is, in fact, current policy with the FCC.
> > I'd like to think this stuff could coexist with various HF/VHF
> > communications, but have *severe* reservations about it; especially after
> > W1RFI and others went through areas with BPL and put the video on the net.
> >
> > Actually, the BPL question should cause many folks to try and reach some
> > kind of argreement rather than the constant flames. BPL will affect
> > amateurs who have passed code exams, amateurs who have not taken a code
> > exam, CBers, SWL enthusiasts and others.
> >
> > Certainly there will be 'attacks' (if you will) on some of the UHF/SHF
> > amateur bands. Some accomodations will have to be made, hopefully with some
> > spectrum replacement. Pagers and cellphones require bandwidth and now we
> > have cellphones that take (and transmit) pictures. Wireless cameras will
> > pass information over the air. The cameras will, most likely, be very low
> > power and not a concern. Cellphones and similar devices, along with many
> > other users (hey, digital tv has arrived) will make some demands.
> > Hopefully, the FCC will try and accomodate everyone as much as possible
> > (however, don't hold your breath on any government agency - both Republicans
> > and Democrats are beholden to various, albeit often different, special
> > interest groups).
> >
> > What amazes me is that this *one* interest (the power companies with BPL)

> > may well be allowed to wreck havoc with many (far more than just amateur,
> > which is what some folks think) users. I'm not even sure how inexpensively
> > BPL could be rolled out in a rural area. They would either need some kind
> > of boosters or run a *lot* of rf power at the source. Maybe I'm wrong, but
> > my thinking is that BPL would likely be targeted at suburbs where many might
> > live too far away for DSL, but the distribution costs for BPL might not be
> > too much.
> >
> > In any case, thanks for your input, Dave.
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> Glad you found an ally in your scheme to interfere. But you should
> take it off-line to work out the details. Public postings of
> stupidity of such magnitude really won't endear y/our cause to the
> FCC. Best of luck.

You have a rare ability to see the facts spread out before you and to
come to an incorrect conclusion. There was nothing I wrote which would
make me an ally of anyone in a "scheme to interfere".

I pointed out some reality. I asked a question.

Dave K8MN

2901. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 16:39:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402200839.36ed76f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87627

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4033F76F.8F5ACE43@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > Dunno where I got the notion it was on the Kentucky side of the crick.
>
> You're likely thinking of the old WCKY at 1530 on the dial. It is now
> WSAI which was at 1360. Confusing enough for you? WCKY was owned by
> L.B. Wilson, a Kentuckian and the call stood for W Covington KentuckY.
> Transmitters are on a hilltop overlooking Covington and the studios are
> in downtown Cincinnati.

Probably, I do remember seeing BC towers on a hill near Covington.
Maybe that is where my confusion started. Usta run up and down 75 to
Lexington and Danville. Made Danville to the airport in two hours flat
on one occasion by golly.

> Dad tried a couple of Buicks but has owned a number of Merc Grand
> Marquis Limiteds over the last couple of decades.

Barge pilot huh? Pop has a USCG Master's ticket?

Went to the local Enterpise vehicle rental store a bit back, told 'em
I wanted the cheapest set of wheels they had for a week. Like the
$10/day Metro three-banger they'd been hyping. One thing led to
another, I wound up with some monster Pontiac for the price of the
three-banger. Talk about "road shock" . . I'll spare ya my thoughts
when I first squeezed the beast into a parking slot at my favorite
food emporium. Tried to. When I turned it back in a week later I still
hadn't found out what a third of the stupid bottons in the thing were
supposed to do. Maybe Ralph Nader was right after all.

> I'm a small car guy.
> I'm now on my third Dodge Neon, this one is bright yellow and has a
> spoiler.

Yoicks . . . ! Didja install the mandatory resonator on the tailpipe
yet?

I'm big on small cars too, gots me a silly little 4 dr. '96
Chebby/Suzuki/Metro Geo w/150k miles on it. I keep telling myself I
really oughta get one for the other foot. Managed to blow a piston
last fall, $1,600 engine rebuild by my pet Benz wrench, runs like a
Swiss watch now. 'Cept my nickle-Extra N3 buddy backed his friggin'
monster Freightliner Classic into the rear end of my nice little Geo
and "reconfigured" a bit of sheet metal . . Back to the Benz shop . .
red body, green trunk deck and the rest is still in primer.

Dunno if I can trust it to make Wheeling & vicinity and back or not but I'm seriously mulling that prospect come the warmer winds of the days ahead. I figger if I gotta thumb it back home on the PA tpk. I might as well do it when it's warmer.

> > I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .
> > .
>
> I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
> panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.

Yeah, great start . . I like your National Blue and the brushed SS panel concept a bunch for openers. Needs to be expanded though.

Jim's obvious genius being that he's managed to come up with a 100W 80/40/20 CW xcvr which is spread across two whole shelves. Breakthrough systems design concept; "widely distributed CW transceivers".

About as counter-miniturization as it gets right? So he's already ingeniously solved that one. As a matter of policy I submit that we should concentrate on just the packaging problem and let him handle the "engineering". He is, after all, the group MSEE.

I'm thinking maybe your National Blue for the front surround and the SS panel then maybe something like a flip-top transparent blue tinted plastic cabinet along the lines of an iMac so that everybody could actually see how it works. Could also include a built-in soldering station for doing the never-ending mods? And a drawer in which to store spare eight-pin tube sockets of course.

OK, so it would be about the size of a steamer trunk and it would need castors to be able move it about . . details, details . . don't bore me with stupid details, "I'm a concept guy . . "

> > > Sure do. It sits next to the S-40A. The engraved German silver dial is
> > > super looking.
> >
> > There's some trip bait . . I've always wanted to listen to one of
> > those '30s rcvrs but never had the oportunity.
>
> My HRO is the mechanical marvel but for performance,

Nice old boat anchors, great dial mechanisms. I used an HRO 50 when I took the graveyard shift on 40M in my first-ever contest, a neighborhood club Field Day exercise. Smooooth tuning.

> I'd have to say
> that the RME-69 has it beat.

You got a 69 too??!

http://oak.cats.ohiou.edu/~postr/bapix/RME69.html

> If we talk about the modern era, I'm
> partial to the 75A-3 (modified to A-4 with the Universal Radio product
> detector) for the ham bands

I'm partial to the 75A4 myself, I had one for years which had the
W2VCZ front end mods. Best 160/80/40 RX out there until rigs like that
later 940s finally came along.

> and the 51S-1 for general coverage.

THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.

> > > I've noted Globe King 500-C's going for $3,000+. I was amazed to get
> > > $775 for a 51J-4 the year before last.
> >
> > NICE radio!
>
> It fell into my "if you don't turn it on and use it" category. I found
> other uses for the money. I need to reduce the size of my collection of
> heavy iron and increase the number of dollars. I can use the dollars
> for modern marvels.

I hear ya and I agree, I'm on the same course.

> Not a bad idea. I think I may have told you that OH7XM was trying to
> repair a TS-850 for a fellow in Helsinki. He found that the frequency
> display unit is no longer available. That's one of the things which has
> kept me away from K'wood.

Sure I remember that one. Sad. So far it seems like the 940s are still
being supported at least to some extent. Plus there are still ten
jillion of 'em out there and for absolute fact the repair shops are
hoarding junkers for parts in this country. But it ain't last forever
like the tube rigs have.

Kenwood made itself a legend in the '80s and a lotta folk still yearn
for a new competition-grade xcvr but lookit the junk they're peddling
these days. TS-2000 . . gimmee a break! There are persistent rumors
all over about Kenwood cooking some killer new xcvr in the back room
but I'm not holding my breath.

> > > I don't support the ARRL's "gimme" for tens of thousands.
> >
> > Ham radio has bigger problems than this one.
>
> I don't know that they're bigger. They're mostly just "other".

There's enough policy-shredding fodder running today to keep RRAP
running for YEARS to come.

> > > Now Len can't
> > > accuse us of not discussing amateur radio policy, his favorite topic for
> > > some obscure reason.

> >
> > A Putz is a Putz is a Putz, whatta bore.
>
> We're not dealing with ordinary here. This one was in the BIG TIME once
> upon a time.

"Plop-plop, fizz, fizz . . "

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2902. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 17:10:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87628

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4033F76F.8F5ACE43@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > > Dunno where I got the notion it was on the Kentucky side of the crick.
> >
> > You're likely thinking of the old WCKY at 1530 on the dial. It is now
> > WSAI which was at 1360. Confusing enough for you? WCKY was owned by
> > L.B. Wilson, a Kentuckian and the call stood for W Covington KentuckY.
> > Transmitters are on a hilltop overlooking Covington and the studios are
> > in downtown Cincinnati.
>
> Probably, I do remember seeing BC towers on a hill near Covington.
> Maybe that is where my confusion started. Usta run up and down 75 to
> Lexington and Danville. Made Danville to the airport in two hours flat
> on one occasion by golly.

Cincinnati, like Rome, is built on seven hills. There are a number of
other hills on the Kentucky shore. Most of 'em have radio towers. I
operated from four spots during my days in the area: As WB4KTR/8, I was
a block off the U.C. campus on top of the hill in an area called
Clifton. I had no tower but was able to put a mast on top of the three
storey commercial building. I moved across the river to Fort Thomas in
'74 and operated from atop the hill in that town with a tribander on a
40' push-up mast. Site three was in Mt. Airy, across the road from a
nice, quiet 1600 acre city forest. I used a 60 foot tower there.
Finally, I moved to the west side of the city to Cheviot. That same 60
footer was used there and was then hauled around the world. There are
still tower bases for that one in the ground in Botswana and Tanzania.
The tower stayed in Dar es Salaam. The embassy now uses it for a
repeater antenna.

> > Dad tried a couple of Buicks but has owned a number of Merc Grand
> > Marquis Limiteds over the last couple of decades.
>
> Barge pilot huh? Pop has a USCG Master's ticket?

You know the drill: Mom feels "safer" in the big car.

> Went to the local Enterpise vehicle rental store a bit back, told 'em
> I wanted the cheapest set of wheels they had for a week. Like the
> $10/day Metro three-banger they'd been hyping. One thing led to
> another, I wound up with some monster Pontiac for the price of the

> three-banger. Talk about "road shock" . . I'll spare ya my thoughts
> when I first squeezed the beast into a parking slot at my favorite
> food emporium. Tried to. When I turned it back in a week later I still
> hadn't found out what a third of the stupid bottons in the thing were
> supposed to do. Maybe Ralph Nader was right after all.

In a tale similar to yours, we came back to the U.S. from Helsinki in
the late 90's and ended up with a Pontiac Grand Am. I was underwhelmed
with the underpowered, poor-handling beast.

> > I'm a small car guy.
> > I'm now on my third Dodge Neon, this one is bright yellow and has a
> > spoiler.
>
> Yoicks . . . ! Didja install the mandatory resonator on the tailpipe
> yet?

Naw, all stock. I stop using the performance tires when the factory
rubber gives up the ghost. It doesn't matter which tires I buy, the
twisty, hilly roads hereabouts make certain that I get only about 25,000
miles on them as the outside corners get worn down.

> I'm big on small cars too, gots me a silly little 4 dr. '96
> Chebby/Suzuki/Metro Geo w/150k miles on it. I keep telling myself I
> really oughta get one for the other foot. Managed to blow a piston
> last fall, $1,600 engine rebuild by my pet Benz wrench, runs like a
> Swiss watch now. 'Cept my nickle-Extra N3 buddy backed his friggin'
> monster Freightliner Classic into the rear end of my nice little Geo
> and "reconfigured" a bit of sheet metal . . Back to the Benz shop . .
> red body, green trunk deck and the rest is still in primer.

It'll fit right in here! Just be careful you don't end up with a deer
pasted to the front of it.

> Dunno if I can trust it to make Wheeling & vicinity and back or not
> but I'm seriously mulling that prospect come the warmer winds of the
> days ahead. I figger if I gotta thumb it back home on the PA tpk. I
> might as well do it when it's warmer.

I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear. If you talk 'EY into coming,
you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.

> > > I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .
> > > .
> > >
> > > I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
> > > panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.
>
> Yeah, great start . . I like your National Blue and the brushed SS
> panel concept a bunch for openers. Needs to be expanded though.
>
> Jim's obvious genius being that he's managed to come up with a 100W

> 80/40/20 CW xcvr which is spread across two whole shelves.
> Breakthrough systems design concept; "widely distributed CW
> transceivers".
>
> About as counter-miniturization as it gets right? So he's already
> ingeniously solved that one. As a matter of policy I submit that we
> should concentrate on just the packaging problem and let him handle
> the "engineering". He is, after all, the group MSEE.
>
> I'm thinking maybe your National Blue for the front surround and the
> SS panel then maybe something like a flip-top transparent blue tinted
> plastic cabinet along the lines of an iMac so that everybody could
> actually see how it works. Could also include a built-in soldering
> station for doing the never-ending mods? And a drawer in which to
> store spare eight-pin tube sockets of course.
>
> OK, so it would be about the size of a steamer trunk and it would need
> castors to be able move it about . . details, details . . don't bore
> me with stupid details, "I'm a concept guy . . "

I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
stainless panel.

> > > > Sure do. It sits next to the S-40A. The engraved German silver dial is
> > > > super looking.
> > >
> > > There's some trip bait . . I've always wanted to listen to one of
> > > those '30s rcvrs but never had the oportunity.
> >
> > My HRO is the mechanical marvel but for performance,
>
> Nice old boat anchors, great dial mechanisms. I used an HRO 50 when I
> took the graveyard shift on 40M in my first-ever contest, a
> neighborhood club Field Day exercise. Smooooth tuning.
>
> > I'd have to say
> > that the RME-69 has it beat.
>
> You got a 69 too??!

Yeah--with 5 and 10m converter, and also from the same era an FB-7 and
an SW-3.

> http://oak.cats.ohiou.edu/~postr/bapix/RME69.html
>
> > If we talk about the modern era, I'm
> > partial to the 75A-3 (modified to A-4 with the Universal Radio product
> > detector) for the ham bands
>
> I'm partial to the 75A4 myself, I had one for years which had the

> W2VCZ front end mods. Best 160/80/40 RX out there until rigs like that
> later 940s finally came along.

Great receiver though the current pricing is too rich for my blood.

> > and the 51S-1 for general coverage.
>
> THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
> but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
> the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.

Talk to me!

Dave K8MN

2903. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 17:20:28 UTC
From: modrisco@tds.net
Message-ID: <e09403b8.0402200920.633aea75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
news:<c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>...
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville

Placed one order with Universal Radio, and it was promptly processed.
Have been waiting on a back order (Sony AN-LP1 Active Loop SW antenna)
since early January. I'm sure they're waitning on Sony to deliver to
them, but it's frustrating.

2904. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 20:54:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402201254.f735d86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87630

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40362C44.F9B7E06@earthlink.net>...
>
> You have a rare ability to see the facts spread out before you and to
> come to an incorrect conclusion. There was nothing I wrote which would
> make me an ally of anyone in a "scheme to interfere".
>
> I pointed out some reality. I asked a question.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, whenever I come across something posted here that lacks "good
amateur practice," your name pops up.

2905. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:08:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402201308.6ac058da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
news:<c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>...
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville

They've got a thing for cats. I often wonder if I should send them an
anonymous fax of a "Far Side" cat cartoon, the one where the cat is
being hauled away by two cops. ;^)

2906. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:19:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403679E3.60A09E32@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87632

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40362C44.F9B7E06@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > You have a rare ability to see the facts spread out before you and to
> > come to an incorrect conclusion. There was nothing I wrote which would
> > make me an ally of anyone in a "scheme to interfere".
> >
> > I pointed out some reality. I asked a question.

>
> Dave, whenever I come across something posted here that lacks "good
> amateur practice," your name pops up.

It would appear that my name pops up because you attempt to make an
association where none exists. I'm not involved in a scheme. I did,
however, ask you how a licensed service can intentionally interfere with
a non-licensed producer of RF. You've not yet come up with a response.

Dave K8MN

2907. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:34:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220163458.07155.00000808@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87635

In article <FJnZb.12140$W74.2937@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"The Eternal Squire" wrote:
>>
>> So far as I know, FCC regs allow the
>> use of any code which is not intended
>> to obscure the meaning of the message,
>> and that this regulation can be satisfied
>> by the mere publication of the code.
>> This email is intended to publish a
>> telegraphy (Morse) code so that it might
>> be permissible to use. (snip)
>
> You might want to contact the FCC for specific requirements before
>proceeding. I sincerely doubt this newsgroup is "publication" to the extent
>expected by the FCC. Wider publication will likely be needed, such as in a
>major radio-related magazine or book.

Dwight, I take off for a few days and this place gets even sillier than before! :-)

Too many get off on their own "realities" and leave this dimension for some emotionally-overloading FICTIONAL universe.

Tolkien's "Middle Earth" isn't on the ITU's Region list and New Zealand (where the film triology was made) still speaks English as a primary language. Tolkien himself was an Englishman.

With all the "magic" in the enjoyable film triology, they don't really need any simple on-off carrier keying to communicate...just speak into their rings...or a birdbath...or container of magic potion.

I was wondering why old Star Trek fan sub-set Vulcan lovers were until I realized the Vulcans communicated solely by "CW" (Curse Words) and sub-space radio. FCC has no regs on sub-space radio. Mama Dee would say (I'm sure) that it's okay to legally interfere with a sub-space radio if you have a federally authorized amateur radio license.

Gotta love the weirdness in here! :-)

LHA / WMD

2908. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:35:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220163503.07155.00000809@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87637

In article <1e4e3692.0402200335.164d7c18@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Dear Beeping Bill:
>>
>> How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?
>
>Why an NOI and now an NPRM for such a Part 15 device?
>
>The rules will change.

State Department Dave lives in a different reality and isn't quite up to speed on FCC abbreviations. An "NPRM" is a Notice of Proposed Rule Making but big Dave thinks the rules are already in place.

Mama Dee lives in another reality where she thinks it is perfectly legal for any licensed amateur to deliberately interfere with unlicensed electronics.

The gunnery nurse is on a peak of his manic-depressive cycle again and busy trying to peddle it to a single destination in his twilight zone.

tRoll keeps slipping in his macro butter. The Katapult King is off on an old-radio bender (better than shooting bears for the navy). Now Hampton wants to get agressive against an enemy of radio that hasn't been installed everywhere.

To them there are Monsters Under The Bed everywhere (not realizing they are looking into mirrors when saying that).

I think that all the regulars ought to go on back to tawking about all them amateur radio policy subjects like trolleys, muscle cars for orion-sitters, old radio broadcast stations, making fun of the U.S. military, making fun of others not liking them, architects, show biz folk, and the legality of federally licensed amateurs to do anything because they are Federally Authorized..

What with all those multiple copies of TAFKA Rev Jim's (which "is not his fault" even though I don't get such repeats on other news-groups or other problems with AOL), it's not worth staying in here. Except to see the creativity in rationalizing they are always correct and all others are mistaken.

LHA / WMD

2909. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:35:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220163506.07155.00000810@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87638

In article <mzbZb.3833$t16.2902497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>The marketing hype is cheap broadband for the rural areas. Economic reality
>is that it will probably never be extended into the rural areas even if some
>suburban areas do go for it.

You have the "studies" to prove this as a fact?

>Every single transformer between the injection
>point of the signal and the end user must be bypassed with the BPL signal
>for that signal to work.

Of course you KNOW the EXACT CHARACTERISTICS of "a BPL
signal," don't you?

I don't and won't presume to guess. But, you are AUTHORIZED by the
FCC to "legally interfere with any unlicensed service (of any kind)" and
are therefore blameless.

>If you only have one user every few miles, it will
>never pay off. And of course you've mentioned the power and/or signal
>boosters required. Periodic boosters all along the line will be needed.

Ah so, the federal authorization magically makes all amateurs into
technical experts who KNOW things all through answering a few
questions and passing a morse code test.

Must be that new "interest" thing in hum radio.

LHA / WMD

2910. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:35:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220163508.07155.00000811@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87633

In article <XpbZb.3829$t16.2901181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Interfering with a Part 15 device doesn't happen to be illegal.
>
>Part 15 devices are not allowed to interfere with any licensed radio service
>and must accept (i.e. tolerate) interference from any licensed radio
>service.

Riiiiiight. Do your TVI thing, Mama Dee, interfere with pacemakers
and wired telephones and CB radios and whatever you want. You
have the "legal right" to do that from your federal authorization?

Must be all that "interest" thing in hum radio.

LHA / WMD

2911. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:35:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220163511.07155.00000812@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87636

In article <tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>You see, if an unlicensed transmitter is going to put some electric field
>into my receiver, I simply want to return the favor - with interest.

Of course. "Interest."

Feel free to "return favors" to cardiac patients using pacemakers and
other medical devices using RF coupling. Mama Dee says that sort
of thing is LEGAL because YOU HAVE A LICENSE and the federal
AUTHORIZATION to do such.

Feel free to generate TVI with your authorized amateur radio license
even though broadcast TV is also authorized. "Return with interest."
I'll bet Mama Dee will say that is perfectly legal, too.

Feel free to spritz your neighbors with RF 24/7. You are authorized to
transmit and it is so difficult to measure EM radiation levels by
amateurs. "Return with interest" all the irritation they caused you.

"Interest" in amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

2912. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:35:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220163512.07155.00000813@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87634

In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Jim,
>
>Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?

ADA is the callsign of Headquarters, United States Army Pacific,
Fort Shafter, Hawaii. That callsign has been active since 1946 and
in continuous use all this time, connected with area command
headquarters in the Pacific region.

Why do you insist on making fun of the United States Army?

Go back to abusing yourself with all those oriongasms.

LHA / WMD

2913. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:46:49 UTC
From: Dan Conti <dconti@nj.rr.com>
Message-ID: <dfvZb.161515$cM1.29926685@twister.nyc.rr.com>
Source record: 87641
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Universal Radio is horrible. Period.

After giving them many chances after knowing better, they continually disappoint.

They NEVER have anything in stock, DO NOT communicate, and will not ship to addresses other then the billing address.

Thanks to their horrible service, I've gone elsewhere and always saved money. Thanks Universal!

Dan
> "Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
> news:c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net...
>
>>I would like to get some opinions about
>>Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>>
>>My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
>>and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
>>or more to back order.
>>
>>Rusty in Louisville
>
>
>
> Had significant trouble with an R8B order. They did not ship as they
> promised and the worst part was they lied to me. The office manager was
> exceptionally surly when I called and asked what had happened. I doubt they
> know the first thing about good customer service.
>
>
>
>

2914. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:47:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40368068.D4988F09@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87639

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:402EAC18.488E92E4@earthlink.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >
> > > > >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> > > >
> > > > Uh huh!
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I'll ask:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
> > >
> > > Why would they be "unqualified?"
> >
> > Let's be specific: It is because they will not have passed the exam
> > which the FCC says they must pass in order to qualify for a specific
> > class of license.
>
> Which, as anyone familiar with incentive licensing, has
> NOTHING to do with actually being qualified to do anything
> specific to amateur radio based on the additional privileges.

The regs state that someone who wishes to use those particular hunks of
RF real estate will pass those exams. If someone hasn't passed the
exam, he or she has not met the qualifications for occupying particular
band segments.

> > > Let's be serious here!
> >
> > It is getting tougher to be serious when you persist in yanking our
> > lanyards.
>
> Me? I just support the ARRL petition....I didn't propose

> it.

I'm not confused about who produced it and I'm not confused about your support for it, though I believe such support is unwise.

> Seems you don't like anyone giving an opinion
> contrary to yours.

Where was that written? You surely don't expect me to sit mute while you lead the cheering section for something I believe to be wrong, do you?

> If you don't agree with me, I really don't
> give a damn...

That much is evident. Let me quote you: "Seems you don't like anyone giving an opinion contrary to yours".

> ...as the ONLY arbiter of the outcome that
> matters is what the FCC will think and do.

We have some evidence of what the FCC has thought in the current regulations.

> > > In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no bearing
> > > at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
> >
> > Let's do this one in your manner: Whatever floats your boat. Life's
> > a--well, you know the drill.
>
> Glad to see you have nothing credible to refute my statement.

If that is your view, then it applies equally to you non-refutations of earlier statements. After all, you're the guy who used those exact responses.

> > > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
> >
> > How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit on VHF/UHF. I'm
> > betting that the answer is "none".
>
> Doesn't matter. They can if they want. Also, what
> makes you assume ALL technicians are beginners?

The assumption is yours. I wrote nothing about all Technicians being beginners.

> > > > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
> reduction
> > > in
> > > > >>the written test requirements for those licenses.
> > > > >

> > > > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> > > > >
> > > > > Give me a break, Bill!
> > > > >
> > > > > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> > > >
> > > > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > > > what?
> > >
> > > They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher class
> > > license. No ifs, ands or buts.
> >
> > Yet you can't offer one operating skill or privilege that would
> > be covered by such lack of having passed the requisit test.

That isn't the point at all. If such is your belief, there is nothing
to prevent doing away entirely with all but one license class and making
the exams much easier. You claimed that you didn't support watering
down the tests. Here you're making a case for dumbing down the whole
shebang.

> > > > > >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time
> > reduction,
> > > > > > > >but it's still a reduction.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the
> > reason's
> > > > > > > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> > > > > > > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> > > > > > > permanent reductions in requirements.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Are the people qualified?
> > > > >
> > > > > YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> > > > > unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
> > > > > they would be unqualified.
> > >
> > > By your statement, you are supporting a watering down of both the
> > > General and Extra class licenses. I'm quite certain that this is
> > > something you stated that you'd never support.
> >
> > If you want it clearer...I support the ARRL petition.

I didn't agree with it when I read it and I don't agree with it when you
say you support it.

> In doing so, I acknowledge that there will be, if implemented
> as submitted, a ONE_TIME reduction of test requirements
> for those hams that get free upgrades. I also recognize and

> understand that other than the one-time upgrades, there
> will be NO reduction in written test requirements for Extra
> and General.
>
> Clear enough for you?

I've never had any trouble understanding your view. You seem to not be
able to see where such a position can lead. If the material isn't
deemed necessary for an upgrade on a one-time basis, it is difficult to
justify it as being necessary any time.

> > > > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years. Why,
> > > because
> > > > > > no one losses any privileges.
> > > > >
> > > > > Are they qualified?
> > > >
> > > Broken record here it seems.
> >
> > The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not been
> > forthcoming.
>
> The question keeps coming up because some people can't
> understand the difference between a ONE-TIME waiver as
> opposed to a PERMANENT change in requirements.

I haven't seen any evidence that there are people unable to tell the
difference. I see evidence that your position could lead to some
unintended consequences.

> > > > A few things here.
> > > >
> > > > IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is *no
> > > > reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support that
> you
> > > > are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as the
> > > > evil Morse code supporters.
> > >
> > > I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
> > > relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
> > > system as created simply asks for passage of another test
> > > on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
> > > that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
> > > that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
> > > spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
> > > spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
> > > power.
> >
> > So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of the

> > elimination of incentive licensing.
>
> I do NOT support a permanant reduction of written requirements.
> I support a limited incentive system but I wish the additional
> privileges bore some relationship to the additional knowledge being
> tested for.

Nice waffle.

> > There can be no other explanation.
>
> I just gave you one above. The fact that I recognize the reality of
> privileges vs knowledge being virtually non-existent, and that
> I am willing to state the obvious, does not mean I must, therefore,
> oppose incentive licensing.

You must. You must. You support permitting those who have not passed
certain elements being granted a freebie upgrade. Such an upgrade is at
odds with incentive licensing.

> > If your agenda extends not just to the elimination of morse testing but
> > to the watering down of the written exams, why not be bold? Come out and
> > say so.
>
> Because it isn't true!

That thing which looks like a duck is quacking and swimming.

> > > > If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
> > > > and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a
> great
> > > > disservice.
> > > >
> > > > Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> > > > support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
> > >
> > > The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> > > novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> > > power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
> >
> > The League's position provides a "gimme" to tens of thousands by
> > granting a by on testing. It is apparent that if it can be done on a
> > one-time basis, it can be done permanently.
>
> Is that what ARRL is proposing? Is that what I have
> stated I support? Answer - NO!
>
> > > > I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that we'll
> just
> > > > do this once
> > >
> > > Believe whatever makes you feel good.

> >
> > Is that how you decide what to believe?
>
> Depends on the decision to be made and the circumstances.

"If it feels good, do it".

> > > > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
> > > >
> > > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> > > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> > > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> > > or Advanced to Extra.
> > >
> > You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from Tech
> > to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
> > thousands.
> > Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it necessary
> > to do.
>
> Read the ARRL petition. ARRL makes the case and I agree with their
> logic. No need to repeat it again.

Yeah, it is kind of embarrassing. I can understand why you wouldn't
want it repeated.

> > > > I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test requirements.
> > > > I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI. But
> > > > here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for access
> > > > to HF. A pattern forms.
> > > >
> > > Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> > > background too.
> > >
> > I didn't hear music. I did read your words and Carl's words. What you
> > are writing these days is at odds with the earlier statements. Your
> > earlier statements which traditionally began, "all we want is..." sound
> > disingenuous.
>
> What is at odds with you is that you don't understand the difference
> between ONE-TIME and PERMANENT change. If it makes
> you happy to think that supporting a one-time waiver makes Carl
> and I supports of reducing requiremnts, then you are free
> to enjoy your own beliefs.

I fully understand the difference. It does not make me happy to believe
that your support of a "just this once" freebie constitutes a reduction
in requirements, I still see it happening.

> > > Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.
> > >
> > Opposition to the League's plan floats mine right now. I suppose your

> > comment is better than one of Lennie's "TS" brushoffs.
>
> Frankly Dave, I don't give a damn.

That has long been apparent.

Dave K8MN

2915. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 21:49:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403680EF.2BD75369@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87640

William wrote:

> Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.

You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".

Dave K8MN

2916. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:00:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402201400.113d4fcf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87642

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<mzbZb.3833$t16.2902497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:1QaZb.2312$2z1.2282@news01.roc.ny...
> > Dave,
> >
> > What amazes me is that this *one* interest (the power companies with BPL)
> > may well be allowed to wreck havoc with many (far more than just amateur,
> > which is what some folks think) users. I'm not even sure how
> inexpensively
> > BPL could be rolled out in a rural area. They would either need some kind
> > of boosters or run a *lot* of rf power at the source. Maybe I'm wrong,
> but
> > my thinking is that BPL would likely be targeted at suburbs where many
> might
> > live too far away for DSL, but the distribution costs for BPL might not be
> > too much.
>
> The marketing hype is cheap broadband for the rural areas. Economic reality
> is that it will probably never be extended into the rural areas even if some
> suburban areas do go for it. Every single transformer between the injection
> point of the signal and the end user must be bypassed with the BPL signal
> for that signal to work. If you only have one user every few miles, it will
> never pay off. And of course you've mentioned the power and/or signal
> boosters required. Periodic boosters all along the line will be needed.

It's worse than that Dee.

Power lines used for BPL will have very significant losses per block
or however you might measure it and there is a distinct limit to the
number of amplifiers which can be used per injection point. Bottom
line is that BPL won't work unless it's periodically and frequently
fed by a fiber optic or cable TV type "primary source", a backbone.
The BPL system currently being installed in Manassas VA will make use
of a municipally-funded fiber optic backbone.

The simple fact of the matter is that BPL will not happen in the
boonies unless it's fed into the boonies on some sort of backbone. So
if Farmer Jones doesn't already have cable TV, DSL/ISDN or fiber optic
service available the probability of Jones getting a BPL feed is nil.
The FCC commissioners who are hyping BPL are either stupid beyond
belief or are lying thru their teeth.

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

2917. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:01:42 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <atvZb.88652$jk2.435496@attbi_s53>
Source record: 87643

Perhaps something in Klingon would be better ...oh brother ...way TOO much time on his hands ....

73 Tom KI3R

2918. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:02:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403683C8.7C98CA31@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87644

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0402160205.59cf0658@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Nancy
> >> > Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> > >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
> >> > >
> >> > >PJ
> >> >
> >> > Been vacationing in outer space?
> >> >
> >> > Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in
> the
> >> > early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox
> >> > was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got
> >> > rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move
> to
> >> > Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International"
> >> > but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It
> all
> >> > ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.
> >> >
> >> > The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in
> >> > 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily
> >> > spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.
>

> > > Set the hook now. Steady!

> > > Ziiiiiiiiing!

> > > Okay, now let him run with it. Try and tire him out, then reel him in.

> > > You can haul him down to the taxidermy shop in the morning and have him
> > > mounted. Get a little brass plate reading "Pisces Maximus Anderson".

> >Hysterical, it don't get NO better than this, Nancy got us the new
> >record Putzian faux pas.

> Quite true, whether it be "Nancy" or "PJ" or whatever...living in the past
> seems to be a "qualification" for olde-tyme hammes of the morse
> persuasion.

It surely looks as if "Nancy" caught The Big Fish right here in the
present.

> There hasn't been a new BC-610 made for a half century or so, yet all
> IMAGINE they are still being made in Chicago and anyone can write a
> non-existant corporation for "information."

I don't think that "all IMAGINE" any more than all believe "Ham Radio"
to be other than a defunct magazine.

> Countless radio yachts are
> moored by such boat anchors and many olde-tymers love to scrape off
> the barnacles and tell many a tale of love and affection for those raddios
> that glow in the dark (much as the eyes of the olde-tymers glow in the
> dark when describing their wonderous adventures of expertise).

I knew you'd understand. You've often regaled us with those tales of the
40 KW bandblasters at ADA when you were in your youth.

> "Expertise" as equated by the mental and emotional stability of seven-
> year-old Extras that all must emulate to "be as good as them." :-)

You can start by passing an "Extra right out of the box" and attempting
to match the experience of the seven-year-old Extra. I doubt you'll
have time to catch up with the rest of us, General, Advanced or Extra.

> Must be that all that radiotelegraphy rots the brain...

Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
Hallicrafters troll.

Dave K8MN

2919. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:04:55 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <bwvZb.88672$jk2.434444@attbi_s53>
Source record: 87645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"starman" <starman@tech.net> wrote in message
news:40358EED.F877E125@tech.net...
> sdl wrote:
> >
> > I had a negative experience and would *not* recommend Universal Radio.

No experience here with Universal Radio but I would whole heartedly
recommend R&L. I won't go into details here but they were very good to me.

73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2920. Re: GMRS and requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:12:47 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <zDvZb.90489$uV3.553246@attbi_s51>
Source record: 87646

"Paul" <flowerfarts3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:7e284$40303fe4$d8536fd5$19988@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040215094252.25867.00001269@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > >Not a
> > >bad deal really and it's cheaper and likely more
> > >useful than a subscription to QST... ;)
> >
> > A trip to Mcdonalds is more useful than QST
>
> Do you mean to say that reading QST gives one
> a bad case of the shi+s just as well as eating the
> stuff in buns allegedly sold as "food" at McDonalds ?
>
> Wonders never cease! :) :) :)

Hey wait a minute ..you mean that there are others that get the screamers
from McDonald's ????? I thought it was just me .... Oh -Oh ...now the list
has disintegrated into diarrhea discussions ..but on the other hand it is
not that far a distance from rectal to oral "running".

73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2921. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:12:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4036864A.F5CF82F8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87647

Loon Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Jim,
> >
> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
>
> ADA is the callsign of Headquarters, United States Army Pacific,
> Fort Shafter, Hawaii. That callsign has been active since 1946 and
> in continuous use all this time, connected with area command
> headquarters in the Pacific region.
>
> Why do you insist on making fun of the United States Army?

Oh, you simply misunderstood once again. I wasn't poking fun at the
Army.
I was poking fun at you personally, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

2922. Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:17:51 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <c1612fira1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 87648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Why is it not OK to freeband on unused parts
of 11 and 10 meters?

Organized, long term freebanders are very aware
where they operate and take great measure to
ensure against talking on an amateur frequency
or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there,
why shouldn't I, especially if I want to have a nice
DX contact with one of them?

Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men"
off the freqs. Same analogy as the gun issue...
when guns are outlawed only outlaws will have
guns...no, you won't find many freebanders lobbying
for change to open the freqs because the law as
it reads, doesn't bug us.

No rationalization is even needed except to reply to
folks that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is
these folks that feel they need a reason why we do
what we do, not us.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Fri Feb 20 23:17:51 2004 depuis l'IP : ac8bbce3.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2923. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 22:40:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40368CC3.4050402@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Twistedhed wrote a troll....

2924. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-20 23:55:49 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0402201555.30749e7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87650

Bob <none> wrote in message

>
> Did they violate part 97 of FCC regulations OR Did the control operator
> violate their 1ST amendment rights
>

Neither. Their conversation was not in violation of part 97, and the
control operator is free to turn the repeater on or off at his whim.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2925. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 00:05:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <SgxZb.12514$W74.6941@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87651

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40368068.D4988F09@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:402EAC18.488E92E4@earthlink.net...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > >
> > > > > >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> > > > >
> > > > > Uh huh!
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I'll ask:
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
> > > >
> > > > Why would they be "unqualified?"
> > >
> > > Let's be specific: It is because they will not have passed the exam
> > > which the FCC says they must pass in order to qualify for a specific
> > > class of license.
> >
> > Which, as anyone familiar with incentive licensing, has
> > NOTHING to do with actually being qualified to do anything
> > specific to amateur radio based on the additional privileges.
>
> The regs state that someone who wishes to use those particular hunks of
> RF real estate will pass those exams. If someone hasn't passed the
> exam, he or she has not met the qualifications for occupying particular
> band segments.

If the FCC goes with the ARRL proposal, then there will be a "one-time"
waiver of certain tests to accomodate the upgrades...which then means
that those new upgraded Extras or Generals do, indeed,
```

constitute fully qualified hams for those license
classes.

> > > > Let's be serious here!
> > >
> > > It is getting tougher to be serious when you persist in yanking our
> > > lanyards.
> > >
> > Me? I just support the ARRL petition....I didn't propose
> > it.
>
> I'm not confused about who produced it and I'm not confused about your
> support for it, though I believe such support is unwise.

Your free to hold whatever opinion you wish.

> > Seems you don't like anyone giving an opinion
> > contrary to yours.
>
> Where was that written? You surely don't expect me to sit mute while
> you lead the cheering section for something I believe to be wrong, do
> you?

Whatever floats your boat.

> > If you don't agree with me, I really don't
> > give a damn...
>
> That much is evident. Let me quote you: "Seems you don't like anyone
> giving an opinion contrary to yours".

Your point? That is my opinion of how I read your comments...which
is certainly my right.

> > ...as the ONLY arbiter of the outcome that
> > matters is what the FCC will think and do.
>
> We have some evidence of what the FCC has thought in the current
> regulations.

Somehow I suspect the ARRL BOD does also...but I suspect it
isn't in sync with what you think.

> > > > In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no
bearing
> > > > at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
> > > >
> > > > Let's do this one in your manner: Whatever floats your boat. Life's
> > > > a--well, you know the drill.
> > >
> > Glad to see you have nothing credible to refute my statement.
>
> If that is your view, then it applies equally to you non-refutations of

> earlier statements. After all, you're the guy who used those exact
> responses.

Whatever floats your boat.

> > > > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > > > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > > > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
> > >
> > > How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit on VHF/UHF.
I'm
> > > betting that the answer is "none".
> >
> > Doesn't matter. They can if they want. Also, what
> > makes you assume ALL technicians are beginners?
>
> The assumption is yours. I wrote nothing about all Technicians being
> beginners.

Nor did I suggest that "all" Techs are beginners....
but it is still a fact that all technicians, both beginners and "old hands"
are allowed 1500 watts.

> > > > > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
> > reduction
> > > > > > >>in the written test requirements for those licenses.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > > > > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > > > > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Give me a break, Bill!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > > > > > what?
> > > > >
> > > > > They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher class
> > > > > license. No ifs, ands or buts.
> > >
> > > Yet you can't offer one operating skill or privilege that would
> > > be covered by such lack of having passed the requisit test.
>
> That isn't the point at all. If such is your belief, there is nothing
> to prevent doing away entirely with all but one license class and making
> the exams much easier. You claimed that you didn't support watering
> down the tests. Here you're making a case for dumbing down the whole
> shebang.

Believe what you wish. I support the "one-time" upgrades.
If that makes you think I support permanent "dumbing down"

then you have a lapse of logic somewhere.

> > > > > >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time
> > reduction,
> > > > > > > >but it's still a reduction.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the
> > reason's
> > > > > > > > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> > > > > > > > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> > > > > > > > permanent reductions in requirements.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Are the people qualified?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> > > > > > unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
> > > > > > they would be unqualified.
> > > > >
> > > > By your statement, you are supporting a watering down of both the
> > > > General and Extra class licenses. I'm quite certain that this is
> > > > something you stated that you'd never support.
> > >
> > If you want it clearer...I support the ARRL petition.
> >
> I didn't agree with it when I read it and I don't agree with it when you
> say you support it.

Fair enough.

> > In doing so, I acknowledge that there will be, if implemented
> > as submitted, a ONE_TIME reduction of test requirements
> > for those hams that get free upgrades. I also recognize and
> > understand that other than the one-time upgrades, there
> > will be NO reduction in written test requirements for Extra
> > and General.
> >
> > Clear enough for you?
> >
> I've never had any trouble understanding your view. You seem to not be
> able to see where such a position can lead. If the material isn't
> deemed necessary for an upgrade on a one-time basis, it is difficult to
> justify it as being necessary any time.

Yawn. That's for the FCC to decide and, I suspect the FCC
can live with a one-time upgrade without believeing it
jeopardizes all future requirements. Governments often waive
criminal and monetary fines by waiving them and offering
special "tax amnesty" periods. After the "amnesty period" is over,
if you are found guilty of eevading the taxes, you think the
courts accept an argument that if the fines were waived once
they should be permanently waived?

> > > > > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.
Why,
> > > > because
> > > > > > no one losses any privileges.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Are they qualified?
> > > > >
> > > > Broken record here it seems.
> > >
> > > The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not been
> > > forthcoming.
> >
> > The question keeps coming up because some people can't
> > understand the difference between a ONE-TIME waiver as
> > opposed to a PERMANENT change in requirements.
>
> I haven't seen any evidence that there are people unable to tell the
> difference. I see evidence that your position could lead to some
> unintended consequences.

And I don't. There's plenty of "waivered" situations in government
as already noted.

> > > > > A few things here.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > IF the people getting the free upgrade are qualified then there is
*no
> > > > > reason to increase the requirements ever again*. If you support
that
> > you
> > > > > are just as supportive of a hazing requirement (over-testing) as
the
> > > > > evil Morse code supporters.
> > > > >
> > > > I repeat agin, the incentive licensing system bears NO true
> > > > relation to the increased privileges granted. The incentive
> > > > system as created simply asks for passage of another test
> > > > on subject matter of a more difficult content. Knowledge of
> > > > that material certainly doesn't lead to any special qualification
> > > > that differentiates an Extra operating in the "Extra Only"
> > > > spectrum from that of a General operating in the General
> > > > spectrum of the same band at the same maximum permitted
> > > > power.
> > >
> > > So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of the
> > > elimination of incentive licensing.
> >
> > I do NOT support a permanant reduction of written requirements.
> > I support a limited incentive system but I wish the additional
> > privileges bore some relationship to the additional knowledge being

> > tested for.
>
> Nice waffle.

No waffle at all. THAT is my specific position and I do wish that licensing privileges did have a relationship to the additional knowledge being tested for.

> > > There can be no other explanation.
> >
> > I just gave you one above. The fact that I recognize the reality of
> > privileges vs knowledge being virtually non-existent, and that
> > I am willing to state the obvious, does not mean I must, therefore,
> > oppose incentive licensing.
>
> You must. You must. You support permitting those who have not passed
> certain elements being granted a freebie upgrade. Such an upgrade is at
> odds with incentive licensing.

Yawn. Tellit to the FCC then. Clearly the ARRL BOD doesn't accept your argument. Seems to me I'm in good company then.

> > > If your agenda extends not just to the elimination of morse testing but
> > > to the watering down of the written exams, why not be bold? Come out and
> > > say so.
> >
> > Because it isn't true!
>
> That thing which looks like a duck is quacking and swimming.

Yawn. Your perceptions do not make it so.

> > > > > If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them upward
> > > > > and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a
> > great
> > > > > > disservice.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> > > > > > support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
> > > > >
> > > > > The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> > > > > novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> > > > > power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code test)
> > > >
> > > > The League's position provides a "gimme" to tens of thousands by
> > > > granting a by on testing. It is apparent that if it can be done on a
> > > > one-time basis, it can be done permanently.
> > >

> > Is that what ARRL is proposing? Is that what I have
> > stated I support? Answer - NO!
> >
> > > > > > I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that
we'll
> > just
> > > > > > do this once
> > > > >
> > > > > Believe whatever makes you feel good.
> > > >
> > > > Is that how you decide what to believe?
> > >
> > Depends on the decision to be made and the circumstances.
>
> "If it feels good, do it".

Depends on the decision. If it is a nice day and I have a decision
to make regarding Mow the Lawn or Take a drive in my antique car
with the top down...well I've taken the "feel good" decision on
that choice many times. Haven't you made similar decisions?
Wake up, decide it is a nice day and call your boss to tell him or
her you're taking a vaction day?

> > > > > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
> > > > >
> > > > > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> > > > > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> > > > > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> > > > > or Advanced to Extra.
> > > >
> > > > You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from Tech
> > > > to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
> > > > thousands.
> > > > Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it
necessary
> > > > to do.
> > >
> > > Read the ARRL petition. ARRL makes the case and I agree with their
> > > logic. No need to repeat it again.
> >
> > Yeah, it is kind of embarrassing. I can understand why you wouldn't
> > want it repeated.

Repeat it all you want. I've neither the time nor inclination to
cut and paste it in here just to make you happy. If anyone else
is curious...go to www.arrl.org.

> > > > > > I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test
requirements.
> > > > > > I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI.
But

> > > > > here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for
access
> > > > > to HF. A pattern forms.
> > > >
> > > > Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> > > > background too.
> > >
> > > I didn't hear music. I did read your words and Carl's words. What
you
> > > are writing these days is at odds with the earlier statements. Your
> > > earlier statements which traditionally began, "all we want is..."
sound
> > > disingenuous.
> >
> > What is at odds with you is that you don't understand the difference
> > between ONE-TIME and PERMANENT change. If it makes
> > you happy to think that supporting a one-time waiver makes Carl
> > and I supports of reducing requiremnts, then you are free
> > to enjoy your own beliefs.
>
> I fully understand the difference. It does not make me happy to believe
> that your support of a "just this once" freebie constitutes a reduction
> in requirements, I still see it happening.

There's that Twilight Zone music again.

> > > > Believe whatever you want, whatever floats your boat.
> > >
> > > Opposition to the League's plan floats mine right now. I suppose your
> > > comment is better than one of Lennie's "TS" brushoffs.
> >
> > Frankly Dave, I don't give a damn.
>
> That has long been apparent.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2926. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 00:35:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220193553.05539.00004440@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87652

In article <40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
>comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear.

I'll bring the hot sauce. They don't call it "Total Insanity" for nothing.

>If you talk 'EY into coming,
>you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.

I got an air mattress for travel....

>> > > I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .

aw geez...

>> > I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
>> > panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.

Miniature is for poodles.

>> Yeah, great start . . I like your National Blue and the brushed SS
>> panel concept a bunch for openers. Needs to be expanded though.

Too fruity for me.

>> Jim's obvious genius being that he's managed to come up with a 100W
>> 80/40/20 CW xcvr which is spread across two whole shelves.

Anybody can make 'em small. I make 'em GOOD.

How many FD QSOs you make so far with the little stuff? The Type 7 did 629 one
year....

>> Breakthrough systems design concept; "widely distributed CW
>> transceivers".

It's called "modular design". The cat's meow.
>>
>> About as counter-miniturization as it gets right? So he's already
>> ingeniously solved that one. As a matter of policy I submit that we
>> should concentrate on just the packaging problem and let him handle
>> the "engineering". He is, after all, the group MSEE.

"Anybody who says size doesn't matter never had a really big one".

>I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
>four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive

>stainless panel.

Fits in a two-footer vertically with room to spare.....
>
>> > My HRO is the mechanical marvel but for performance,
>>
>> Nice old boat anchors, great dial mechanisms.

Ugh. Ten turns to cover the band? Puhleeze, I did better in high school.

The Type 7 uses a cap from a junked BC-221. The Type 6 and 5 used caps from
ARC-5 transmitters.

Swords into plowshares.....

>> > I'd have to say
>> > that the RME-69 has it beat.
>>
>> You got a 69 too??!
>
>Yeah--with 5 and 10m converter, and also from the same era an FB-7 and
>an SW-3.
>
>> http://oak.cats.ohiou.edu/~postr/bapix/RME69.html

I copied one feature from RME: they didn't label much on the panel. They said
if you didn't know what the knobs did you shouldn't be using the set.

>> THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
>> but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
>> the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.
>
>Talk to me!
>
I probably have a plug that will work. And a line cord. Etc.

Got rid of all my Johnson gear, though (sniff). Adventurer, Viking 2 with 122,
Valiant.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2927. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 00:53:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <m_xZb.4135$t16.3093530@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87653

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0402201400.113d4fcf@posting.google.com...
> The simple fact of the matter is that BPL will not happen in the
> boonies unless it's fed into the boonies on some sort of backbone. So
> if Farmer Jones doesn't already have cable TV, DSL/ISDN or fiber optic
> service available the probability of Jones getting a BPL feed is nil.
> The FCC commissioners who are hyping BPL are either stupid beyond
> belief or are lying thru their teeth.
>
> w3rv

If not "stupid beyond belief", then they just aren't bothering to read up on
the realities of implementation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2928. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 01:11:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4036B018.4BA8E11A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87654
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Twistedhed wrote a troll....

...and Leonard "Big Fish" Anderson can expound endlessly about the fact
that they haven't produced any freeband frequencies since 1955.

Dave K8MN

2929. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 01:20:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_nyZb.13558$hm4.5533@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87655

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Dwight, I take off for a few days and
> this place gets even sillier than before! :-)
>
> Too many get off on their own "realities"
> and leave this dimension for some emotionally-
> overloading FICTIONAL universe.
>
> Tolkien's "Middle Earth" isn't on the ITU's
> Region list and New Zealand (where the film
> triology was made) still speaks English as a
> primary language. Tolkien himself was an
> Englishman. (snip)

To be honest, I hardly glanced at anything beyond the first paragraph.
I'll have to turn off "hide read messages" and take another look to see what
you're talking about. Sounds silly enough to be worth the effort though.
Thanks for the heads up.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2930. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 01:41:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4036B743.CCF4493F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87656

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:40368068.D4988F09@earthlink.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:402EAC18.488E92E4@earthlink.net...
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:rIOdnUzDiu8VwbPdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
> > > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >>Do you support those free upgrades or not?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I (K2UNK) do...on this "one time" basis.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Uh huh!
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'll ask:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Are those who get the so called "one time" upgrade qualified?
> > > > >
> > > > > Why would they be "unqualified?"
> > > >
> > > > Let's be specific: It is because they will not have passed the exam
> > > > which the FCC says they must pass in order to qualify for a specific
> > > > class of license.
> > >
> > > Which, as anyone familiar with incentive licensing, has
> > > NOTHING to do with actually being qualified to do anything
> > > specific to amateur radio based on the additional privileges.
> >
> > The regs state that someone who wishes to use those particular hunks of
> > RF real estate will pass those exams. If someone hasn't passed the
> > exam, he or she has not met the qualifications for occupying particular
> > band segments.
>
> If the FCC goes with the ARRL proposal, then there will be a "one-time"
```

> waiver of certain tests to accomodate the upgrades

No kidding?

>...which then means
> that those new upgraded Extras or Generals do, indeed,
> constitute fully qualified hams for those license
> classes.

Yeah, I know that. I'm trying to keep that part of the ARRL proposal
from taking place.

> > > > > Let's be serious here!
> > > >
> > > > It is getting tougher to be serious when you persist in yanking our
> > > > lanyards.
> > >
> > > Me? I just support the ARRL petition....I didn't propose
> > > it.
> >
> > I'm not confused about who produced it and I'm not confused about your
> > support for it, though I believe such support is unwise.
>
> Your free to hold whatever opinion you wish.

You're correct.

> > > Seems you don't like anyone giving an opinion
> > > contrary to yours.
> >
> > Where was that written? You surely don't expect me to sit mute while
> > you lead the cheering section for something I believe to be wrong, do
> > you?
>
> Whatever floats your boat.

Non-response noted.

> > > If you don't agree with me, I really don't
> > > give a damn...
> >
> > That much is evident. Let me quote you: "Seems you don't like anyone
> > giving an opinion contrary to yours".
>
> Your point?

...went right over your head.

> That is my opinion of how I read your comments...which
> is certainly my right.

I'll hold in reserve my opinion of how you read my comments.

> > > ...as the ONLY arbiter of the outcome that
> > > matters is what the FCC will think and do.
> >
> > We have some evidence of what the FCC has thought in the current
> > regulations.
>
> Somehow I suspect the ARRL BOD does also...but I suspect it
> isn't in sync with what you think.

That should have become obvious to you a little earlier.

> > > > > In the incentive license scheme the privileges gained have no
> bearing
> > > > > > at all to the knowledge base in the sylabus for the license test.
> > > > >
> > > > > Let's do this one in your manner: Whatever floats your boat. Life's
> > > > > a--well, you know the drill.
> > > >
> > > Glad to see you have nothing credible to refute my statement.
> > >
> > If that is your view, then it applies equally to you non-refutations of
> > earlier statements. After all, you're the guy who used those exact
> > responses.
>
> Whatever floats your boat.

Non-response noted.

> > > > > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > > > > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > > > > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
> > > >
> > > How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit on VHF/UHF.
> I'm
> > > > betting that the answer is "none".
> > >
> > Doesn't matter. They can if they want. Also, what
> > makes you assume ALL technicians are beginners?
> >
> > The assumption is yours. I wrote nothing about all Technicians being
> > beginners.
>
> Nor did I suggest that "all" Techs are beginners....

Did you think I wrote anything about such a thing?

> but it is still a fact that all technicians, both beginners and "old hands"
> are allowed 1500 watts.

Yep. No one seems to have had a problem with that in the past.
Beginners aren't likely to run 1500 watts on 2m or 6m and "old hands"
are more likely to know what they're doing.

> > > > > > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
> > > reduction
> > > > > > >>in the written test requirements for those licenses.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > > > > > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > > > > > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Give me a break, Bill!
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > > > > > > what?
> > > > > >
> > > > > They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher class
> > > > > license. No ifs, ands or buts.
> > > >
> > > Yet you can't offer one operating skill or privilege that would
> > > be covered by such lack of having passed the requisit test.
> > >
> > That isn't the point at all. If such is your belief, there is nothing
> > to prevent doing away entirely with all but one license class and making
> > the exams much easier. You claimed that you didn't support watering
> > down the tests. Here you're making a case for dumbing down the whole
> > shebang.
>
> Believe what you wish. I support the "one-time" upgrades.
> If that makes you think I support permanent "dumbing down"
> then you have a lapse of logic somewhere.

On the contrary. If such material is not needed by thousands and
thousands on a one-time basis, why would it need to be tested at all,
ever?

> > > > > > >>Now you might argue that it's only a temporary or one-time
> > > reduction,
> > > > > > > > >but it's still a reduction.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It is a ONE time reduction. You and I can disagree about the
> > > reason's
> > > > > > > > to do it, but my support or anyone else's support of the one
> > > > > > > > time upgrade does NOT mean I or anyone else supports
> > > > > > > > permanent reductions in requirements.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Are the people qualified?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > YES...and if you think otherwise, please tell us what makes them
> > > > > > > unqualified and/or in what specific aspect(s) or priviliges
> > > > > > > they would be unqualified.
> > > > > >
> > > > > By your statement, you are supporting a watering down of both the

> > > > General and Extra class licenses. I'm quite certain that this is
> > > > something you stated that you'd never support.
> > >
> > > If you want it clearer...I support the ARRL petition.
> >
> > I didn't agree with it when I read it and I don't agree with it when you
> > say you support it.
>
> Fair enough.
>
> > > In doing so, I acknowledge that there will be, if implemented
> > > as submitted, a ONE_TIME reduction of test requirements
> > > for those hams that get free upgrades. I also recognize and
> > > understand that other than the one-time upgrades, there
> > > will be NO reduction in written test requirements for Extra
> > > and General.
> > >
> > > Clear enough for you?
> >
> > I've never had any trouble understanding your view. You seem to not be
> > able to see where such a position can lead. If the material isn't
> > deemed necessary for an upgrade on a one-time basis, it is difficult to
> > justify it as being necessary any time.
>
> Yawn. That's for the FCC to decide and, I suspect the FCC
> can live with a one-time upgrade without believeing it
> jeopardizes all future requirements.

Burp. I suspect that not many FCC staffers care one way or the other.
The FCC has long abdicated its responsibilities in enforcement, planning
and testing.

> Governments often waive
> criminal and monetary fines by waiving them and offering
> special "tax amnesty" periods. After the "amnesty period" is over,
> if you are found guilty of eevading the taxes, you think the
> courts accept an argument that if the fines were waived once
> they should be permanently waived?

A freebie amateur radio licensing waiver is not a criminal matter nor is
it a fine. What is under discussion is amateur radio licensing and
whether the testing for certain classes of license are truly necessary
if they can be waived for thousands and thousands of people.

> > > > > > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small matter.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of years.
> Why,
> > > > > because
> > > > > > > > no one losses any privileges.
> > > > > >

> > > > > > Are they qualified?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Broken record here it seems.
> > > > >
> > > > > The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not been
> > > > > forthcoming.
> > > >
> > > > The question keeps coming up because some people can't
> > > > understand the difference between a ONE-TIME waiver as
> > > > opposed to a PERMANENT change in requirements.
> > >
> > I haven't seen any evidence that there are people unable to tell the
> > difference. I see evidence that your position could lead to some
> > unintended consequences.
>
> And I don't. There's plenty of "waivered" situations in government
> as already noted.

You've written of quite disparate scenarios, having nothing to do with
the topic of discussion.

> > > > > So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of the
> > > > > elimination of incentive licensing.
> > > >
> > > > I do NOT support a permanant reduction of written requirements.
> > > > I support a limited incentive system but I wish the additional
> > > > privileges bore some relationship to the additional knowledge being
> > > > tested for.
> > >
> > > Nice waffle.
> >
> > No waffle at all.

I don't agree.

> THAT is my specific position and I do wish that
> licensing privileges did have a relationship to the additional knowledge
> being tested for.

But, Bill, that is for the FCC to decide and they are the final arbiter
;-)

> > > > > There can be no other explanation.
> > > >
> > > > I just gave you one above. The fact that I recognize the reality of
> > > > privileges vs knowledge being virtually non-existent, and that
> > > > I am willing to state the obvious, does not mean I must, therefore,
> > > > oppose incentive licensing.
> > >
> > > You must. You must. You support permitting those who have not passed
> > > certain elements being granted a freebie upgrade. Such an upgrade is at
> > > odds with incentive licensing.

>
> Yawn. Tellit to the FCC then.

Burp. I shall.

> Clearly the ARRL BOD doesn't
> accept your argument.

The League's board isn't required to accept it, nor have I noted any
opposition. I can make my views to clear to my Director and to those
other Directors and Vice-Directors I know. I've already made my view
known to Dave Sumner.

Seems to me I'm in good company then.

Not necessarily.

> > > > If your agenda extends not just to the elimination of morse testing
> but
> > > > to the watering down of the written exams, why not be bold? Come out
> and
> > > > say so.
> > >
> > > Because it isn't true!
> >
> > That thing which looks like a duck is quacking and swimming.
>
> Yawn. Your perceptions do not make it so.

Scratch No, your quacking and swimming make it so.

> > > > > > If they are not qualified, then you are not only sending them
> upward
> > > > > > and onward without the proper qualifications, you are doing them a
> > > great
> > > > > > disservice.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Quite frankly, I believe that You, Carl, and Mr. W5YI do *indeed*
> > > > > > support permanent changes in the written requirement access to HF.
> > > > > >
> > > > > The ARRL does not take that position at all...except for the "new"
> > > > > novice which would have greater HF privileges...but with limited
> > > > > power. Carl and I support the ARRL petition (except for the code
> test)
> > > >
> > > > The League's position provides a "gimme" to tens of thousands by
> > > > granting a by on testing. It is apparent that if it can be done on a
> > > > one-time basis, it can be done permanently.
> > >
> > > Is that what ARRL is proposing? Is that what I have
> > > stated I support? Answer - NO!
> > >
> > > > > > I refuse to believe that you are all that naive to think that

> we'll
> > > just
> > > > > > do this once
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Believe whatever makes you feel good.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Is that how you decide what to believe?
> > > > >
> > > > Depends on the decision to be made and the circumstances.
> > >
> > "If it feels good, do it".
>
> Depends on the decision. If it is a nice day and I have a decision
> to make regarding Mow the Lawn or Take a drive in my antique car
> with the top down...well I've taken the "feel good" decision on
> that choice many times. Haven't you made similar decisions?
> Wake up, decide it is a nice day and call your boss to tell him or
> her you're taking a vaction day?

Izzat what we've had under discussion, taking a drive in an antique car
'cuz it's a nice day? How about calling your boss and telling him
you're taking a couple of days to mull over the ARRL's proposal for
revamping amateur radio testing?
>
> > > > > > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go up.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The only
> > > > > > > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> > > > > > > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to General
> > > > > > > or Advanced to Extra.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from Tech
> > > > > > > to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
> > > > > > > thousands.
> > > > > > > Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it
> necessary
> > > > > > to do.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Read the ARRL petition. ARRL makes the case and I agree with their
> > > > > > logic. No need to repeat it again.
> > > > >
> > > > Yeah, it is kind of embarrassing. I can understand why you wouldn't
> > > > want it repeated.
> > >
> > Repeat it all you want.

You told me that there was no need to repeat it.

> I've neither the time nor inclination to
> cut and paste it in here just to make you happy.

As long as you support freebie upgrades, you aren't going to make me
happy.

> If anyone else
> is curious...go to www.arrl.org.
>
> > > > > > I remember promises of never accepting reduction in test
> requirements.
> > > > > > I remember the explicit distancing of personal opinions from NCI.
> But
> > > > > > here you all are, supporting reductions in the requirements for
> access
> > > > > > to HF. A pattern forms.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yea, yea...and with the music to twilight Zone in the
> > > > > > background too.
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't hear music. I did read your words and Carl's words. What
> you
> > > > > are writing these days is at odds with the earlier statements. Your
> > > > > earlier statements which traditionally began, "all we want is..."
> sound
> > > > > disingenuous.
> > > >
> > > > What is at odds with you is that you don't understand the difference
> > > > between ONE-TIME and PERMANENT change. If it makes
> > > > you happy to think that supporting a one-time waiver makes Carl
> > > > and I supports of reducing requiremnts, then you are free
> > > > to enjoy your own beliefs.
> > >
> > I fully understand the difference. It does not make me happy to believe
> > that your support of a "just this once" freebie constitutes a reduction
> > in requirements, I still see it happening.
> >
> There's that Twilight Zone music again.

It only seems to be playing at your place. A freebie upgrade is a
reduction in requirements *punto*.

Dave K8MN

2931. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 01:43:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <GIyZb.13584$hm4.9147@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"William" wrote:
>
> They've got a thing for cats. I often
> wonder if I should send them an
> anonymous fax of a "Far Side" cat
> cartoon, the one where the cat is
> being hauled away by two cops. ;^)

They've also got a thing for that young lady with the short dress and high heels sitting in front of the radios in their showroom. Her photograph has been in every single catalog I've received (for years). Universal says they've been in business since 1942 and I have to wonder at this point if that same photograph has been in the catalog throughout all that time. Indeed, that "young woman" could be 70-80 years old today. However, the dress, hair style, and style of high heels, suggests the picture was taken in the 70's, which means she may only be 40-50 years old. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2932. Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 01:44:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vKyZb.4147$t16.3101198@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87658

Well I read on qrz and eham where another petition has been submitted. If people want to delay whatever ruling the FCC finally issues that's probably the most effective way to do it. If I haven't lost count, that's 16 petitions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2933. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 03:16:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220221630.15923.00003910@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 87661

In article <d22b54c3.0402201400.113d4fcf@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Power lines used for BPL will have very significant losses per block
>or however you might measure it and there is a distinct limit to the
>number of amplifiers which can be used per injection point. Bottom
>line is that BPL won't work unless it's periodically and frequently
>fed by a fiber optic or cable TV type "primary source", a backbone.
>The BPL system currently being installed in Manassas VA will make use
>of a municipally-funded fiber optic backbone.

Of course - BPL is just a way of getting that "last mile". Avoids having to go into people's houses and businesses and run wire, which is a serious cost and liability issue, to say nothing of consumer resistance. Putting bypass couplers on the pole pig is easy compared to running wire in a customer's house.

The big sell points are "no installatio! Just plug it in!" and the extreme portability. "Every power socket in your house is now a broadband internet connection" - "easier than dialup!" etc.

Of course the same is true of the various 802.11 alphabet soup systems coming out too - and those are faster!
>
>The simple fact of the matter is that BPL will not happen in the
>boonies unless it's fed into the boonies on some sort of backbone. So
>if Farmer Jones doesn't already have cable TV, DSL/ISDN or fiber optic
>service available the probability of Jones getting a BPL feed is nil.

Exactly. And for the same reasons: the customer density is too low.

Y'know, all those deregulators need some history lessons. A lot of infrastructure was built as govt' projects or as govt. edicts because the ROI was too low. Remember the REA - Rural Electrification Authority?

>The FCC commissioners who are hyping BPL are either stupid beyond
>belief or are lying thru their teeth.

None of them are engineers - they're "regulators". And they're tasked by your buddy Shrub to come up with whizbang technocures like hydrogen fuel and BPL. Right!

And Ralph Nader is going to run again. GEts worse every day.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2934. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 03:17:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040220221703.15923.00003911@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 87662

In article <vKyZb.4147$t16.3101198@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Well I read on qrz and eham where another petition has been submitted.

Me too, some outfit called the Foundation for Amateur Radio or some such. Six members. I wrote a comparison of their proposal and the ARRL one......

>If
>people want to delay whatever ruling the FCC finally issues that's probably
>the most effective way to do it.

bwaahaahaa

>If I haven't lost count, that's 16 petitions.

That agrees with my count.

Neither the ARRL nor the FAR petition has an RM number yet. And K0HB hasn't even submitted his proposal. So we're not even close to an NPRM yet...

Just like the '60s all over again. A pile of proposals - watch FCC pick a bit of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.

Maybe I should do a proposal....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2935. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 03:20:36 UTC
From: The Eternal Squire <eternalsquire@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <a_GdnYqFPsnyWqvdRVn-uw@comcast.com>
Source record: 87659

garigue,

Any intelligent civilization would have either evolved heliography or
telegraphy
for specific needs. A magic-based civilization would have evolved
heliography,
a technology-based civilization would have evolved telegraphy.

You could either:
1) Think of it as a SETI exercise. CW would carry far better over
interstellar distance
on microwave frequencies than voice, RTTY, or image.

2) Just let the rest of us have some clean, healthy fun. Play is
healthy for the soul.

The Eternal Squire

garigue <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:atvZb.88652$jk2.435496@attbi_s53...
> Perhaps something in Klingon would be better ...oh brother ...way TOO much
> time on his hands ....
>
> 73 Tom KI3R
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.564 / Virus Database: 356 - Release Date: 1/19/04

2936. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 03:21:32 UTC
From: The Eternal Squire <eternalsquire@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <RZOdnaOv6406WqvdRVn-gw@comcast.com>
Source record: 87660

Any intelligent civilization would have either evolved heliography or
telegraphy
for specific needs. A magic-based civilization would have evolved
heliography,
a technology-based civilization would have evolved telegraphy.

You could either:
1) Think of it as a SETI exercise. CW would carry far better over
interstellar distance
on microwave frequencies than voice, RTTY, or image.

2) Just let the rest of us have some clean, healthy fun. Play is
healthy for the soul.

The Eternal Squire

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:_nyZb.13558$hm4.5533@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, I take off for a few days and
> > this place gets even sillier than before! :-)
> >
> > Too many get off on their own "realities"
> > and leave this dimension for some emotionally-
> > overloading FICTIONAL universe.
> >
> > Tolkien's "Middle Earth" isn't on the ITU's
> > Region list and New Zealand (where the film
> > triology was made) still speaks English as a
> > primary language. Tolkien himself was an
> > Englishman. (snip)
>
>
> To be honest, I hardly glanced at anything beyond the first paragraph.
> I'll have to turn off "hide read messages" and take another look to see
what
> you're talking about. Sounds silly enough to be worth the effort though.
> Thanks for the heads up.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.564 / Virus Database: 356 - Release Date: 1/19/04

2937. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 03:33:37 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9495E57AF459Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87663

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040220221703.15923.00003911@mb-m12.aol.com:

> In article <vKyZb.4147$t16.3101198@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>Well I read on qrz and eham where another petition has been submitted.
>
> Me too, some outfit called the Foundation for Amateur Radio or some
> such. Six members. I wrote a comparison of their proposal and the ARRL
> one......
>
>>If
>>people want to delay whatever ruling the FCC finally issues that's
>>probably the most effective way to do it.
>
> bwaahaahaa
>
>>If I haven't lost count, that's 16 petitions.
>
> That agrees with my count.
>
> Neither the ARRL nor the FAR petition has an RM number yet. And K0HB
> hasn't even submitted his proposal. So we're not even close to an NPRM
> yet...
>
> Just like the '60s all over again. A pile of proposals - watch FCC pick
> a bit of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.
>
> Maybe I should do a proposal....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

The FAR is an organisation that raises money for college scholarships to be paid to licenced hams. Their major annual fundraiser is a very large hamfest. Not on the scale of, say, Dayton, but pretty big. I used to go to it, but they moved the location further away. I used to be a member and get their newsletter, which is another way they raise money, and quite a few ham clubs are affiliated to them also.

That said, do you know what's in their petition. I am curious.

2938. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 04:14:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htetm67.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87664

On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 00:53:38 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>If not "stupid beyond belief", then they [The Five Tubeless Tyres]
>just aren't bothering to read up on the realities of implementation.

They've gotten The Word from much higher than the Commission or
NTIA or even DoD.

It will be interesting to see who the movers and shakers (read:
investors and controllers) of the BPL business are when the
inevitable Congressional inquiry is forced to take place.

"No Millionaire Left Behind" ???

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
a.k.a. Peter J. Paranoid

2939. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 04:14:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hteu0g8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87665

On 21 Feb 2004 03:17:03 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Just like the '60s all over again. A pile of proposals - watch FCC
>pick a bit of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.

Isn't that what a regulatory agency 'sposed to do? <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2940. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 06:19:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <oJKdnRd_5sBPZKvdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87667

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
>
>>You see, if an unlicensed transmitter is going to put some electric field
>>into my receiver, I simply want to return the favor - with interest.
>
>
> Of course. "Interest."
>
> Feel free to "return favors" to cardiac patients using pacemakers and
> other medical devices using RF coupling. Mama Dee says that sort
> of thing is LEGAL because YOU HAVE A LICENSE and the federal
> AUTHORIZATION to do such.
>
> Feel free to generate TVI with your authorized amateur radio license
> even though broadcast TV is also authorized. "Return with interest."
> I'll bet Mama Dee will say that is perfectly legal, too.
>
> Feel free to spritz your neighbors with RF 24/7. You are authorized to
> transmit and it is so difficult to measure EM radiation levels by
> amateurs. "Return with interest" all the irritation they caused you.
>
> "Interest" in amateur radio.
>
> LHA / WMD

So just how would Dave's 10 meter beacon generate TVI, interfere with pacemakers or other medical devices? There are many 10 meter beacons in operation, are they doing all this interference you blabber about? How about all the hams using 10 meters and all the other ham frequencies on a daily basis? Are they knocking out cardiac patients who have pacemakers.

Too bad you were never able to pass the ham exam, then you would know better than to make the absurd statements you do, just chalk it up to someone too old for his time I guess.

If BPL gets rolling in my neck of the woods, I will probably put up a 10 meter beacon as well, all legal. You wanna make something of it?

2941. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 06:21:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <oJKdnRZ_5sD-Z6vdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87670

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
>
> Ah so, the federal authorization magically makes all amateurs into
> technical experts who KNOW things all through answering a few

Something that is obviously beyond you capabilities. You sure have a hard on for those who have had the smarts enough to pass the amateur exam and get a license. Poor lennyboy, just can't hack it.

2942. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 06:22:28 UTC
From: Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <l5ud30h82qcdh6n15vbercsh95h96493sm@4ax.com>
Source record: 87666

On Sat, 14 Feb 2004 18:33:05 GMT, "N8IE" <dot.com@dot.com> wrote:

>Who cares?
>The ARRL is a joke.
>The hobby is a joke.
>
>Ham Radio is dead, RIP.

Then why are you still here? Do something worthwhile for Ham Radio
instead of whining and boohooing.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

2943. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 06:27:06 UTC
From: Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <ldud30pl3n27kscaposu0q8ugc9gi7h9s6@4ax.com>
Source record: 87668

On 17 Feb 2004 02:19:51 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <UGrXb.4535$W74.321@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>
>>Hong Kong has been added to the list of countires
>>dropping code testing.
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>So...what? Is there some point here? The USA will do so as well, all
>in good time. The incline of the slippery slope of our country's descent
>into intellectual and ultimately economic poverty is increasing, and we're
>picking up speed on our drop into the abyss. Hong Kong, Denmark, and
>all the rest of the dumbed-down "No-Code" countries just got there before
>us, that's all.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Oh give it a rest, roll. Everyone has heard your moaning and groaning
for years. Do something constructive. Stop whining. Get a life.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

2944. Re: testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 06:27:45 UTC
From: Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <8iud305u3b6pjd3grc39hegm812hcnq6k6@4ax.com>
Source record: 87669

On Sun, 15 Feb 2004 00:28:02 GMT, "testing" <test@test.com> wrote:

>test message
>
You failed! You'll have to retest,now.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

2945. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 11:41:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ztHZb.13301$W74.7670@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87671

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4036B743.CCF4493F@earthlink.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
(SNIP)
> > > The regs state that someone who wishes to use those particular hunks
of
> > > RF real estate will pass those exams. If someone hasn't passed the
> > > exam, he or she has not met the qualifications for occupying
particular
> > > band segments.
> >
> > If the FCC goes with the ARRL proposal, then there will be a "one-time"
> > waiver of certain tests to accomodate the upgrades
>
> No kidding?
>
> >...which then means
> > that those new upgraded Extras or Generals do, indeed,
> > constitute fully qualified hams for those license
> > classes.
>
> Yeah, I know that. I'm trying to keep that part of the ARRL proposal
> from taking place.

Go for it then. But if you fail in your effort, those that will
be "free" upgraded are qualified because they will have been
upgradedaccording to FCC rules at the time.

(SNIP)
> > > > ...as the ONLY arbiter of the outcome that
> > > > matters is what the FCC will think and do.
> > >
> > > We have some evidence of what the FCC has thought in the current
> > > regulations.
> >
> > Somehow I suspect the ARRL BOD does also...but I suspect it
> > isn't in sync with what you think.
>
> That should have become obvious to you a little earlier.

It has never been unclear to me.

(SNIP)
> > > > > > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > > > > > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > > > > > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit
> > > > > > on VHF/UHF. I'm betting that the answer is "none".
> > > > >
> > > > > Doesn't matter. They can if they want. Also, what
> > > > > makes you assume ALL technicians are beginners?
> > > >
> > > The assumption is yours. I wrote nothing about all
> > > Technicians bbeing beginners.
> >
> > Nor did I suggest that "all" Techs are beginners....
>
> Did you think I wrote anything about such a thing?

YOU said: "Also, what makes you (me) assume ALL
technicians are beginners?" I made no such assumption,
nor did I suggest it in what I wrote previously.

> > but it is still a fact that all technicians, both beginners and "old
hands"
> > are allowed 1500 watts.
>
> Yep. No one seems to have had a problem with that in the past.
> Beginners aren't likely to run 1500 watts on 2m or 6m and
> "old hands" are more likely to know what they're doing.

You still ignore thefact that beginners CAN run 1500 watts.

> > > > > > > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
> > > > reduction
> > > > > > > > >>in the written test requirements for those licenses.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > > > > > > > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > > > > > > > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Give me a break, Bill!
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > > > > > > > > > what?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher
class
> > > > > > > > license. No ifs, ands or buts.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yet you can't offer one operating skill or privilege that would

> > > > be covered by such lack of having passed the requisit test.
> > >
> > > That isn't the point at all. If such is your belief, there is nothing
> > > to prevent doing away entirely with all but one license class and
making
> > > the exams much easier. You claimed that you didn't support watering
> > > down the tests. Here you're making a case for dumbing down the whole
> > > shebang.
> >
> > Believe what you wish. I support the "one-time" upgrades.
> > If that makes you think I support permanent "dumbing down"
> > then you have a lapse of logic somewhere.
>
> On the contrary. If such material is not needed by thousands and
> thousands on a one-time basis, why would it need to be tested at all,
> ever?

You still ignore the reality of non-relationship of
privileges vs license class. The ONLY logic behind
the current system is Incentive Licensing.

(SNIP)
> > > > In doing so, I acknowledge that there will be, if implemented
> > > > as submitted, a ONE_TIME reduction of test requirements
> > > > for those hams that get free upgrades. I also recognize and
> > > > understand that other than the one-time upgrades, there
> > > > will be NO reduction in written test requirements for Extra
> > > > and General.
> > > >
> > > > Clear enough for you?
> > >
> > > I've never had any trouble understanding your view. You seem to not
be
> > > able to see where such a position can lead. If the material isn't
> > > deemed necessary for an upgrade on a one-time basis, it is difficult
to
> > > justify it as being necessary any time.
> >
> > Yawn. That's for the FCC to decide and, I suspect the FCC
> > can live with a one-time upgrade without believeing it
> > jeopardizes all future requirements.
>
> Burp. I suspect that not many FCC staffers care one way or the other.
> The FCC has long abdicated its responsibilities in enforcement, planning
> and testing.

Please do comment to that effect in your FCC filing when
you do so.

> > Governments often waive
> > criminal and monetary fines by waiving them and offering

> > special "tax amnesty" periods. After the "amnesty period" is over,
> > if you are found guilty of eevading the taxes, you think the
> > courts accept an argument that if the fines were waived once
> > they should be permanently waived?
>
> A freebie amateur radio licensing waiver is not a criminal matter nor is
> it a fine.

So how come many states have raised driver's license
ages for teenagers and not had any problems. If a
16 year old was qualified to drive a few years ago, why
can't they now? The point is that requirements can and
do change for various things.

> What is under discussion is amateur radio licensing and
> whether the testing for certain classes of license are truly necessary
> if they can be waived for thousands and thousands of people.

Testing for US hams has changed many times. When
Generals LOST privileges in 1968, no one raised a legal
argument that if a General was qualified in 1965 to
operate on all allowed Amateur spectrum, that the
same General should be legally qualified to do so after
Incentive licensing.

> > > > > > > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small
matter.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of
years.
> > Why,
> > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > no one losses any privileges.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Are they qualified?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Broken record here it seems.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not
been
> > > > > forthcoming.
> > > > >
> > > > The question keeps coming up because some people can't
> > > > understand the difference between a ONE-TIME waiver as
> > > > opposed to a PERMANENT change in requirements.
> > >
> > I haven't seen any evidence that there are people unable to tell the
> > > difference. I see evidence that your position could lead to some
> > > unintended consequences.
> >
> > And I don't. There's plenty of "waivered" situations in government

> > as already noted.
>
> You've written of quite disparate scenarios, having nothing to do with
> the topic of discussion.

There are many analogies: Raised the drinking age, raised
the smoking age, driver's license age, waiving tax penalties,
waiving of illegal alien penalties. Not one situation has been
rolled back to the "waived" condition after reinstatement
of the waived requirements, laws or regulations. Legally,
it isn't an issue.

> > > > > So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of
the
> > > > > elimination of incentive licensing.
> > > >
> > > > I do NOT support a permanant reduction of written requirements.
> > > > I support a limited incentive system but I wish the additional
> > > > privileges bore some relationship to the additional knowledge being
> > > > tested for.
> > >
> > > Nice waffle.
> >
> > No waffle at all.
>
> I don't agree.

I don't care.

> > THAT is my specific position and I do wish that
> > licensing privileges did have a relationship to the additional knowledge
> > being tested for.
>
> But, Bill, that is for the FCC to decide and they are the final arbiter
> ;-)

Absolutely correct. It is, in the end, the FCC's decision.
Nothing I have said, nothing I wish, makes it any different.
I can and will add my voice to those that comment to the
FCC as to my preferences.

(SNIP)
> > Clearly the ARRL BOD doesn't
> > accept your argument.
>
> The League's board isn't required to accept it, nor have I noted any
> opposition. I can make my views to clear to my Director and to those
> other Directors and Vice-Directors I know. I've already made my view
> known to Dave Sumner.
>
> Seems to me I'm in good company then.
>

> Not necessarily.

You are entitled to your opinion.

(SNIP)

> > > > > > Believe whatever makes you feel good.
> > > > >
> > > > > Is that how you decide what to believe?
> > > >
> > > > Depends on the decision to be made and the circumstances.
> > >
> > > "If it feels good, do it".
> >
> > Depends on the decision. If it is a nice day and I have a decision
> > to make regarding Mow the Lawn or Take a drive in my antique car
> > with the top down...well I've taken the "feel good" decision on
> > that choice many times. Haven't you made similar decisions?
> > Wake up, decide it is a nice day and call your boss to tell him or
> > her you're taking a vaction day?
>
> Izzat what we've had under discussion, taking a drive in an antique car
> 'cuz it's a nice day? How about calling your boss and telling him
> you're taking a couple of days to mull over the ARRL's proposal for
> revamping amateur radio testing?

I could do that.

> > > > > > > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go
up.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The
only
> > > > > > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> > > > > > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to
General
> > > > > > or Advanced to Extra.
> > > > >
> > > > > You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from
Tech
> > > > > to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
> > > > > thousands.
> > > > > Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it
> > necessary
> > > > > to do.
> > > >
> > > > Read the ARRL petition. ARRL makes the case and I agree with their
> > > > logic. No need to repeat it again.
> > >
> > > Yeah, it is kind of embarrassing. I can understand why you wouldn't
> > > want it repeated.
> >

> > Repeat it all you want.
>
> You told me that there was no need to repeat it.

I said I wasn't going to repeat it. You can do it all
you want.

> > I've neither the time nor inclination to
> > cut and paste it in here just to make you happy.
>
> As long as you support freebie upgrades, you aren't going to make me
> happy.

Then prepare to be unhappy for now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2946. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 12:44:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402210444.359c8bfb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87672

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<403679E3.60A09E32@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40362C44.F9B7E06@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > You have a rare ability to see the facts spread out before you and to
> > > come to an incorrect conclusion. There was nothing I wrote which would
> > > make me an ally of anyone in a "scheme to interfere".
> > >
> > > I pointed out some reality. I asked a question.
>
> >
> > Dave, whenever I come across something posted here that lacks "good
> > amateur practice," your name pops up.
>
> It would appear that my name pops up because you attempt to make an
> association where none exists. I'm not involved in a scheme.

If you say so (wink).

I did,
> however, ask you how a licensed service can intentionally interfere with
> a non-licensed producer of RF. You've not yet come up with a response.

The same way you can communicate with French who had no license to
operate where they were operating.

2947. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 12:48:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402210448.7668a627@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87673

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040220163503.07155.00000809@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402200335.164d7c18@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Dear Beeping Bill:
> >>
> >> How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?
> >>
> >Why an NOI and now an NPRM for such a Part 15 device?
> >
> >The rules will change.
>
> State Department Dave lives in a different reality and isn't quite up to
> speed on FCC abbreviations. An "NPRM" is a Notice of Proposed
> Rule Making but big Dave thinks the rules are already in place.
>
> Mama Dee lives in another reality where she thinks it is perfectly
> legal for any licensed amateur to deliberately interfere with
> unlicensed electronics.
>
> The gunnery nurse is on a peak of his manic-depressive cycle
> again and busy trying to peddle it to a single destination in his
> twilight zone.
>
> tRoll keeps slipping in his macro butter. The Katapult King is off
> on an old-radio bender (better than shooting bears for the navy).
> Now Hampton wants to get agressive against an enemy of radio
> that hasn't been installed everywhere.
>
> To them there are Monsters Under The Bed everywhere (not
> realizing they are looking into mirrors when saying that).
>
> I think that all the regulars ought to go on back to tawking about all
> them amateur radio policy subjects like trolleys, muscle cars for
> orion-sitters, old radio broadcast stations, making fun of the U.S.
> military, making fun of others not liking them, architects, show biz
> folk, and the legality of federally licensed amateurs to do anything
> because they are Federally Authorized..
>
> What with all those multiple copies of TAFKA Rev Jim's (which "is
> not his fault" even though I don't get such repeats on other news-
> groups or other problems with AOL), it's not worth staying in here.
> Except to see the creativity in rationalizing they are always correct

> and all others are mistaken.
>
> LHA / WMD

These people are dysfunctional.

2948. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 12:53:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402210453.3b14635e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87674

"The Eternal Squire" <eternalsquire@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<a_GdnYqFPsnyWqvdRVn-uw@comcast.com>...
> garigue,
>
> Any intelligent civilization would have either evolved heliography or
> telegraphy
> for specific needs. A magic-based civilization would have evolved
> heliography,
> a technology-based civilization would have evolved telegraphy.
>
> You could either:
> 1) Think of it as a SETI exercise. CW would carry far better over
> interstellar distance
> on microwave frequencies than voice, RTTY, or image.

You don't want the aliens to think we're idiots, do you?

2949. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 12:59:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402210459.61ab9eba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<GIyZb.13584$hm4.9147@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" wrote:
> >
> > They've got a thing for cats. I often
> > wonder if I should send them an
> > anonymous fax of a "Far Side" cat
> > cartoon, the one where the cat is
> > being hauled away by two cops. ;^)
>
>
> They've also got a thing for that young lady with the short dress and high
> heels sitting in front of the radios in their showroom. Her photograph has
> been in every single catalog I've received (for years). Universal says
> they've been in business since 1942 and I have to wonder at this point if
> that same photograph has been in the catalog throughout all that time.
> Indeed, that "young woman" could be 70-80 years old today. However, the
> dress, hair style, and style of high heels, suggests the picture was taken
> in the 70's, which means she may only be 40-50 years old. :-)

Universal is a couple miles from my home. I've bought small items
from them, but have never ordered by mail any radio, so did not
comment on topic. But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
her 40's.

Have you seen the gal in the Burghart advertisements? Wow!

2950. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 13:07:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402210507.45212b9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87676
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:<c1612fira1@news.x-echo.com>...
> Why is it not OK to freeband on unused parts
> of 11 and 10 meters?
>
> Organized, long term freebanders are very aware
> where they operate and take great measure to
> ensure against talking on an amateur frequency
> or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there,
> why shouldn't I, especially if I want to have a nice
> DX contact with one of them?

You should. You're special. You should do anything you like because
you are better than everyone else. Because you are better than
everyone else, you should enjoy priveleges that no one else has.
Speed on the highway and cut-in at the exits. Help yourself to free
cable television. Commit insurance fraud. Do some insider trading,
and kidnap someone. Run for office.

2951. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 13:09:24 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <40375884.856D0C97@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 87677
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

William wrote:

> > They've also got a thing for that young lady with the short dress and high
> > heels sitting in front of the radios in their showroom. Her photograph has
> > been in every single catalog I've received (for years). Universal says
> > they've been in business since 1942 and I have to wonder at this point if
> > that same photograph has been in the catalog throughout all that time.
> > Indeed, that "young woman" could be 70-80 years old today. However, the
> > dress, hair style, and style of high heels, suggests the picture was taken
> > in the 70's, which means she may only be 40-50 years old. :-)
>
> Universal is a couple miles from my home. I've bought small items
> from them, but have never ordered by mail any radio, so did not
> comment on topic. But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
> goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
> amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
> her 40's.

That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI

Steve
Holland, MI
Drake R7, R8 and R8B

http://www.iserv.net/~n8kdv/dxpage.htm

2952. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 14:13:53 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <BIJZb.6154$J84.5232@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 87678
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0402210507.45212b9e@posting.google.com...
> Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:<c1612fira1@news.x-echo.com>...
> > Why is it not OK to freeband on unused parts
> > of 11 and 10 meters?
> >
> > Organized, long term freebanders are very aware
> > where they operate and take great measure to
> > ensure against talking on an amateur frequency
> > or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> > If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there,
> > why shouldn't I, especially if I want to have a nice
> > DX contact with one of them?
>
> You should. You're special. You should do anything you like because
> you are better than everyone else. Because you are better than
> everyone else, you should enjoy priveleges that no one else has.
> Speed on the highway and cut-in at the exits. Help yourself to free
> cable television. Commit insurance fraud. Do some insider trading,
> and kidnap someone. Run for office.

George Dubya?

2953. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 14:15:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040221091530.29660.00003091@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87679

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hteu0g8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 21 Feb 2004 03:17:03 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Just like the '60s all over again. A pile of proposals - watch FCC
>>pick a bit of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.
>
> Isn't that what a regulatory agency 'sposed to do? <ggg>

I dunno, but it's what a lot of them do do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2954. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 14:15:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040221091536.29660.00003092@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87680

In article <Xns9495E57AF459Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>The FAR is an organisation that raises money for college scholarships to be
>paid to licenced hams.

This isn't them. It has six members. Look on eham.net under the discussion
about the ARRL being representative.

>That said, do you know what's in their petition. I am curious.

It's 59 pages but it boils down to this, in no particular order:

- Three license classes: Tech, General, Extra. Basically the same test
requirements as today (including 5 wpm code for General and Extra)

- No change to General or Extra privs

- Novices get upgraded to Tech, Advanceds get upgraded to Extra, both for free
(no test).

- Techs and Tech Pluses merge, get all same privileges as listed below

- Techs retain all VHF/UHF

- Techs get 100W PEP on HF on parts of 160, 80, 40, 15 and 10. CW/data on all
those bands, 'phone on 160, 10 and 15.

Basically, they dropped the code test for Tech Plus privileges, added data on
the CW parts, and added a bit of 160 and 15 meter 'phone. Much less HF than the
ARRL proposal, and you need a Tech to get it.

I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2955. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 14:20:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221092024.29660.00003093@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87681

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hteu0g8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 21 Feb 2004 03:17:03 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Just like the '60s all over again. A pile of proposals - watch FCC
>>pick a bit of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.
>
> Isn't that what a regulatory agency 'sposed to do? <ggg>

I dunno, but it's what a lot of them do do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2956. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 14:20:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221092025.29660.00003094@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 87682

In article <Xns9495E57AF459Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>The FAR is an organisation that raises money for college scholarships to be
>paid to licenced hams.

This isn't them. It has six members. Look on eham.net under the discussion
about the ARRL being representative.

>That said, do you know what's in their petition. I am curious.

It's 59 pages but it boils down to this, in no particular order:

- Three license classes: Tech, General, Extra. Basically the same test
requirements as today (including 5 wpm code for General and Extra)

- No change to General or Extra privs

- Novices get upgraded to Tech, Advanceds get upgraded to Extra, both for free
(no test).

- Techs and Tech Pluses merge, get all same privileges as listed below

- Techs retain all VHF/UHF

- Techs get 100W PEP on HF on parts of 160, 80, 40, 15 and 10. CW/data on all
those bands, 'phone on 160, 10 and 15.

Basically, they dropped the code test for Tech Plus privileges, added data on
the CW parts, and added a bit of 160 and 15 meter 'phone. Much less HF than the
ARRL proposal, and you need a Tech to get it.

I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2957. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 15:02:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402210702.4764bb2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87683

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040220163511.07155.00000812@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <tZUYb.1983$5H5.1110@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >You see, if an unlicensed transmitter is going to put some electric field
> >into my receiver, I simply want to return the favor - with interest.
>
> Of course. "Interest".

Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
directly to you?

Steve, K4YZ

2958. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 15:03:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402210703.632bf08b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87684

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040220163503.07155.00000809@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402200335.164d7c18@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Dear Beeping Bill:
> >>
> >> How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?
> >>
> >Why an NOI and now an NPRM for such a Part 15 device?
> >
> >The rules will change.
>
> State Department Dave lives in a different reality and isn't quite up to
> speed on FCC abbreviations. An "NPRM" is a Notice of Proposed
> Rule Making but big Dave thinks the rules are already in place.

More sniping from the NG Putz.

Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
directly to you?

Steve, K4YZ

2959. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 15:07:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402210707.72ed63c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87685

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040220163506.07155.00000810@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <mzbZb.3833$t16.2902497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >The marketing hype is cheap broadband for the rural areas. Economic reality
> >is that it will probably never be extended into the rural areas even if some
> >suburban areas do go for it.
>
> You have the "studies" to prove this as a fact?
>
> >Every single transformer between the injection
> >point of the signal and the end user must be bypassed with the BPL signal
> >for that signal to work.
>
> Of course you KNOW the EXACT CHARACTERISTICS of "a BPL
> signal," don't you?
>
> I don't and won't presume to guess. But, you are AUTHORIZED by the
> FCC to "legally interfere with any unlicensed service (of any kind)" and
> are therefore blameless.
>
> >If you only have one user every few miles, it will
> >never pay off. And of course you've mentioned the power and/or signal
> >boosters required. Periodic boosters all along the line will be needed.
>
> Ah so, the federal authorization magically makes all amateurs into
> technical experts who KNOW things all through answering a few
> questions and passing a morse code test.
>
> Must be that new "interest" thing in hum radio.

Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
directly to you?

You were asked a specific and direct question in another thread,
ironically about BPL, however you choose to ignore it.

Bravo for me. Proves a point, but I see you still continue to
hound and antagonize others about BPL issues without offering one bit
of technical enlightenment about it yourself.

Not surprising since the answer will unravell you yet again.

Care to stop being a fool long enough to go to that thread and
answer the question?

Steve, K4YZ

2960. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 15:09:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402210709.2df2d652@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87686

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<oJKdnRZ_5sD-Z6vdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
> >
> >
> > Ah so, the federal authorization magically makes all amateurs into
> > technical experts who KNOW things all through answering a few
>
> Something that is obviously beyond you capabilities. You sure have a
> hard on for those who have had the smarts enough to pass the amateur
> exam and get a license. Poor lennyboy, just can't hack it.

Exactly my point.

Also, please note a thread addressed specifically to him, asking
him to validate his sniping at others about BPL without addressing the
technical concerns it poses.

He cannot do so without dropping his drawers in public (again).

Sucks to be Lennie, I guess...

Steve, K4YZ

2961. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 15:12:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402210712.44950e2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87687

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.htetm67.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 00:53:38 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >If not "stupid beyond belief", then they [The Five Tubeless Tyres]
> >just aren't bothering to read up on the realities of implementation.

But they're not stupid so what does that leave?

> They've gotten The Word from much higher than the Commission or
> NTIA or even DoD.
>
> It will be interesting to see who the movers and shakers (read:
> investors and controllers) of the BPL business are when the
> inevitable Congressional inquiry is forced to take place.

What do you see triggering a Congressional flap over BPL??

> "No Millionaire Left Behind" ???

. . oughta be an interesting campaign . .

2962. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 16:06:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402210806.68781f73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87688

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >

> Cincinnati, like Rome, is built on seven hills. There are a number of
> other hills on the Kentucky shore. Most of 'em have radio towers. I
> operated from four spots during my days in the area: As WB4KTR/8, I was
> a block off the U.C. campus on top of the hill in an area called
> Clifton. I had no tower but was able to put a mast on top of the three
> storey commercial building. I moved across the river to Fort Thomas in
> '74 and operated from atop the hill in that town with a tribander on a
> 40' push-up mast. Site three was in Mt. Airy, across the road from a
> nice, quiet 1600 acre city forest. I used a 60 foot tower there.
> Finally, I moved to the west side of the city to Cheviot.

Jeez. Didja ever get to completely unpack??

> That same 60
> footer was used there and was then hauled around the world. There are
> still tower bases for that one in the ground in Botswana and Tanzania.
> The tower stayed in Dar es Salaam. The embassy now uses it for a
> repeater antenna.

"World's most traveled tower". Foggy Bottom did pay you for the tower
when you left it with 'em right?

> In a tale similar to yours, we came back to the U.S. from Helsinki in
> the late 90's and ended up with a Pontiac Grand Am. I was underwhelmed
> with the underpowered, poor-handling beast.

I gave up on Detroit iron 20 years ago and I haven't run across any
particularly good reasons to go back.

> Naw, all stock. I stop using the performance tires when the factory
> rubber gives up the ghost. It doesn't matter which tires I buy, the
> twisty, hilly roads hereabouts make certain that I get only about 25,000
> miles on them as the outside corners get worn down.

I have some West Virginny time under my belt, I understand the "hills"
and the driving condx. A month in the coal mines in the Bluefield area
working an accident expert witness job was one of my "tours". Very
different part of the world when it comes to driving. And everything
else for that matter vs. here. Not a place for timid or anal drivers.

> > monster Freightliner Classic into the rear end of my nice little Geo
> > and "reconfigured" a bit of sheet metal . . Back to the Benz shop . .
> > red body, green trunk deck and the rest is still in primer.

>
> It'll fit right in here!

Heeee!

> Just be careful you don't end up with a deer
> pasted to the front of it.

I'm tuned, we have monstrous herds of the things close at hand right
here, we do some *serious* deer-ducking too. At 60 mph on four-lane
divided highways.

> > Dunno if I can trust it to make Wheeling & vicinity and back or not
> > but I'm seriously mulling that prospect come the warmer winds of the
> > days ahead. I figger if I gotta thumb it back home on the PA tpk. I
> > might as well do it when it's warmer.
>
> I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
> comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear. If you talk 'EY into coming,
> you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.

He gets the back deck, I get the guest room.

> > > > I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .
> > > > .
> > >
> > > I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
> > > panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.
> >
> > OK, so it would be about the size of a steamer trunk and it would need
> > castors to be able move it about . . details, details . . don't bore
> > me with stupid details, "I'm a concept guy . . "
>
> I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
> four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
> stainless panel.

This is gonna be a class radio, right up there with the IC-7800, cost
in NO object.

> >
> > > I'd have to say
> > > that the RME-69 has it beat.
> >
> > You got a 69 too??!
>
> Yeah--with 5 and 10m converter, and also from the same era an FB-7 and
> an SW-3.

Boy that's a real keeper, lotta WW2 history wrapped around that one.

> > I'm partial to the 75A4 myself, I had one for years which had the
> > W2VCZ front end mods. Best 160/80/40 RX out there until rigs like that

> > later 940s finally came along.
>
> Great receiver though the current pricing is too rich for my blood.

Mine suffered a horrible demise, I doan wanna hear what they're worth today!

> > > and the 51S-1 for general coverage.
> >
> > THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
> > but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
> > the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.
>
> Talk to me!

Eventually. Bigger priorities are looming for now.

I'm gonna spend a few hours running with the big dawgs this weekend as a reality check, third op at the N3RS baby multi in the ARRL CW DX blast. Haven't done one of these for a quarter century, this is gonna be UGLY.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

2963. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 16:32:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402210832.10c4df44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87689

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040220193553.05539.00004440@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
> >comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear.
>
> I'll bring the hot sauce. They don't call it "Total Insanity" for nothing.

That's why you get the back deck.

> >If you talk 'EY into coming,
> >you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.
>
> I got an air mattress for travel....

No thanks, I'd rather travel in my car.

> >> > I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
> >> > panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.
>
> Miniature is for poodles.

Yeah, like Audrey Hepburn.

> >> Jim's obvious genius being that he's managed to come up with a 100W
> >> 80/40/20 CW xcvr which is spread across two whole shelves.
>
> Anybody can make 'em small. I make 'em GOOD.
>
> How many FD QSOs you make so far with the little stuff? The Type 7 did 629 one
> year....

How many did it make last year?

My Type 75A4/T4XB did 1,000-1,200 several times in the CQ WW CW. And
you . . ?

> "Anybody who says size doesn't matter never had a really big one".

SPARE us!

> >I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
> >four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
> >stainless panel.
>
> Fits in a two-footer vertically with room to spare.....

There ya go Dave, the four foot rack will work.

> >> > My HRO is the mechanical marvel but for performance,
> >>
> >> Nice old boat anchors, great dial mechanisms.
>
> Ugh. Ten turns to cover the band? Puhleeze, I did better in high school.

Better at what?

> The Type 7 uses a cap from a junked BC-221. The Type 6 and 5 used caps from
> ARC-5 transmitters.

Dayum, another N2EY stroke of genius. And here all us no-clues been
using these synthesizer thingeys, tsk, tsk, shame on us.

> I copied one feature from RME: they didn't label much on the panel. They said
> if you didn't know what the knobs did you shouldn't be using the set.

Anybody who doesn't know what knobs are for is a sick pup.

> >> THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
> >> but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
> >> the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.
> >
> >Talk to me!
> >
> I probably have a plug that will work. And a line cord. Etc.

The cord is a no-brainer, it's the female 8 or 11 pin plug or whatever
it is which is problem.

> Got rid of all my Johnson gear, though (sniff). Adventurer, Viking 2 with 122,
> Valiant.

Good riddance, they're probably doing splendidly on 27 Mhz by now.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2964. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 16:43:10 UTC
From: GlennS <GlennVA56@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <cd2f301o8ih18ksmg7lmrlifh0o3ssbsio@4ax.com>
Source record: 87690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
wrote:

>> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
>> goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
>> amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
>> her 40's.
>
>That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI

Is this her? If so, you're right!
http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html

2965. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 16:46:46 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <40378B76.EF340E5F@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 87691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

GlennS wrote:

> On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
> >> goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
> >> amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
> >> her 40's.
> >
> >That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
>
> Is this her? If so, you're right!
> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html

Of course I'm right! You should have seen her about 18 years ago!

Steve
Holland, MI
Drake R7, R8 and R8B

http://www.iserv.net/~n8kdv/dxpage.htm

2966. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 16:52:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221115240.12501.00006333@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87692

In article <fn0j20dfeur0dm6f3vs5e7anvik9m8le5s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 11 Feb 2004 00:00:18 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>In article <1u6i20d300evmf3tgti4gjt5cp20lt8s5e@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:

>>>On 10 Feb 2004 09:52:50 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>>>>Without the ARRL, do you think we'd still have amateur radio? I don't.
>>>
>>>Um, the rest of the planet does not have the ARRL, and amateur radio
>>>is still going strong there.....

>>In large part that's because of US influence at the international level.
>>Also the IARU, which was founded by guess who?
>
>Perhaps, but are there specific historical facts which support that
>theory?

Yep. Maxim, Mrs. Maxim (she spoke fluent French, the language used in the
conferences back then) Ken Warner and several other ARRL folks went to the
Paris conferences of 1924, 1925 and 1927 to push for the very existence of
amateur radio. Amateur radio did not actually exist by international treaty
until 1927 - hams were simply a subset of various countries' nongovernment
radio services.

>The ARRL was a founding member of IARU - not the only founding
>member....

True - but it was an ARRL idea.
>
>>Except for Japanese 4th class licensees, how many hams are there in the rest
>>of the planet?
>
>Well, my trusty EuroCall 2003 CD lists 276,446 callsigns in Europe
>alone - even if a couple of guys died, there's probably more than that
>now. I don't have figures for Asia, Africa, Oceania or the rest of
>the Americas (except that there's around 56,000 or so up here...).

Once you get outside of Europe, North America, the British Commonwealth and
Japan, there aren't many of us. China has more than a billion people - and how
many hams? A few thousand, maybe.
>
>Quite a few, anyway! DX wouldn't be the same without 'em..... ;)

>
>That's a lot of real estate, covering some 150 or so countries, give
>or take a few....
>
Right. And there are 682,000 US hams, which is more than twice as many as in
all of densely populated Europe.
>>
>>You might want to check out what the rest of the world wanted to do to
>>amateur radio in the 1920s at the Paris conferences....
>
>Would you have a link handy for that one?

No, but do a search for W2XOY's "Wayback Machine".

>And, did the ARRL actually exert that much influence over the other
>members? As there is one IARU zone for each ITU zone, I'd expect that
>they would have infinitely more say in the Zone 2 group than the
>others...they may have been founders of the IARU in 1925, but they
>didn't own it - did they?

ARRL organized IARU. The zone thing came later.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>73, Leo
>

2967. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 17:29:28 UTC
From: Michael Moore <m.moore@NOSPAMutoronto.ca>
Message-ID: <PzMZb.120$nd2.4769@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 87693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dave Holford wrote:
>
> Tom Welch wrote:
>
>>I bought a new radio from Universal Radio
>>and got a radio that didn't work and was a
>>return from a prior sale.
>>
>>THe people at Universal Radio restock used
>>radios and sell them as new.
>>
>>FUCK UNIVERSAL RADIO, I will never do business
>>with these crooks again.
>>
>>Tom Welch
>
>
>
>
> Not bad, 90% approval.
> Sounds like they can be trusted to do a good job.

LOL. I have a similar experience to Tom's. Why go with an
apparent "90% approval rating" when you can go with a 100%
approval rating, i.e. try Grove Enterprises or AES.

--
M2

2968. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 17:31:45 UTC
From: Michael Moore <m.moore@NOSPAMutoronto.ca>
Message-ID: <YBMZb.121$nd2.4907@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 87694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

N8KDV wrote:

>
> GlennS wrote:
>
>
>>On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
>>wrote:
>>
>>
>>>> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
>>>>goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
>>>>amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
>>>>her 40's.
>>>
>>>That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
>>
>> Is this her? If so, you're right!
>>http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
>>http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html
>
>
> Of course I'm right! You should have seen her about 18 years ago!

LOL. That picture was her about 20-30 years ago.

--
M2

>
> Steve
> Holland, MI
> Drake R7, R8 and R8B
>
> http://www.iserv.net/~n8kdv/dxpage.htm
>
>

2969. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 17:34:23 UTC
From: Michael Moore <m.moore@NOSPAMutoronto.ca>
Message-ID: <qEMZb.122$nd2.4848@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 87695
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Michael Moore wrote:

> N8KDV wrote:
>
>>
>> GlennS wrote:
>>
>>
>>> On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
>>>>> goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
>>>>> amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
>>>>> her 40's.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
>>>
>>>
>>> Is this her? If so, you're right!
>>> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
>>> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html
>>
>>
>>
>> Of course I'm right! You should have seen her about 18 years ago!
>
>
> LOL. That picture was her about 20-30 years ago.
>
> --
> M2

You should see her husband's (Fred) picture -- right from
the high school yearbook.

--
M2

2970. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 17:49:38 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <40379A32.69320D11@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 87696
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Michael Moore wrote:

> N8KDV wrote:
>
> >
> > GlennS wrote:
> >
> >
> >>On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
> >>wrote:
> >>
> >>
>>>> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
>>>>goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
>>>>amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
>>>>her 40's.
> >>>
> >>>That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
> >>
> >> Is this her? If so, you're right!
> >>http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
> >>http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html
> >
> >
> > Of course I'm right! You should have seen her about 18 years ago!
>
> LOL. That picture was her about 20-30 years ago.

No, it's not... those pictures are of much more recent vintage than 20-30
years ago... guaranteed.

> > Steve
> > Holland, MI
> > Drake R7, R8 and R8B
> >
> > http://www.iserv.net/~n8kdv/dxpage.htm
> >
> >

2971. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 18:10:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402211010.2bf0c2bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87697

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040220221630.15923.00003910@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402201400.113d4fcf@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> The big sell points are "no installatio! Just plug it in!" and the extreme
> portability. "Every power socket in your house is now a broadband internet
> connection" - "easier than dialup!" etc.
>
> Of course the same is true of the various 802.11 alphabet soup systems coming
> out too - and those are faster!

I'm not up to speed on the methods which will be used to transport the
802.11 type signals into buildings but I assume it'll be carried over
existing cable TV wiring to a Part 15 tranciever/modem somewhere in
the building. Or something along those lines. Makes a helluva lot
more sense economically and in all other respects vs. BPL. In
particular they won't trash the HF spectrum like BPL does. I undertand
that they would use a band of frequencies which would "endanger" our
2.4 Mhz allocations. But like I posted somewhere else earlier, I'll
trade 2.4 Mhz for 14 Mhz any day.

The current show-stopper for the 802.11 crowd seems to be a lack of
standards and coordination. Which is very typical of fledgling
technologies, everybody wants their pet system to become the alpha
technology. And eventually evolutionary forces will do what they've
always done and some 802.11 type system or another will be ready to
market on a global scale. When that finally happens I expect that what
little bits and pieces of BPL might actually still be around will be
buried and forgotten. Quicky.

As as far as serving pore stranded Farmer Jones' needs if he's really
hot for broadband access all he has to do is sign up for dish service.
Which has been out there for *years*.

> None of them are engineers - they're "regulators".

They're bush-league (pun intended)politicians as usual and don't have
to be engineers, their job is listen to the FCC technical staff,
that's why the FCC has technical experts on the payroll. As if they
care about any "technical details" like obliterating HF radio with
BPL, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. sed "Just DO it" and that's that. I've
been wondering if Commerce is being leaned on about watering down the
upcoming NTIA BPL study. I'll just bet it is.

> And they're tasked by your
> buddy Shrub

You jest!

> to come up with whizbang technocures like hydrogen fuel and BPL.
> Right!
>
> And Ralph Nader is going to run again. GEts worse every day.

Comic relief. Beats Ross Perot.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2972. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 18:13:23 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0402211013.a393325@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87698

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

> And K0HB hasn't even submitted his proposal.

Yes he has.

> So we're not even close to an NPRM yet...

How did you reach that conclusion, oh great Imperial Pontificator?
FCC can issue an NPRM without considering input from ARRL, K0HB, or
Donald Duck.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

2973. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 18:24:27 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@homo.nut>
Message-ID: <c187or05et@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 87699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <40379A32.69320D11@nospam.iserv.net>, N8KDV says...
>
>
>
>Michael Moore wrote:
>
>> N8KDV wrote:
>>
>> >
>> > GlennS wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> >>On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
>> >>wrote:
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
>> >>>goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
>> >>>amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
>> >>>her 40's.
>> >>>
>> >>>That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
>> >>
>> >> Is this her? If so, you're right!
>> >>http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
>> >>http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html
>> >
>> >
>> > Of course I'm right! You should have seen her about 18 years ago!
>>
>> LOL. That picture was her about 20-30 years ago.
>
I banged her last week.

You ask w

2974. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 19:42:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040221144205.12501.00006334@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87700

In article <403680EF.2BD75369@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>William wrote:
>
>> Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.
>
>You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".
>
>Dave K8MN

Incorrect...YOU are here...

LHA / WMD

2975. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 19:42:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040221144208.12501.00006335@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87701

In article <4036864A.F5CF82F8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Loon Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
>>
>> ADA is the callsign of Headquarters, United States Army Pacific,
>> Fort Shafter, Hawaii. That callsign has been active since 1946 and
>> in continuous use all this time, connected with area command
>> headquarters in the Pacific region.
>>
>> Why do you insist on making fun of the United States Army?
>
>Oh, you simply misunderstood once again. I wasn't poking fun at the
>Army. I was poking fun at you personally, Leonard.

You consistently poke fun at anyone who opposes your opinions...
save on NON-radio discussions in here which have nothing to do
with any policy subjects.

You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because a veteran of
that service branch was assigned to ADA for three years and did
not kiss your [expletive deleted] godhood in reverence.

You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because they and the
other branches dropped morse code for fixed-point to fixed-point
communications back in 1948.

You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because they had HF
radio facilities a half century ago that makes the entirety of the
United States Department of State look puny in re communications.

You MAKE FUN of professionals in the firield of electronics because
you consider your amateur status as "better" than professionals.

All you can do, besides gabble about NON-radio subjects in here, is
to MAKE FUN of anyone you disagree with.

Your "fun" is really a pathetic attempt at humiliation which does not
have the effect you desire. It did not six years ago and does not do

so now.

You don't, or can't discuss any policy subject at length, only call those who disagree with you names and try to insult them.

You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur community.

Shrug. Not good for the amateur image to make others be like you.

LHA / WMD

2976. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 19:44:52 UTC
From: Incognito <BLB@sero.net>
Message-ID: <UyOZb.7954$C21.5957@fed1read07>
Source record: 87702
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Top Notch Ham Radio Store -- been doing biz with them for many years.
Always courteous service, knowledge sales staff, fast delivery
Two thumbs up (:-)

--
Incognito By Necessity (:-(

If you can't convince them, confuse them.
- - -Harry S Truman

2977. The french pirate ON4EHM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 20:00:02 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <09b6d45f459dfd87e174c5944969c426@dizum.com>
Source record: 87703

Many pirates use ON calls from France
on HF bands. F1 calls are CEPT class
2 and are not allowed on HF bands in
France for now. So they have found a
trick, they buy an ON license in
Belgium and use the F/ON call in France.
It is not allowed since an alien call
cannot be used in France with F/ for
more than 3 months (CEPT rules).
Belgium has edited false CEPT class 1
licenses to CEPT class 2 operators
after WRC 2003.

ON4EHM is F1EHM

Thierry HAMADOU
111 rue de DONZY
58200 COSNE-SUR-LOIRE

Phone : +33-03-86-28-59-48

Please avoid any QSO with him.

2978. Time for fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 20:16:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <40PZb.4336$t16.3254526@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87704

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0402210806.68781f73@posting.google.com...
> I'm gonna spend a few hours running with the big dawgs this weekend as
> a reality check, third op at the N3RS baby multi in the ARRL CW DX
> blast. Haven't done one of these for a quarter century, this is gonna
> be UGLY.
>

I am definitely note a "big dawg" but having fun. Picked up a couple of new DX countries while I was at it. However I've heard several that I'd like to get with pileups just to big for me to break (Oman, Ivory Coast and some others). Oh well maybe I'll get lucky sometime this weekend.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2979. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 20:19:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <z3PZb.4338$t16.3255295@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87706

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0402211013.a393325@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>
> > And K0HB hasn't even submitted his proposal.
>
> Yes he has.
>

So is it up to 17 petitions?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2980. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 20:20:38 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94969C0841462elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87705

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040221091536.29660.00003092@mb-m24.aol.com:

> In article <Xns9495E57AF459Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>The FAR is an organisation that raises money for college scholarships
>>to be paid to licenced hams.
>
> This isn't them. It has six members. Look on eham.net under the
> discussion about the ARRL being representative.
>
>>That said, do you know what's in their petition. I am curious.
>
> It's 59 pages but it boils down to this, in no particular order:
>
> - Three license classes: Tech, General, Extra. Basically the same test
> requirements as today (including 5 wpm code for General and Extra)
>
> - No change to General or Extra privs
>
> - Novices get upgraded to Tech, Advanceds get upgraded to Extra, both
> for free (no test).
>
> - Techs and Tech Pluses merge, get all same privileges as listed below
>
> - Techs retain all VHF/UHF
>
> - Techs get 100W PEP on HF on parts of 160, 80, 40, 15 and 10. CW/data
> on all those bands, 'phone on 160, 10 and 15.
>
> Basically, they dropped the code test for Tech Plus privileges, added
> data on the CW parts, and added a bit of 160 and 15 meter 'phone. Much
> less HF than the ARRL proposal, and you need a Tech to get it.
>
> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

Doesn't sound a likely prosepect

2981. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 20:25:58 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94969CEFD31A1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87707

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in
news:5ee63311.0402211013.a393325@posting.google.com:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>
>> And K0HB hasn't even submitted his proposal.
>
> Yes he has.
>
>> So we're not even close to an NPRM yet...
>
> How did you reach that conclusion, oh great Imperial Pontificator?
> FCC can issue an NPRM without considering input from ARRL, K0HB, or
> Donald Duck.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
>

The first 14 petitions came in very quickly. The League's was late, but
will at least get read because of who they are. I think we can effectively
discount any further petitions, the FCC will just give them a quick glance.
So an NPRM may not be long in coming.

I guess my date in the pool will probably turn out to be too early, as it
doesn't allow enough time for comments on the NPRM. I will make one more
predicition, though, Element 1 will not survive the process.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2982. Opinions on eham.com? QRZ.com? QTH.com?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 20:35:23 UTC
From: Mike Rophone <Kilo@Watt.org>
Message-ID: <2004221-213523-638329@foorum.com>
Source record: 87715

QRZ.com was one of the first. QTH.com is one of the neebies. They
are opening up a bees nest of BS with their forums. Eham will publish
everything from racial slurs to hams demanding ham businesses be JAILED
if their parts are a week or two late. If you have something positive to offer,
you're generally censored. (I guess the theory is that flames bring "visitors"
to the site.)

I gave up on QRZ.com YEARS ago when they started the forum crap. The mud
slinging got so bad, it became worse than Usenet! (Hard to believe, huh?!)

The latest entry is QTH.com. Scott seems to be keeping it under control. But
how long before someone posts the wrong thing and QTH.com gets involved in a
libel case???

I know some of you are going to choke, but I think one of the best, most well
maintained, most positive, and most responses from classifieds is ARRL.org. Now
if they'd just get a DX Cluster server at the site, I'd be their all day!

73 from Mike
--
Ce message a ete poste via la plateforme Web club-Internet.fr
This message has been posted by the Web platform club-Internet.fr

http://forums.club-internet.fr/

2983. BPL NPRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 21:11:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040221161135.05957.00000583@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87708

The docket number for the FCC's NPRM on BPL is 04-37. That is in the FCC's Notices as of 21 Feb 04 even though the Notice is dated 12 Feb 04.

As of a quarter to 1 PM, PST, on 21 Feb 04, the first - and only - document on 04-37 is from the NAC, National Antenna Consortium.

For those who wish to view the Comments on 04-37 directly, the web address for the ECFS is:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi

Type in 04-37 in the upper left form block and press the Enter key to retrieve the Comments...if any more are forthcoming. Note: The FCC has NOT YET posted the NPRM text on the ECFS, a procedure followed in the past with other dockets. It is not on the Office of Engineering and Technology page although the OET usually takes care of changes in Part 15..

Strangely absent is any Comments from the ARRL which some say is the lone ranger in "fighting BPL." [apparently not enough sliver bullets in Newington's holster although they've had a week or more opportunity to reply] The general goals of "Broadband" as stated by the FCC is dated 3/13/03 or very nearly a year past.

LHA / WMD

2984. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 21:49:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <rnQZb.13790$W74.12635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87709

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040221091536.29660.00003092@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <Xns9495E57AF459Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >The FAR is an organisation that raises money for college scholarships to
be
> >paid to licenced hams.
>
> This isn't them. It has six members. Look on eham.net under the discussion
> about the ARRL being representative.
>
> >That said, do you know what's in their petition. I am curious.
>
> It's 59 pages but it boils down to this, in no particular order:
>
> - Three license classes: Tech, General, Extra. Basically the same test
> requirements as today (including 5 wpm code for General and Extra)
>
> - No change to General or Extra privs
>
> - Novices get upgraded to Tech, Advanceds get upgraded to Extra, both for
free
> (no test).
>
> - Techs and Tech Pluses merge, get all same privileges as listed below
>
> - Techs retain all VHF/UHF
>
> - Techs get 100W PEP on HF on parts of 160, 80, 40, 15 and 10. CW/data on
all
> those bands, 'phone on 160, 10 and 15.
>
> Basically, they dropped the code test for Tech Plus privileges, added data
on
> the CW parts, and added a bit of 160 and 15 meter 'phone. Much less HF
than the
> ARRL proposal, and you need a Tech to get it.
>
> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I believe it also proposes NO public question pools and
a 10 day waiting period before retesting a failed element.

Neither of these are likly at all. With the internet today, questions
will become public regardless of any effort to not publish them and
as for a waiting period on retesting, I can see no "same day"
retesting, but anything beyond that becomes an administrative
pain in the butt for VECs and FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2985. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 22:10:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402211410.70909308@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87710

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040220221703.15923.00003911@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <vKyZb.4147$t16.3101198@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Well I read on qrz and eham where another petition has been submitted.
>
> Me too, some outfit called the Foundation for Amateur Radio or some such. Six
> members. I wrote a comparison of their proposal and the ARRL one......
>
> >If
> >people want to delay whatever ruling the FCC finally issues that's probably
> >the most effective way to do it.
>
> bwaahaahaa
>
> >If I haven't lost count, that's 16 petitions.
>
> That agrees with my count.
>
> Neither the ARRL nor the FAR petition has an RM number yet. And K0HB hasn't
> even submitted his proposal. So we're not even close to an NPRM yet...
>
> Just like the '60s all over again.

I remember it well. I turned two in 1960.

A pile of proposals - watch FCC pick a bit
> of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.
>
> Maybe I should do a proposal....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You absolutely should. I'd enjoy seeing a PCTA propose the theory
that a Morse Code Exam is a disincentive to the use of CW on HF.

2986. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 22:15:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402211415.4f4b7d94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net> wrote in message
news:<40375884.856D0C97@nospam.iserv.net>...
> William wrote:
>
> > > They've also got a thing for that young lady with the short dress and high
> > > heels sitting in front of the radios in their showroom. Her photograph has
> > > been in every single catalog I've received (for years). Universal says
> > > they've been in business since 1942 and I have to wonder at this point if
> > > that same photograph has been in the catalog throughout all that time.
> > > Indeed, that "young woman" could be 70-80 years old today. However, the
> > > dress, hair style, and style of high heels, suggests the picture was taken
> > > in the 70's, which means she may only be 40-50 years old. :-)
> >
> > Universal is a couple miles from my home. I've bought small items
> > from them, but have never ordered by mail any radio, so did not
> > comment on topic. But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
> > goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
> > amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
> > her 40's.
>
> That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
>
> Steve
> Holland, MI
> Drake R7, R8 and R8B

Ham Radio sure is busting out all over!

What is the Djibouti card on your site?

bb

2987. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 22:18:49 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <4037D949.3357E6F@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 87712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

William wrote:

> N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net> wrote in message
news:<40375884.856D0C97@nospam.iserv.net>...
> > William wrote:
> >
> > > > They've also got a thing for that young lady with the short dress and high
> > > > heels sitting in front of the radios in their showroom. Her photograph has
> > > > been in every single catalog I've received (for years). Universal says
> > > > they've been in business since 1942 and I have to wonder at this point if
> > > > that same photograph has been in the catalog throughout all that time.
> > > > Indeed, that "young woman" could be 70-80 years old today. However, the
> > > > dress, hair style, and style of high heels, suggests the picture was taken
> > > > in the 70's, which means she may only be 40-50 years old. :-)
> > >
> > > Universal is a couple miles from my home. I've bought small items
> > > from them, but have never ordered by mail any radio, so did not
> > > comment on topic. But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
> > > goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
> > > amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
> > > her 40's.
> >
> > That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
> >
> > Steve
> > Holland, MI
> > Drake R7, R8 and R8B
>
> Ham Radio sure is busting out all over!
>
> What is the Djibouti card on your site?

It's a QSL from Radio Djibouti.

I was fortunate (or was it unfortunate) enough to visit Djibouti in 1979. Quite the
experience.
No, I didn't hear them on SW then, but I did hear them on MW.

>
>
> bb

2988. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 22:20:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402211420.22debd2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87713

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ztHZb.13301$W74.7670@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:4036B743.CCF4493F@earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> (SNIP)
> > > > The regs state that someone who wishes to use those particular hunks
> of
> > > > RF real estate will pass those exams. If someone hasn't passed the
> > > > exam, he or she has not met the qualifications for occupying
> particular
> > > > band segments.
> > >
> > > If the FCC goes with the ARRL proposal, then there will be a "one-time"
> > > waiver of certain tests to accomodate the upgrades
> >
> > No kidding?
> >
> > >...which then means
> > > that those new upgraded Extras or Generals do, indeed,
> > > constitute fully qualified hams for those license
> > > classes.
> >
> > Yeah, I know that. I'm trying to keep that part of the ARRL proposal
> > from taking place.
>
> Go for it then. But if you fail in your effort, those that will
> be "free" upgraded are qualified because they will have been
> upgradedaccording to FCC rules at the time.
>
> (SNIP)
> > > > > ...as the ONLY arbiter of the outcome that
> > > > > matters is what the FCC will think and do.
> > > >
> > > > We have some evidence of what the FCC has thought in the current
> > > > regulations.
> > >
> > > Somehow I suspect the ARRL BOD does also...but I suspect it
> > > isn't in sync with what you think.
> >

> > That should have become obvious to you a little earlier.
>
> It has never been unclear to me.
>
> (SNIP)
> > > > > > > I'd strongly suggest the greater danger to personal or others
> > > > > > > life/limb is equally shared by Tech thru Extra as it relates to
> > > > > > > permitted VHF/UHF operating at the legal limit.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How many beginners do you know who run the legal limit
> > > > > > > on VHF/UHF. I'm betting that the answer is "none".
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Doesn't matter. They can if they want. Also, what
> > > > > > > makes you assume ALL technicians are beginners?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The assumption is yours. I wrote nothing about all
> > > > > > Technicians bbeing beginners.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nor did I suggest that "all" Techs are beginners....
> > >
> > > Did you think I wrote anything about such a thing?
>
> YOU said: "Also, what makes you (me) assume ALL
> technicians are beginners?" I made no such assumption,
> nor did I suggest it in what I wrote previously.
>
> > > but it is still a fact that all technicians, both beginners and "old
> hands"
> > > are allowed 1500 watts.
> >
> > Yep. No one seems to have had a problem with that in the past.
> > Beginners aren't likely to run 1500 watts on 2m or 6m and
> > "old hands" are more likely to know what they're doing.
>
> You still ignore thefact that beginners CAN run 1500 watts.
>
> > > > > > > > >>If you support them, then by definition you are supoorting a
> reduction
> > > > > > > > > >>in the written test requirements for those licenses.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Incomplete statement. Supporting a one-time upgrade doesn't
> > > > > > > > > > > mean anyone supports "permanent" reductions of the written
> > > > > > > > > > > requirements. THAT is the critical difference.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Give me a break, Bill!
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Are the people getting the "one time upgrade" qualified?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Tell me why they would be unqualified? Unqualified as to doing
> > > > > > > > > > what?

> > > > > >
> > > > > > They will not have met the qualifications for holding the higher
> class
> > > > > > license. No ifs, ands or buts.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yet you can't offer one operating skill or privilege that would
> > > > > > be covered by such lack of having passed the requisit test.
> > > > > >
> > > > > That isn't the point at all. If such is your belief, there is nothing
> > > > > to prevent doing away entirely with all but one license class and
> making
> > > > > the exams much easier. You claimed that you didn't support watering
> > > > > down the tests. Here you're making a case for dumbing down the whole
> > > > > shebang.
> > > >
> > > > Believe what you wish. I support the "one-time" upgrades.
> > > > If that makes you think I support permanent "dumbing down"
> > > > then you have a lapse of logic somewhere.
> > >
> > On the contrary. If such material is not needed by thousands and
> > thousands on a one-time basis, why would it need to be tested at all,
> > ever?
>
> You still ignore the reality of non-relationship of
> privileges vs license class. The ONLY logic behind
> the current system is Incentive Licensing.
>
> (SNIP)
> > > > > > In doing so, I acknowledge that there will be, if implemented
> > > > > > as submitted, a ONE_TIME reduction of test requirements
> > > > > > for those hams that get free upgrades. I also recognize and
> > > > > > understand that other than the one-time upgrades, there
> > > > > > will be NO reduction in written test requirements for Extra
> > > > > > and General.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Clear enough for you?
> > > > >
> > > > > I've never had any trouble understanding your view. You seem to not
> be
> > > > > able to see where such a position can lead. If the material isn't
> > > > > deemed necessary for an upgrade on a one-time basis, it is difficult
> to
> > > > > justify it as being necessary any time.
> > > >
> > > > Yawn. That's for the FCC to decide and, I suspect the FCC
> > > > can live with a one-time upgrade without believeing it
> > > > jeopardizes all future requirements.
> > >
> > Burp. I suspect that not many FCC staffers care one way or the other.
> > The FCC has long abdicated its responsibilities in enforcement, planning

> > and testing.
>
> Please do comment to that effect in your FCC filing when
> you do so.
>
> > > Governments often waive
> > > criminal and monetary fines by waiving them and offering
> > > special "tax amnesty" periods. After the "amnesty period" is over,
> > > if you are found guilty of eevading the taxes, you think the
> > > courts accept an argument that if the fines were waived once
> > > they should be permanently waived?
> > >
> > A freebie amateur radio licensing waiver is not a criminal matter nor is
> > it a fine.
>
> So how come many states have raised driver's license
> ages for teenagers and not had any problems. If a
> 16 year old was qualified to drive a few years ago, why
> can't they now? The point is that requirements can and
> do change for various things.
>
> > What is under discussion is amateur radio licensing and
> > whether the testing for certain classes of license are truly necessary
> > if they can be waived for thousands and thousands of people.
>
> Testing for US hams has changed many times. When
> Generals LOST privileges in 1968, no one raised a legal
> argument that if a General was qualified in 1965 to
> operate on all allowed Amateur spectrum, that the
> same General should be legally qualified to do so after
> Incentive licensing.
>
> > > > > > > > >>And since it affects over 400,000 hams, it's not a small
> matter.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > If it goes through it will be forgotten in a couple of
> years.
> Why,
> because
> > > > > > > > > > no one losses any privileges.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Are they qualified?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Broken record here it seems.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The question keeps coming up because straight answers have not
> been
> > > > > > > forthcoming.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > The question keeps coming up because some people can't

> > > > > understand the difference between a ONE-TIME waiver as
> > > > > opposed to a PERMANENT change in requirements.
> > > > >
> > > > > I haven't seen any evidence that there are people unable to tell the
> > > > > difference. I see evidence that your position could lead to some
> > > > > unintended consequences.
> > > >
> > > > And I don't. There's plenty of "waivered" situations in government
> > > > as already noted.
> > >
> > > You've written of quite disparate scenarios, having nothing to do with
> > > the topic of discussion.
> >
> > There are many analogies: Raised the drinking age, raised
> > the smoking age, driver's license age, waiving tax penalties,
> > waiving of illegal alien penalties. Not one situation has been
> > rolled back to the "waived" condition after reinstatement
> > of the waived requirements, laws or regulations. Legally,
> > it isn't an issue.
> >
> > > > > > So you do stand in support of reduced testing requirements and of
> > the
> > > > > > elimination of incentive licensing.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I do NOT support a permanant reduction of written requirements.
> > > > > > I support a limited incentive system but I wish the additional
> > > > > > privileges bore some relationship to the additional knowledge being
> > > > > > tested for.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nice waffle.
> > > >
> > > > No waffle at all.
> > >
> > > I don't agree.
> >
> > I don't care.
> >
> > > > THAT is my specific position and I do wish that
> > > > licensing privileges did have a relationship to the additional knowledge
> > > > being tested for.
> > >
> > > But, Bill, that is for the FCC to decide and they are the final arbiter
> > > ;-)
> >
> > Absolutely correct. It is, in the end, the FCC's decision.
> > Nothing I have said, nothing I wish, makes it any different.
> > I can and will add my voice to those that comment to the
> > FCC as to my preferences.
> >
> > (SNIP)

> > > Clearly the ARRL BOD doesn't
> > > accept your argument.
> >
> > The League's board isn't required to accept it, nor have I noted any
> > opposition. I can make my views to clear to my Director and to those
> > other Directors and Vice-Directors I know. I've already made my view
> > known to Dave Sumner.
> >
> > Seems to me I'm in good company then.
> >
> > Not necessarily.
>
> You are entitled to your opinion.
>
>
> (SNIP)
>
> > > > > > > Believe whatever makes you feel good.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Is that how you decide what to believe?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Depends on the decision to be made and the circumstances.
> > > > >
> > > > "If it feels good, do it".
> > >
> > > Depends on the decision. If it is a nice day and I have a decision
> > > to make regarding Mow the Lawn or Take a drive in my antique car
> > > with the top down...well I've taken the "feel good" decision on
> > > that choice many times. Haven't you made similar decisions?
> > > Wake up, decide it is a nice day and call your boss to tell him or
> > > her you're taking a vaction day?
> >
> > Izzat what we've had under discussion, taking a drive in an antique car
> > 'cuz it's a nice day? How about calling your boss and telling him
> > you're taking a couple of days to mull over the ARRL's proposal for
> > revamping amateur radio testing?
>
> I could do that.
>
> > > > > > > > and no one will notice that suddenly the requirements will go
> up.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The requirements won't go up...they will stay the same. The
> only
> > > > > > > > thing happening here (if FCC approves) is the written test will
> > > > > > > > be waiver one time for the particular ham going from Tech to
> General
> > > > > > > > or Advanced to Extra.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You mean, those hams who will not have passed the exam to go from

> Tech
> > > > > > to General or Advanced to Extra. You mean a "gimme" for tens of
> > > > > > thousands.
> > > > > > Tell us again the motivation for such a thing. What makes it
> necessary
> > > > > > to do.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Read the ARRL petition. ARRL makes the case and I agree with their
> > > > > > logic. No need to repeat it again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yeah, it is kind of embarrassing. I can understand why you wouldn't
> > > > > want it repeated.
> > > >
> > > Repeat it all you want.
> >
> You told me that there was no need to repeat it.
>
> I said I wasn't going to repeat it. You can do it all
> you want.
>
> > > I've neither the time nor inclination to
> > > cut and paste it in here just to make you happy.
> >
> > As long as you support freebie upgrades, you aren't going to make me
> > happy.
>
> Then prepare to be unhappy for now.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I'm trying to recall any happy moment that that Dave has shared with us on rrap.

2989. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 22:32:57 UTC
From: radioactivened@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040221173257.20400.00000145@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87714

George Busch wa3moj why are you forging twistedhed again and crossposting to amateur groups? Leave the forging to kc8ldo.

2990. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 23:32:49 UTC
From: Colnel BeltSander <vavavavoomme0@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8cd7b$4037eb0d$d1cc4523$28492@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 87716

Yeah, most hams being retired old tightwads
who know everything an have nothing better to do
you know....

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:vKyZb.4147$t16.3101198@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> Well I read on qrz and eham where another petition has been submitted.
If
> people want to delay whatever ruling the FCC finally issues that's
probably
> the most effective way to do it. If I haven't lost count, that's 16
> petitions.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2991. Re: Question about wa3moj

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-21 23:54:33 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@homo.nut>
Message-ID: <c18r3p021j3@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 87718

I had sweaty man love with george.

In article <20040221173257.20400.00000145@mb-m04.aol.com>, Radioactivened
says...
>
>George Busch wa3moj why are you forging twistedhed again and crossposting to
>amateur groups? Leave the forging to kc8ldo.

You ask w

2992. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 00:14:38 UTC
From: Mike Maghakian <mikemaghakian@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <EcCdnVDZSYPtaard4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 87717
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

they are very good on returns, my friend bought a used antenna from
them, sent it back and they did not charge him a restocking fee.

there is one dealer www.radios4you.com /(electronic-specialties on eBay)
that does not give refunds under most situations.

from their website:

5. All Sales Final. Sorry we do not offer a satisfaction warranty and do
not accept returns. Reasonable attempts will be made to provide an
upgrade solution if requested and the original product is returned in
new condition. A 25% restocking fee will be deducted for returns without
explicit e-mail approval.

Rusty in Louisville wrote:
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville
>
>
>

2993. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:02:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221200227.23171.00004225@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87719

In article <Xns94969C0841462elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>Doesn't sound a likely prosepect

The FISTS proposal has more of a chance, I think.

It will be interesting to see when/if all these proposals get RM numbers and
how long it is before FCC does the NPRM thing. Perhaps we need another pool!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2994. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:02:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221200232.23171.00004226@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87721

In article <rnQZb.13790$W74.12635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I believe it also proposes NO public question pools and
>a 10 day waiting period before retesting a failed element.

You are correct, sir! Thanks for the reminder.
>
>Neither of these are likly at all.

The 10 day wait is possible but not likely. How could it be enforced?

>With the internet today, questions
>will become public regardless of any effort to not publish them

Agreed. All it would take is one VE who wanted to make them public.

Also, someone would have to rewrite the entire existing Q&A pools. Who is going to bell that cat?

>and
>as for a waiting period on retesting, I can see no "same day"
>retesting, but anything beyond that becomes an administrative
>pain in the butt for VECs and FCC.

FCC won't do it.

The only way I could see it happening would be for there to be some sort of "clearinghouse" where all the VEs would send their records for comparison. The clearinghouse would keep the last 10-11 days' worth of records and look for the same person taking the same test less than 10 days apart, and pass it on to FCC.

Sun will rise in the west on the day that happens!

What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE session" but that's about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2995. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:02:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221200234.23171.00004227@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87720

In article <5ee63311.0402211013.a393325@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>
>> And K0HB hasn't even submitted his proposal.
>
>Yes he has.

Formally or as a comment?
>
>> So we're not even close to an NPRM yet...
>
>How did you reach that conclusion, oh great Imperial Pontificator?

The same way you don't.

>FCC can issue an NPRM without considering input from ARRL, K0HB, or
>Donald Duck.

Sure - but they haven't. And there's no hurry.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2996. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:02:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221200236.23171.00004228@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87722

In article <d22b54c3.0402211010.2bf0c2bf@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040220221630.15923.00003910@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402201400.113d4fcf@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> The big sell points are "no installatio! Just plug it in!" and the extreme
>> portability. "Every power socket in your house is now a broadband internet
>> connection" - "easier than dialup!" etc.
>>
>> Of course the same is true of the various 802.11 alphabet soup systems
>> coming out too - and those are faster!
>
>I'm not up to speed on the methods which will be used to transport the
>802.11 type signals into buildings

It's called "radio". aka "wireless". The modems/routers/hubs have these funny things called "antennas" on them and so do the boxes out on the utility pole.

>but I assume it'll be carried over
>existing cable TV wiring to a Part 15 tranciever/modem somewhere in
>the building. Or something along those lines.

No wires at all. You been to Microcenter lately?

>Makes a helluva lot
>more sense economically and in all other respects vs. BPL. In
>particular they won't trash the HF spectrum like BPL does.

It's also faster, more robust, and even more portable. Put a PCIMCIA cardmodem in your lapper and surf anywhere.

>I undertand
>that they would use a band of frequencies which would "endanger" our
>2.4 Mhz allocations. But like I posted somewhere else earlier, I'll
>trade 2.4 Mhz for 14 Mhz any day.

Some of them do and that's not good. Others are in the 5 GHz region. What is most important is that we can have a protected slice of GHz *and* those technologies can exist.
>
>The current show-stopper for the 802.11 crowd seems to be a lack of
>standards and coordination. Which is very typical of fledgling
>technologies, everybody wants their pet system to become the alpha

>technology. And eventually evolutionary forces will do what they've
>always done and some 802.11 type system or another will be ready to
>market on a global scale.

BINGO! I knew you'd get it. Just like VHS smacked Beta's rear years ago.

>hen that finally happens I expect that what
>little bits and pieces of BPL might actually still be around will be
>buried and forgotten. Quicky.
>
Hopefully they'll not get off the ground. But it still has to be fought because
once they get established they can set a precedent for other bad technologies.

>As as far as serving pore stranded Farmer Jones' needs if he's really
>hot for broadband access all he has to do is sign up for dish service.
>Which has been out there for *years*.

The reason Farmer Jones doesn't have DSL or a cable modem is the same reason he
won't have BPL: not enough customers per mile.
>
>> None of them are engineers - they're "regulators".
>
>They're bush-league (pun intended)politicians as usual and don't have
>to be engineers, their job is listen to the FCC technical staff,
>that's why the FCC has technical experts on the payroll.

But they don't have to do what the techies say.

> As if they
>care about any "technical details" like obliterating HF radio with
>BPL, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. sed "Just DO it" and that's that.

Like code waivers from Papa Bush.

>I've
>been wondering if Commerce is being leaned on about watering down the
>upcoming NTIA BPL study. I'll just bet it is.

Who knows?
>
>> And they're tasked by your
>> buddy Shrub
>
>You jest!

Not at all. Just good ol
thousand-points-of-light-republican-coat-no-millionaire-left-behind-trickl
e-down business as usual.....
>
>> to come up with whizbang technocures like hydrogen fuel and BPL.
>> Right!
>>
>> And Ralph Nader is going to run again. GEts worse every day.

>
>Comic relief. Beats Ross Perot.

Ralph Nader is Shrub's best friend. Without him, Algore would be in the White House.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2997. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:10:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <akTZb.2779$CV1.12@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 87723

Hello, Dave

Can I start one with Hammarlund? :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:403683C8.7C98CA31@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <d22b54c3.0402160205.59cf0658@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >news:<402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>...
> > >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
Nancy
> > >> > Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
> > >> >
> > >> > >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
> > >> > >
> > >> > >PJ
> > >> >
> > >> > Been vacationing in outer space?
> > >> >
> > >> > Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out
Hallicrafters in
> > the
> > >> > early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later.
[Wilcox
> > >> > was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox
got
> > >> > rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their
move
> > to
> > >> > Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters
International"
> > >> > but didn't go for a few more years until it went into
receivership. It
> > all
> > >> > ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.

> > >> >
> > >> > The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model
in
> > >> > 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950
(primarily
> > >> > spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that
decade.
> >
>
> > > > Set the hook now. Steady!
>
> > > > Ziiiiiiiiing!
>
> > > > Okay, now let him run with it. Try and tire him out, then reel him
in.
>
> > > > You can haul him down to the taxidermy shop in the morning and have
him
> > > > mounted. Get a little brass plate reading "Pisces Maximus
Anderson".
>
>
> > >Hysterical, it don't get NO better than this, Nancy got us the new
> > >record Putzian faux pas.
>
>
>
> > Quite true, whether it be "Nancy" or "PJ" or whatever...living in the
past
> > seems to be a "qualification" for olde-tyme hammes of the morse
> > persuasion.
>
> It surely looks as if "Nancy" caught The Big Fish right here in the
> present.
>
> > There hasn't been a new BC-610 made for a half century or so, yet all
> > IMAGINE they are still being made in Chicago and anyone can write a
> > non-existant corporation for "information."
>
> I don't think that "all IMAGINE" any more than all believe "Ham Radio"
> to be other than a defunct magazine.
>
> > Countless radio yachts are
> > moored by such boat anchors and many olde-tymers love to scrape off
> > the barnacles and tell many a tale of love and affection for those
raddios
> > that glow in the dark (much as the eyes of the olde-tymers glow in
the
> > dark when describing their wonderous adventures of expertise).
>

> I knew you'd understand. You've often regaled us with those tales of the
> 40 KW bandblasters at ADA when you were in your youth.
>
> > "Expertise" as equated by the mental and emotional stability of
seven-
> > year-old Extras that all must emulate to "be as good as them." :-)
>
> You can start by passing an "Extra right out of the box" and attempting
> to match the experience of the seven-year-old Extra. I doubt you'll
> have time to catch up with the rest of us, General, Advanced or Extra.
>
> > Must be that all that radiotelegraphy rots the brain...
>
> Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
> Hallicrafters troll.
>
> Dave K8MN

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.593 / Virus Database: 376 - Release Date: 2/20/04

2998. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:28:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <dBTZb.2780$LK1.2122@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 87724

Len,

I know you love to .... um .... shake things up .... but ... I had my 1st class radiotelephone license in 1966. I also worked in Electromagnetic Compatibilty testing in 1995. Believe me, even an improperly grounded power pole can cause problems. No, I am not suggesting "interfering" with an unlicensed service. I am suggesting asserting the rights of a licensed service. Unlicensed services may not cause interference and must put up with interference. You, and some others, think this is an "amateur vs. the world" thing. It is not. There will be problems with other services, I can assure you.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040220163506.07155.00000810@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <mzbZb.3833$t16.2902497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >The marketing hype is cheap broadband for the rural areas. Economic reality
> >is that it will probably never be extended into the rural areas even if some
> >suburban areas do go for it.
>
> You have the "studies" to prove this as a fact?
>
> >Every single transformer between the injection
> >point of the signal and the end user must be bypassed with the BPL signal
> >for that signal to work.
>
> Of course you KNOW the EXACT CHARACTERISTICS of "a BPL
> signal," don't you?
>
> I don't and won't presume to guess. But, you are AUTHORIZED by the
> FCC to "legally interfere with any unlicensed service (of any kind)" and
> are therefore blameless.
>
> >If you only have one user every few miles, it will
> >never pay off. And of course you've mentioned the power and/or signal
> >boosters required. Periodic boosters all along the line will be needed.
>

> Ah so, the federal authorization magically makes all amateurs into
> technical experts who KNOW things all through answering a few
> questions and passing a morse code test.
>
> Must be that new "interest" thing in hum radio.
>
> LHA / WMD

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.593 / Virus Database: 376 - Release Date: 2/20/04

2999. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:47:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htgh7kb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87725

On 21 Feb 2004 07:12:26 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> It will be interesting to see who the movers and shakers (read:
>> investors and controllers) of the BPL business are when the
>> inevitable Congressional inquiry is forced to take place.
>
>What do you see triggering a Congressional flap over BPL??

Knowledgeable member of Some Agency gets p.o.-ed at The Power that pushes this down eveyone's throat, damn the interference, full speed ahead, and uses back-channel contacts to The Congress which wants some reason to stick The Power anyhow and gather headlines.

Ought to make a good "made-for-television" script or maybe even "The West Wing".

Or maybe no one really gives a damn.....

>> "No Millionaire Left Behind" ???
>
>.. . oughta be an interesting campaign . .

Stay tuned. November is coming up rapidly...

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3000. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:48:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402211748.4f1b8ae5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87726

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040221144208.12501.00006335@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <4036864A.F5CF82F8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Loon Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
> >>
> >> ADA is the callsign of Headquarters, United States Army Pacific,
> >> Fort Shafter, Hawaii. That callsign has been active since 1946 and
> >> in continuous use all this time, connected with area command
> >> headquarters in the Pacific region.
> >>
> >> Why do you insist on making fun of the United States Army?
> >
> >Oh, you simply misunderstood once again. I wasn't poking fun at the
> >Army. I was poking fun at you personally, Leonard.
>
> You consistently poke fun at anyone who opposes your opinions...
> save on NON-radio discussions in here which have nothing to do
> with any policy subjects.
>
> You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because a veteran of
> that service branch was assigned to ADA for three years and did
> not kiss your [expletive deleted] godhood in reverence.
>
> You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because they and the
> other branches dropped morse code for fixed-point to fixed-point
> communications back in 1948.
>
> You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because they had HF
> radio facilities a half century ago that makes the entirety of the
> United States Department of State look puny in re communications.

I recall him making fun of "This is the Air Force" c1958.

3001. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 01:56:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402211756.64c2fe06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87727

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402210703.632bf08b@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040220163503.07155.00000809@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0402200335.164d7c18@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >> Dear Beeping Bill:
> > >>
> > >> How can a licensed user intentionally interfere with an unlicensed user?
> > >
> > >Why an NOI and now an NPRM for such a Part 15 device?
> > >
> > >The rules will change.
> >
> > State Department Dave lives in a different reality and isn't quite up to
> > speed on FCC abbreviations. An "NPRM" is a Notice of Proposed
> > Rule Making but big Dave thinks the rules are already in place.
>
> More sniping from the NG Putz.
>
> Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> directly to you?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.

3002. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 02:49:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htgk6mc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87728

On 22 Feb 2004 01:02:36 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>It's called "radio". aka "wireless". The modems/routers/hubs have
>these funny things called "antennas" on them and so do the boxes out
>on the utility pole.

I had that 10 years ago - it was called Ricochet/Microtel, ran at dial-up speed using the 900 MHz non-licensed spectrum/technology, and worked just great. 24/7 connection with no extra phone line, DSL and Cable Modem service not quite on the market yet, and standards still being debated by several technical groups that I was a member of.

Just about five years ago they went broke and stopped offering the service. I still have the device in the original carton (had to look at it to remember the name). I had heard that they tried to revive it at higher speed in the 2.4 GHz Part 15 band, but they aren't offering that service in this area and probably never will, what with everyone using 802.11b LAN access.

>>I undertand
>>that they would use a band of frequencies which would "endanger" our
>>2.4 Mhz allocations. But like I posted somewhere else earlier, I'll
>>trade 2.4 Mhz for 14 Mhz any day.

The 802.11b "Wi-Fi" LAN technology operates at 2.4 GHz, not MHz.

The nice part about that is that Wi-Fi Channel 1 (IIRC) falls totally within the portion of the band that is shared between Amateur and Non-Licensed Part 15 users, and (theoretically, at least) a licensed ham can hang a super-high-gain antenna and a power amp on a commnercial Wi-Fi unit (CompUSA "special") operating on that channel, modifications that non-licensed Part 15 users cannot do.

Just think what 1500 W TPO would do to the neighborhood Wi-Fi users.

DX records. "King of the Hill".

>Some of them do and that's not good. Others are in the 5 GHz region.

802.11g - "Wide-Area" LAN or WAN. The Bay Area Wireless Communications Alliance members were discussing this about 5 years ago when I was active with that group. A higher-powered version requiring a point-to-multipoint microwave system license was starting to be pitched to a different crowd from the 802.11b (2.4 GHz) users.

>What is most important is that we can have a protected slice of GHz *and*
>those >technologies can exist.

>>The current show-stopper for the 802.11 crowd seems to be a lack of
>>standards and coordination. Which is very typical of fledgling
>>technologies,

These ARE standards. Just different applications. Carl Stevenson
is a national and international expert on them.

>>And eventually evolutionary forces will do what they've
>>always done and some 802.11 type system or another will be ready to
>>market on a global scale.

Both the 802.11b (short-range) and 802.11g (long-range) systems have
been marketed on a global scale for several years. Don't confuse
them with the differing standards for cellphoes and color TV - USA
vs the rest of the world.

>BINGO! I knew you'd get it. Just like VHS smacked Beta's rear years ago.

What makes you think that Beta died when VHS became the consumer
standard? The TV and broadcast industry standardized on Beta for
field recording, but alas Sony is no longer supporting it, having
had it replaced by digital technology. Look for the same thing to
happen with VHS - "everyone" is going to DVDs.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3003. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 03:10:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221221048.13960.00000827@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87729

In article <4035A6BB.44FEC4B9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >Jim,
>> >
>> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
>> >
>> Who or what is an "LHA"?
>
>Best I can determine, it is similar to a WMD.

What has been destroyed? And what does the Americans with Disabilities Act
have to do with any of it?

>According to the
>"LHA/WMD" sig I've noted, the two may be used interchangeably.

I have no idea who you are referring to. What's this person's amateur radio
callsign? Why should I be concerned about this person?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3004. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 03:10:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221221052.13960.00000828@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87731

In article <d22b54c3.0402210832.10c4df44@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040220193553.05539.00004440@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
>> >comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear.
>>
>> I'll bring the hot sauce. They don't call it "Total Insanity" for nothing.
>
>That's why you get the back deck.

"Fire in the hole!"

>> >If you talk 'EY into coming,
>> >you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.
>>
>> I got an air mattress for travel....
>
>No thanks, I'd rather travel in my car.

HAW!

>
>> >> > I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
>> >> > panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.
>>
>> Miniature is for poodles.
>
>Yeah, like Audrey Hepburn.

How'd you know she was one of my favorites?

>> >> Jim's obvious genius being that he's managed to come up with a 100W
>> >> 80/40/20 CW xcvr which is spread across two whole shelves.
>>
>> Anybody can make 'em small. I make 'em GOOD.
>>
>> How many FD QSOs you make so far with the little stuff? The Type 7 did 629
>> one year....
>
>How many did it make last year?

About 300 in SS, in a half-hearted effort.
>
>My Type 75A4/T4XB did 1,000-1,200 several times in the CQ WW CW.

Sure - with ten times the power and big antennas, in a contest twice as long as
SS or FD.
With all the comforts of home and a spotting net......

>And you . . ?

DX isn't my bag. Domestic contests are. One of the Barracuda Rules is that you
don't
try to beat the other guy at his game, you get him to play your game.
>
>> "Anybody who says size doesn't matter never had a really big one".
>
>SPARE us!

How many you put in the log for 'RS?

>> >I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
>> >four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
>> >stainless panel.
>>
>> Fits in a two-footer vertically with room to spare.....
>
>There ya go Dave, the four foot rack will work.

Twice over.
>
>> >> > My HRO is the mechanical marvel but for performance,
>> >>
>> >> Nice old boat anchors, great dial mechanisms.
>>
>> Ugh. Ten turns to cover the band? Puhleeze, I did better in high school.
>
>Better at what?

Better at mechanical dials.
>
>> The Type 7 uses a cap from a junked BC-221. The Type 6 and 5 used caps from
>> ARC-5 transmitters.
>
>Dayum, another N2EY stroke of genius.

You betcha, cost me maybe $5 for the whole VFO assembly. Including spares.

>And here all us no-clues been
>using these synthesizer thingeys, tsk, tsk, shame on us.
>
You had a synthesizer in 1972?

>> I copied one feature from RME: they didn't label much on the panel. They
>> said

>> if you didn't know what the knobs did you shouldn't be using the set.
>
>Anybody who doesn't know what knobs are for is a sick pup.

Exactly. I have each one's functions memorized. Plus they are ergonomically designed. No fatigue after hours of use.
>
>> >> THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
>> >> but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
>> >> the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.
>> >
>> >Talk to me!
>> >
>> I probably have a plug that will work. And a line cord. Etc.
>
>The cord is a no-brainer, it's the female 8 or 11 pin plug or whatever
>it is which is problem.

Count the pins and let me know, I have both. Plus the hoods and the clamps and more line cords than I can remember. 2 wire, 3 wire, whatever.

Just as long as they're not the oddball 9 pin ones that EFJ used. Those things are so rare that some owners have actually hacked into and modified their Johnsons to mate with less unusual devices.

>> Got rid of all my Johnson gear, though (sniff). Adventurer, Viking 2 with
>> 122, Valiant.
>
>Good riddance, they're probably doing splendidly on 27 Mhz by now.

Not at all. The Adventurer doesn't work 'phone, the Vikings (I had 2) went to a ham pal, and the Valiant went to an AMer.

The one Viking 2 was used to make my one-and-only 160 QSO. But that's another story....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3005. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 03:10:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040221221054.13960.00000829@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87730

In article <w5OdnT3yHryVyrHdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Here is the response I received from Alan Shark, president and CEO of
>the Power Line Communications Association, on my question of the
>intereference that will be caused by BPL. These guys are simply ignoring
>any facts because big money is at stake. Other countries have abandoned
>BPL because of the intereference it causes, yet this guy claims "there
>is no hard evidence to suport the AWRL (ARRL) concerns." I emailed him
>back and suggested he go to the ARRL web site and take a look at the
>videos made that clearly shows the level of interference. I also asked
>him who these scientists are he refers to and if they had any hard
>evidence that BPL will not cause interference to the HF spectrum. Think
>there is some reason for his last name being Shark?
>
>***************
>I appreciate your concern. To date there is no such hard evidence to
>support the AWRL concerns. In fact scientists have disputed such claims.
>Let's see what the NTIA and the FCC come up with by way of real-life
>field tests. As a veteran who has fought for our country, and who loves
>this country, I would not support something that would in anyway be
>harmful to local, state or national security.
>
JJ,

I am reminded of Bagdad Bob's denials about the Iraq war...."I triple promise
you, there are no Americans anywhere near Bagdad" while on a split screen there
ran scenes of the Bagdad airport being occupied by allied troops...

Hey - maybe that's a technique - put together a split screen presentation....

All anyone has to do is take a portable SW receiver to the BPL test sites and
listen. Of course you first have to find the sites, and visit them when the BPL
is active. And you need a way to demonstrate that the noise is, indeed, BPL.

The reason for the flatout denial is simple: If interference of *any* kind is
admitted to, it opens Pandora's box for the BPL folks.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3006. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 03:14:50 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.comunspam
Message-ID: <20040221221450.11022.00004236@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 87732

In article <pd9h005fafcc1865drb90h9fst9o20iein@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 17 Jan 2004 00:57:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <mgmd00h8pvglt1bh4a0chc1sgem7p2e2p4@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>For some reason, this discussion keeps going off on a tangent from the
>>>core "issue" that began our discourse.
>>
>>There are several issues, not just one.
>
>OK - I'm listening.
>
>>
>>>Perhaps I haven't stated it
>>>clearly enough, or during the discussion the original issue has become
>>>clouded.
>>>
>>Let's see what you've got, then.
>
>Let's go.
>
>>
>>>I have responded to your comments below, but I fear that we will
>>>continue forever if we are not discussing exactly the same issue.
>>>
>>>I understand that, due to your standards, you find Kim's callsign
>>>inappropriate.
>>
>>That's correct. It's also an issue to some people.
>
>OK - fair enough. And it shouldn't be.

But it is! And that's one of my points.

>Your personal standards are
>your own - no one else's.

They are shared in this case by some other people, so your
statement of "no one else's" isn't true.

> Let's clear that one off - agreed?

Once you agree that they are shared by some but not all others, yes.
>>
>>> No issue there - that is entirely your right.
>>
>>Some people say it isn't. Not you, but some others.
>
>Others may, but who cares - it's none of their business.

Whether or not it's someone's business is an issue, too.
>
>>>I also
>>>understand that you do not wish to use it in any of your posts.
>>
>>Also correct. And also an issue to some people, who say that my deletion of
>>Kim's call is "wrong".
>
>Let's focus on that one, and agree that deleting her call from your
>post is necessary for you to due to your standards. I have no issue
>there at all. If you don't want to use it, OK. Let's clear this one
>off too - agreed?

OK, fine. You have no problem with my not using her callsign.

>>>Again, no issue there - I respect that.
>>>
>>>For clarity, I'll restate it in clear and concise wording:
>>>
>>>Kim feels that eliminating just her callsign from your post was
>>>unfair, as it singled her out. I agree.
>>
>>And I disagree. Kim singled herself out by choosing that callsign. As you
>>are aware.
>
>Yes she did - and quite intentionally, too, as she has stated.

BINGO!
>
>That wasn't, however, what I was saying in my statement above. Simply
>that Kim feels that you singled her out too, by omitting just her call
>from the list.

Understood.
>
>Forget the inappropriatenesss of the call for a moment

Why? It is that inappropriateness which was the cause of the whole thing.

>....do you see where she might get that feeling?

Sure.

Do you see where others might get the same or similar feelings?

>>>Would finding a compromise
>>>whereby neither your standards nor Kim's feelings - such as removing
>>>all of the callsigns and listing only names for all participants -
>>>have not been a fairer way to handle this situation for all concerned?
>>
>>No, it wouldn't.
>
>Honestly, I dont agree with you on this point.

That's OK. You can post her callsign, my callsign, or nobody's callsign in
your posts. Just don't try to get me to post them or not post them in *my*
posts....

>It would have been an
>easy compromise to make,

Easy - and not in acordance with my standards.

> and woulld potentially have offended no one.

Incorrect. It would have offended me.

>More on this further down in the post!
>
>>>That's the only issue that I am discussing, Jim.
>>
>>No, it isn't, but we'll get to that later. Right now, let's discuss that
>>issue.
>>
>>It seems to me that what you're saying is that I should either include
>>everyone's callsign, or no one's.
>>
>>Now since I don't wish to include Kim's callsign, that leaves only the
>>option of including no one's callsign, in order to accomodate Kim's feelings.
>
>Agreed - in order to treat everyone equally, that would be the only
>other option available given the situation.

But it would *not* treat everyone equally. Those with appropriate callsigns
would
not get to see them posted. Everyone would suffer for one person's choice.
>
>>But what about everyone else's feelings, including mine? I want my call
>>listed.
>>
>>I would feel disrespected to be listed by name rather than callsign or name
>>and callsign on an amateur radio newsgroup.
>
>Yes, and I believe that Kim feels exactly the same way, Jim. For the
>same reason as you, I suppose - she is also a ham. (She does not feel
>that her call is in any way wrong, remember.)

I use the word "inappropriate". "Wrong" implies a moral judgement.
>

>>Maybe Dee, Dave, Carl, Dwight, Jim, Jim, Steve, et. al also want *their*
>>callsigns listed, and would feel disrespected if I listed by name only.
>>
>>Don't the feelings of everyone else count?
>
>Of course they do - but are you sure that these people world be that
>upset by this?

I know I would be - that's one.

>(except Dave, of course - he appears, from his recent
>correspondence, to be annoyed that Kim is still breathing... :))

I don't see any indication that Dave, K8MN wants Kim to die. I do see an indication that Dave would like Kim to choose a more appropriate callsign.

So if we assume K8MN agrees with me, that's two.

Perhaps others would feel disrespected too.

So you're saying that Kim's feelings are more important than Jim's (N2EY) and Dave's (K8MN) feelings. And maybe more.
>
>In fact, if it had been my post, I would have revised it to names only
>immediately after Kim's original complaint.

But it wasn't your post. It was my post.

By your logic, I should change my screen name and email address and how I sign posts, because they are derived from my callsign, too.

>And seen what comments
>came back next. If I had several legitimate complaints (without the
>agendas that we have seen in several recent posts {not yours, Jim!)
>which obviously relate to Kim personally rather than just her
>call...), then yes there would be no other alternative than to put the
>calls back - but I would have written and offered Kim the option of
>going by name only or dropping out before I went ahead.

So I should potentially disrespect a bunch of other hams with appropriate callsigns to please Kim? And if some of them complain, I get to put their callsigns back but not Kim's?

Why not just do what I did and avoid the potential of disrespecting hams with appropriate callsigns?

>At least I'd
>be able to tell Kim that I tried to fix it for her, but it didn't work
>out with the rest of the group.

That would be passing the buck.

>Maybe it's just me, but I would try first to resolve her complaint if
>possible, out of respect for her as a fellow amateur.

I respect her as a fellow amateur. But I also respect other amateurs
with appropriate callsigns.

>I prefer
>compromise whenever possible - not compromising my standards, but
>finding a way to achieve a balance.
>
What about when your standards cannot be compromised?

>>Note also, Kim said that if I wouldn't use her callsign, she didn't want to
>>be on the list..
>
>True, but that was after the had become frustrated with trying to
>solve this issue.
>
She was not willing to do anything to solve the issue other than complain and
protest.

>>>Your rights and
>>>standards are not at question here.
>>
>>Yes, they are. I've been told that "it's not my place" to determine whether
>>a callsign is appropriate or not. I've been told that my actions are "wrong".
>>
Also, the word "prejudice" has been used...

>>As you are aware.
>
>I did state that it is in fact no one individual's place to determine
>what is or is not appropriate for the ARS - that role belongs to the
>regulators, and to the will of the majority of us, I suppose.

It was that it was not *my* (N2EY's) place to decide.
>
>Each of us is however completely in charge of determining what is
>appropriate for us as an individual, however. No question there.

And I say it's appropriate for me to post the calls and words of hams with
appropriate callsigns and to edit out the calls and words of those who
use inappropriate ones.

>Jim, my intent was not to criticize your standards

Well, you did. I could even say you disrespected me in the way you did it.

>- simply to point
>out that perhaps a more amicable solution to this issue was possible
>without compromising anyone's standards - finding a common ground for
>all.

I do not agree that your proposed solution wasn't a compromise to my standards.
>
>That's it - that's my point.
>

And here's one more issue to think about:

Every community, including the ARS, has its standards. Consider residential neighborhoods as an analogy.

Some community standards are concretely and legally stated, like zoning ordinances and building codes. Others are part of the general community culture, such as keeping one's property in reasonable repair and not mowing your lawn at 3 AM. A lot of the latter come under the heading of "being a good neighbor".

If someone wants to be accepted and respected in a community, it is necessary to act (more or less) in accordance with reasonable community standards. That doesn't mean everyone must be exactly alike and never do anything different than the neighbors, but it *does* mean that community standards need to be considered.

The fact that not all community standards are codified into law doesn't mean they aren't important. For example, painting one's house in odd colors and patterns may be legal in some communities, but it's not the mark of being a "good neighbor".

What Kim wants to do is to reject the ARS' "community standards" in her choice of callsign, yet still receive the same respect and acceptance from other hams as those who choose appropriate callsigns. Just like the person who paints their house purple and orange in a dazzle pattern, then wonders why the neighbors put up fences and shrubs to conceal the view.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3007. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 03:50:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403826C5.D5BA8FF5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87733

Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> Hello, Dave
>
> Can I start one with Hammarlund? :))

Now you've done it, Jim. Foghorn Lenhorn will treat us to a dissertation on the history of the company and let us all in on how long it has been since Hammarlund produced a receiver.

Dave K8MN

3008. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 04:01:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40382958.A907298E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87734

William wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> > muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> > directly to you?

> Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
> answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.

Bleeping Bill,

There is no East Germany.

Let's take the time machine back to 1972....

Teacher: "Brian Burke, what key factors led to the drafting of the 1964 Civil Rights bill?"

William-Brian: "I understand that a number of Frenchmen commonly disregard their own laws."

Teacher: "Is it possible for you to answer a direct question?"

William-Brian: "This is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat."

Dave K8MN

3009. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 04:05:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40382A2E.5F5D8BB5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87735

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <4035A6BB.44FEC4B9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
> >> >
> >> Who or what is an "LHA"?
> >
> >Best I can determine, it is similar to a WMD.
>
> What has been destroyed? And what does the Americans with Disabilities Act
> have to do with any of it?
>
> >According to the
> >"LHA/WMD" sig I've noted, the two may be used interchangeably.
>
> I have no idea who you are referring to. What's this person's amateur radio
> callsign? Why should I be concerned about this person?

This particular individual has no amateur callsign. He is Leonard H.
Anderson but he shouldn't be confused with Leonard H. Anderson WA6HKH of
Montana, whose views are quoted in this month's issue of "CQ".

There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.

Dave K8MN

3010. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 04:11:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40382B97.BD641CFC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87736

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0402210832.10c4df44@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040220193553.05539.00004440@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >> In article <40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:

> >> >I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
> >> >four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
> >> >stainless panel.
> >>
> >> Fits in a two-footer vertically with room to spare.....
> >
> >There ya go Dave, the four foot rack will work.
>
> Twice over.

You need room for mods and future additions. Don't forget ventilation.
You need plenty of ventilation.

> >> >> THAT's the one Collins rcvr I'd love to have. I have a meatball S3-B
> >> >> but I'm gonna dump it. Needs a power cord. Which is a minor pain in
> >> >> the butt job, need to dredge up a chassis plug.
> >> >
> >> >Talk to me!
> >> >
> >> I probably have a plug that will work. And a line cord. Etc.
> >
> >The cord is a no-brainer, it's the female 8 or 11 pin plug or whatever
> >it is which is problem.
>
> Count the pins and let me know, I have both. Plus the hoods and the clamps and
> more line cords than I can remember. 2 wire, 3 wire, whatever.

He needs a standard 11 pin female socket (no mounting flanges) with
hood.

Dave K8MN

3011. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 04:14:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40382C74.5E95EF85@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87737

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <403680EF.2BD75369@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >William wrote:
> >
> >> Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.
> >
> >You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".

> Incorrect...YOU are here...

After re-reading Brian's statement and my response, your comment makes
no sense whatever.

Dave K8MN

3012. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 04:28:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87738

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4036864A.F5CF82F8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Loon Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40351D78.6390D6F2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Jim,
> >> >
> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
> >>
> >> ADA is the callsign of Headquarters, United States Army Pacific,
> >> Fort Shafter, Hawaii. That callsign has been active since 1946 and
> >> in continuous use all this time, connected with area command
> >> headquarters in the Pacific region.
> >>
> >> Why do you insist on making fun of the United States Army?
> >
> >Oh, you simply misunderstood once again. I wasn't poking fun at the
> >Army. I was poking fun at you personally, Leonard.
>
> You consistently poke fun at anyone who opposes your opinions...
> save on NON-radio discussions in here which have nothing to do
> with any policy subjects.

You keep trying to make this about a group of people. It isn't. It is
about you.

> You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because a veteran of
> that service branch was assigned to ADA for three years and did
> not kiss your [expletive deleted] godhood in reverence.

No, I haven't made fun of the Army. You keep trying to involve others.
It is about you.

> You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because they and the
> other branches dropped morse code for fixed-point to fixed-point
> communications back in 1948.

No, the Army isn't involved. There's only you.

> You MAKE FUN of the United States Army because they had HF
> radio facilities a half century ago that makes the entirety of the
> United States Department of State look puny in re communications.

Neither the Army nor the Department of State has anything to do with
this.
There's only you.

> You MAKE FUN of professionals in the firield of electronics because
> you consider your amateur status as "better" than professionals.

Not at all. I spent a career as a profession in the "firield" of
electronics. My professional career and my decades as a radio amateur
are not linked. As a radio amateur, I never thought I was better than
myself as a professional. But enough of this, the issue is you. While
you worked as a professional in radio, you've never been a part of
amateur radio.

> All you can do, besides gabble about NON-radio subjects in here, is
> to MAKE FUN of anyone you disagree with.

Wrong again, Mr. One Track. This isn't about "anyone I disagree with".
It is about you, Leonard H. Anderson, self-proclaimed advocate for
something-or-other in amateur radio.

> Your "fun" is really a pathetic attempt at humiliation which does not
> have the effect you desire. It did not six years ago and does not do
> so now.

Check your wayback machine, Len. It has been well in excess of six
years.
You come off as pompous and condescending. You'd like to convince us
that no one here can possibly know as much as you about radio. You'd
have us believe that we should accept your view of how amateur radio
should be regulated, yet you aren't a part of amateur radio at all.
That and you're easy to humiliate.

> You don't, or can't discuss any policy subject at length, only call
> those who disagree with you names and try to insult them.

We can always count on you for a laugh, kindly old pirhana. Tell us how
you conduct yourself and why you so frequently draw fire.

> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
> community.

And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.

> Shrug. Not good for the amateur image to make others be like you.

How would you know? You aren't involved.

Dave K8MN

3013. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:22:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FUXZb.14223$W74.9968@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87739

"The Eternal Squire" wrote:
>
> (snip) You could either:
> 1) Think of it as a SETI exercise.
> CW would carry far better over
> interstellar distance on microwave
> frequencies than voice, RTTY, or
> image. (snip)

Who would one talk to over those vast distances? We use Morse code, while most off-world residents used Zugth code. Besides, code use elsewhere is still declining after being dropped as a testing requirement about 6,406k years ago.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3014. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:23:24 UTC
From: Michael Moore <m.moore@NOSPAMutoronto.ca>
Message-ID: <mVXZb.127$nd2.4906@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 87740
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Maghakian wrote:

> they are very good on returns, my friend bought a used antenna from
> them, sent it back and they did not charge him a restocking fee.

This makes sense and may explain why so many are receiving
returned goods as new items.

--
M2

3015. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:38:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <z7YZb.14230$W74.13604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"William" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > They've also got a thing for that young
> > lady with the short dress and high heels
> > sitting in front of the radios in their
> > showroom. (snip) However, the
> > dress, hair style, and style of high heels,
> > suggests the picture was taken in the
> > 70's, which means she may only be
> > 40-50 years old. :-)
>
> Universal is a couple miles from my
> home. I've bought small items from
> them, but have never ordered by
> mail any radio, so did not comment
> on topic. But as far as the slender
> blond with the high heels goes, I've
> seen her there and she's one of the
> hottest ladies in amateur radio, but
> I don't think she has a license. She's
> probably in her 40's.

Yep, as noted above, I guessed she was somewhere in her 40's.

> Have you seen the gal in the Burghart
> advertisements? Wow!

No, I haven't. I'll have to keep my eyes open for it. 8-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3016. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:44:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <HdYZb.14235$W74.13514@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87742
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"GlennS" wrote:
>
> Is this her? If so, you're right!
> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html

It's hard to tell if the picture in the catalog and the pictures on the web site are of the same woman. None of the pictures are close-ups of the face. Regardless, the woman on the web site certainly does fill out that top very nicely.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3017. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:48:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <RgYZb.14241$W74.3643@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87743
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"N8KDV" wrote:
>
> Michael Moore wrote:
> > LOL. That picture was her about
> > 20-30 years ago.
>
> No, it's not... those pictures are of
> much more recent vintage than 20-30
> years ago... guaranteed.

I think Michael was talking about the picture in the catalog (as 20-30 years ago), not the pictures on the web site. The woman in the catalog is much younger looking - perhaps the same woman, but an older picture of her.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3018. Re: Time for fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:49:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402212249.7f7bb56e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87744

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<40PZb.4336$t16.3254526@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0402210806.68781f73@posting.google.com...
> > I'm gonna spend a few hours running with the big dawgs this weekend as
> > a reality check, third op at the N3RS baby multi in the ARRL CW DX
> > blast. Haven't done one of these for a quarter century, this is gonna
> > be UGLY.
> >
>
> I am definitely not a "big dawg" but having fun.

That's what matters! unless of course you go in to build score which
is a whole different ballgame altogether.

> Picked up a couple of new
> DX countries while I was at it.

There ya go. If it wasn't for the battalions of "casual ops" like you
there wouldn't be an ARRL DX contest.

> However I've heard several that I'd like to
> get with pileups just to big for me to break (Oman, Ivory Coast and some
> others). Oh well maybe I'll get lucky sometime this weekend.

Unless you have a pile-buster station avoid the pileups like they're
the Plauge in the major DX contests. I cannot tell you how many times
I've seen examples of some exotic or another generating a ruckus for
maybe a half hour or so then suddenly nothing on the freq. As often as
not he's off hopping up or down the band quietly sniping random q's
here and there in order to avoid any more 30 over 9 pileup Excedrin
headaches. Expeditions excepted.

Just keep surfing the band at a decent rate in some orderly manner and
listen, listen, listen. But jeez don't just park! He'll likely show up
outta nowhere usually working somebody else. So get good at polite and
fast tailending. Polite beats pounding on him for obvious reasons plus
you might also attract another pileup. I shot myself in the foot a
couple times with that one and I'm still in a hurt for Bouvet.

So the mobs are pounding the Oman station into the ground and in the
meanwhile the Big Dawgs have either worked the station in the Ivory
Coast or have lost interest in him or have just plain lost him and
bingo he's now "available" 30 Khz up the band and ya got him.

If ya just *gotta* do a pileup however NEVER jump right in if yer a
Little Dawg: Get a quick grip on his modus operandi. Use both of yer

VFOs. Find the guy who just worked him and call him up 500Hz. Or whatever game he's playing that seems to work. Smarts, stealth and treachery beats kilowatts every time.

Sometimes.

>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

3019. Re: Opinions on eham.com? QRZ.com? QTH.com?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:49:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403850D8.5040005@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87745

Mike Rophone wrote:

>QRZ.com was one of the first. QTH.com is one of the neebies. They
>are opening up a bees nest of BS with their forums. Eham will publish
>everything from racial slurs to hams demanding ham businesses be JAILED
>if their parts are a week or two late. If you have something positive to offer,
>you're generally censored. (I guess the theory is that flames bring "visitors"
>to the site.)
>
>I gave up on QRZ.com YEARS ago when they started the forum crap. The mud
>slinging got so bad, it became worse than Usenet! (Hard to believe, huh?!)
>
Worse than rrap? Come to think of it, from what I've heard, rrap is a
quite civil
tea party compared to some of the soc.culture.* groups. s.c.india
particularly
bad. And years back in s.c.china it seemed that "running dog" was a really
bad insult. Back when Tienamen Square happened I looked at s.c.c to see if
there was any "insider" insight to be had. Not much it turned out. it
was mostly
bored grad students arguing with each other.

>
>
>

3020. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 06:55:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40385235.3000809@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87746

N2EY wrote:

>
>What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE session" but that's
>about it.
>
>
>
That would be surfficient enough of a rule change. Some VEs arrange
things where
the guy who registers the testees and takes the fees leaves before the
tests come out.
So it isn't possible to reregister and pay another fee at the same
session.

3021. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 07:10:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402212310.6db9bafb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87747

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<403683C8.7C98CA31@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <d22b54c3.0402160205.59cf0658@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >news:<402FFC76.265EDEBF@earthlink.net>...
> > >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > In article <fMPXb.4826$WW3.2120@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Nancy
> > >> > Young" <lifeteime@yahoo.com> writes:
> > >> >
> > >> > >I would write the Hallicrafters Company, as they manufacture them.
> > >> > >
> > >> > >PJ
> > >> >
> > >> > Been vacationing in outer space?
> > >> >
> > >> > Bill Halligan retired in 1966. Northrup bought out Hallicrafters in
> the
> > >> > early 1970s and transferred that to Wilcox a few years later. [Wilcox
> > >> > was a long-time maker of commercial-government radios] Wilcox got
> > >> > rid of it after a couple, sold it to an entrepreneur after their move
> to
> > >> > Texas. What was left was incorporated at "Hallicrafters International"
> > >> > but didn't go for a few more years until it went into receivership. It
> all
> > >> > ended in the early 1980s. Hallicrafters is only a memory now.
> > >> >
> > >> > The Chicago-based original Hallicrafters produced its last model in
> > >> > 1972. Production on the military BC-610s ended about 1950 (primarily
> > >> > spares) with many remaining in service until the end of that decade.
> > >
> >
> > > > > Set the hook now. Steady!
> >
> > > > > Ziiiiiiiiing!
> >
> > > > > Okay, now let him run with it. Try and tire him out, then reel him in.
> >
> > > > > You can haul him down to the taxidermy shop in the morning and have him
> > > > > mounted. Get a little brass plate reading "Pisces Maximus Anderson".
> >

>
> > >Hysterical, it don't get NO better than this, Nancy got us the new
> > >record Putzian faux pas.
>
>
>
> > Quite true, whether it be "Nancy" or "PJ" or whatever...living in the past
> > seems to be a "qualification" for olde-tyme hammes of the morse
> > persuasion.
>
> It surely looks as if "Nancy" caught The Big Fish right here in the
> present.
>
> > There hasn't been a new BC-610 made for a half century or so, yet all
> > IMAGINE they are still being made in Chicago and anyone can write a
> > non-existant corporation for "information."
>
> I don't think that "all IMAGINE" any more than all believe "Ham Radio"
> to be other than a defunct magazine.
>
> > Countless radio yachts are
> > moored by such boat anchors and many olde-tymers love to scrape off
> > the barnacles and tell many a tale of love and affection for those raddios
> > that glow in the dark (much as the eyes of the olde-tymers glow in the
> > dark when describing their wonderous adventures of expertise).
>
> I knew you'd understand. You've often regaled us with those tales of the
> 40 KW bandblasters at ADA when you were in your youth.
>
> > "Expertise" as equated by the mental and emotional stability of seven-
> > year-old Extras that all must emulate to "be as good as them." :-)
>
> You can start by passing an "Extra right out of the box" and attempting
> to match the experience of the seven-year-old Extra. I doubt you'll
> have time to catch up with the rest of us, General, Advanced or Extra.
>
> > Must be that all that radiotelegraphy rots the brain...
>
> Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
> Hallicrafters troll.

AWSHIT DAVE, HELP ME GET UP OFF THE FLOOR WILLYA?? OmGawd, I cain't
breath . . priceless . .

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3022. Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 07:21:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87748

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040221091536.29660.00003092@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <Xns9495E57AF459Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >The FAR is an organisation that raises money for college scholarships to
be
> >paid to licenced hams.
>
> This isn't them. It has six members. Look on eham.net under the discussion
> about the ARRL being representative.
>
> >That said, do you know what's in their petition. I am curious.
>
> It's 59 pages but it boils down to this, in no particular order:
>
> - Three license classes: Tech, General, Extra. Basically the same test
> requirements as today (including 5 wpm code for General and Extra)
(SNIP)

I just read the proposal. Much of the code retention argument
is the same as was raised and dismissed by the FCC in
the R&O for 98-143...howvever, there is a section
21 that I have no clue what they are talking about. It reads:

"21. Finally, it should be noted that by removing the Morse
radiotelegraphy requirements from the General Class and
Amateur Extra Class licenses, the Commission would be
creating the groundwork for a socially divisive caste system
within the Amateur Service - the 'no-codes' versus the
'know-codes'. To some degree, this is already a fact in
some circles. Amateur radio, by its very nature, is a very
social pursuit. However, by removing telegraphy from the
requirements of the General Class and Amateur Extra
Class licenses as petitioned by some in the community,
the Commission is potentially embarking upon a mission
that is virtually guaranteed to become a very expensive
enforcement nightmare." End of Quoted material

What does dropping code testing for General or
Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a very expensive
enforcement nightmare."

Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be

allowed by the FCC to operate morse?

What am I missing here?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3023. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 07:27:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <FRYZb.14264$W74.6094@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87749

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040221200232.23171.00004226@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <rnQZb.13790$W74.12635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I believe it also proposes NO public question pools and
> >a 10 day waiting period before retesting a failed element.
>
> You are correct, sir! Thanks for the reminder.
> >
> >Neither of these are likly at all.
>
> The 10 day wait is possible but not likely. How could it be enforced?

Agree 100%

> >With the internet today, questions
> >will become public regardless of any effort to not publish them
>
> Agreed. All it would take is one VE who wanted to make them public.

Test takers themselves could, as was done by Bash in the 60's
just remember a couple of questions and share them on RRAQ
(rec.radio.amateur.questions :-)

> Also, someone would have to rewrite the entire
> existing Q&A pools. Who is going
> to bell that cat?

Agree again.

> >and
> >as for a waiting period on retesting, I can see no "same day"
> >retesting, but anything beyond that becomes an administrative
> >pain in the butt for VECs and FCC.
>
> FCC won't do it.
>
> The only way I could see it happening would be for there to be
> some sort of "clearinghouse" where all the VEs would send their
> records for comparison. The clearinghouse would keep the last
> 10-11 days' worth of records and look for the same person taking

> the same test less than 10 days apart, and pass it on to FCC.
>
> Sun will rise in the west on the day that happens!
>
> What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE session" but
that's
> about it.

Wow, Jim, we are in 100% agreement here on those two
points.

Cheers and see my post on "section 21". I'm interested
in your opinion of what the petitioners are suggesting.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3024. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 08:03:16 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402220807400.1822@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87750

On Wed, 18 Feb 2004, Tony P. wrote:
> In article <20040218001116.02537.00003026@mb-m23.aol.com>, lenover21
> @aol.com says...
> > In article <40329EFF.3070105@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >
> > >In today's paper (Star Ledger) it said that the ITU established
> > >a new code symbol for "@". It is the letters A and C run together.
> >
> > Such wonderful news for all the olde-tyme morosemen out
> > there! No doubt will be of tremendous help in alleviating
> > communications carrier grid lock!
> >
>
> Hey - at least now it'll be easy to pass an email address for QSL
> purposes.

Is it really? Sending the word "at" is still faster!

3025. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 08:13:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402220815290.1822@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87751

On Tue, 17 Feb 2004, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Sun, 15 Feb 2004 22:54:22 -0800, Jack Hamilton wrote:
> >KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net> wrote:
> >
> >>They were not violating part 97 of FCC regulations, AND the control
> >>operator did NOT violate 1st Amendment rights. Only the Government
> >>can be in violation of 1st Amendment rights. Private citizens are not
> >>bound by the 1st Amendment.
> >
> >In Pruneyard Shopping Center vs. Robins, Pruneyard Shopping Center was
> >required to allow a group of high school students to circulate petitions
> >on shopping center property. The decision was based on free speech
> >rights in the state constitution, not on US Constitution. According to
> >a discussion entitled "Why Can Shopping Malls Limit Free Speech?" at
> ><http://slate.msn.com/id/2079885/>, only California, New Jersey,
> >Colorado, Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, and Pennsylvania have such
> >constitutional provisions.
> >
> >Someone could try to make a case for this rule applying to the use of an
> >amateur radio repeater located in one of those seven states, especially
> >if the repeater equipment had been purchased or subsidized by a
> >government agency.
> >
> >Note: I'm not a lawyer,
>
> That is obvious if you are relying on _Pruneyard_. The U S
> Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (which covers
> California as well as 7 other Western states) held in _Howard
> v City of Burlingame_ that there are NO First Amendment rights
> granted by the amateur license. No, none, nada.
>
> Much as I don't like the rest of that decision, it is clear.

Doesn't surprise me. The 9th circuit is usually in "left-field" as compared to the rest of the appellate circuits, so I understand from their ruling history - even when they do get something technically correct (e.g. "under God" in the PoA being unconstitutional by violating "freedom of religion"). Most of the cases that I have seen to come to that conclusion are in the tax area.

> >so if you want to bring such a case, don't ask me for help.
>
> I am an attorney who handles amateur radio cases, and I wouldn't
> take such a case because I do not want to appear a fool in the eyes
> of my peers or future clients.
>

> Now back to The Morse Wars.....

3026. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 08:25:35 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402220823260.1822@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 87752

On Wed, 18 Feb 2004, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0402161041390.870@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>
> >Seriously, as long as it's not a forbidden topic (i.e. violates the rules), I
> >don't see a problem. There was no violation by the discussion participants.
> >I
> >would only see that run afoul of the rules if they were actively managing
> >some
> >sort of political action on the issue....
>
> Dieter:
>
> I'm not sure that "actively managing some sort of political action" would
> be a violation of Part 97, either. The only firm restriction is against using
> amateur radio in direct support of commercial interests -- i.e. direct
> "business" use of amateur radio communications to facilitate revenue-
> generating activities by a business. So, it would seem to me, that
> organizing "political action" for or against gay marriage on amateur radio
> would be OK, as long as the trustee(s) of the repeater(s) so used were in
> agreement. You just couldn't use the same repeater(s) to advertise the
> sale of rings, tuxedos, and wedding dresses to the betrothed gays.

I disagree: 47 CFR 97.113(a) [snipped]: "... to facilitate the business or commercial affairs of any party." Generally, a party seeking election of a candidate to public office or an organization backing a ballot measure MEETS this condition, regardless of whom or over what is being voted on. Of course, this only restricts those actively engaged in the campaign; not two citizens uninvolved (except for their casting of votes on election day) who are merely discussing the issue.

However, such is allowed to another (inferior) "radio service" in 95.413(a)(10)!
;-)

3027. Re: Time for fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 13:02:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LL1_b.4523$t16.3396266@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87753

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0402212249.7f7bb56e@posting.google.com...
> If ya just *gotta* do a pileup however NEVER jump right in if yer a
> Little Dawg: Get a quick grip on his modus operandi. Use both of yer
> VFOs. Find the guy who just worked him and call him up 500Hz. Or
> whatever game he's playing that seems to work. Smarts, stealth and
> treachery beats kilowatts every time.
>
> Sometimes.
>

Yup and sometimes the "pileup" melts away and there are major lulls. So I just note the frequency and keep checking back periodically. Snagged the Ivory Coast that way.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3028. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 13:04:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SN1_b.4524$t16.3396362@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87755

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40385235.3000809@ix.netcom.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> >What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE session" but
that's
> >about it.
> >
> >
> >
> That would be surfficient enough of a rule change. Some VEs arrange
> things where
> the guy who registers the testees and takes the fees leaves before the
> tests come out.
> So it isn't possible to reregister and pay another fee at the same
> session.
>

Actually the VEs always have the option to not run a retest. When we've had limited time access to the facility or have limited time due to other commitments, we've simply stated no retests at that particular session.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3029. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 13:05:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040222080527.12501.00006382@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 87754

In article <40382A2E.5F5D8BB5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <4035A6BB.44FEC4B9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> >Jim,
>> >> >
>> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
>> >> >
>> >> Who or what is an "LHA"?
>> >
>> >Best I can determine, it is similar to a WMD.
>>
>> What has been destroyed? And what does the Americans with Disabilities Act
>> have to do with any of it?
>>
>> >According to the
>> >"LHA/WMD" sig I've noted, the two may be used interchangeably.
>>
>> I have no idea who you are referring to. What's this person's amateur radio
>> callsign? Why should I be concerned about this person?
>
>This particular individual has no amateur callsign.

Why not? Is the Tech written too difficult for him to pass?

>He is Leonard H. Anderson

How do you know? Have you actually met him or otherwise verified his identity?

I could claim to be a lady with red hair on this newsgroup - how would you know
I am not?

Reminds me of a PHC joke:

Two penguins are in Antartica.
One penguin says to the other: "You look like you're wearing a tuxedo"
The other penguin replies "How do you know I'm not?"

>but he shouldn't be confused with Leonard H. Anderson WA6HKH of
>Montana, whose views are quoted in this month's issue of "CQ".

I did see that but WA6HKH's address was given as Sun City or Sun Valley or some such in California.

>There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.
>
I did not think there was.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3030. Retests at VE sessions - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 13:31:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5b2_b.14376$W74.7886@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87756

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:SN1_b.4524$t16.3396362@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:40385235.3000809@ix.netcom.com...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > >What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE
> > > >session" but that's about it.
> > >
> > > That would be surfficient enough of a rule change.
> > > Some VEs arrange things where
> > > the guy who registers the testees and takes the fees leaves
> > > before the tests come out.
> > > So it isn't possible to reregister and pay another fee at the
> > > same session.
> > >
>
> Actually the VEs always have the option to not run a retest.

I agree.

> When we've had limited time access to the facility
> or have limited time due to other commitments, we've
> simply stated no retests at that particular session.

I believe you don't need any reason to not allow
retests. There is no "right" to an immediate retest
for anyone regardless of how long the test session
may actually be.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3031. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 13:38:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402220538.67cc0db6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87757

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40382958.A907298E@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> > > muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> > > directly to you?
>
> > Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
> > answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.
>
> Bleeping Bill,
>
> There is no East Germany.
>
> Let's take the time machine back to 1972....
>
> Teacher: "Brian Burke, what key factors led to the drafting of the 1964
> Civil Rights bill?"
>
> William-Brian: "I understand that a number of Frenchmen commonly
> disregard their own laws."
>
> Teacher: "Is it possible for you to answer a direct question?"
>
> William-Brian: "This is America, not East Germany. We have the right
> not to answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat."
>
>
> Dave K8MN

Bleeping David, I stand corrected. I should have stated "TFUSSRSCFKA
East Germany." It never occured to me that the image of human
opression in that former country would have been so fleeting. How
quickly you forget. But thank you for your vigilance as netgroup cop.
It is important work for you. You are free to go back to working out
of band Frenchmen again.

3032. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 13:58:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4038B523.829F7D0B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87758

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40382958.A907298E@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > > Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> > > > muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> > > > directly to you?
> >
> > > Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
> > > answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.
> >
> > Bleeping Bill,
> >
> > There is no East Germany.
> >
> > Let's take the time machine back to 1972....
> >
> > Teacher: "Brian Burke, what key factors led to the drafting of the 1964
> > Civil Rights bill?"
> >
> > William-Brian: "I understand that a number of Frenchmen commonly
> > disregard their own laws."
> >
> > Teacher: "Is it possible for you to answer a direct question?"
> >
> > William-Brian: "This is America, not East Germany. We have the right
> > not to answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat."

> Bleeping David, I stand corrected. I should have stated "TFUSSRSCFKA
> East Germany." It never occured to me that the image of human
> opression in that former country would have been so fleeting. How
> quickly you forget.

See how you play it? I tell you that there is no East Germany; you tell
me that I've quickly forgotten. I didn't forget anything, Brian. I
told you that there is no East Germany.

> But thank you for your vigilance as netgroup cop.

You did not receive a citation. You are not required to pay a fine.

> It is important work for you. You are free to go back to working out
> of band Frenchmen again.

And you are free to continue your fetish over things French. Give my regards to Doctor Evil.

Dave K8MN

3033. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 14:06:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4038B71A.36268DCB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87759

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <40382A2E.5F5D8BB5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <4035A6BB.44FEC4B9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> >Jim,
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
> >> >> >
> >> >> Who or what is an "LHA"?
> >> >
> >> >Best I can determine, it is similar to a WMD.
> >>
> >> What has been destroyed? And what does the Americans with Disabilities Act
> >> have to do with any of it?
> >>
> >> >According to the
> >> >"LHA/WMD" sig I've noted, the two may be used interchangeably.
> >>
> >> I have no idea who you are referring to. What's this person's amateur radio
> >> callsign? Why should I be concerned about this person?
> >
> >This particular individual has no amateur callsign.
>
> Why not? Is the Tech written too difficult for him to pass?

It might be that or it might be that his decades-long interest in
amateur radio is a sham.

> >He is Leonard H. Anderson
>
> How do you know? Have you actually met him or otherwise verified his identity?

My feeling is that an imposter wouldn't have revealed so many easily
verifiable claims such as previous workplaces, address and the like.

> I could claim to be a lady with red hair on this newsgroup - how would you know
> I am not?

Good point, though if Len has the red hair, I feel confident that he has
the red rubber nose and shoes to go with it.

> Reminds me of a PHC joke:
>
> Two penguins are in Antartica.
> One penguin says to the other: "You look like you're wearing a tuxedo"
> The other penguin replies "How do you know I'm not?"
>
> >but he shouldn't be confused with Leonard H. Anderson WA6HKH of
> >Montana, whose views are quoted in this month's issue of "CQ".
>
> I did see that but WA6HKH's address was given as Sun City or Sun Valley or some
> such in California.

He must be a highly mobile individual. The RAC lists him as in Montana.

> >There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.
> >
> I did not think there was.

My guess is that the man is one of those who can clear a bar by simply
walking in and taking a seat.

Dave K8MN

3034. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 14:19:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4038BA29.A20D08DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87760

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40363F88.1F9E0731@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
>
> > Cincinnati, like Rome, is built on seven hills. There are a number of
> > other hills on the Kentucky shore. Most of 'em have radio towers. I
> > operated from four spots during my days in the area: As WB4KTR/8, I was
> > a block off the U.C. campus on top of the hill in an area called
> > Clifton. I had no tower but was able to put a mast on top of the three
> > storey commercial building. I moved across the river to Fort Thomas in
> > '74 and operated from atop the hill in that town with a tribander on a
> > 40' push-up mast. Site three was in Mt. Airy, across the road from a
> > nice, quiet 1600 acre city forest. I used a 60 foot tower there.
> > Finally, I moved to the west side of the city to Cheviot.
>
> Jeez. Didja ever get to completely unpack??

It was good training for the Foreign Service days ahead. Unpack
everything, put up the antennas, operate for two or three years, take
down the antennas, pack everything, move to a new location, unpack
everything, put up the antennas...

> > That same 60
> > footer was used there and was then hauled around the world. There are
> > still tower bases for that one in the ground in Botswana and Tanzania.
> > The tower stayed in Dar es Salaam. The embassy now uses it for a
> > repeater antenna.
>
> "World's most traveled tower". Foggy Bottom did pay you for the tower
> when you left it with 'em right?

Indeed they did and they paid to move it a bunch of times.

> > In a tale similar to yours, we came back to the U.S. from Helsinki in
> > the late 90's and ended up with a Pontiac Grand Am. I was underwhelmed
> > with the underpowered, poor-handling beast.
>
> I gave up on Detroit iron 20 years ago and I haven't run across any
> particularly good reasons to go back.

Most of the U.S. machines are now much better than those made a couple
of decades back. You'll find a few Q-ships though. The Pontiac Vibe,
for example, is a Toyota.

> > Naw, all stock. I stop using the performance tires when the factory
> > rubber gives up the ghost. It doesn't matter which tires I buy, the
> > twisty, hilly roads hereabouts make certain that I get only about 25,000
> > miles on them as the outside corners get worn down.
>
> I have some West Virginny time under my belt, I understand the "hills"
> and the driving condx. A month in the coal mines in the Bluefield area
> working an accident expert witness job was one of my "tours". Very
> different part of the world when it comes to driving. And everything
> else for that matter vs. here. Not a place for timid or anal drivers.

We have some of both but they are usually self-removed from the gene
pool.
Unfortunately, they often take others with them.

> > Just be careful you don't end up with a deer
> > pasted to the front of it.
>
> I'm tuned, we have monstrous herds of the things close at hand right
> here, we do some *serious* deer-ducking too. At 60 mph on four-lane
> divided highways.

The past couple of winters it hasn't been uncommon to come home at night
to find twenty or thirty of the critters on our place. They've even
bedded down right around the perimeter of the house.

> > > Dunno if I can trust it to make Wheeling & vicinity and back or not
> > > but I'm seriously mulling that prospect come the warmer winds of the
> > > days ahead. I figger if I gotta thumb it back home on the PA tpk. I
> > > might as well do it when it's warmer.
> >
> > I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
> > comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear. If you talk 'EY into coming,
> > you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.
>
> He gets the back deck, I get the guest room.

The guest room is comfy. The futon is twelve feet from the rig.

> > > > > I keep wondering how she'd "restyle" N2EY's Southgate 7 contraption .
> > > > > .
> > > > >
> > > > I see it in a National 60's blue wrinkle cabinet with satin stainless
> > > > panel. There'd be no miniaturization with plenty of room for mods.
> > > >
> > > OK, so it would be about the size of a steamer trunk and it would need
> > > castors to be able move it about . . details, details . . don't bore
> > > me with stupid details, "I'm a concept guy . . "
> >
> > I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
> > four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
> > stainless panel.
>

> This is gonna be a class radio, right up there with the IC-7800, cost
> in NO object.

Reminds me of OH2BH's classic tale of the Russian EMP-proof cellular
phone. It was all vacuum tubes and took up the trunk of a car.

> Eventually. Bigger priorities are looming for now.
>
> I'm gonna spend a few hours running with the big dawgs this weekend as
> a reality check, third op at the N3RS baby multi in the ARRL CW DX
> blast. Haven't done one of these for a quarter century, this is gonna
> be UGLY.

I heard one of your ops calling LU2EWL on 10m yesterday.

Dave K8MN

3035. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 14:58:20 UTC
From: "Lawrence J. Nader" <layr@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <gs3_b.375635$xy6.1937369@attbi_s02>
Source record: 87761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Maghakian wrote:
> they are very good on returns, my friend bought a used antenna from
> them, sent it back and they did not charge him a restocking fee.
>
>
> there is one dealer www.radios4you.com /(electronic-specialties on eBay)
> that does not give refunds under most situations.
>
> from their website:
>
> 5. All Sales Final. Sorry we do not offer a satisfaction warranty and do
> not accept returns. Reasonable attempts will be made to provide an
> upgrade solution if requested and the original product is returned in
> new condition. A 25% restocking fee will be deducted for returns without
> explicit e-mail approval.
>
>
>
>
>
> Rusty in Louisville wrote:
>
>> I would like to get some opinions about
>> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>>
>> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
>> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
>> or more to back order.
>>
>> Rusty in Louisville
>>
>>
>>
>
Yes. They are very courteous and helpful. I too have had slow response
insofar as when my item leaves their facility. Takes a week or more
from when the order is placed. I also have experienced the back order
phenomenon on numerous occasions.

3036. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 15:46:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402220746.68b4da21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87762

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> What does dropping code testing for General or
> Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a very expensive
> enforcement nightmare."
>
> Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
> doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
> allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
>
> What am I missing here?

I don't think you're missing a thing, Bill...However the
"authors" of the petition you cite are certainly a bit shy of a bag
full...! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

3037. Re: Time for fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 15:51:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402220751.2c66962a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87763

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<40PZb.4336$t16.3254526@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0402210806.68781f73@posting.google.com...
> > I'm gonna spend a few hours running with the big dawgs this weekend as
> > a reality check, third op at the N3RS baby multi in the ARRL CW DX
> > blast. Haven't done one of these for a quarter century, this is gonna
> > be UGLY.
> >
>
> I am definitely note a "big dawg" but having fun. Picked up a couple of new
> DX countries while I was at it. However I've heard several that I'd like to
> get with pileups just to big for me to break (Oman, Ivory Coast and some
> others). Oh well maybe I'll get lucky sometime this weekend.

I'm not one of those "big dawgs" either, Dee...What I like to do
with the contests is set some personal goal within the contest...

In the 2000 ARRL Sweepstakes, I wanted to work (1) W.A.S. within
24 hours, and (2) A Clean Sweep...I didn't get to put in the time to
do the "under 24" part, although I did get my Sweep's Mug for both the
CW >>AND<< SSB weekends!

I'd like to go portable and work this years Sweeps from VO1 if I
get the chance...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3038. Re: Time for fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 15:57:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402220757.59195ee2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87764

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402212249.7f7bb56e@posting.google.com>...

>Smarts, stealth and
> treachery beats kilowatts every time.
>
> Sometimes.

LOL! I'd say "usually", Brian! But I usually do exactly what you
suggested...Find the last guy's spot, then go up or down a bit.
Sometimes it's a matter of finding out if they are starting high and
dropping down, starting low and tuning up, or "rocking chair", going
up and down between...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3039. Re: BPL NPRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 16:02:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402220802.7f28b70d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87765

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040221161135.05957.00000583@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> Strangely absent is any Comments from the ARRL which some say
> is the lone ranger in "fighting BPL." [apparently not enough sliver
> bullets in Newington's holster although they've had a week or more
> opportunity to reply] The general goals of "Broadband" as stated by
> the FCC is dated 3/13/03 or very nearly a year past.

Well, Your Scumminess, you started out on a good foot, posting the
information about the NPRM, but then you HAD to take a snide swipe at
"someone" with the "Lone Ranger" crap.

Who is the "who" that you refer to as allegedly saying the ARRL
is the ONLY entity "fighting BPL"...?!?!

Just another LennieLie as far as I can see since even the ARRL's
own website site has cited other organizations who have come out
AGAINST the BPL proposition.

Just wondering, Your Putziness...WHO is the WHO to whom you
refer...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3040. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 17:17:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222121726.05539.00004473@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87767

In article <dBTZb.2780$LK1.2122@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>I know you love to .... um .... shake things up .... but ... I had my 1st
>class radiotelephone license in 1966.

Irrelevant in this newsgroup. Some of the amateurs in here seem to
think an Amateur Extra class license is a "PhD in radio." No other
radio licenses are allowed to figure in...

>I also worked in Electromagnetic Compatibilty testing in 1995.

Another guy in here has you beat...worked as a purchasing agent
for a set-top box maker. High-level knowledge.

EMI testing, Tempest, the whole works is fairly normal work on any
DoD contract. So? You think BPL is equivalent to an EMP?!?

>Believe me, even an improperly grounded power
>pole can cause problems.

Yes, all those wooden utility poles are real tough radiators...?

>No, I am not suggesting "interfering" with an
>unlicensed service. I am suggesting asserting the rights of a licensed
>service.

OK, plant the flag and claim HF is the sovereign terrortory of hams.

Mama Dee has interpreted the law and sent down an encyclical that
any ham can do anything as long as they have a LICENSE and "are
authoritized to radiate."

Not quite right, that, but it pleases the machismo of some.

You rather clearly stated an INTENT to interfere. Intent is not
evidenciary per se, but it doesn't win you any friends in court..

>Unlicensed services may not cause interference and must put up
>with interference.

Nooo, not quite and the OET won't buy that by itself, nor would any
courts in most countries, USA included.

If all could be summed up that easily, it would be "perfectly legal"
for you to hold a 5 W HT up to the abdomen of a pacemaker wearer
and thumb the PTT switch. Are you licensed by the FCC to
deliberately interfere with anything? I don't think so. We can toss a
coin to see if the pacemaker wearer has an infarc.

>You, and some others, think this is an "amateur vs. the
>world" thing. It is not.

I didn't write that. You imagined that in another burst of macho testosterone, ASSERTING yourself.

Does your geographic territory NEED another beacon? The pioneering and exploration of HF was pretty much over with when the USA got into WW2. If you NEED QSLs so much, advertise for some on the Internet.

>There will be problems with other services, I can assure you.

Duhhhhhh...no kiddin, huh?

Jim, I'm more than well aware of potential interference problems in radio, all the way from VLF on up into the microwaves. That's where I've been working for a half century and still keep my hand in.

I've also had four tours of duty as a juror and understand quite well what INTENT is. No LLD needed for that.

All the aging olde-tyme hammes in here seem to be ASSERTING themselves in some adolescent machismo in tuff tawk...and none of them has demonstrated knowledge-one about the BPL signal levels or the data protocol or anything else about any BPL system proposed. None of the tuff tawkers seem to know anything yet they all talk like they are a cross between expert PhDs in EMI and The Terminator gutturally announcing "Ahl be backkk." [just before driving through the door of a police station and killing lots of cops] :-)

All that anyone seems to want to do is wait until Newington spoon-feeds them "what they need to know" and cause a lot of wing-flapping and squawking. Nobody seems to check the FCC website. Nobody has gone out to try to find a representative technical document from one of the proposed BPL systems. All seem to be whistling in the dark while tiptoeing through the graveyard.

The NPRM is announced as docket number 04-37 and there is one document (as of Saturdy, 21 Feb 04) on that NPRM. The text of the NPRM isn't available on the 'web. Perhaps the executives in Newington have a copy...the general public doesn't have it available.

None of you KNOW what the characteristics of any proposed BPL system IS, yet you are all "expert" on it becoming the downfall of HF for Hams. Will it interfere in general? Probably. Will it have terrible interference and cancel all the events in the ham playground? Unknown.

Meanwhile, think about how you wing-flappers appear to the guvmint and the industry, all the while demonstrating near-absolute-zero on thinking and radiation expertise. Tawkin tuff in here doesn't cut it on getting rid of it. Tawking tuff doan police your playground. EM spectrum ain't da 'hood and you guys ain't da onley Boyz in da HF 'hood.

LHA / WMD

3041. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 17:17:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222121729.05539.00004474@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87766

In article <1e4e3692.0402211756.64c2fe06@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
>> muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
>> directly to you?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
>answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.

Don't bother with him, Brian. The gunnery nurse went over to the
dark side of Checkpoint Charlie a long time ago. He is Grade A
Stasi (Statspolizei), Certified. [emphasis on the latter]

He may be getting hand-me-downs from Kolonel Klunk, der
Komandant, when they do lunch along the Ku-damm.

LHA / WMD

3042. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 18:54:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <rV6_b.3498$3b6.190@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 87768

Yep,

I was going to mention that last night but assumed it would be
self-evident. I keep forgetting that nothing is evident to many loose in
this newsgroup ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
>> Is it really? Sending the word "at" is still faster!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.593 / Virus Database: 376 - Release Date: 2/20/04

3043. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 19:57:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222145703.23171.00004261@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87769

In article <d22b54c3.0402212310.6db9bafb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
>> Hallicrafters troll.
>
>AWSHIT DAVE, HELP ME GET UP OFF THE FLOOR WILLYA?? OmGawd, I cain't
>breath . . priceless . .

"Priceless?" Kellie, you have a very low-value humor.

Herr robust can't tuff tawk anything technical in raddio or hamhistory so he goes to his "workshop" and fabricates low-tech falseness to use as a "subject" in a ham radio policy newsgroup.

Come on back with some more Tales of the South Pacific and your bear-shooting for naval intelligence plus all that techtawk about 28 VDC jeeps in WW2 and how they all were mounted with ARC-5s.

Bill Halligan's company Hallicrafters has a proud history in radio in the United States. Located in a part of Chicago (also the starting city for Paul Galvin's Motorola), it isn't in the refined, sophisticated east where hoagie munching and gaz tawk is predominant and some denizens secretly want to be Sopranos. Chicago is in the midwest, apparently in your mental concept of the "western frontier."

A BC-610 is a very old transmitter design, went obsolete many many years ago in the military and everywhere else (except in memories of olde-tyme hamme raddio types still glorying in long-past history they were never a part of). Hallicrafters has been GONE for three decades as a radio producer, and the name/logo has been GONE for two decades. Hallicrafters is DEFUNCT in the quaint speech of the raddio kops in this newsgroup.

It is GONE, DEFUNCT like the glorious memories of derring-do and raddio pioneering of the heroic, stalwart, macho morsemen of olde. You just continue to press on (weakly) in personal insults of others not kissing your [expletive deleted] and brilliant technical intellects. Such paints such a cozy picture of enthusing others to be just like you and herr robust in U.S. hum raddio.

'Enthusing?' No, more like euthanasia.

Keep up your morse. Take morse viagra.

LHA / WMD

3044. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 19:57:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222145708.23171.00004262@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87774

In article <FUXZb.14223$W74.9968@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"The Eternal Squire" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) You could either:
>> 1) Think of it as a SETI exercise.
>> CW would carry far better over
>> interstellar distance on microwave
>> frequencies than voice, RTTY, or
>> image. (snip)
>
> Who would one talk to over those vast distances? We use Morse code, while
>most off-world residents used Zugth code. Besides, code use elsewhere is
>still declining after being dropped as a testing requirement about 6,406k
>years ago.

:-)

Careful, Dwight, now you will start the morse-zugth code wars all over again (done in this newsgroup 8,192 years ago...according to Google).

At the Interstellar Telecommunications Union (ITU) of Stardate 1928 on the 3rd planet of Arianna Huffington IV, Mrs. Hiram Percy Maxim spoke French to the assembled delegates thereby starting an interstellar dispute over which on-off coding was superior. [French is not an inter-stellar language] She had used naughty French words after being refused to use the specially-constructed Terran rest room.

The Interstellar Telecommunications Union standardized all amateur licensing at 5 WPM (Words Per Month) of the de facto standard, Interstellar Zugth Code. The ARRL, totally without kidney function [they were pissed off], has refused any comment on this serious (or should I say Sirius?) rift in interstellar radio requirements. Even today there is absolutely NO mention of Zugth Code on the ARRL website.

The militaries of the galactic region adoptes SubSpace Radio with high-speed video-audio-mental data rates and gave up any thought of going back to prehistoric Zugth (or Morse) codings. Clearly, according to the Interstellar Amateur Radio Union, the militaries were not fulfilling keeping up the heroic, glorious tradition of on-off codings.

After all, Interstellar Zugth Code is the "universe language" argued the remainder of the Interstellar Telecommunications Union delegates and morse codings are based on a minority written language of a minority of the Interstellar Community. They were of the United

Opinion that those learning quaint morse codings were not showing any dedication and resolve, and especially, Interest in raddio, to the Interstellar Community.

--- from an Appendix of the Orange Catholic Bible published in 16,391, Princess Irulan and F. Herbert, editors.

3045. Re: BPL NPRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 19:57:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222145711.23171.00004263@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87773

In article <5c01b95b.0402220802.7f28b70d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040221161135.05957.00000583@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
>> Strangely absent is any Comments from the ARRL which some say
>> is the lone ranger in "fighting BPL." [apparently not enough sliver
>> bullets in Newington's holster although they've had a week or more
>> opportunity to reply] The general goals of "Broadband" as stated by
>> the FCC is dated 3/13/03 or very nearly a year past.
>
> Well, Your Scumminess, you started out on a good foot, posting the
>information about the NPRM, but then you HAD to take a snide swipe at
>"someone" with the "Lone Ranger" crap.

The Public Notice of the FCC on the new NPRM, docket 04-37, was dated 12 February 2004. That was ten days ago.

The ONLY entry on the ECFS for 04-37 is dated 19 February 2004 and it is NOT from the ARRL.

FCC 03-104 is an NOI, a Notice Of Inquiry, not a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 03-104 had 5,199 documents on public record as of 21 February 2004.

> Who is the "who" that you refer to as allegedly saying the ARRL
>is the ONLY entity "fighting BPL"...?!?!

You have 5,199 documents to check on the "who" and you will find several organizations and many individuals NOT allied with ARRL on 03-104.

> Just another LennieLie as far as I can see since even the ARRL's
>own website site has cited other organizations who have come out
>AGAINST the BPL proposition.

Newsflash, stasi gunnery nurse: The ARRL does NOT regulate or do much of anything else on wired data services in the USA. The FCC gets involved only insofar as radiation of RF.

There was NO, repeat NO "proposition" on BPL. 03-104 was an NOI, not an NPRM.

Docket 04-37 will concern itself with Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R. and will not take away any precious spectral playground allocations to amateurs on HF.

The ARRL has NOT yet published any text of NPRM 04-37. Neither
has the FCC as of 22 February 2004.

The ARRL has NOT yet published any sort of technical description
of any proposed BPL systems.

The FCC has put on public record several documents from the UK
and Europe on "PLC," the similar data transmission systems being
tried out there. You are free to search the FCC website or the entire
Internet to get information, including journals and trade publications
of the electronics industry for any detailed technical specifications
on PLC or BPL. [you will not find much even if you know how to
search...doubtful since you are content with being spoon-fed
information from your the beloved ARRL]

Without any technical information on proposed power levels or
exact spectral energy content thereof, everyone has been running off
at the keyboard in a surprising show of ignorant technical bigotry,
assuming the USA BPL will be like some high-powered narrowband
RF signal parked directly on amateur HF bands. You've put your
entire "electronics expertise" into a Belief System that the ARRL will
do all the work in "analyzing BPL" for you. That allows you the free
time to run around flapping your chicken wings and calling all the
non-believers (in the ARRL) for [expletive deleted] [expletive deleted].

If you look in Google you WILL find the other "whos" that I mentioned
in here, in public postings. [in addition to both short- and long-term
memory loss and inability to focus, you show symptoms of
intellectual presbyopia, a hardening of the mental eyeball]

> Just wondering, Your Putziness...WHO is the WHO to whom you
>refer...?!?!

Right now the "WHO" would be the World Health Organization,
specifically the mental health part. You are seriously lacking any
social skills in interacting with other humans, demonstrated by the
constant use of [expletive deleted] and [expletive deleted] in public
postings not to your liking.

Now take your medications and continue to study "Electricity for
Dummies" to start you on the road to a continuing interest in amateur
radio theory. With hard work and study, you can become a leader in
the amateur community from your dedication and perserverance to the
service.

At ease. Dismissed.

LHA / WMD

3046. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 19:57:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222145713.23171.00004264@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87771

In article <40382C74.5E95EF85@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>After re-reading Brian's statement and my response, your comment makes
>no sense whatever.

Poor baby. Another with intellectual presbyopia. Tsk, tsk.

3047. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 19:57:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222145715.23171.00004265@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87770

In article <20040222080527.12501.00006382@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>>There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.
>>
>I did not think there was.

There you have it.

No worries.

Keep your morse up. Use morse viagra.

3048. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 19:57:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222145718.23171.00004266@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 87772

In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
>> community.
>
>And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
>General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.

I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
compensation.

I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
pecuniary interest since 1947.

I am not a ham. I have a beef with certain U.S. government laws.

You keep fishing for trolls and aren't taking your meds.

>How would you know? You aren't involved.

Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
unless they have an amateur license.

Right. NOBODY can become involved unless they are already involved.

Right. In order to "show interest in radio," everyone has to learn morse
code and get a ham license. It is impossible to have any "interest" in
radio through a working career in radio or electronics. The ham license
is absolutely mandatory "to show interest in radio." Right.

Right. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states
that no citizen can comment about any amateur radio regulations unless
they already possess an amateur radio license. Right.

I am so glad you "explained" all of those things. [it's like LOTR code]

Has the ARRL approached you for more hints in generating interest in
getting "interested in radio" as you've outlined in here?

No? That's so interesting.

3049. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 20:52:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222155258.22081.00004205@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87777

In article <d22b54c3.0402212310.6db9bafb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
>> Hallicrafters troll.
>
>AWSHIT DAVE, HELP ME GET UP OFF THE FLOOR WILLYA?? OmGawd, I cain't
>breath . . priceless . .

"Priceless?" Kellie, you have a very low-value humor.

Herr robust can't tuff tawk anything technical in raddio or hamhistory so he goes to his "workshop" and fabricates low-tech falseness to use as a "subject" in a ham radio policy newsgroup.

Come on back with some more Tales of the South Pacific and your bear-shooting for naval intelligence plus all that techtawk about 28 VDC jeeps in WW2 and how they all were mounted with ARC-5s.

Bill Halligan's company Hallicrafters has a proud history in radio in the United States. Located in a part of Chicago (also the starting city for Paul Galvin's Motorola), it isn't in the refined, sophisticated east where hoagie munching and gaz tawk is predominant and some denizens secretly want to be Sopranos. Chicago is in the midwest, apparently in your mental concept of the "western frontier."

A BC-610 is a very old transmitter design, went obsolete many many years ago in the military and everywhere else (except in memories of olde-tyme hamme raddio types still glorying in long-past history they were never a part of). Hallicrafters has been GONE for three decades as a radio producer, and the name/logo has been GONE for two decades. Hallicrafters is DEFUNCT in the quaint speech of the raddio kops in this newsgroup.

It is GONE, DEFUNCT like the glorious memories of derring-do and raddio pioneering of the heroic, stalwart, macho morsemen of olde. You just continue to press on (weakly) in personal insults of others not kissing your [expletive deleted] and brilliant technical intellects. Such paints such a cozy picture of enthusing others to be just like you and herr robust in U.S. hum raddio.

'Enthusing?' No, more like euthanasia.

Keep up your morse. Take morse viagra.

LHA / WMD

3050. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 20:53:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222155300.22081.00004206@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87778

In article <FUXZb.14223$W74.9968@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"The Eternal Squire" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) You could either:
>> 1) Think of it as a SETI exercise.
>> CW would carry far better over
>> interstellar distance on microwave
>> frequencies than voice, RTTY, or
>> image. (snip)
>
> Who would one talk to over those vast distances? We use Morse code, while
>most off-world residents used Zugth code. Besides, code use elsewhere is
>still declining after being dropped as a testing requirement about 6,406k
>years ago.

:-)

Careful, Dwight, now you will start the morse-zugth code wars all over again (done in this newsgroup 8,192 years ago...according to Google).

At the Interstellar Telecommunications Union (ITU) of Stardate 1928 on the 3rd planet of Arianna Huffington IV, Mrs. Hiram Percy Maxim spoke French to the assembled delegates thereby starting an interstellar dispute over which on-off coding was superior. [French is not an inter-stellar language] She had used naughty French words after being refused to use the specially-constructed Terran rest room.

The Interstellar Telecommunications Union standardized all amateur licensing at 5 WPM (Words Per Month) of the de facto standard, Interstellar Zugth Code. The ARRL, totally without kidney function [they were pissed off], has refused any comment on this serious (or should I say Sirius?) rift in interstellar radio requirements. Even today there is absolutely NO mention of Zugth Code on the ARRL website.

The militaries of the galactic region adoptes SubSpace Radio with high-speed video-audio-mental data rates and gave up any thought of going back to prehistoric Zugth (or Morse) codings. Clearly, according to the Interstellar Amateur Radio Union, the militaries were not fulfilling keeping up the heroic, glorious tradition of on-off codings.

After all, Interstellar Zugth Code is the "universe language" argued the remainder of the Interstellar Telecommunications Union delegates and morse codings are based on a minority written language of a minority of the Interstellar Community. They were of the United

Opinion that those learning quaint morse codings were not showing any dedication and resolve, and especially, Interest in raddio, to the Interstellar Community.

--- from an Appendix of the Orange Catholic Bible published in 16,391, Princess Irulan and F. Herbert, editors.

3051. Re: BPL NPRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 20:53:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222155303.22081.00004207@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87779

In article <5c01b95b.0402220802.7f28b70d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040221161135.05957.00000583@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
>> Strangely absent is any Comments from the ARRL which some say
>> is the lone ranger in "fighting BPL." [apparently not enough sliver
>> bullets in Newington's holster although they've had a week or more
>> opportunity to reply] The general goals of "Broadband" as stated by
>> the FCC is dated 3/13/03 or very nearly a year past.
>
> Well, Your Scumminess, you started out on a good foot, posting the
>information about the NPRM, but then you HAD to take a snide swipe at
>"someone" with the "Lone Ranger" crap.

The Public Notice of the FCC on the new NPRM, docket 04-37, was dated 12 February 2004. That was ten days ago.

The ONLY entry on the ECFS for 04-37 is dated 19 February 2004 and it is NOT from the ARRL.

FCC 03-104 is an NOI, a Notice Of Inquiry, not a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 03-104 had 5,199 documents on public record as of 21 February 2004.

> Who is the "who" that you refer to as allegedly saying the ARRL
>is the ONLY entity "fighting BPL"...?!?!

You have 5,199 documents to check on the "who" and you will find several organizations and many individuals NOT allied with ARRL on 03-104.

> Just another LennieLie as far as I can see since even the ARRL's
>own website site has cited other organizations who have come out
>AGAINST the BPL proposition.

Newsflash, stasi gunnery nurse: The ARRL does NOT regulate or do much of anything else on wired data services in the USA. The FCC gets involved only insofar as radiation of RF.

There was NO, repeat NO "proposition" on BPL. 03-104 was an NOI, not an NPRM.

Docket 04-37 will concern itself with Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R. and will not take away any precious spectral playground allocations to amateurs on HF.

The ARRL has NOT yet published any text of NPRM 04-37. Neither
has the FCC as of 22 February 2004.

The ARRL has NOT yet published any sort of technical description
of any proposed BPL systems.

The FCC has put on public record several documents from the UK
and Europe on "PLC," the similar data transmission systems being
tried out there. You are free to search the FCC website or the entire
Internet to get information, including journals and trade publications
of the electronics industry for any detailed technical specifications
on PLC or BPL. [you will not find much even if you know how to
search...doubtful since you are content with being spoon-fed
information from your the beloved ARRL]

Without any technical information on proposed power levels or
exact spectral energy content thereof, everyone has been running off
at the keyboard in a surprising show of ignorant technical bigotry,
assuming the USA BPL will be like some high-powered narrowband
RF signal parked directly on amateur HF bands. You've put your
entire "electronics expertise" into a Belief System that the ARRL will
do all the work in "analyzing BPL" for you. That allows you the free
time to run around flapping your chicken wings and calling all the
non-believers (in the ARRL) for [expletive deleted] [expletive deleted].

If you look in Google you WILL find the other "whos" that I mentioned
in here, in public postings. [in addition to both short- and long-term
memory loss and inability to focus, you show symptoms of
intellectual presbyopia, a hardening of the mental eyeball]

> Just wondering, Your Putziness...WHO is the WHO to whom you
>refer...?!?!

Right now the "WHO" would be the World Health Organization,
specifically the mental health part. You are seriously lacking any
social skills in interacting with other humans, demonstrated by the
constant use of [expletive deleted] and [expletive deleted] in public
postings not to your liking.

Now take your medications and continue to study "Electricity for
Dummies" to start you on the road to a continuing interest in amateur
radio theory. With hard work and study, you can become a leader in
the amateur community from your dedication and perserverance to the
service.

At ease. Dismissed.

LHA / WMD

3052. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 20:53:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222155304.22081.00004208@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87775

In article <40382C74.5E95EF85@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>After re-reading Brian's statement and my response, your comment makes
>no sense whatever.

Poor baby. Another with intellectual presbyopia. Tsk, tsk.

3053. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 20:53:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222155306.22081.00004209@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87776

In article <20040222080527.12501.00006382@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>>There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.
>>
>I did not think there was.

There you have it.

No worries.

Keep your morse up. Use morse viagra.

3054. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 20:53:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040222155308.22081.00004210@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87780

In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
>> community.
>
>And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
>General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.

I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
compensation.

I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
pecuniary interest since 1947.

I am not a ham. I have a beef with certain U.S. government laws.

You keep fishing for trolls and aren't taking your meds.

>How would you know? You aren't involved.

Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
unless they have an amateur license.

Right. NOBODY can become involved unless they are already involved.

Right. In order to "show interest in radio," everyone has to learn morse
code and get a ham license. It is impossible to have any "interest" in
radio through a working career in radio or electronics. The ham license
is absolutely mandatory "to show interest in radio." Right.

Right. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states
that no citizen can comment about any amateur radio regulations unless
they already possess an amateur radio license. Right.

I am so glad you "explained" all of those things. [it's like LOTR code]

Has the ARRL approached you for more hints in generating interest in
getting "interested in radio" as you've outlined in here?

No? That's so interesting.

3055. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 21:28:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40391E94.17C54190@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87781

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
> >> community.
> > >
> > >And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
> > >General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.
> >
> > I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
> > longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
> > compensation.

Right. There you go back into your professional background. That isn't
amateur radio. Lots of us are hobbyists in any number of fields.
You're some kind of hobbyist. You aren't a radio amateur.

> I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
> pecuniary interest since 1947.

Bully for you. You haven't been involved in amateur radio at all.

> I am not a ham. I have a beef with certain U.S. government laws.

...and I'm certain that the FCC and all of hamdom are just sick over
that.
I guess you really showed us, huh?

> You keep fishing for trolls and aren't taking your meds.

I keep fishing and I keep getting bites. You, after all, seem to be the
"Big Fish".

> > > Shrug. Not good for the amateur image to make others be like you.

> >How would you know? You aren't involved.

I returned your snipped line to its rightful place. We wouldn't want
you to mislead others now, would we?

> Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
> outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
> unless they have an amateur license.

You can read up on it in "Now You're Talking".

> Right. NOBODY can become involved unless they are already involved.

Wrong. NOBODY can become unvolved until they take steps to do so.
You can read up on astronomy. That alone does not make you an
astronomer.
You can peruse magazines and books on auto repair. Those things alone
do not make you a car mechanic.

> Right. In order to "show interest in radio," everyone has to learn morse
> code and get a ham license.

Wrong. You've been corrected on this same mis-statement of yours on a
number of occasions. It is "interest in AMATEUR radio", Leonard.
Neither your decades-long "interest" nor your "Extra right out of the
box" boast of several years ago have resulted in your having taken a
single step toward obtaining even the most basic level of amateur radio
license.

> It is impossible to have any "interest" in
> radio through a working career in radio or electronics. The ham license
> is absolutely mandatory "to show interest in radio." Right.

Wrong. See my comments above.

> Right. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states
> that no citizen can comment about any amateur radio regulations unless
> they already possess an amateur radio license. Right.

You've commented. End of involvement.

> I am so glad you "explained" all of those things. [it's like LOTR code]
>
> Has the ARRL approached you for more hints in generating interest in
> getting "interested in radio" as you've outlined in here?

A number of them did merit explanation after you attempted to twist them
into something else. It is "interested in AMATEUR radio". Why do you
persist in deleting that very important word?

> No? That's so interesting.

You've misdefined your interest. You have interest in internet
newsgroup posting. You have interest in outlining your past
professional glories.
You aren't involved in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3056. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 21:31:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40391F5C.250AC4D3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87782

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040222080527.12501.00006382@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >>There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.
> >>
> >I did not think there was.
>
> There you have it.
>
> No worries.
>
> Keep your morse up. Use morse viagra.

Looks like you're the candidate for that stuff, Len--clear up to the
summit of

e w o r d s p e r m i n u t e.
v
i
f

Looks like you could use some lead in your pencil.

Dave K8MN

3057. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 21:39:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40392142.C6139598@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87783

Len Over 21 wrote:

> > > >William wrote:

> > > > Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.

> > >You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".

> > Incorrect...YOU are here...

> >In article <40382C74.5E95EF85@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

> >After re-reading Brian's statement and my response, your comment makes
> >no sense whatever.

> Poor baby. Another with intellectual presbyopia. Tsk, tsk.

I had no idea that's what you were diagnosed with, Len. I'm awfully sorry. I should have realized that there was something behind these seemingly senseless outbursts of yours. I did you a favor and re-inserted the part you snipped. If you look at the whole thing, perhaps it'll become clear to you how you made your error.

Dave K8MN

3058. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 21:48:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40392332.65267E76@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87784

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0402212310.6db9bafb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
> >> Hallicrafters troll.
> > >
> > >AWSHIT DAVE, HELP ME GET UP OFF THE FLOOR WILLYA?? OmGawd, I cain't
> > >breath . . priceless . .
> >
> > "Priceless?" Kellie, you have a very low-value humor.

It looks pretty funny from here, Lynnard.

> Herr robust can't tuff tawk anything technical in raddio or hamhistory
> so he goes to his "workshop" and fabricates low-tech falseness to
> use as a "subject" in a ham radio policy newsgroup.

I didn't offer you the hook, Leonard. I only commented on the
aftermath.
The bait was dangled. You swallowed it and ran with it. You must be
all tuckered out.

> Come on back with some more Tales of the South Pacific and your
> bear-shooting for naval intelligence plus all that techtawk about
> 28 VDC jeeps in WW2 and how they all were mounted with ARC-5s.

What has any of that to do with the results of the Big Hallicrafters
Fishing Expedition of 2004?

> Bill Halligan's company Hallicrafters has a proud history in radio in
> the United States. Located in a part of Chicago (also the starting
> city for Paul Galvin's Motorola), it isn't in the refined, sophisticated
> east where hoagie munching and gaz tawk is predominant and some
> denizens secretly want to be Sopranos. Chicago is in the midwest,
> apparently in your mental concept of the "western frontier."
>
> A BC-610 is a very old transmitter design, went obsolete many many
> years ago in the military and everywhere else (except in memories
> of olde-tyme hamme raddio types still glorying in long-past history
> they were never a part of). Hallicrafters has been GONE for three
> decades as a radio producer, and the name/logo has been GONE
> for two decades. Hallicrafters is DEFUNCT in the quaint speech of
> the raddio kops in this newsgroup.

Haven't you had enough? Are you incapable of being embarrassed?

> It is GONE, DEFUNCT like the glorious memories of derring-do and
> raddio pioneering of the heroic, stalwart, macho morsemen of olde.
> You just continue to press on (weakly) in personal insults of others
> not kissing your [expletive deleted] and brilliant technical intellects.
> Such paints such a cozy picture of enthusing others to be just like
> you and herr robust in U.S. hum raddio.

Sure Hallicrafters is as defunct as "Ham Radio" magazine. Many of us enjoy indulging in nostalgia over our radio equipment and our past in amateur radio. You'll have to actually pass some exams and obtain a license before you can have a past in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3059. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 23:34:25 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9497BCEF5AA3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87785

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040221200227.23171.00004225@mb-m05.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94969C0841462elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>>Doesn't sound a likely prosepect
>
> The FISTS proposal has more of a chance, I think.
>
> It will be interesting to see when/if all these proposals get RM
> numbers and how long it is before FCC does the NPRM thing. Perhaps we
> need another pool!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an organisation for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that they would suggest anything that is actually responsive to the removal of the international CW test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).

Alun

3060. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 23:40:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040222184030.25517.00004437@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 87786

In article <dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>I just read the proposal. Much of the code retention argument
>is the same as was raised and dismissed by the FCC in
>the R&O for 98-143...howvever, there is a section
>21 that I have no clue what they are talking about. It reads:
>
>"21. Finally, it should be noted that by removing the Morse
>radiotelegraphy requirements from the General Class and
>Amateur Extra Class licenses, the Commission would be
>creating the groundwork for a socially divisive caste system
>within the Amateur Service - the 'no-codes' versus the
>'know-codes'.

We've had hams who never passed a code test since 1991. Where have these guys been?

>To some degree, this is already a fact in
>some circles.

Oh?

>Amateur radio, by its very nature, is a very
>social pursuit. However, by removing telegraphy from the
>requirements of the General Class and Amateur Extra
>Class licenses as petitioned by some in the community,
>the Commission is potentially embarking upon a mission
>that is virtually guaranteed to become a very expensive
>enforcement nightmare." End of Quoted material

Couldn't that same thing be said of almost anything? Multiple license classes, vabity calls, operating awards.....
>
>What does dropping code testing for General or
>Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a very expensive
>enforcement nightmare."
>
I have no idea. I had no part in writing the thing, just in analyzing it.

Why not ask the authors? A few of them are all over eham.net

>Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
>doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
>allowed by the FCC to operate morse?

I don't see how, since that hasn't been the case for Techs.

>What am I missing here?

I'm not sure what they're getting at, either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3061. Re: Retests at VE sessions - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 23:41:26 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9497BE1F8ADC0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87787

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in news:5b2_b.14376$W74.7886
@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:SN1_b.4524$t16.3396362@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>> news:40385235.3000809@ix.netcom.com...
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > >
>> > >What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE
>> > >session" but that's about it.
>> > >
>> > That would be surfficient enough of a rule change.
>> > Some VEs arrange things where
>> > the guy who registers the testees and takes the fees leaves
>> > before the tests come out.
>> > So it isn't possible to reregister and pay another fee at the
>> > same session.
>> >
>>
>> Actually the VEs always have the option to not run a retest.
>
> I agree.
>
>> When we've had limited time access to the facility
>> or have limited time due to other commitments, we've simply stated no
>> retests at that particular session.
>
> I believe you don't need any reason to not allow
> retests. There is no "right" to an immediate retest
> for anyone regardless of how long the test session
> may actually be.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

OTOH, I don't beleive in imposing additional requirements beyond what the
FCC says. We always allow instant retests in our group, subject only to

having enough exam papers. It doesn't help people much on the theory, but it's possible to get entirely different results in consecutive code tests. Every time I've seen someone do an instant re-test on theory they've failed again, often by a greater margin, but on code anything can happpen.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3062. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-22 23:45:57 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9497BEE3676AFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87788

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0402220746.68b4da21@posting.google.com:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>>
>> What does dropping code testing for General or
>> Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a very expensive
>> enforcement nightmare."
>>
>> Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
>> doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
>> allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
>>
>> What am I missing here?
>
> I don't think you're missing a thing, Bill...However the
> "authors" of the petition you cite are certainly a bit shy of a bag
> full...! ! ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

I think that reading section 21 is a bit like entering the twilight zone.
Somehow 'Area 51' comes to mind!

3063. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:12:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402221612.3a98287c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87789

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222145708.23171.00004262@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> Careful, Dwight, now you will start the morse-zugth code wars all over
> again (done in this newsgroup 8,192 years ago...according to Google).

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue."
Leonard H. Anderson, from one of his many mistruths.

Steve, K4YZ

3064. Re: BPL NPRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:25:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402221625.55ef40a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87790

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222145711.23171.00004263@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0402220802.7f28b70d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > Who is the "who" that you refer to as allegedly saying the ARRL
> >is the ONLY entity "fighting BPL"...?!?!
>
> You have 5,199 documents to check on the "who" and you will find
> several organizations and many individuals NOT allied with ARRL
> on 03-104.
>
> > Just another LennieLie as far as I can see since even the ARRL's
> >own website site has cited other organizations who have come out
> >AGAINST the BPL proposition.
>
> Newsflash, stasi gunnery nurse: The ARRL does NOT regulate or
> do much of anything else on wired data services in the USA. The
> FCC gets involved only insofar as radiation of RF.

No one said they are, Lennie.

You were asked WHO said the ARRL is allegedly the "lone ranger"
arguing against BPL.

You have FAILED to directly answer the question...again.

> You've put your
> entire "electronics expertise" into a Belief System that the ARRL will
> do all the work in "analyzing BPL" for you. That allows you the free
> time to run around flapping your chicken wings and calling all the
> non-believers (in the ARRL) for [expletive deleted] [expletive deleted].

Not so, Your Dog Fellatingness...

I ASKED YOU TO SPECICIFY WHO SAID THE ARRL IS THE "LONE RANGER"
IN ANTI-BPL DISCOURSE.

You, once again, launched into yet another verbose rambling
soleley designed to cover your NON-answer.

> If you look in Google you WILL find the other "whos" that I mentioned
> in here, in public postings. [in addition to both short- and long-term
> memory loss and inability to focus, you show symptoms of
> intellectual presbyopia, a hardening of the mental eyeball]

You HAVE NOT mentionsed ANY "whos".

You have alleged that the ARRL is positioning itself as the only entity that is against this, and the FACTS are that there are numerous other entities against it, and the ARRL itself has acknowledged the position of those other entities.

> > Just wondering, Your Putziness...WHO is the WHO to whom you
> >refer...?!?!
>
> Right now the "WHO" would be the World Health Organization,
> specifically the mental health part. You are seriously lacking any
> social skills in interacting with other humans, demonstrated by the
> constant use of [expletive deleted] and [expletive deleted] in public
> postings not to your liking.

Lying and misrepresentation of the facts are not to my liking, Your Lyingness, hence my insatiable desire to continue to poke holes in your rants.

You DO make it easy to do.

> Now take your medications and continue to study "Electricity for
> Dummies" to start you on the road to a continuing interest in amateur
> radio theory. With hard work and study, you can become a leader in
> the amateur community from your dedication and perserverance to the
> service.

Sorry Lennie..I'm already licensed...But I have a copy of "Tune in the World" and "Now You're Talking" from classes I've taught that I'd be glad to loan you so YOU can get a license...(Please say no...I'd hate to have a scumbag like you in Amateur Radio...)

> At ease.

Always.

>Dismissed.

Not by you, I'm not.

Steve, K4YZ

3065. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:27:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <JNb_b.15053$W74.1854@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87791

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040222184030.25517.00004437@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I just read the proposal. Much of the code retention argument
> >is the same as was raised and dismissed by the FCC in
> >the R&O for 98-143...howvever, there is a section
> >21 that I have no clue what they are talking about. It reads:
> >
> >"21. Finally, it should be noted that by removing the Morse
> >radiotelegraphy requirements from the General Class and
> >Amateur Extra Class licenses, the Commission would be
> >creating the groundwork for a socially divisive caste system
> >within the Amateur Service - the 'no-codes' versus the
> >'know-codes'.
>
> We've had hams who never passed a code test since 1991. Where have these
guys
> been?
>
> >To some degree, this is already a fact in
> >some circles.
>
> Oh?
>
> >Amateur radio, by its very nature, is a very
> >social pursuit. However, by removing telegraphy from the
> >requirements of the General Class and Amateur Extra
> >Class licenses as petitioned by some in the community,
> >the Commission is potentially embarking upon a mission
> >that is virtually guaranteed to become a very expensive
> >enforcement nightmare." End of Quoted material
>
> Couldn't that same thing be said of almost anything? Multiple license
classes,
> vabity calls, operating awards.....
> >
> >What does dropping code testing for General or
> >Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a very expensive
> >enforcement nightmare."
> >
> I have no idea. I had no part in writing the thing, just in analyzing it.
>

> Why not ask the authors? A few of them are all over eham.net
>
> >Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
> >doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
> >allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
>
> I don't see how, since that hasn't been the case for Techs.
>
> >What am I missing here?
>
> I'm not sure what they're getting at, either.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Here's AG4RQ's response to my questions:

K2UNK Question: What does dropping code testing for General
or Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a
very expensive enforcement nightmare."?

AQ5RQ Reply: Bill, the enforcememt nightmare would come
from instantly granting a quarter of a million or more
Techs HF privileges. We have intentional QRM on
the bands already. Add a quarter of a million Techs
to the bands, along with the resentment over this
whole code/no-code issue. What do you think will
happen?

K2UNK Question: Does RAF believe that if a General
or Advanced (K2UNK, mental goof, meant to say Extra)
doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
allowed by the FCC to operate morse?

AG4RQ Reply: Under the RAF proposal, the only Generals
and Extras (You said Advanced. I think you meant
Extra) would be those who passed a code test. We
want to keep licensing requirements for General and
Extra as is, with a 5 wpm code test.

Clearly section 21 is anything BUT clear as to what RAF
believes...IMHO.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3066. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:30:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402221630.1b50027d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87792

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4038B523.829F7D0B@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40382958.A907298E@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > > > Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> > > > > muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> > > > > directly to you?
>
> > > > Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
> > > > answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.
> > >
> > > Bleeping Bill,
> > >
> > > There is no East Germany.
> > >
> > > Let's take the time machine back to 1972....
> > >
> > > Teacher: "Brian Burke, what key factors led to the drafting of the 1964
> > > Civil Rights bill?"
> > >
> > > William-Brian: "I understand that a number of Frenchmen commonly
> > > disregard their own laws."
> > >
> > > Teacher: "Is it possible for you to answer a direct question?"
> > >
> > > William-Brian: "This is America, not East Germany. We have the right
> > > not to answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat."
>
> > Bleeping David, I stand corrected. I should have stated "TFUSSRSCFKA
> > East Germany." It never occured to me that the image of human
> > opression in that former country would have been so fleeting. How
> > quickly you forget.
>
> See how you play it? I tell you that there is no East Germany; you tell
> me that I've quickly forgotten. I didn't forget anything, Brian. I
> told you that there is no East Germany.

Sorry, Dave, but it might have worked if you had told me there was no "Atlantis."

> > But thank you for your vigilance as netgroup cop.
>

> You did not receive a citation. You are not required to pay a fine.

Hopefully you won't require me to work out of band Frenchmen as community service.

> > It is important work for you. You are free to go back to working out
> > of band Frenchmen again.
>
> And you are free to continue your fetish over things French. Give my
> regards to Doctor Evil.

Regards, Dr. Evil.

3067. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:35:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402221635.93a06b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87793

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222121729.05539.00004474@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402211756.64c2fe06@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> >> muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> >> directly to you?
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
> >answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.
>
> Don't bother with him, Brian. The gunnery nurse went over to the
> dark side of Checkpoint Charlie a long time ago. He is Grade A
> Stasi (Statspolizei), Certified. [emphasis on the latter]
>
> He may be getting hand-me-downs from Kolonel Klunk, der
> Komandant, when they do lunch along the Ku-damm.
>
> LHA / WMD

Ahem, sorry Len, but I was just informed that there is no East
Germany, and thus by extension, no Checkpoint Charlie. Probably never
existed. "Tear Down That Wall," was just a Hollywood stunt like the
moon landing.

3068. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:36:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402221636.4afa534@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87794

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222145718.23171.00004266@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
> >General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.
>
> I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
> longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
> compensation.

You MIGHT have been an electronics technician at some point in
time. At present, no contribution of any import can be attributed to
Leonard H. Anderson at ANY level. Several articles in "Ham Radio"
magazine carry your by-line but cannot be verified as "original"
work..At best you were able to successfully plagerize anothers work by
careful re-editing. The one personal reference I could contact at a
place you alleged to "work" was of passive participation, at best.

> I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
> pecuniary interest since 1947.

But not AMATEUR RADIO, the central subject of this forum. In
THIS matter you have zero-point-squat experience.

The physics of radio are irrelevent here...It's the application.

> I am not a ham. I have a beef with certain U.S. government laws.

You ARE a liar and an antagonist. These are documented.

> You keep fishing for trolls and aren't taking your meds.

Seems he caught one. Want him to throw you back when you're all
grown up?

> >How would you know? You aren't involved.
>
> Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
> outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
> unless they have an amateur license.

You have no EXPERIENCE in AMATEUR RADIO from which to make an
informed opinion.

> Right. NOBODY can become involved unless they are already involved.

You have no EXPERIENCE in AMATEUR RADIO from which to make an
informed opinion.

> Right. In order to "show interest in radio," everyone has to learn morse
> code and get a ham license. It is impossible to have any "interest" in
> radio through a working career in radio or electronics. The ham license
> is absolutely mandatory "to show interest in radio." Right.

You have no EXPERIENCE in AMATEUR RADIO from which to make an
informed opinion.

> Right. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states
> that no citizen can comment about any amateur radio regulations unless
> they already possess an amateur radio license. Right.

You have no EXPERIENCE in AMATEUR RADIO from which to make an
informed opinion.

When lying and antagonism are desireable traits, we'll come find
you for hints.

Steve, K4YZ

3069. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:43:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402221643.2e693daf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87795

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222145703.23171.00004261@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402212310.6db9bafb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Naw, the first sign of brain rot is the inability to spot a
> >> Hallicrafters troll.
> > >
> > >AWSHIT DAVE, HELP ME GET UP OFF THE FLOOR WILLYA?? OmGawd, I cain't
> > >breath . . priceless . .
> >
> > "Priceless?" Kellie, you have a very low-value humor.

I think it was great...You got caught up in a troll by trying to
exert your Newsgroup Manhood in a verbose and (failingly) snide
response to teh initial post.

Now you're even MORE verbose trying to hide your embarassment and
foolishness in a whirwind of rhetoric...

Didn't work...ya made a fool out of yourself and WE (we, the
royal "we") have been laughing our buns off ever since.

Go ahead, Lennie...Launch into another (meaningless) history on
the BC-610, including playing your own personally autographed "Radio
History" verson of "Trivial Pursuit".

It's been a slow week...we could use the laugh! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

3070. Re: The french pirate ON4EHM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:44:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402221644.66ecf4e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87796

Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<09b6d45f459dfd87e174c5944969c426@dizum.com>...
> Many pirates use ON calls from France
> on HF bands. F1 calls are CEPT class
> 2 and are not allowed on HF bands in
> France for now. So they have found a
> trick, they buy an ON license in
> Belgium and use the F/ON call in France.
> It is not allowed since an alien call
> cannot be used in France with F/ for
> more than 3 months (CEPT rules).
> Belgium has edited false CEPT class 1
> licenses to CEPT class 2 operators
> after WRC 2003.
>
> ON4EHM is F1EHM
>
> Thierry HAMADOU
> 111 rue de DONZY
> 58200 COSNE-SUR-LOIRE
>
> Phone : +33-03-86-28-59-48
>
> Please avoid any QSO with him.

Nomen, sorry, but amateur radio according to Heyle reqires you to
respond to these French CQ's. The only time you can refuse is if the
suffix is "tit."

3071. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:45:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402221645.56299a82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87797

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222121726.05539.00004473@mb-m16.aol.com>...

> Meanwhile, think about how you wing-flappers appear to the guvmint
> and the industry, all the while demonstrating near-absolute-zero on
> thinking and radiation expertise. Tawkin tuff in here doesn't cut it on
> getting rid of it. Tawking tuff doan police your playground. EM
> spectrum ain't da 'hood and you guys ain't da onley Boyz in da HF
> 'hood.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"
Leonard H Anderson, from one of his more prolific newsgroup mistruths.

Steve, K4YZ

3072. Re: Denmark

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:48:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402221648.14f2241d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87798

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040221221054.13960.00000829@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <w5OdnT3yHryVyrHdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Here is the response I received from Alan Shark, president and CEO of
> >the Power Line Communications Association, on my question of the
> >intereference that will be caused by BPL. These guys are simply ignoring
> >any facts because big money is at stake. Other countries have abandoned
> >BPL because of the intereference it causes, yet this guy claims "there
> >is no hard evidence to suport the AWRL (ARRL) concerns." I emailed him
> >back and suggested he go to the ARRL web site and take a look at the
> >videos made that clearly shows the level of interference. I also asked
> >him who these scientists are he refers to and if they had any hard
> >evidence that BPL will not cause interference to the HF spectrum. Think
> >there is some reason for his last name being Shark?
> >
> >***************
> >I appreciate your concern. To date there is no such hard evidence to
> >support the AWRL concerns. In fact scientists have disputed such claims.
> >Let's see what the NTIA and the FCC come up with by way of real-life
> >field tests. As a veteran who has fought for our country, and who loves
> >this country, I would not support something that would in anyway be
> >harmful to local, state or national security.
> >
> JJ,
>
> I am reminded of Bagdad Bob's denials about the Iraq war....

I'm reminded of TAFKA Rev Jim's declaration that a Morse Code Exam is
a disincentive to the use of CW on HF, after a decade of denial that
the exam is any impediment at all.

3073. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 00:59:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402221659.54fa5de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87799

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
> doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
> allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
>
> What am I missing here?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill, your question reminds me of a scenario painted by Steve, to
which TAFKA Rev Jim responded below. It is very enlightening to see
that after a decade of saying that the Morse Code Exam was no barrier
at all to the Amateur Service, he pipes in with a new theory - that a
Morse Exam is a disincentive to the use of CW on HF.

Thought you might enjoy the flip-flop.

bb
---
billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> >
> > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > incentive to use voice only!
>
> Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> or greater disincentive since 1912.
>
> Why is it NOW a problem?

Why?

3074. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 01:00:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040222200015.22081.00004211@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87800

In article <4038B71A.36268DCB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <40382A2E.5F5D8BB5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <4035A6BB.44FEC4B9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >> >Jim,
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Are you forwarding these messages via LHA's home version of ADA?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> Who or what is an "LHA"?
>> >> >
>> >> >Best I can determine, it is similar to a WMD.
>> >>
>> >> What has been destroyed? And what does the Americans with Disabilities
>Act
>> >> have to do with any of it?
>> >>
>> >> >According to the
>> >> >"LHA/WMD" sig I've noted, the two may be used interchangeably.
>> >>
>> >> I have no idea who you are referring to. What's this person's amateur
>radio
>> >> callsign? Why should I be concerned about this person?
>> >
>> >This particular individual has no amateur callsign.
>>
>> Why not? Is the Tech written too difficult for him to pass?
>
>It might be that or it might be that his decades-long interest in
>amateur radio is a sham.

Then why should anyone be concerned?
>
>> >He is Leonard H. Anderson
>>

>> How do you know? Have you actually met him or otherwise verified his
>>identity?
>
>My feeling is that an imposter wouldn't have revealed so many easily
>verifiable claims such as previous workplaces, address and the like.

Perhaps - but has anyone actually verified any of them? Has anyone actually
met this individual, either in person or on the ham bands?

All sorts of people post anonymously here. One more would not be a surprise.

You and I have verified each other's existence on air and via QSL cards.
>
>> I could claim to be a lady with red hair on this newsgroup - how would you
>> know I am not?
>
>Good point, though if Len has the red hair, I feel confident that he has
>the red rubber nose and shoes to go with it.

Just another Bozo on the bus, then?

My taste in red haired ladies goes to Angie Everhart.

>> Reminds me of a PHC joke:
>>
>> Two penguins are in Antartica.
>> One penguin says to the other: "You look like you're wearing a tuxedo"
>> The other penguin replies "How do you know I'm not?"

The more times I hear that one, the funnier it gets.

>> >but he shouldn't be confused with Leonard H. Anderson WA6HKH of
>> >Montana, whose views are quoted in this month's issue of "CQ".
>>
>> I did see that but WA6HKH's address was given as Sun City or Sun Valley or
>> some such in California.
>
>He must be a highly mobile individual. The RAC lists him as in Montana.

Those left-coasters! What a wild, madcap existence!

>> >There's certainly no cause for concern or alarm.

>> I did not think there was.
>
>My guess is that the man is one of those who can clear a bar by simply
>walking in and taking a seat.

Sounds quite unpleasant.

I am still unclead about the connection to the Americans with Disablities Act
(ADA), however.

73 de Jim, N2EY

btw, KA1HR was a real station in the Phillippines back when they were under US jursidiction.

3075. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 01:23:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040222202337.05957.00000616@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87801

In article <ldud30pl3n27kscaposu0q8ugc9gi7h9s6@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil
<bogus@fake.com> writes:

>>So...what? Is there some point here? The USA will do so as well, all
>>in good time. The incline of the slippery slope of our country's descent
>>into intellectual and ultimately economic poverty is increasing, and we're
>>picking up speed on our drop into the abyss. Hong Kong, Denmark, and
>>all the rest of the dumbed-down "No-Code" countries just got there before
>>us, that's all.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Oh give it a rest, roll. Everyone has heard your moaning and groaning
>for years. Do something constructive. Stop whining. Get a life.

Filth:

Get a life? Thanks anyway, but I've already got one. A very good life,
indeed. And one of the little things that makes it better is the ability to
fully enjoy my hobby as a radio amateur, complete with the ability to
use the Morse/CW mode. Sorry about your bad luck, OM.

>The Patriot
>
>America, Love it or leave it!
>If you're not with us, You're against us.

Sooo, my desire not to have our society plummet down the slippery slope
of non-existant standards, be they educational, moral, social, or even those
related to amateur radio licensing. Apparently, all that is perfectly OK with
you, and you call yourself a "patriot?" Remove the "pat" and you're a lot
closer to the truth!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3076. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 01:42:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040222204233.05957.00000617@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87803

In article <5tv930lls77pif39bnilkooh00r14cji13@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com> writes:

>> WHO CARES, HAM RADIO IS NOTHING MORE THAN A GLOIRIFIED CB SERVICE ANYMORE.
>
>Oh stop whining. Move forward into the 21st century or drop dead,
>whichever you prefer.

Now, THERE is what I call a persuasive argument -- NOT!!! Of course, as no-coder arguments usually go, it is one of the more logical. Kind of reminds me of the "Democratic" Party, who have, as their principle motive for winning the 2004 Presidential Election, the visceral hatred of President Bush just because he is conducting himself as a true patriot in his efforts to secure our country from the threat of terrorism. Not a single one of the '04 Democratic Presidential candidates (with the possible exception of Sen. Joe Lieberman, who is now out of the race) has or had any vision for his administration more original than raising Federal taxes, expanding Federal government social programs, and subordinating our national sovreignty to the United Nations in matters of International security policy. All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus making us just another Third World nation. How charming.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3077. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 01:42:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040222204236.05957.00000618@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87802

In article <ldud30pl3n27kscaposu0q8ugc9gi7h9s6@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil
<bogus@fake.com> writes:

>>So...what? Is there some point here? The USA will do so as well, all
>>in good time. The incline of the slippery slope of our country's descent
>>into intellectual and ultimately economic poverty is increasing, and we're
>>picking up speed on our drop into the abyss. Hong Kong, Denmark, and
>>all the rest of the dumbed-down "No-Code" countries just got there before
>>us, that's all.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Oh give it a rest, roll. Everyone has heard your moaning and groaning
>for years. Do something constructive. Stop whining. Get a life.

Filth:

Get a life? Thanks anyway, but I've already got one. A very good life,
indeed. And one of the little things that makes it better is the ability to
fully enjoy my hobby as a radio amateur, complete with the ability to
use the Morse/CW mode. Sorry about your bad luck, OM.

>The Patriot
>
>America, Love it or leave it!
>If you're not with us, You're against us.

Sooo, my desire not to have our society plummet down the slippery slope
of non-existant standards, be they educational, moral, social, or even those
related to amateur radio licensing. Apparently, all that is perfectly OK with
you, and you call yourself a "patriot?" Remove the "pat" and you're a lot
closer to the truth!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3078. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 01:54:57 UTC
From: rsilly <silly@silly.net>
Message-ID: <96b022399b93540410b46478add204d1@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 87804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

On 20 Feb 2004 22:17:51 GMT, Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote:

>Why is it not OK to freeband on unused parts
>of 11 and 10 meters?
>
>Organized, long term freebanders are very aware
>where they operate and take great measure to
>ensure against talking on an amateur frequency
>or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
>If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there,
>why shouldn't I, especially if I want to have a nice
>DX contact with one of them?
>
>Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men"
>off the freqs. Same analogy as the gun issue...
>when guns are outlawed only outlaws will have
>guns...no, you won't find many freebanders lobbying
>for change to open the freqs because the law as
>it reads, doesn't bug us.
>
>No rationalization is even needed except to reply to
>folks that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is
>these folks that feel they need a reason why we do
>what we do, not us.
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>Le : Fri Feb 20 23:17:51 2004 depuis l'IP : ac8bbce3.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

FORGERY,THIS POST BROUGHT TO YOU COURTESY OF WA3MOJ

3079. Re: BPL NPRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 03:15:07 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <q4CdnTm0VZ2q7qTdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87805

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>
> You have alleged that the ARRL is positioning itself as the only
> entity that is against this, and the FACTS are that there are numerous
> other entities against it, and the ARRL itself has acknowledged the
> position of those other entities.

Lennyboy is in denial, the Office of Homeland Security and FEMA are just
two of many other entities that are in the fight against BPL.
Lennyboy can't stand it because all us hams have a license that
authorizes us to transmit on certain frequencies and he can't pass the test.

3080. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 05:00:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040223000058.00545.00004489@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87809

In article <40391E94.17C54190@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
determined to be as snarly as possible scribbles in crayon:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
>> >> community.
>> >
>> >And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
>> >General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.
>>
>> I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
>> longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
>> compensation.
>
>Right. There you go back into your professional background.

I've been working on that professional background for 51 years. :-)

>That isn't amateur radio.

That isn't HAM radio, sweetums. "Amateur" is defined as "without
pecuniary interest." Even the FCC defines amateur radio that way.

>Lots of us are hobbyists in any number of fields.

You are out standing in your field now.

>You're some kind of hobbyist. You aren't a radio amateur.

Poor baby. Still so confused, scrunching up his fat little fingers,
bound and determined to Have His Way! :-)

Hobbyists in radio are defineable as amateurs in radio if they do not
make any income from it.

LICENSES in amateur radio are required to transmit RF on allocated
amateur radio bands in order to be legal with the federal government.

Poor baby, doesn't understand that amateur radio licenses are NO
GOOD outside of allocated amateur bands. That's true. Anyone can
verify that with Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, especially in
Parts 1 and 2..

Did you know that the federal government can operate all kinds of RF emitters without having ANY operators licensed? True. A ham license there isn't worth the price of a ham sandwich. No criminal liability!

Don't you just HATE it when your rant gets destroyed?

>> I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
>> pecuniary interest since 1947.
>
>Bully for you. You haven't been involved in amateur radio at all.

:-) I haven't been involved in LICENSED amateur radio.

Too bad I can't bring up Jim Fisk as a reference (he is SK). I don't know about Alf Wilson, W6NIF, or Rich Rosen. They were rather involved with HAM RADIO. :-)

>I guess you really showed us, huh?

That's not difficult. :-)

>I returned your snipped line to its rightful place. We wouldn't want
>you to mislead others now, would we?

Anyone can read these public postings without your selective editing. :-)

You don't seem to comprehend half of it, but that's quite another problem and all yours.

>> Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
>> outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
>> unless they have an amateur license.
>
>You can read up on it in "Now You're Talking".

Morsemanship isn't "talking." It's beeping.

>> Right. NOBODY can become involved unless they are already involved.
>
>Wrong. NOBODY can become unvolved until they take steps to do so.
>You can read up on astronomy. That alone does not make you an
>astronomer.

Oh? Astronomers need to be "licensed" and take a morse test?

I don't think so. But, if your false statement makes you happy, why should I upset your nirvana?

[you might research "astronomy" and who spots what, but that would make you see stars...]

>You can peruse magazines and books on auto repair. Those things alone
>do not make you a car mechanic.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!!!!!

Riiiiight. I guess Kragen and all those auto parts stores are doomed
for lack of sales, right? :-)

>> Right. In order to "show interest in radio," everyone has to learn morse
>> code and get a ham license.
>
>Wrong. You've been corrected on this same mis-statement of yours on a
>number of occasions. It is "interest in AMATEUR radio", Leonard.

Noooo, noooo. You are desperately trying to hang on but are
inexorably drawn over the edge. It's a very long drop below you...

LICENSED amateur radio is what you are trying (vainly) to say and then
only to be legal with the federal government on transmitting RF energy
WITHIN allocated amateur radio bands. As the FCC explains, an
amateur radio license is NOT required for transmitting RF energy outside
of amateur radio bands. That sort of thing is quite illegal. :-).

That's only for CIVILIAN radio services and the FCC has NO jurisdiction
over government users of radio.

But, did you know that UNLICENSED civilians can use certain allocated
radio bands and transmit RF energy without taking a single test? True!
Been several of those since 1958! Ask the FCC about non-amateur
radio services if you are too "involved" in amateur radio activity to go
look it up. :-)

>Neither your decades-long "interest" nor your "Extra right out of the
>box" boast of several years ago have resulted in your having taken a
>single step toward obtaining even the most basic level of amateur radio
>license.

Poor baby. Still angry over the past?

You STILL can't understand why I am here. I've explained it enough
times, but your have this set-in-concrete mind that can't get flexible
enough to understand. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

If you are still munching cashews from your glorious middle Africa
"Foreign Service" days, I'd throw them out...either than or too much
beeping has affected your mind. [Guinea-Bisseau is the African
center for cashew exporting...about their best export...]

>> Right. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states
>> that no citizen can comment about any amateur radio regulations unless
>> they already possess an amateur radio license. Right.
>
>You've commented. End of involvement.

Not even close to the "end."

"Comments" are NOT "involvement" even in your distorted little Middle
Earth view, Frodo. [you aren't Golem, but the resemblance is there]

>A number of them did merit explanation after you attempted to twist them
>into something else. It is "interested in AMATEUR radio". Why do you
>persist in deleting that very important word?

Sigh..."amateur" refers to an activity without pecuniary interest. The
FCC uses those same words. [the FCC granted your amateur radio
license]

The word "amateur" (with or without all-capitals) does not explicitly
say TRANSMISSION OF RF ENERGY IN ALLOCATED AMATEUR
RADIO BANDS. Your prized amateur radio license is NO GOOD for
legal transmission of RF energy OUTSIDE of allocated amateur bands.

In fact, in some U.S. civilian radio services it is perfectly legal to
transmit RF energy WITHOUT a license of any kind!!! Sunovagun!

Poor baby. Another Heilian rant shot down in flames.

>You've misdefined your interest.

Not me. YOU. All wrong, Golem...er, I mean Frodo.

I HAVE defined my "interest" quite correctly.

That you totally refuse to believe it is not my problem. Yours.

Your intellectual presbyopia is glaringly obvious.

>You have interest in internet newsgroup posting.

No more so than regular physical exercise. :-)

I have lots of interest in my bank. I have monetary interest elsewhere.

>You have interest in outlining your past professional glories.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, very subjective use of adjectives on your part.

I've spent 51 years in professional radio-electronics activity and none
of it can qualify as "glorious." Intellectually INTERESTING, yes, and
some of it quite enjoyable. If some of it was more involved than what
you did, TS, that's the breaks of life.

Maybe your distemper is flaring up again because I got assigned to
a very large HF transmitting facility while in the U.S. Army...and got
rank and responsibility operating many high-powered HF transmitters.
51 years ago. Before your first hamme raddio license. TS for you.

>You aren't involved in amateur radio.

Not involved in TRANSMITTING RF ENERGY ON ALLOCATED HAM
BANDS, true. :-)

TRANSMIT, Baggins, TRANSMIT. Like in legal RF energy within
those tight, confining HF band bounds.

I'm just advocating the elimination of morse code testing for any radio license but you desperately want to make that some kind of grande production of drama and pathos, a giant mountain built out of a mole hill of your old morse message blanks. Tsk, tsk, tsk, you try such theatrics! Do you have an interest in the theater? :-)

I'll just put you down in the same emotional category as other emotionally-seven-year-old Extras.

Those are very "involved" as long as their attention spans last... :-)

LHA / WMD

3081. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 05:01:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040223000100.00545.00004490@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87806

In article <40391F5C.250AC4D3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Looks like you could use some lead in your pencil.

Okay, get the lead out of your ass and pass it around. :-)

LHA / WMD

Some things just seem to "write themselves," don't they? :-)

3082. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 05:01:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040223000102.00545.00004491@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87807

In article <40392142.C6139598@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> > > >William wrote:
>
>> > > > Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.
>
>> > >You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".
>
>> > Incorrect...YOU are here...
>
>> >In article <40382C74.5E95EF85@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>> >After re-reading Brian's statement and my response, your comment makes
>> >no sense whatever.
>
>> Poor baby. Another with intellectual presbyopia. Tsk, tsk.
>
>I had no idea that's what you were diagnosed with, Len.

HAR! YOU are the one diagnosed with it... :-)

Presbyopia: A common condition in humans around 40 and older
where the eyeball becomes less flexible, thus requiring bifocal or
trifocal lens correction for wide-range optical focussing.

Intellectual presbyopia: A common condition among olde-tyme
hammes of the morse persuasion whose mind has become
inflexible and incapable of understanding communications they
are not familiar with or not explained by the League in some
publication such as "Talking for Dummies."

>I'm awfully sorry.

True enough. [surprising self-depreciatory admission!]

>I should have realized that there was something behind these
>seemingly senseless outbursts of yours.

Yes, those "outbursts" are down in the noise level of independent
thought. You don't have much of that.

>I did you a favor and re-inserted the part you snipped.

Why? Did your letter-tracing-finger run down to the bottom of the monitor again?

>If you look at the whole thing,
>perhaps it'll become clear to you how you made your error.

My only "error" is considering that olde-tyme hammes of the morse persuasion MIGHT try to be civil or at least accept the fate of morse testing defeat with some grace. In that regard I was absolutely wrong and admit it freely. :-)

Was there anything else, then?

LHA / WMD

3083. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 05:01:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040223000104.00545.00004492@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 87808

In article <40392332.65267E76@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Sure Hallicrafters is as defunct as "Ham Radio" magazine.

Poor baby. Still hurting because you never got an article accepted?

...or couldn't understand the technical content in any of its 22 year
independent publishing existance?

:-)

>Many of us
>enjoy indulging in nostalgia over our radio equipment and our past in
>amateur radio.

You should. Not much future left for you...

>You'll have to actually pass some exams and obtain a
>license before you can have a past in amateur radio.

...and herr robust needs to actually pass a psychiatrist's tests to
rejoin the human race and have civil social intercourse with us.

So far you haven't passed those tests. Poor baby.

Now, you sit right down in front of your raddio and have an oriongasm
thinking that those without ham licenses would never understand it.
That seems to sooth your snarly nature.

Work some DX. But don't reveal that some of them are out-of-band
Frenchmen.

LHA / WMD

3084. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 05:20:20 UTC
From: Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <g63j305q9he8rm593lurrhllmugosjiks5@4ax.com>
Source record: 87810

On 23 Feb 2004 01:23:37 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <ldud30pl3n27kscaposu0q8ugc9gi7h9s6@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil
><bogus@fake.com> writes:
>
>>>So...what? Is there some point here? The USA will do so as well, all
>>>in good time. The incline of the slippery slope of our country's descent
>>>into intellectual and ultimately economic poverty is increasing, and we're
>>>picking up speed on our drop into the abyss. Hong Kong, Denmark, and
>>>all the rest of the dumbed-down "No-Code" countries just got there before
>>>us, that's all.
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>Oh give it a rest, roll. Everyone has heard your moaning and groaning
>>for years. Do something constructive. Stop whining. Get a life.
>
>Filth:
>
>Get a life? Thanks anyway, but I've already got one. A very good life,
>indeed. And one of the little things that makes it better is the ability to
>fully enjoy my hobby as a radio amateur, complete with the ability to
>use the Morse/CW mode. Sorry about your bad luck, OM.
>
>>The Patriot
>>
>>America, Love it or leave it!
>>If you're not with us, You're against us.
>
>Sooo, my desire not to have our society plummet down the slippery slope
>of non-existant standards, be they educational, moral, social, or even those
>related to amateur radio licensing. Apparently, all that is perfectly OK with
>you, and you call yourself a "patriot?" Remove the "pat" and you're a lot
>closer to the truth!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

You sure can babble on, rollo. Of course, you've had lots of practice.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

3085. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 05:26:48 UTC
From: Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com>
Message-ID: <9e3j30pedlp8j9rgg8bkebjjo0f2lv8oos@4ax.com>
Source record: 87811

On 23 Feb 2004 01:42:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <5tv930lls77pif39bnilkooh00r14cji13@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil
><bogus@fake.com> writes:
>
>>> WHO CARES, HAM RADIO IS NOTHING MORE THAN A GLOIRIFIED CB SERVICE ANYMORE.
>>
>>Oh stop whining. Move forward into the 21st century or drop dead,
>>whichever you prefer.
>
>Now, THERE is what I call a persuasive argument -- NOT!!! Of course, as
>no-coder arguments usually go, it is one of the more logical. Kind of
>reminds me of the "Democratic" Party, who have, as their principle
>motive for winning the 2004 Presidential Election, the visceral hatred of
>President Bush just because he is conducting himself as a true patriot
>in his efforts to secure our country from the threat of terrorism. Not a
>single one of the '04 Democratic Presidential candidates (with the
>possible exception of Sen. Joe Lieberman, who is now out of the race) has
>or had any vision for his administration more original than raising Federal
>taxes, expanding Federal government social programs, and subordinating
>our national sovreignty to the United Nations in matters of International
>security policy. All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
>are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
>and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
>making us just another Third World nation. How charming.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Jeez, you actually made sense for a moment there, rollo. That is until
you swerved back onto your usual rant about "no-coders." If you could
put aside your irrational fear of, and hatred for anyone who doesn't
prostrate themselves at the feet of the great Morse God, you might be
on your way to becoming a real human being.
--
The Patriot

America, Love it or leave it!
If you're not with us, You're against us.

3086. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 06:07:11 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aa3629929da5b769898e1@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 87812
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <cd2f301o8ih18ksmg7lmrlifh0o3ssbsio@4ax.com>, GlennVA56
@hotmail.com says...
> On Sat, 21 Feb 2004 08:09:24 -0500, N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> But as far as the slender blond with the high heels
> >> goes, I've seen her there and she's one of the hottest ladies in
> >> amateur radio, but I don't think she has a license. She's probably in
> >> her 40's.
> >
> >That would be Barb Osterman... She is KC8VWI
>
> Is this her? If so, you're right!
> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour1.html
> http://www.universal-radio.com/tour2.html
>
>
>
>

Ah, the wonders of lastic surgery...

BDK

3087. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 06:09:02 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aa3630b236adc279898e2@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 87813
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <PzMZb.120$nd2.4769@news20.bellglobal.com>,
m.moore@NOSPAMutoronto.ca says...
> Dave Holford wrote:
> >
> > Tom Welch wrote:
> >
> >>I bought a new radio from Universal Radio
> >>and got a radio that didn't work and was a
> >>return from a prior sale.
> >>
> >>THe people at Universal Radio restock used
> >>radios and sell them as new.
> >>
> >>FUCK UNIVERSAL RADIO, I will never do business
> >>with these crooks again.
> >>
> >>Tom Welch
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Not bad, 90% approval.
> > Sounds like they can be trusted to do a good job.
>
> LOL. I have a similar experience to Tom's. Why go with an
> apparent "90% approval rating" when you can go with a 100%
> approval rating, i.e. try Grove Enterprises or AES.
>
>
> --
> M2
>
>

AES 100%?? Puleeeze..

I'm at least one person that's not happy with them..

BDK

3088. Please join me at QRZ.com discussing actions to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 06:22:28 UTC
From: Martin@CoachingSupport.com
Message-ID: <845eaf75.0402222222.7d584b68@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87814

I have created a discussion on QRZ.com about stopping BPL. I thought
it would be redundant to have the same post here so I am posting the
web link below. If you are committed to personal action on BPL please
join me!

http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?s=40398dca3cb5ffff;act=ST;f=7;t=56114;st=0

OR go to http://www.qrz.com/ ,select the Forum section and search BPL
in the "Talk and Opinions" section.

Thanks, KI4CFS Martin

3089. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 09:35:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WPj_b.17834$hm4.5215@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87815

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> Doesn't surprise me. The 9th circuit is
> usually in "left-field" as compared to
> the rest of the appellate circuits, so I
> understand from their ruling history -
> even when they do get something
> technically correct (e.g. "under God"
> in the PoA being unconstitutional by
> violating "freedom of religion"). (snip)

I disagree. Freedom of religion (or, more specificially, "the free exercise thereof" - the actual words of the Constitution) would not make the words "under God" unconstitutional. Instead, such a ruling would place limits on the free exercise of religion and on freedom of speech. The First Amendment says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

Notice there are not just words about the "establishment of religion," but also words about the free exercise of religion. Those opposed to religion love to point to the "establishment" clause while carefully ignoring the "free exercise" clause. However, they do so at the detriment of our Rights.

The words "under God" do not establish a religion. Since many religions believe in a God, no religion is established. Specific government recognition of religions which don't believe in a God, while placing "speech" limits on religions which do, would violate the "establishment" clause in the first case and the "free exercise" clause in the second. Government enforced removal of all mention of religion would also violate the "free exercise" clause (and the "free speech" clause).

The Constitution should never be used to ban any mention of religion in this country or this government - not if the "free exercise" clause is truly respected.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3090. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 10:05:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%fk_b.17843$hm4.17675@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87816

"Len Over 21" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > Who would one talk to over those vast
> > distances? We use Morse code, while
> > most off-world residents used Zugth code.
> > Besides, code use elsewhere is still
> > declining after being dropped as a testing
> > requirement about 6,406k years ago.
>
> :-)
>
> Careful, Dwight, now you will start the
> morse-zugth code wars all over again (done
> in this newsgroup 8,192 years ago...according
> to Google).

A risk I had to take to illustrate the point.

> At the Interstellar Telecommunications Union
> (ITU) of Stardate 1928 on the 3rd planet of
> Arianna Huffington IV, Mrs. Hiram Percy Maxim
> spoke French to the assembled delegates thereby
> starting an interstellar dispute over which on-off
> coding was superior. [French is not an inter-
> stellar language] She had used naughty French
> words after being refused to use the specially-
> constructed Terran rest room.

I'm glad to see I'm not the only one who thinks Arianna Huffington just flew in from some other planet. Suze Orman is another of my "favorites" - I suspect she still is on another planet.

> The Interstellar Telecommunications Union
> standardized all amateur licensing at 5 WPM
> (Words Per Month) of the de facto standard,
> Interstellar Zugth Code. (snip)

To be fair, we should point out that the words in some of those off-world languages are fairly long. As such, it does take time to send them using any operating mode. That's one reason they dropped the ID requirements - some couldn't finish a word before they had to ID again. I'm still listening to a guy that started talking about four years ago. I don't know which planet he is from - he hasn't got that far yet. Whatever the case, I'm darn sure glad it's not a CW contact.

> (snip) --- from an Appendix of the Orange
> Catholic Bible published in 16,391, Princess
> Irulan and F. Herbert, editors.

Thanks for that fine recount of those events. We all benefit from repeated looks at the past.

[or, on a more serious note, to write all of that, you have too much time on your hands] ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3091. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 11:09:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 87817

In article <JNb_b.15053$W74.1854@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Here's AG4RQ's response to my questions:
>
>K2UNK Question: What does dropping code testing for General
>or Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a
>very expensive enforcement nightmare."?
>
>AQ5RQ Reply: Bill, the enforcememt nightmare would come
>from instantly granting a quarter of a million or more
>Techs HF privileges.

Quarter million? More like 322,000, since the ARRL-proposed free upgrade would
go to all Techs and Tech Pluses.

OTOH there's no indication of how many would actually use the new privileges.

>We have intentional QRM on
>the bands already.

Haven't heard any on CW, myself...

>Add a quarter of a million Techs
>to the bands, along with the resentment over this
>whole code/no-code issue. What do you think will
>happen?

How will anyone know who is who just from a callsign? There's sure to be some
resentment no matter what.

Some fun facts:

If either the ARRL or FAR proposals are enacted, about 322,000 Techs and Pluses
will have more HF/MF. Not just 'phone but CW and data. The ARRL proposal
spreads them out over most of nine bands while the FAR proposal concentrates
all 322,000 into half of 160, small slivers of 80 and 40, and a bit more of 10
and 15. And no 'phone on the bands between 2 and 25 MHz.

Which proposal do you think will maximize crowding and resentment?

Comparisons to the old Novice are not valid because there were far fewer than
322,000. It's clear that one reason ARRL proposed the upgrade to General was to
avoid crowding.

>K2UNK Question: Does RAF believe that if a General
>or Advanced (K2UNK, mental goof, meant to say Extra)
>doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be

>allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
>
>AG4RQ Reply: Under the RAF proposal, the only Generals
>and Extras (You said Advanced. I think you meant
>Extra) would be those who passed a code test. We
>want to keep licensing requirements for General and
>Extra as is, with a 5 wpm code test.
>----------------

He didn't understand the question?

It's clear from the proposal that all license classes would be allowed to use Morse. Not an issue.

>Clearly section 21 is anything BUT clear as to what RAF
>believes...IMHO.
>
I think it's pretty clear. The FAR/RAF? proposal was written as a reaction to the ARRL proposal, and is similar in some ways but offers drastically less HF/MF (space and bands) to hams who haven't passed a code test.

The big question, then, comes down to this:

If it is accepted that Element 1 will be removed for at least some classes of licenses with HF privs, (note that "if", folks!) is it preferable to:

A) limit them to small parts of a few bands that are relatively unpopular, particularly during sunspot minima years

or

B) allow them significant access to all HF/MF bands?

Personally, I don't think the 5 wpm code test is a real "barrier" to anyone, given the wide range of accomodations now in place and the training methods now available. But if it's going to be dropped for some license classes, it seems to me that B makes more sense than A.

IOW, ARRL would spread the free upgradees out and give them a smorgasboard of options, FAR would concentrate them and give them a restricted diet.

Which do you think makes more sense?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3092. Re: Retests at VE sessions - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 11:52:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402230352.6f2f2178@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87818

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<5b2_b.14376$W74.7886@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> I believe you don't need any reason to not allow
> retests. There is no "right" to an immediate retest
> for anyone regardless of how long the test session
> may actually be.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Depends, Bill. If they've offered instant retests before it will be
hard to jerk them back. I'm going to guess that most of the VE's have
offered instant restests.

bb

3093. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 12:00:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87819

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9497BCEF5AA3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20040221200227.23171.00004225@mb-m05.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns94969C0841462elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >>Doesn't sound a likely prosepect
> >
> > The FISTS proposal has more of a chance, I think.
> >
> > It will be interesting to see when/if all these proposals get RM
> > numbers and how long it is before FCC does the NPRM thing. Perhaps we
> > need another pool!
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> >
>
> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an organisation
> for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that they would suggest
> anything that is actually responsive to the removal of the international CW
> test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).
>
> Alun

Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
organization.

3094. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 12:49:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402230449.1e080f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87820

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040223000058.00545.00004489@mb-m02.aol.com>...

After having committed the words "I am only here to civilly
debate the Morse Code test issue", Leonard H. Anderson, a known
pathological liar and newsgroup antagonist, further demonstrated his
illness by commiting THESE words to the newsgroup:

> In article <40391E94.17C54190@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> determined to be as snarly as possible scribbles in crayon:

> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
> >> >> community.
> >> >
> >> >And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
> >> >General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.
> >>
> >> I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
> >> longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
> >> compensation.
> >
> >Right. There you go back into your professional background.
>
> I've been working on that professional background for 51 years. :-)
>
> >That isn't amateur radio.
>
> That isn't HAM radio, sweetums. "Amateur" is defined as "without
> pecuniary interest." Even the FCC defines amateur radio that way.

AND...Your Scumminess...THEY ("They" being the very same FCC YOU
cited) don't call it "Ham" radio...THEY call it AMATUER Radio.

YOU, after all, are the one whio points out that THEY, not "we"
nor the ARRL, are the one's who "make the rules"...

Ergo YOU, licensed or not, are bound by THIER regulations by
virtue of being a US citizen.

Sorry, Your Putziness...Dems da facts.

> >Lots of us are hobbyists in any number of fields.
>
> You are out standing in your field now.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...From yet another LennieLie perpetrated in this forum by
Leonard H. Anderson.

> >You're some kind of hobbyist. You aren't a radio amateur.
>
> Poor baby. Still so confused, scrunching up his fat little fingers,
> bound and determined to Have His Way!

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...From yet another LennieLie perpetrated in this forum by
Leonard H. Anderson.

> Hobbyists in radio are defineable as amateurs in radio if they do not
> make any income from it.

Yet the FCC defines RADIO AMATEURS as being licensed in the
Amateur Radio Service.

Scumbag spinmasters such as yourself can spin it any way you
want...You're STILL not a Radio Amateur BY THE FCC'S DEFINITION.

> Poor baby, doesn't understand that amateur radio licenses are NO
> GOOD outside of allocated amateur bands. That's true. Anyone can
> verify that with Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, especially in
> Parts 1 and 2..

Not germane to the FACT that YOU do not have ANY OPERATOR or
STATION license combintation that will allow you to operate a radio
station in the AMATUER RADIO SERVICE...Nor in any other service, save
for Part 15 and Part 95.

> Did you know that the federal government can operate all kinds of RF
> emitters without having ANY operators licensed? True. A ham license
> there isn't worth the price of a ham sandwich. No criminal liability!

Not germane to the FACT that YOU do not have ANY OPERATOR or
STATION license combintation that will allow you to operate a radio
station in the AMATUER RADIO SERVICE...Nor in any other service, save
for Part 15 and Part 95.

> Don't you just HATE it when your rant gets destroyed?

I am sure he would if he were ranting or if anything he'd said
were untrue.

YOU are free to believe otherwise, but YOU are the one ranting,
and YOU are the one who DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA as a LICENSED
OPERATOR in ANY radio service, Lennie.

Your GROL allows you NO priviledges WITHOUT a station license.

Your GROL >>ONLY<< allows you to "operate" under the auspices of
someone else's station license, and ONLY to the DISCREET channel(s)
and THE mode specified by THAT licnese.

> >> I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
> >> pecuniary interest since 1947.
> >
> >Bully for you. You haven't been involved in amateur radio at all.
>
> I haven't been involved in LICENSED amateur radio.

As of today you've NOT been involved in AMATEUR RADIO. You are
not a licensee. You've had some articles published in an long-defunct
magazine, but you have yet to prove to anyone that your "work" was
original

> Too bad I can't bring up Jim Fisk as a reference (he is SK). I don't
> know about Alf Wilson, W6NIF, or Rich Rosen. They were rather
> involved with HAM RADIO.

Judging by thier callsigns, they are licensed AMATEUR RADIO
OPERATORS, as defined by the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION...

You >>DO<< remember them, don't you, Sir Scumbag? THEY are the
UNLICENSED politicians that YOU constantly remind us that are IN
CHARGE...

THEY are the one's who define what AMATEUR RADIO is...NOT an
unlicensed, ex-radio technician retiree in Southern Kalifornia.

> >I guess you really showed us, huh?
>
> That's not difficult.

So far for YOU, it is...You've not showed us anything but
your...well...your butt...

Guess you need to get those "Depends" taped up a bit higher,
Lennie.

> >I returned your snipped line to its rightful place. We wouldn't want
> >you to mislead others now, would we?
>
> Anyone can read these public postings without your selective
> editing.

A Pearl of Wisdom from the master of the "selectiv(ly) edit(ed)"
rant.

> You don't seem to comprehend half of it, but that's quite another
> problem and all yours.

Comprehend THIS, Scumbag:

Not germane to the FACT that YOU do not have ANY OPERATOR or
STATION license combintation that will allow you to operate a radio

station in the AMATUER RADIO SERVICE...Nor in any other service, save
for Part 15 and Part 95.

> >> Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
> >> outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
> >> unless they have an amateur license.
> >
> >You can read up on it in "Now You're Talking".
>
> Morsemanship isn't "talking." It's beeping.

It's communicating. Skillful communicating at that.

It's a skill that we Might Morsemen have that the Unwashed do
not.

> >Wrong. You've been corrected on this same mis-statement of yours on a
> >number of occasions. It is "interest in AMATEUR radio", Leonard.
>
> Noooo, noooo. You are desperately trying to hang on but are
> inexorably drawn over the edge. It's a very long drop below you...
>
> LICENSED amateur radio is what you are trying (vainly) to say and then
> only to be legal with the federal government on transmitting RF energy
> WITHIN allocated amateur radio bands. As the FCC explains, an
> amateur radio license is NOT required for transmitting RF energy outside
> of amateur radio bands. That sort of thing is quite illegal.

Only YOU are trying to discuss "outside of amateur radio bands",
Lennie, and that's only because it's the only thing that can even
REMOTELY tie you to any form of radio communication.

> That's only for CIVILIAN radio services and the FCC has NO jurisdiction
> over government users of radio.

Hmmmmm.....Since we're CIVILIANS, it seems PERFECTLY appropritate
that THOSE are the "rules" that we discuss.

> But, did you know that UNLICENSED civilians can use certain allocated
> radio bands and transmit RF energy without taking a single test? True!
> Been several of those since 1958! Ask the FCC about non-amateur
> radio services if you are too "involved" in amateur radio activity to go
> look it up.

With the exception of Part 15 and Part 95, any citizen operating
an UNLICENSED radio transmitter is at risk for criminal prosecution.

> >Neither your decades-long "interest" nor your "Extra right out of the
> >box" boast of several years ago have resulted in your having taken a
> >single step toward obtaining even the most basic level of amateur radio
> >license.
>
> Poor baby. Still angry over the past?

>
> You STILL can't understand why I am here. I've explained it enough
> times, but your have this set-in-concrete mind that can't get flexible
> enough to understand. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...

Yes, Lennie...we know why you are "here"...We've added THAT lie
in with the REST of the ones you've promulgated in this forum.

> If you are still munching cashews from your glorious middle Africa
> "Foreign Service" days, I'd throw them out...either than or too much
> beeping has affected your mind. [Guinea-Bisseau is the African
> center for cashew exporting...about their best export...]

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...

As I said...

> >A number of them did merit explanation after you attempted to twist them
> >into something else. It is "interested in AMATEUR radio". Why do you
> >persist in deleting that very important word?
>
> Sigh..."amateur" refers to an activity without pecuniary interest. The
> FCC uses those same words. [the FCC granted your amateur radio
> license]

BIGGER SIGH....The very same FCC Commissioners that YOU
constantly refer to are the ones who have made the definition,
Scumbag.

In the context of FCC rules and regulations, "Amateur" is a
person LICENSED in the AMATUER RADIO SERVICE...

A status YOU do not presently hold...Thank God.

> In fact, in some U.S. civilian radio services it is perfectly legal to
> transmit RF energy WITHOUT a license of any kind!!! Sunovagun!

Ohhhhhhhhh, baby!

Part 15 and Part 95....

I am soooooooooooo impressed! About enough "RF energy" to be
heard across town if the conditions are right with the technical
limitations imposed by PArt 15, and door-to-door trash that makes it
almost impossible to be heard across town even if the conditions ARE
right on Part 95.

> Poor baby. Another Heilian rant shot down in flames.

Not hardly.

Since you try to change the >>FCC'S<< definition of what Amateurs
are, and since YOU are NOT an FCC Commissioner and not entitled to

that priviledge, I'd say the "rant" was yours and the one going down
in flames is you...Again...

> >You've misdefined your interest.
>
> Not me. YOU. All wrong, Golem...er, I mean Frodo.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...Leonard H. Anderson

> I HAVE defined my "interest" quite correctly.

Not by FCC definitions, Lennie...Only by your own. In the eyes
of the FCC, you are just a private citizen.., a "hobbyist",
perhaps...An "amateur" in many different ways, but in THIER
deifintion, you are NOT an "Amateur".

> That you totally refuse to believe it is not my problem. Yours.

The YOU "totally refuse" to accept that your attempts to rewrite
federal definitions to YOUR satisfaction is laughable....That you do
it in public and in such a way as to totally humiliate yourself and
family name is incredulous.

> Your intellectual presbyopia is glaringly obvious.

YOUR lack of ANY intellectual contributions to Amateur Radio are
even more glaring.

> >You have interest in internet newsgroup posting.
>
> No more so than regular physical exercise.

I still offer to take you around the block a few times, Your
Putziness...To make it more interesting, I'll carry my field pack with
me (around 40 pounds).

> I have lots of interest in my bank. I have monetary interest elsewhere.
>
> >You have interest in outlining your past professional glories.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, very subjective use of adjectives on your part.

WHOOHOO! Such an allegation coming from the master of the
Newsgroup Obfuscation!

> I've spent 51 years in professional radio-electronics activity and none
> of it can qualify as "glorious."

No doubt...how "glorius" can it be to follow in someone elses
footsteps step-by-step...?!?!

> Intellectually INTERESTING, yes, and
> some of it quite enjoyable. If some of it was more involved than what
> you did, TS, that's the breaks of life.

How "involved" can a copycat be, Lennie...?!?!

> Maybe your distemper is flaring up again because I got assigned to
> a very large HF transmitting facility while in the U.S. Army...and got
> rank and responsibility operating many high-powered HF transmitters.
> 51 years ago. Before your first hamme raddio license. TS for you.

Again with the relapsing to profanity (or at least the
insinuation of profanity) in order to "make a point"...

Your "assignment" as a radio clerk in 1950's Japan is about as
"glorious" as your life ever got, I am sure, hence your blatherings
and antagonism in THIS forum...

Poor Lennie...Still unable to bring himself off his marble
pillar long enough to join mere mortals and take an Amateur Radio exam
and join in with the rest of us...enjoying Amatuer Radio and all that
it entails...

> >You aren't involved in amateur radio.
>
> Not involved in TRANSMITTING RF ENERGY ON ALLOCATED HAM
> BANDS, true.

Thee are no "HAM BANDS" in the United States, Lennie...However
the Federal Communications Commission >>DOES<< specify the allocation
of numerous bands from the MF spectrum through microwaves to the
AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE.

47CFR refers, if you need help...

> TRANSMIT, Baggins, TRANSMIT. Like in legal RF energy within
> those tight, confining HF band bounds.

Ignorance, Lennie....97% of all Amateur Radio allocations are
ABOVE 30Mhz...Spectrum YOU could be using by the end of the week if
wanted to...

> I'm just advocating the elimination of morse code testing for any radio
> license but you desperately want to make that some kind of grande
> production of drama and pathos, a giant mountain built out of a mole
> hill of your old morse message blanks. Tsk, tsk, tsk, you try such
> theatrics! Do you have an interest in the theater?

Lennie, you've only further proven that YOU are so far out of
touch with YOURSELF and what you do in this forum, that you warrant
confinement as a 5150 mental health hold under California revised code
for evaluation of mental health disorders.

> I'll just put you down in the same emotional category as other
> emotionally-seven-year-old Extras.
>
> Those are very "involved" as long as their attention spans last.

Obviously the chronologically aged seven year old had enough attention span to pass the exam...Which seems to have eluded you....at HOW old...?!?!

Rant, rant, rant, Lennie...we have YOUR number.

It's ZERO.

Steve, K4YZ

3095. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 16:39:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <403A2CB9.8010802@psu.edu>
Source record: 87821

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>
>>Doesn't surprise me. The 9th circuit is
>>usually in "left-field" as compared to
>>the rest of the appellate circuits, so I
>>understand from their ruling history -
>>even when they do get something
>>technically correct (e.g. "under God"
>>in the PoA being unconstitutional by
>>violating "freedom of religion"). (snip)
>
>
>
> I disagree. Freedom of religion (or, more specificially, "the free
> exercise thereof" - the actual words of the Constitution) would not make the
> words "under God" unconstitutional. Instead, such a ruling would place
> limits on the free exercise of religion and on freedom of speech. The First
> Amendment says:
>
> "Congress shall make no law respecting an
> establishment of religion, or prohibiting the
> free exercise thereof..."
>
> Notice there are not just words about the "establishment of religion," but
> also words about the free exercise of religion. Those opposed to religion
> love to point to the "establishment" clause while carefully ignoring the
> "free exercise" clause. However, they do so at the detriment of our Rights.
>
> The words "under God" do not establish a religion. Since many religions
> believe in a God, no religion is established. Specific government
> recognition of religions which don't believe in a God, while placing
> "speech" limits on religions which do, would violate the "establishment"
> clause in the first case and the "free exercise" clause in the second.
> Government enforced removal of all mention of religion would also violate
> the "free exercise" clause (and the "free speech" clause).
>
> The Constitution should never be used to ban any mention of religion in
> this country or this government - not if the "free exercise" clause is truly
> respected.

Some good points Dwight. The "under God" part, which was added in the
early 1950's bears inspection though. What was the intent of those who
added this part? Is there a reason that they chose the word "God"

instead of "Vishnu" or (take your pick)?

And there is the crux of the matter. I would hazard a guess that the same people that find the removal of the words "Under God" a bad thing, would bne equally as distressed if they had to say "Under Vishnu" in their place.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3096. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 16:49:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402230849.25cf6683@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87822

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040221200236.23171.00004228@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402211010.2bf0c2bf@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >I'm not up to speed on the methods which will be used to transport the
> >802.11 type signals into buildings
>
> It's called "radio". aka "wireless". The modems/routers/hubs have these funny
> things called "antennas" on them and so do the boxes out on the utility pole.
> >but I assume it'll be carried over
> >existing cable TV wiring to a Part 15 tranciever/modem somewhere in
> >the building. Or something along those lines.
>
> No wires at all. You been to Microcenter lately?

Spare me the lectures willya??! I'm about ten feet from one, they're
everywhere and I don't need a tour of Microcenter to "find out what
they are". And yes it does need a wire, in this case a cable TV
connection to the modems/routers/hub. Is this the "Wi-Fi 802 dot
something" which is being hyped? I don't think so.

> >Makes a helluva lot
> >more sense economically and in all other respects vs. BPL. In
> >particular they won't trash the HF spectrum like BPL does.
>
> It's also faster, more robust, and even more portable. Put a PCIMCIA cardmodem
> in your lapper and surf anywhere.

Wrong. Surf around as long as you're in Starbucks, in an airport
terminal, in a Hilton and maybe you'll find a connection. Now drive a
few miles to the Wharton Tract or even to Ridley Creek State Park and
try to get a connect yer lapper-with-an-antenna.

> >I undertand
> >that they would use a band of frequencies which would "endanger" our
> >2.4 Mhz allocations. But like I posted somewhere else earlier, I'll
> >trade 2.4 Mhz for 14 Mhz any day.
>
> Some of them do and that's not good. Others are in the 5 GHz region. What is
> most important is that we can have a protected slice of GHz *and* those
> technologies can exist.

And if "they" can't find a "solution" then kiss the 2.4 Ghz (got it
right that time) ham band 'bye-'bye. Get comfortable with the concept

> >> And Ralph Nader is going to run again. GEts worse every day.
> >
> >Comic relief. Beats Ross Perot.
>
> Ralph Nader is Shrub's best friend. Without him, Algore would be in the White
> House.

At this point I'm not in the least bit convinced that Gore would have
been one bit worse that the Shrub. Democrats are the free-spenders and
the Rebublicans are the fiscally conservative right? Have you checked
the size of the national debt recently?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3097. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 16:54:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402230854.7da68dcb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87823

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9497BCEF5AA3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose?

You can read the entire FISTS proposal at:

http://www.fists.org/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf

It can be summed up in six major points:

1) Techs get Tech Plus HF privileges without a code test (which
effectively merges the two license classes)

2) Techs allowed all digital modes on HF.

3) Extra code test made 12 wpm

4) No retesting at the same VE session

5) Improved written exams (see petition for details)

6) All the rest of the existing rules stay as-is (no free upgrades,
Tech remains entry-level exam, etc.)

The FAR/RAF proposal was obviously written in response to the ARRL
one, and the two of them are much more alike than they are to the
FISTS proposal.

> Given that they are an organisation
> for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that they would suggest
> anything that is actually responsive to the removal of the international CW
> test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).

Note that under the FISTS proposal Techs would not have to take a code
test to get Novice/Tech Plus HF.

Note also that the vast majority of individuals commenting supported
this
proposal, and that agreement among FISTS members was in excess of 98%.

Will FCC enact all of it? Maybe not, but if you don't ask you never
get.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3098. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 17:22:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <z8mdnUfvyajfpafd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87824

Barry OGrady wrote:
> On 15 Feb 2004 19:39:38 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>
>>In article <8UNXb.2566$t16.2157387@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Actually by the FCC rules the licensed 7 year old doesn't require adult
>>>supervision.
>>
>> Also by FCC regulations, amateurs cannot operate outside their
>> allocated bands.
>>
>> Let's hear it for the seven-year-old Extras rewarded for doing good
>> work for the amateur community! :-)
>
>
> Does anyone remember the very young person who was granted a pilots
> license because they passed their test, and who then crashed on their
> first solo flight?
>
>
>> LHA / WMD

They would have had to successfully flown solo several times before
getting a license.

3099. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 17:36:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402230936.75e1f40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87825

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.htgk6mc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 22 Feb 2004 01:02:36 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >>I undertand
> >>that they would use a band of frequencies which would "endanger" our
> >>2.4 Mhz allocations. But like I posted somewhere else earlier, I'll
> >>trade 2.4 Mhz for 14 Mhz any day.
>
> The 802.11b "Wi-Fi" LAN technology operates at 2.4 GHz, not MHz.

QSL.

> The nice part about that is that Wi-Fi Channel 1 (IIRC) falls
> totally within the portion of the band that is shared between
> Amateur and Non-Licensed Part 15 users, and (theoretically, at
> least) a licensed ham can hang a super-high-gain antenna and a power
> amp on a commnercial Wi-Fi unit (CompUSA "special") operating on
> that channel, modifications that non-licensed Part 15 users cannot
> do.
>
> Just think what 1500 W TPO would do to the neighborhood Wi-Fi users.
>
> DX records. "King of the Hill".

Pisser-offer to end all.

But would it be any worse than the days when the first consumer TV
receivers hit the shelves and hams "invented" TVI? How long ago?? It's
all circles.

> >Some of them do and that's not good. Others are in the 5 GHz region.
>
> 802.11g - "Wide-Area" LAN or WAN. The Bay Area Wireless
> Communications Alliance members were discussing this about 5
> years ago when I was active with that group. A higher-powered
> version requiring a point-to-multipoint microwave system license
> was starting to be pitched to a different crowd from the 802.11b
> (2.4 GHz) users.
>
> >What is most important is that we can have a protected slice of GHz *and*
> >those >technologies can exist.
>
> >>The current show-stopper for the 802.11 crowd seems to be a lack of
> >>standards and coordination. Which is very typical of fledgling
> >>technologies,

>
> These ARE standards. Just different applications.

Depends on what/how/who defines a "standard". Touch-tone pads are
standard. The rest are questionable on that scale, and in the case of
the instant topic very questionable. I spend a good bit of time
cruising the financial news, London Financial Times, Reuters, Business
Week, anywhere where I don't have to cough up coin to get into like
the WSJ. The technologies which will matter down the road are those
Wall Street buys into. The rest will be orphaned. Good collection of
articles by the investments pundits on the likes of Wi-Fi and the
related standards problems they see in this field.

http://www.businessweek.com/technology/tc_special/tc_04wifi.htm

Speaking of orphans . . I have yet to run into a single peep about BPL
anywhere in the tech investments rags so far. I think this silently
speaks volumes about the future of BPL.

> Carl Stevenson
> is a national and international expert on them.

Yup, would have been nice to have him in this thread.

> >>And eventually evolutionary forces will do what they've
> >>always done and some 802.11 type system or another will be ready to
> >>market on a global scale.
>
> Both the 802.11b (short-range) and 802.11g (long-range) systems have
> been marketed on a global scale for several years. Don't confuse
> them with the differing standards for cellphoes and color TV - USA
> vs the rest of the world.

You're right.

> >BINGO! I knew you'd get it. Just like VHS smacked Beta's rear years ago.
>
> What makes you think that Beta died when VHS became the consumer
> standard? The TV and broadcast industry standardized on Beta for
> field recording, but alas Sony is no longer supporting it, having
> had it replaced by digital technology. Look for the same thing to
> happen with VHS - "everyone" is going to DVDs.

They're selling computers which don't have floppy drives. I tried to
remember when I last used a floppy. Years ago.

w3rv

3100. Re: Please join me at QRZ.com discussing actions to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 17:39:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040223123941.26379.00000236@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87826

Get real, I think BPL is a great thing, cant wait to subscribe.

3101. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 17:49:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402230949.189878a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87827

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<FRYZb.14264$W74.6094@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040221200232.23171.00004226@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > In article <rnQZb.13790$W74.12635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> > Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >I believe it also proposes NO public question pools and
> > >a 10 day waiting period before retesting a failed element.
> >
> > You are correct, sir! Thanks for the reminder.
> > >
> > >Neither of these are likly at all.
> >
> > The 10 day wait is possible but not likely. How could it be enforced?
>
> Agree 100%

One way would be for FCC to compare dates of all incoming VE test
reports. That's just not going to happen!

> > >With the internet today, questions
> > >will become public regardless of any effort to not publish them
> >
> > Agreed. All it would take is one VE who wanted to make them public.
>
> Test takers themselves could, as was done by Bash in the 60's
> just remember a couple of questions and share them on RRAQ
> (rec.radio.amateur.questions :-)

That too.
>
> > Also, someone would have to rewrite the entire
> > existing Q&A pools. Who is going
> > to bell that cat?
>
> Agree again.

Not just rewritten but recertified by FCC. Don't hold yer breath!

I'm all for secret tests and a 30 day wait. But such things are simply
not in the cards for the foreseeable future. The stuff FISTS wants has

a better chance!

Heck, the reason we have 10 year licenses is to save FCC admin work.
> > > >and
> > > >as for a waiting period on retesting, I can see no "same day"
> > > >retesting, but anything beyond that becomes an administrative
> > > >pain in the butt for VECs and FCC.
> > >
> > > FCC won't do it.
> > >
> > > The only way I could see it happening would be for there to be
> > > some sort of "clearinghouse" where all the VEs would send their
> > > records for comparison. The clearinghouse would keep the last
> > > 10-11 days' worth of records and look for the same person taking
> > > the same test less than 10 days apart, and pass it on to FCC.
> > >
> > > Sun will rise in the west on the day that happens!
> > >
> > > What *could* be implemented is "no retest at the same VE session" but
> > > that's about it.
> >
> > Wow, Jim, we are in 100% agreement here on those two
> > points.

Why are you surprised? Those issues were debated here years ago and
the
same conclusions reached.

It would be neat to see if the FAR folks would volunteer to run a VE
session cross-check clearinghouse at their own expense to enforce the
10 day rule. Or to take on rewriting all of the question pools.

> > Cheers and see my post on "section 21". I'm interested
> > in your opinion of what the petitioners are suggesting.

I think I answered that one. Remind me if I didn't.

It sure looks to me like the FARRAF thing was written in response to
the ARRL proposal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3102. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 17:55:39 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0402230955.15ca0055@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87828

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote

>
> Sure - but they haven't.
>

Of course they have! They've issued literally thousands and thousands
of NRPM's without considering input from me, ARRL, and Donald Duck.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Most Reverend Keeper of the Codes of Q

3103. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 18:37:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402231037.35663d4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87829

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.htgh7kb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 21 Feb 2004 07:12:26 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> It will be interesting to see who the movers and shakers (read:
> >> investors and controllers) of the BPL business are when the
> >> inevitable Congressional inquiry is forced to take place.
> >
> >What do you see triggering a Congressional flap over BPL??
>
> Knowledgeable member of Some Agency gets p.o.-ed at The Power that
> pushes this down eveyone's throat, damn the interference, full speed
> ahead, and uses back-channel contacts to The Congress which wants
> some reason to stick The Power anyhow and gather headlines.
>
> Ought to make a good "made-for-television" script or maybe even "The
> West Wing".

Might not be too far off base here Phil. There's a congresscritter/ham
who has expressed his view and he's on the telecoms committee.

>
> Or maybe no one really gives a damn.....

Nah, a lotta folk give a damn.

>
> >> "No Millionaire Left Behind" ???
> >
> >.. . oughta be an interesting campaign . .
>
> Stay tuned. November is coming up rapidly...

Can't happen soon enough for me.

w3rv

3104. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 19:35:47 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0402231135.629061d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87830
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote:
>From: wa2ise@ix.netcom.com (Robert=A0Casey)
>>Twistedhed wrote a troll....
>
>
>
>LOL...."Twistedhed" wrote no such thing,,,,

yes he did...

http://tinyurl.com/293vf

3105. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies/Speaking of which...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 20:58:25 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <jOt_b.47091$kR3.17860@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 87831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

That's enough reason NOT to mess with 10 Meters. LOL!

They got another company up in Maine AND wrote a letter to FedEx as well.

I know it's a troll, but it is still a good answer. <<snicker>>

J

Mr. Carl Leonard Ross
CLR Transport
1310 Ozone Drive
Saluda, NC 28773

SUBJECT: Warning Notice--Unlicensed Radio Operation

Dear Mr. Ross:

Information before the Commission indicates that your vehicle, US DOT #
11131374, bearing NC license LP-2598, on Interstate 85 between Gastonia and
Kings Mountain, NC, was the source of unlicensed radio transmissions on the
Ten Meter Amateur Radio band on July 14, 2003.

Please be advised that operation of radio transmitting equipment without a
license is a violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as
amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 301, and will subject the operator to fine or
imprisonment, as well as an in rem seizure of any non-certified radio
transmitting equipment, in cooperation with the United States Attorney for
your jurisdiction. Monetary forfeitures normally range from $7,500 to
$10,000.

You are requested to contact me at 717-338-2502 to discuss this matter.

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0402231135.629061d8@posting.google.com...
> twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote:
> >From: wa2ise@ix.netcom.com (Robert=A0Casey)
> >>Twistedhed wrote a troll....
> >
> >
> >
> >LOL...."Twistedhed" wrote no such thing,,,,
>
> yes he did...
>
> http://tinyurl.com/293vf

3106. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 21:47:50 UTC
From: BP <barkingpumpkin@net.net>
Message-ID: <103kt867ek1i1d2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 87832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote in
news:c034bd2.0402231135.629061d8@posting.google.com:

> twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote:
>>From: wa2ise@ix.netcom.com (Robert=A0Casey)
>>>Twistedhed wrote a troll....
>>
>>
>>
>>LOL...."Twistedhed" wrote no such thing,,,,
>
> yes he did...
>
> http://tinyurl.com/293vf

Just for the sake of being *relevent* to this thread..

http://tinyurl.com/2jddd

3107. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-23 23:35:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402231535.7514b27f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87833

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402221635.93a06b4@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222121729.05539.00004474@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0402211756.64c2fe06@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >> Lennie, is there some reason you can take time to antagonize and
> > >> muck-rake through other threads, but you cannot answer a question put
> > >> directly to you?
> > >>
> > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >Steve, this is America, not East Germany. We have the right not to
> > >answer without some thug putting is jack boot on our throat.
> >
> > Don't bother with him, Brian. The gunnery nurse went over to the
> > dark side of Checkpoint Charlie a long time ago. He is Grade A
> > Stasi (Statspolizei), Certified. [emphasis on the latter]
> >
> > He may be getting hand-me-downs from Kolonel Klunk, der
> > Komandant, when they do lunch along the Ku-damm.
>
> Ahem, sorry Len, but I was just informed that there is no East
> Germany, and thus by extension, no Checkpoint Charlie. Probably never
> existed. "Tear Down That Wall," was just a Hollywood stunt like the
> moon landing.

That's OK...I didn't really expect Lennie to stand up and answer.
He lacks the male applicances and testosterone levels to operate it
anyway.

Like I said...His silence was his answer, and his reference (once
again_ to the (defunct) East German secret police is typical.

Seems Lennie has an afinity for "defunct" things...Now we (yes,
the "royal" we...) know what ELSE is defunct!

Steve, K4YZ

3108. BPL: FCC's Notice of Proposed Rule Making. Comment Date 4/08

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 00:07:45 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <403a9573.4211265@news.individual.de>
Source record: 87834

BPL: FCC's Notice of Proposed Rule Making. Comment Date 4/08

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-29A1.doc
--
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

3109. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 00:46:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402231646.62ea787f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87835

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040221221052.13960.00000828@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402210832.10c4df44@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message

> >> Miniature is for poodles.
> >
> >Yeah, like Audrey Hepburn.
>
> How'd you know she was one of my favorites?

Your bio is in the members-only Bowling Team Captains website, they
know EVERYTHING about yew boy.

> >> How many FD QSOs you make so far with the little stuff? The Type 7 did 629
> >> one year....
> >
> >How many did it make last year?
>
> About 300 in SS, in a half-hearted effort.

SOP for SS . .

> >My Type 75A4/T4XB did 1,000-1,200 several times in the CQ WW CW.
>
> Sure - with ten times the power

Lemmee know when you run into an SB-200 which does any such thing.
Maybe 450 watts out on a dry cold day. Max.

> and big antennas, in a contest twice as long as
> SS or FD.
> With all the comforts of home and a spotting net......

In a contest which is an order of magnitude tougher than SS never mind
silly FD. Radio picnic.

> DX isn't my bag. Domestic contests are. One of the Barracuda Rules is that you
> don't
> try to beat the other guy at his game, you get him to play your game.

Pretty lame excuse for an excuse Micollis.

>
> How many you put in the log for 'RS?

None on my own. Turned out that more ops showed up than expected, five plus me which rendered me surplus labor. They all know the logger inside out which I don't know so I got attached to the primary run station as it's second set of ears. On 20 & 40 with the legendary W8FJ, incredible op that he is. 200/Hr rates no sweat. Name of my game was to dredge callsigns up out of the muck when he didn't. Worked but he didn't miss many. OhYeah, I got the dust knocked off my skills BIG time! Which is the bottom-line reason I tripped to Glenmoore to burrow in with this bunch. Mission accomplished. In spades.

Two-station HP category, 6,000+ q's, 11.3 meg, missed a one-weekend 5BDXCC by one lousy mult on 80. Howzatt for a shot at a "Clean Sweep" eh? The big Q bands were 40 and 15. Well over 100 mults on 10M sunspot counts be damned.

Went on after the 'test, Sig fired up on 3.830 immediately after the closing bell to find out who beat who while we gnawed on steak sammiches Mrs. Sig supplied. The Big Guns from all the clubs were on freq, looney operation, guys jumped in with CW instead of SSB . . . helluva lot of fun, all of it.

> >> >I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
> >> >four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
> >> >stainless panel.
> >>
> >> Fits in a two-footer vertically with room to spare.....
> >
> >There ya go Dave, the four foot rack will work.
>
> Twice over.

Until ya add the "transverters" for 160, 60, 30, 17, 15, 12 and 10M which the thing cannot get on now. Then comes the "modulator" and the serial port which it doesn't have either . . Yeah, Dave. We'll need plenty of cubic feet for this abomination.

And by the way Dave the dial in the thing is the rim of a plastic soup bowl. Absolute truth, so help me.

> >> The Type 7 uses a cap from a junked BC-221. The Type 6 and 5 used caps from
> >> ARC-5 transmitters.
> >
> >Dayum, another N2EY stroke of genius.
>
> You betcha, cost me maybe $5 for the whole VFO assembly. Including spares.

Ya obviously got screwed.

> >And here all us no-clues been
> >using these synthesizer thingeys, tsk, tsk, shame on us.
> >
> You had a synthesizer in 1972?

Hell no, but you still have a 1920s style "VFO" and the rest of us do
not.

> >Anybody who doesn't know what knobs are for is a sick pup.
>
> Exactly. I have each one's functions memorized. Plus they are ergonomically
> designed.

Whoosh: Right over yer head.

> No fatigue after hours of use.

I doubt that!

> >> Got rid of all my Johnson gear, though (sniff). Adventurer, Viking 2 with
> >> 122, Valiant.
> >
> >Good riddance, they're probably doing splendidly on 27 Mhz by now.
>
> Not at all. The Adventurer doesn't work 'phone, the Vikings (I had 2) went to a
> ham pal, and the Valiant went to an AMer.

Yeah, yeah. I sold my Valiant to a ham and he went home and
immediately ran it into his 4 el. 11M quad.

> The one Viking 2 was used to make my one-and-only 160 QSO. But that's another
> story....

Good, enough awready . .

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3110. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 00:54:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040223195446.05539.00004487@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87836

In article <ldud30pl3n27kscaposu0q8ugc9gi7h9s6@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil
<bogus@fake.com> writes:

>>So...what? Is there some point here? The USA will do so as well, all
>>in good time. The incline of the slippery slope of our country's descent
>>into intellectual and ultimately economic poverty is increasing, and we're
>>picking up speed on our drop into the abyss. Hong Kong, Denmark, and
>>all the rest of the dumbed-down "No-Code" countries just got there before
>>us, that's all.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Oh give it a rest, roll. Everyone has heard your moaning and groaning
>for years. Do something constructive. Stop whining. Get a life.

Filth:

Get a life? Thanks anyway, but I've already got one. A very good life,
indeed. And one of the little things that makes it better is the ability to
fully enjoy my hobby as a radio amateur, complete with the ability to
use the Morse/CW mode. Sorry about your bad luck, OM.

>The Patriot
>
>America, Love it or leave it!
>If you're not with us, You're against us.

Sooo, my desire not to have our society plummet down the slippery slope
of non-existant standards, be they educational, moral, social, or even those
related to amateur radio licensing. Apparently, all that is perfectly OK with
you, and you call yourself a "patriot?" Remove the "pat" and you're a lot
closer to the truth!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3111. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 00:54:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040223195446.05539.00004486@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87837

In article <5tv930lls77pif39bnilkooh00r14cji13@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil <bogus@fake.com> writes:

>> WHO CARES, HAM RADIO IS NOTHING MORE THAN A GLOIRIFIED CB SERVICE ANYMORE.
>
>Oh stop whining. Move forward into the 21st century or drop dead,
>whichever you prefer.

Now, THERE is what I call a persuasive argument -- NOT!!! Of course, as no-coder arguments usually go, it is one of the more logical. Kind of reminds me of the "Democratic" Party, who have, as their principle motive for winning the 2004 Presidential Election, the visceral hatred of President Bush just because he is conducting himself as a true patriot in his efforts to secure our country from the threat of terrorism. Not a single one of the '04 Democratic Presidential candidates (with the possible exception of Sen. Joe Lieberman, who is now out of the race) has or had any vision for his administration more original than raising Federal taxes, expanding Federal government social programs, and subordinating our national sovreignty to the United Nations in matters of International security policy. All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus making us just another Third World nation. How charming.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3112. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 01:11:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040223201102.05957.00000624@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 87838

In article <d22b54c3.0402230849.25cf6683@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040221200236.23171.00004228@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402211010.2bf0c2bf@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> >I'm not up to speed on the methods which will be used to transport the
>> >802.11 type signals into buildings
>>
>> It's called "radio". aka "wireless". The modems/routers/hubs have these
>funny
>> things called "antennas" on them and so do the boxes out on the utility
>pole.
>> >but I assume it'll be carried over
>> >existing cable TV wiring to a Part 15 tranciever/modem somewhere in
>> >the building. Or something along those lines.
>>
>> No wires at all. You been to Microcenter lately?
>
>Spare me the lectures willya??!

When you spare me, sure!

>I'm about ten feet from one, they're
>everywhere and I don't need a tour of Microcenter to "find out what
>they are". And yes it does need a wire, in this case a cable TV
>connection to the modems/routers/hub. Is this the "Wi-Fi 802 dot
>something" which is being hyped? I don't think so.

There are other systems in use and on the way that require no wiring in your
house.
>
>> >Makes a helluva lot
>> >more sense economically and in all other respects vs. BPL. In
>> >particular they won't trash the HF spectrum like BPL does.
>>
>> It's also faster, more robust, and even more portable. Put a PCIMCIA
>> cardmodem in your lapper and surf anywhere.
>
>Wrong. Surf around as long as you're in Starbucks, in an airport
>terminal, in a Hilton and maybe you'll find a connection. Now drive a
>few miles to the Wharton Tract or even to Ridley Creek State Park and

>try to get a connect yer lapper-with-an-antenna.
>
Make that "anywhere in your house or yard".

Point is that the last-mile problem isn't a real problem at all. Run the fiber down the street on the poles, put a little box every so many poles, use a little encoding, no problem.

>> >I undertand
>> >that they would use a band of frequencies which would "endanger" our
>> >2.4 Mhz allocations. But like I posted somewhere else earlier, I'll
>> >trade 2.4 Mhz for 14 Mhz any day.
>>
>> Some of them do and that's not good. Others are in the 5 GHz region. What
>> is
>> most important is that we can have a protected slice of GHz *and* those
>> technologies can exist.
>
>And if "they" can't find a "solution" then kiss the 2.4 Ghz (got it
>right that time) ham band 'bye-'bye. Get comfortable with the concept

More bandwidth than all of HF.
>
btw, I came across some info on the Manassas thing. $20 month for BPL - for the first three months! Then it jumps to $50/month. On a good day it might get up to half of DSL speed. Maybe.

>> >> And Ralph Nader is going to run again. GEts worse every day.
>> >
>> >Comic relief. Beats Ross Perot.
>>
>> Ralph Nader is Shrub's best friend. Without him, Algore would be in the
>> White House.
>
>At this point I'm not in the least bit convinced that Gore would have
>been one bit worse that the Shrub.

Izzat the sun coming up over Sugartown Road?

>Democrats are the free-spenders and
>the Rebublicans are the fiscally conservative right?

That's what the thousand-points-of-light-family-values-read-my-lips-cloth-coat Republicans keep telling us....

>Have you checked the size of the national debt recently?

Yep. But that's not the big problem - the real 800 pound gorilla is how fast the deficit is making it grow. A few years back we had a surplus....

And now we're supposed to go back to the Moon, and send people to Mars. Yet the odds on a Shuttle failure are worse than 100 to 1...

Tell ya what, let's fund Shrub's moon-mars-madness the same way things like education, mass transit and health care get funded. We could have walkathons and bake sales. Corporate sponsorship in return for advertising space, just like they do in NASCAR and at Indy. Let groups and individuals send in money to buy parts and supplies - a gallon of rocket fuel, coupla resistors for the computer, etc.

NASA can have anything in the Southgate Radio stockroom for a very nominal price.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3113. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 01:19:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402231719.1ec52495@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87839

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4038BA29.A20D08DC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >

> > > 40' push-up mast. Site three was in Mt. Airy, across the road from a
> > > nice, quiet 1600 acre city forest. I used a 60 foot tower there.
> > > Finally, I moved to the west side of the city to Cheviot.
> >
> > Jeez. Didja ever get to completely unpack??
>
> It was good training for the Foreign Service days ahead. Unpack
> everything, put up the antennas, operate for two or three years, take
> down the antennas, pack everything, move to a new location, unpack
> everything, put up the antennas...

Welp at least ya didn't suffer the size of military paychecks despite
the same lifestyle. What were you anyway, comms officer?

> > "World's most traveled tower". Foggy Bottom did pay you for the tower
> > when you left it with 'em right?
>
> Indeed they did and they paid to move it a bunch of times.

Slick. You's have had a helluva time convincing Corporate America to
move a tower every time they relocated you.

> > I gave up on Detroit iron 20 years ago and I haven't run across any
> > particularly good reasons to go back.
>
> Most of the U.S. machines are now much better than those made a couple
> of decades back. You'll find a few Q-ships though. The Pontiac Vibe,
> for example, is a Toyota.

Those are OK, my Chebby Geo is a Suzuki. Two of my daughters have
Saturns and they seem pretty good but boy their pocketbooks got
spanked good. It's all getting mish-mashed, the local GM plant is
starting to gear up for building Saabs.

> > I'm tuned, we have monstrous herds of the things close at hand right
> > here, we do some *serious* deer-ducking too. At 60 mph on four-lane
> > divided highways.
>
> The past couple of winters it hasn't been uncommon to come home at night
> to find twenty or thirty of the critters on our place. They've even
> bedded down right around the perimeter of the house.

A lot of the wild critters which have been running away from human
civilation for years are adapting and moving back in with us. About
five years ago a mountain lion showed up around here. 'Possums and
racoons are driving the city folk nuts, etc. WRT to deer what we need
is more mountain lions, *lots* more.

> > > I have a half side of beef in the freezer, your choice of beverage, a
> > > comfy guest room and plenty of radio gear. If you talk 'EY into coming,
> > > you guys can fight to see who gets the futon in the shack overflow room.
> >
> > He gets the back deck, I get the guest room.
>
> The guest room is comfy. The futon is twelve feet from the rig.

OK then, I'll take the futon.

> > > I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
> > > four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
> > > stainless panel.
> >
> > This is gonna be a class radio, right up there with the IC-7800, cost
> > in NO object.
>
> Reminds me of OH2BH's classic tale of the Russian EMP-proof cellular
> phone. It was all vacuum tubes and took up the trunk of a car.

Only a Russian . .

> > I'm gonna spend a few hours running with the big dawgs this weekend as
> > a reality check, third op at the N3RS baby multi in the ARRL CW DX
> > blast. Haven't done one of these for a quarter century, this is gonna
> > be UGLY.
>
> I heard one of your ops calling LU2EWL on 10m yesterday.

They did quite well on 10M, lotta Qs and mults despite the gloom and
doom over the spots counts.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3114. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 02:37:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87840

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <JNb_b.15053$W74.1854@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Here's AG4RQ's response to my questions:
> >
> >K2UNK Question: What does dropping code testing for General
> >or Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a
> >very expensive enforcement nightmare."?
> >
> >AQ5RQ Reply: Bill, the enforcememt nightmare would come
> >from instantly granting a quarter of a million or more
> >Techs HF privileges.
>
> Quarter million? More like 322,000, since the ARRL-proposed free upgrade
would
> go to all Techs and Tech Pluses.
>
> OTOH there's no indication of how many would actually use the new
privileges.

I believe there are a good number of family member techs
who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.

> >We have intentional QRM on
> >the bands already.
>
> Haven't heard any on CW, myself...

I suspect any animosity would be short lived anyway.

> >Add a quarter of a million Techs
> >to the bands, along with the resentment over this
> >whole code/no-code issue. What do you think will
> >happen?
>
> How will anyone know who is who just from a callsign? There's sure to be
some
> resentment no matter what.
>
> Some fun facts:
>
> If either the ARRL or FAR proposals are enacted, about 322,000 Techs and

Pluses
> will have more HF/MF. Not just 'phone but CW and data. The ARRL proposal
> spreads them out over most of nine bands while the FAR proposal
concentrates
> all 322,000 into half of 160, small slivers of 80 and 40, and a bit more
of 10
> and 15. And no 'phone on the bands between 2 and 25 MHz.
>
> Which proposal do you think will maximize crowding and resentment?

Good point.

> Comparisons to the old Novice are not valid because there were far fewer
than
> 322,000. It's clear that one reason ARRL proposed the upgrade to General
was to
> *avoid* crowding.
>
> >K2UNK Question: Does RAF believe that if a General
> >or Advanced (K2UNK, mental goof, meant to say Extra)
> >doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
> >allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
> >
> >AG4RQ Reply: Under the RAF proposal, the only Generals
> >and Extras (You said Advanced. I think you meant
> >Extra) would be those who passed a code test. We
> >want to keep licensing requirements for General and
> >Extra as is, with a 5 wpm code test.
> >----------------
>
> He didn't understand the question?

Agreed.

> It's clear from the proposal that all license classes would be allowed to
use
> Morse. Not an issue.
>
> >Clearly section 21 is anything BUT clear as to what RAF
> >believes...IMHO.
> >
> I think it's pretty clear. The FAR/RAF? proposal was written as a reaction
to
> the ARRL proposal, and is similar in some ways but offers drastically less
> HF/MF (space and bands) to hams who haven't passed a code test.
>
> The big question, then, comes down to this:
>
> If it is accepted that Element 1 will be removed for at least some classes
of
> licenses with HF privs, (note that "if", folks!) is it preferable to:

>
> A) limit them to small parts of a few bands that are relatively unpopular,
> particularly during sunspot minima years
>
> or
>
> B) allow them significant access to all HF/MF bands?

Well put.

> Personally, I don't think the 5 wpm code test is a real "barrier" to
anyone,
> given the wide range of accomodations now in place and the training
methods now
> available. But if it's going to be dropped for some license classes, it
seems
> to me that B makes more sense than A.

Agreed.

> IOW, ARRL would spread the free upgradees out and give them a smorgasboard
of
> options, FAR would concentrate them and give them a restricted diet.
>
> Which do you think makes more sense?

Agree again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3115. Big Honker Up for Grabs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 03:11:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402231911.1b4774a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87841

"Life is too short for QRP"

http://www.antenna.it/for%20sale.htm

w3rv

3116. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 04:25:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403AD22D.7010001@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87842

>
>
>
>AQ5RQ Reply: Bill, the enforcememt nightmare would come
>from instantly granting a quarter of a million or more
>Techs HF privileges. We have intentional QRM on
>the bands already. Add a quarter of a million Techs
>to the bands, along with the resentment over this
>whole code/no-code issue. What do you think will
>happen?
>
>
>
Well, there were all those general lites and extra lites (I'm one) that got HF phone privs in 2000. And no nightmare happened. Oh there was the usual learning curve all newbies go thru (and a burst of newbies happened) but most everyone learned.

So I would predict that after a short learning curve period that there will be
no problem. Oh there might be a few people fumbling around with CW, but the experienced CW ops might just as soon be happy that new people are interested in the mode. Prehaps some bandwidth in the old novice subbands could be dedicated to training new operators via gentlemen's agreements. Or older ops who haven't touched a key in 20 years.

Again, note that 14.313 was rampant before restructuring.

3117. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 04:32:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403AD3C3.3070005@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87843

>
>
>>
>>
>
>How will anyone know who is who just from a callsign? There's sure to be some
>resentment no matter what.
>
>
>
Lots of extras kept their original callsigns. Though I don't think that
there are any
WN#*** calls that are not vanity calls around anymore. But I kept my
call that
I was assigned as a Tech (5wpm and general written) back in 1976. And I had
to take a sending test back then at the FCC field office. So I would
look like
a no code HFer if this thing goes thru. Not worried about it.

3118. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 05:03:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402232103.64a5328b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87844

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402211410.70909308@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040220221703.15923.00003911@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> > In article <vKyZb.4147$t16.3101198@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >Well I read on qrz and eham where another petition has been submitted.
> >
> > Me too, some outfit called the Foundation for Amateur Radio or some such. Six
> > members. I wrote a comparison of their proposal and the ARRL one......
> >
> > >If
> > >people want to delay whatever ruling the FCC finally issues that's probably
> > >the most effective way to do it.
> >
> > bwaahaahaa
> >
> > >If I haven't lost count, that's 16 petitions.
> >
> > That agrees with my count.
> >
> > Neither the ARRL nor the FAR petition has an RM number yet. And K0HB hasn't
> > even submitted his proposal. So we're not even close to an NPRM yet...
> >
> > Just like the '60s all over again.
>
> I remember it well. I turned two in 1960.

Isn't it about time you upgraded?

> A pile of proposals - watch FCC pick a bit
> > of this and a bit of that and make nobody happy.
> >
> > Maybe I should do a proposal....
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> You absolutely should. I'd enjoy seeing a PCTA propose the theory
> that a Morse Code Exam is a disincentive to the use of CW on HF.

3119. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 06:26:33 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9499EA59F599elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87845

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns9497BCEF5AA3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20040221200227.23171.00004225@mb-m05.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns94969C0841462elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
>> >>>
>> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> >>Doesn't sound a likely prosepect
>> >
>> > The FISTS proposal has more of a chance, I think.
>> >
>> > It will be interesting to see when/if all these proposals get RM
>> > numbers and how long it is before FCC does the NPRM thing. Perhaps
>> > we need another pool!
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an
>> organisation for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that
>> they would suggest anything that is actually responsive to the removal
>> of the international CW test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).
>>
>> Alun
>
> Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
> fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
> organization.
>

I agree fully. I can't quite see them filing a petition to scrap Element 1,
though, can you?

3120. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 10:01:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040224050156.22081.00004275@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87846

In article <d22b54c3.0402231646.62ea787f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040221221052.13960.00000828@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402210832.10c4df44@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>
>> >> Miniature is for poodles.
>> >
>> >Yeah, like Audrey Hepburn.
>>
>> How'd you know she was one of my favorites?
>
>Your bio is in the members-only Bowling Team Captains website, they
>know EVERYTHING about yew boy.

Not quite everyhting, but close enough.
>
>> >> How many FD QSOs you make so far with the little stuff? The Type 7 did
>> >> 629 one year....
>> >
>> >How many did it make last year?
>>
>> About 300 in SS, in a half-hearted effort.
>
>SOP for SS . .

Yup. This little puppy knows better than to run with the big dogs.
>
>> >My Type 75A4/T4XB did 1,000-1,200 several times in the CQ WW CW.
>>
>> Sure - with ten times the power
>
>Lemmee know when you run into an SB-200 which does any such thing.
>Maybe 450 watts out on a dry cold day. Max.

KW in and 450 W out...sigh...

>> and big antennas, in a contest twice as long as
>> SS or FD.
>> With all the comforts of home and a spotting net......
>

>In a contest which is an order of magnitude tougher than SS never mind
>silly FD. Radio picnic.

Maybe when *you* do it...

>> DX isn't my bag. Domestic contests are. One of the Barracuda Rules is that
>> you don't try to beat the other guy at his game, you get him to play your
game.
>
>Pretty lame excuse for an excuse Micollis.
>
I got it from you. You made how many QSOs last FD?

>> How many you put in the log for 'RS?
>
>None on my own. Turned out that more ops showed up than expected, five
>plus me which rendered me surplus labor. They all know the logger
>inside out which I don't know so I got attached to the primary run
>station as it's second set of ears. On 20 & 40 with the legendary
>W8FJ, incredible op that he is. 200/Hr rates no sweat. Name of my game
>was to dredge callsigns up out of the muck when he didn't. Worked but
>he didn't miss many. OhYeah, I got the dust knocked off my skills BIG
>time! Which is the bottom-line reason I tripped to Glenmoore to burrow
>in with this bunch. Mission accomplished. In spades.

I thought so!
>
>Two-station HP category, 6,000+ q's, 11.3 meg, missed a one-weekend
>5BDXCC by one lousy mult on 80. Howzatt for a shot at a "Clean Sweep"
>eh?

Nice!

>The big Q bands were 40 and 15. Well over 100 mults on 10M sunspot
>counts be damned.

Tells ya sumthin. But the Final Authority wannabes tell us nobody uses Morse
anymore...

>Went on after the 'test, Sig fired up on 3.830 immediately after the
>closing bell to find out who beat who while we gnawed on steak
>sammiches Mrs. Sig supplied. The Big Guns from all the clubs were on
>freq, looney operation, guys jumped in with CW instead of SSB . . .
>helluva lot of fun, all of it.

Dogpile!
>
>> >> >I understand, now that you've 'splained it to me. We could use a
>> >> >four-foot rack, turned on its side. That's going to be one expensive
>> >> >stainless panel.
>> >>
>> >> Fits in a two-footer vertically with room to spare.....
>> >

>> >There ya go Dave, the four foot rack will work.
>>
>> Twice over.
>
>Until ya add the "transverters" for 160, 60, 30, 17, 15, 12 and 10M
>which the thing cannot get on now.

Don't need mosta those bands anyway.

>Then comes the "modulator" and the
>serial port which it doesn't have either

Don't need those either.

> . . Yeah, Dave. We'll need
>plenty of cubic feet for this abomination.
>
>And by the way Dave the dial in the thing is the rim of a plastic soup
>bowl. Absolute truth, so help me.

Absolute lie. The Type 4 had a cereal bowl dial - but it was built more than 30
years ago. It was taken apart some time ago and its parts recycled.
>
>> >> The Type 7 uses a cap from a junked BC-221. The Type 6 and 5 used caps
>> >> from ARC-5 transmitters.
>> >
>> >Dayum, another N2EY stroke of genius.

>> You betcha, cost me maybe $5 for the whole VFO assembly. Including spares.
>
>Ya obviously got screwed.

Better'n some lame 5 to 1 slippy balldrive thing. Swords into plowshares,
anyway.

>> >And here all us no-clues been
>> >using these synthesizer thingeys, tsk, tsk, shame on us.
>> >
>> You had a synthesizer in 1972?
>
>Hell no, but you still have a 1920s style "VFO" and the rest of us do
>not.

Simple yet effective. Did someone say "phase noise"?
>
>> >Anybody who doesn't know what knobs are for is a sick pup.
>>
>> Exactly. I have each one's functions memorized. Plus they are ergonomically
>> designed.
>
>Whoosh: Right over yer head.

Not at all. Each knob has a definite function, and despite the obvious
similarities each requires different treatment. A lesson which also applies to
radio.
>
>> No fatigue after hours of use.
>
>I doubt that!

I'm still young.

>> >> Got rid of all my Johnson gear, though (sniff). Adventurer, Viking 2
>> >> with 122, Valiant.
>> >
>> >Good riddance, they're probably doing splendidly on 27 Mhz by now.
>>
>> Not at all. The Adventurer doesn't work 'phone, the Vikings (I had 2) went
>> to a ham pal, and the Valiant went to an AMer.
>
>Yeah, yeah. I sold my Valiant to a ham and he went home and
>immediately ran it into his 4 el. 11M quad.
>
That was a bit longer ago than I sold mine.

>> The one Viking 2 was used to make my one-and-only 160 QSO. But that's
>> another story....
>
>Good, enough awready . .
>
Like it ever stopped *you*...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3121. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 13:12:12 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c1fijaksd06$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87847

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:20040223195446.05539.00004486@mb-m16.aol.com...
<snip>
| All of which confirms my long-held opinion that [INSERT HERE] no-coders
| are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
| and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
| making us just another Third World nation. How charming.
|
| 73 de Larry, K3LT
|

Hi, Larry,

please insert [US-American] in the space indicated above.

Your post reads like a Clown - sketch at Barnum & Baylies Circus, or one of the numbers they show on the Faschingsitzung /Carneval show in European TV.

Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Liberal?

Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Socialist?

What is bad of fraternizing with the Communists, when even the tops of your current administration do so?

Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!

For me it is kind of rediculous expressing this sort of opinion throughout the world, and then signing with a HAM-call.

If your callsign is true and no FAKE, as a HAM you never should discriminate any minority. You are not ANONYMOUS.

Thinking after all you have written above, Larry, your callsign must be faked. A real HAM never could do this kind of beating down on other humans around the world.

God bless, take care,
we all reading this newsgroup throughout the world would not love to loose you. Its a lough-number every time.

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

3122. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 14:14:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402240614.63f9ebc3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87848

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402232103.64a5328b@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402211410.70909308@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040220221703.15923.00003911@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> > > Just like the '60s all over again.
> >
> > I remember it well. I turned two in 1960.
>
> Isn't it about time you upgraded?

I did. I turned 45 in 2003.

3123. Re: Big Honker Up for Grabs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 14:16:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402240616.4649aadd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87849

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0402231911.1b4774a8@posting.google.com>...
> "Life is too short for QRP"
>
> http://www.antenna.it/for%20sale.htm
>
> w3rv

I like the dedicated cooling ductwork. Reminds me of my analog RADAR days.

3124. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 14:21:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402240621.2d58ef4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87850

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<z8mdnUfvyajfpafd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
> They would have had to successfully flown solo several times before
> getting a license.

Gotta love this logic. You get to fly an airplane solo several times
before you can get a pilots license, but can't get on HF without first
taking a morse code test and getting a license.

3125. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 14:27:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402240627.63ac21e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87851

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<403680EF.2BD75369@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
>
> > Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.
>
> You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".
>
> Dave K8MN

"Heil apologists" covers it, don't you think?

3126. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 16:53:52 UTC
From: Newsgroup Lurker <none@none.net>
Message-ID: <c1fvk5$1isqa6$1@ID-59690.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 87852
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I purchased a hand held antenna from Burghardt and was charged $15.00 for
UPS Ground. They don't notify of shipping charges until you receive it, at
least the time I ordered.

Honestly that was my problem since I didn't ask. The truth of it is, that is
far to expensive to charge. Keep product costs down, make up the difference
in shipping I guess.

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40351E15.B45722EB@earthlink.net...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > "Rusty in Louisville" wrote:
> > >
> > > I would like to get some opinions
> > > about Universal Radio, Inc., located
> > > in Reynoldsburg, Ohio. (snip)
> >
> > I've had mixed results with Universal Radio - one order went well and
> > another didn't. I've had slightly better results with Burghardt
> > (www.burghardt-amateur.com) and their prices are often better. However,
> > since you added a shortwave newsgroup to your message, I should point
out
> > that their primary focus is on Amateur Radio, with very little shortwave
> > equipment.
>
> I've had less than pleasant experiences with Universal. The staff seems
> almost surly and almost equally unfamiliar with the equipment they sell.
> Prices are higher, by quite a margin, over other dealers. My personal
> preference is R&L Electronics in Hamilton, Ohio, just north of
> Cincinnati.
>
> Dave K8MN

3127. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 17:10:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402240910.637434ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87853

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > In article <JNb_b.15053$W74.1854@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >Here's AG4RQ's response to my questions:
> > >
> > >K2UNK Question: What does dropping code testing for General
> > >or Extra do that is then "guaranteed to become a
> > >very expensive enforcement nightmare."?
> > >
> > >AQ5RQ Reply: Bill, the enforcememt nightmare would come
> > >from instantly granting a quarter of a million or more
> > >Techs HF privileges.
> >
> > Quarter million? More like 322,000, since the ARRL-proposed free upgrade
> would
> > go to all Techs and Tech Pluses.
> >
> > OTOH there's no indication of how many would actually use the new
> privileges.
>
> I believe there are a good number of family member techs
> who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.

Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
(people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members, not
because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage. FRS/GMRS
took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason for
the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.

>
> > >We have intentional QRM on
> > >the bands already.
> >
> > Haven't heard any on CW, myself...
>
> I suspect any animosity would be short lived anyway.

For some it will never go away, just like the animosity over incentive
licensing or vanity calls or the ARRL or VEs or whathaveyou. For

others it
will simply be "done deal, move on".
>
> > >Add a quarter of a million Techs
> > >to the bands, along with the resentment over this
> > >whole code/no-code issue. What do you think will
> > >happen?
> >
> > How will anyone know who is who just from a callsign? There's sure to be
> > some resentment no matter what.

There's also the possibility that there will be far fewer who will
actually
get on HF no matter what freebies are handed out. Look how much fuss
and
bother it is for some allegedly experienced people to put up a simple
wire
antenna, or to pass any amateur exams at all.

In any event the "very expensive enforcement nightmare" scenario may
or may not become a reality.

> > Some fun facts:
> >
> > If either the ARRL or FAR proposals are enacted, about 322,000 Techs and
> > Pluses
> > will have more HF/MF. Not just 'phone but CW and data. The ARRL proposal
> > spreads them out over most of nine bands while the FAR proposal
> > concentrates
> > all 322,000 into half of 160, small slivers of 80 and 40, and a bit more
> > of 10 and 15. And no 'phone on the bands between 2 and 25 MHz.
> >
> > Which proposal do you think will maximize crowding and resentment?
>
> Good point.

I think the ARRL BoD thought of it first. Or maybe I did, way back in
my
three-class proposal idea.

In fact, if we're gonna have a new entry class with HF, I say they
should have a piece of 160, and all of the WARC bands.

> > Comparisons to the old Novice are not valid because there were far fewer
> > than
> > 322,000. It's clear that one reason ARRL proposed the upgrade to General
> > was to
> > *avoid* crowding.
> >
> > >K2UNK Question: Does RAF believe that if a General
> > >or Advanced (K2UNK, mental goof, meant to say Extra)
> > >doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be

> > >allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
> > >
> > >AG4RQ Reply: Under the RAF proposal, the only Generals
> > >and Extras (You said Advanced. I think you meant
> > >Extra) would be those who passed a code test. We
> > >want to keep licensing requirements for General and
> > >Extra as is, with a 5 wpm code test.
> > >----------------
> >
> > He didn't understand the question?
>
> Agreed.
>
> > It's clear from the proposal that all license classes would be allowed to
> > use Morse. Not an issue.
> >
> > >Clearly section 21 is anything BUT clear as to what RAF
> > >believes...IMHO.
> > >
> > I think it's pretty clear. The FAR/RAF? proposal was written as a reaction
> > to
> > the ARRL proposal, and is similar in some ways but offers drastically less
> > HF/MF (space and bands) to hams who haven't passed a code test.
> >
> > The big question, then, comes down to this:
> >
> > If it is accepted that Element 1 will be removed for at least some classes
> > of
> > licenses with HF privs, (note that "if", folks!) is it preferable to:
> >
> > A) limit them to small parts of a few bands that are relatively unpopular,
> > particularly during sunspot minima years
> >
> > or
> >
> > B) allow them significant access to all HF/MF bands?
>
> Well put.

Thanks - and in that light, the thinking behind the various proposals
becomes
clearer.
>
> > Personally, I don't think the 5 wpm code test is a real "barrier" to
> > anyone,
> > given the wide range of accomodations now in place and the training
> > methods now
> > available. But if it's going to be dropped for some license classes, it
> > seems
> > to me that B makes more sense than A.

>
> Agreed.

If I had my way there'd be at least 5 wpm code for all classes of
license. Why not?
>
> > IOW, ARRL would spread the free upgradees out and give them a smorgasboard
> > of options, FAR would concentrate them and give them a restricted diet.
> >
> > Which do you think makes more sense?
>
> Agree again.

I presume you prefer the ARRL scenario to the RAF one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3128. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 17:17:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0402240917.12699ed0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87854

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<403AD3C3.3070005@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
> >How will anyone know who is who just from a callsign? There's sure to be some
> >resentment no matter what.

> Lots of extras kept their original callsigns.

I had a 2x3 call as an Extra for seven years. I know folks who have
had Extra 30 years and who are still on their original 2x3 callsign.

> Though I don't think that there are any
> WN#*** calls that are not vanity calls around anymore.

By definition they all are.

> But I kept my call that
> I was assigned as a Tech (5wpm and general written) back in 1976. And I had
> to take a sending test back then at the FCC field office.

Yeah, me too, 20 per on a straight key, no biggie.

> So I would look like
> a no code HFer if this thing goes thru.

How?

> Not worried about it.

Heck, I might get on HF 'phone just for the heck of it. Lessee,
Southgate Type 9....FT-241A xtal filter, unit VFO, single conversion
for 75 meters, pair of 6DQ6s in AB2....could be a nice long-weekend
project...

Or maybe dig out that old basket-case HW-101 and slap a new homebrew
VFO in it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3129. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 19:15:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040224141506.02537.00003165@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87857

In article <1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an organisation
>> for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that they would suggest
>> anything that is actually responsive to the removal of the international CW
>> test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).
>>
>> Alun
>
>Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
>fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
>organization.

FISTS, a mighty force (with a woman at the helm) is bound and
determined to have EVERYONE enjoying what they enjoy...
despite the high noise floor of independent thought.

They make [expletive deleted] sure that will be ENFORCED by
keeping the morse code test in amateurism forever and ever.

FISTS represents the "amateur community."

Ergo, all amateurs must demonstrate their dedication and resolve
by satisfying FISTS.

The amateur LAW can never be changed to remove a morse test.
Unthinkable in 1930s thinking. Heretical.

[expletive deleted] :-)

LHA / WMD

3130. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 19:15:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040224141507.02537.00003166@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87855

In article <1e4e3692.0402240621.2d58ef4b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<z8mdnUfvyajfpafd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>>
>> They would have had to successfully flown solo several times before
>> getting a license.
>
>Gotta love this logic. You get to fly an airplane solo several times
>before you can get a pilots license, but can't get on HF without first
>taking a morse code test and getting a license.

ONLY in the "amateur service," Brian.

Way back in 1958 any U.S. civilian could get on HF without any
code test or ANY other test. :-) Been that way ever since.

SGC's SG-2020 HF transceiver is sold to private boat owners who
don't have to take any morse test to operate it legally on HF. Not
even if they buy power amplifiers to boost 20 W output to 400 W.

Many, many, many government and military personnel operate on
HF quite legally every day without having to take any morse test
to "prove their technical ability" to be a "skilled radio operator."

Nope...in the US of A radio amateurs aren't "real" hams until they
pass that archaic morse test...sez the "amateur community."

That's the LAW, and, by [expletive deleted], those olde-tyme
hamme raddio kopps are going to enforce it no matter what!

LHA / WMD

3131. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 19:15:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040224141508.02537.00003167@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87856

In article <%fk_b.17843$hm4.17675@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> (snip) --- from an Appendix of the Orange
>> Catholic Bible published in 16,391, Princess
>> Irulan and F. Herbert, editors.
>
> Thanks for that fine recount of those events. We all benefit from repeated
>looks at the past.

Anyone who has NOT read Frank Herbert's "Dune" novel wouldn't understand 'Orange Catholic Bible' or 'Princess Irulan.' :-)

Very few of the "servicemen" taking everything ultra-seriously in here seem to read anything but QST ads. :-)

> [or, on a more serious note, to write all of that, you have too much time
>on your hands] ;-)

ALL the time I need. :-) :-) :-)

...now, back to the Zugth Code wars!

LHA / WMD

3132. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 19:16:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402241116.1f2f026d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87858

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040224050156.22081.00004275@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402231646.62ea787f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> >In a contest which is an order of magnitude tougher than SS never mind
> >silly FD. Radio picnic.
>
> Maybe when *you* do it...

Go ahead, keep pushing yer luck . .

> >> DX isn't my bag. Domestic contests are. One of the Barracuda Rules is that
> >> you don't try to beat the other guy at his game, you get him to play your
> game.
> >
> >Pretty lame excuse for an excuse Micollis.
> >
> I got it from you. You made how many QSOs last FD?

I had equipment FUBARS, I did not wimp out because I was afraid to
take on "your game".

> >The big Q bands were 40 and 15. Well over 100 mults on 10M sunspot
> >counts be damned.
>
> Tells ya sumthin. But the Final Authority wannabes tell us nobody uses Morse
> anymore...

Pfft . . ! Lotta BS, the reality is obvious.

> >Until ya add the "transverters" for 160, 60, 30, 17, 15, 12 and 10M
> >which the thing cannot get on now.
>
> Don't need mosta those bands anyway.
>
> >Then comes the "modulator" and the
> >serial port which it doesn't have either
>
> Don't need those either.

Take that line of rationalizations out to it's obvious limit and ya
don't "need" a ham license either.

> >And by the way Dave the dial in the thing is the rim of a plastic soup
> >bowl. Absolute truth, so help me.
>

> Absolute lie. The Type 4 had a cereal bowl dial - but it was built more than 30
> years ago. It was taken apart some time ago and its parts recycled.

Abject apologies, I got yer abominations mixed up. Where did you get
the digital display for the S8?

> >> You betcha, cost me maybe $5 for the whole VFO assembly. Including spares.
> >
> >Ya obviously got screwed.
>
> Better'n some lame 5 to 1 slippy balldrive thing. Swords into plowshares,
> anyway.

Ever hear the terms "shaft encoder" or "PTO"?

> >Hell no, but you still have a 1920s style "VFO" and the rest of us do
> >not.
>
> Simple yet effective. Did someone say "phase noise"?

Glad you brought that up. One of my objectives over the weekend was to
sniff out a whole list of ponderments I had on these sorts of topics.
Phase noise: Close to the end of the 'test on 40M the amp T/R relay
hung a couple times and I got to listen to the MP sans antenna. If the
weak hiss was in fact phase noise it was probably 20 dB. down from the
base QRN noise level in the band. Lesson: Given a decent radio phase
noise is never going to be the limiting factor in weak signal
reception anywhere around where thee or me live so fugeddit, yer VFO
is not a "solution" for some "phase noise problem".

Other pins they stuck in sacred balloons:

They don't use QSK, PTT works just fine.
The AGC is always ON.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3133. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 20:41:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87859

N2EY wrote:
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...

> > I believe there are a good number of family member techs
> > who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.
>
> Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
> (people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members, not
> because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
> disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage. FRS/GMRS
> took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
> for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason for
> the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.

Overheard on a 2m repeater in this area of the Ohio Valley yesterday:

"KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".

"KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"

"I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
or somthing".

"Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".

"Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
will talk this far from each other".

It is a brave new world of amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3134. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 21:58:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403BC918.9070903@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87860

N2EY wrote:

>
>
>
>>So I would look like
>>a no code HFer if this thing goes thru.
>>
>>
>
>How?
>
>
With the 2x3 call, but come to think of it, I think that the FCC had
run out of WA#xxx calls long before the no code tech came out. But
I'm not worried about this at all. In reality, I've since forgotten the
5wpm
long ago.

>
>
>>Not worried about it.
>>
>>
>
>Heck, I might get on HF 'phone just for the heck of it. Lessee,
>Southgate Type 9....FT-241A xtal filter, unit VFO, single conversion
>for 75 meters, pair of 6DQ6s in AB2....could be a nice long-weekend
>project...
>
>Or maybe dig out that old basket-case HW-101 and slap a new homebrew
>VFO in it.
>
Do it. Enjoy. Nothin' like the smell of solder and dust on hot vacuum
tubes.....

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

3135. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 22:10:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403BCBE3.7080409@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87861

>
>
>
>Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Liberal?
>
Someone who is too generous with taxpayer money to the poor?

>
>Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Socialist?
>
We're not sure here in the USA, but we suspect that it might be bad....
We were told
all about evil Godless communism back in the Cold War days though. :-)
"Better dead than red" "Kill a commie for your mommy"....

>
>
>
>Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!
>
Chairman Mao of Red China, Kuschiev(sp), Stalin.

AFAIK, every comunist country was a dictatorship, no exceptions. I
don't know why, but it seemed to always work out that way. But there
were also anti-communist dictatorships as well. Not that those were
any better.

>
>For me it is kind of rediculous expressing this sort of opinion throughout
>the world, and then signing with a HAM-call.
>
Don't you guys have a 1st Ammendment over there?.....

>
>
>

3136. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 22:44:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <rLCdnS_SG-pxS6bdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87862

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <1e4e3692.0402240621.2d58ef4b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>>Gotta love this logic. You get to fly an airplane solo several times
>>before you can get a pilots license, but can't get on HF without first
>>taking a morse code test and getting a license.

So, there are a lot of things you must do first before you can solo in an aircraft, like learning how to land, takeoff, read sectional maps, navigate using landmarks, use the VOR for navigation, how to operate the radio and communicate with traffic control using proper procedures ect., ect., and prove to the instructor you can do all this and be safe in the aircraft by yourself. It is a lot more than learning simple Morse code. And by the way, you must be familier enough with Morse code to be able to look at the sectional map and interperate dots and dashes so you can identify VOR's, as the id is sent in code. Them are the rules...don't like it? then don't get a pilots license or ham license. Until the rules change, those are the requirements to meet, like it or not.
>
>
> ONLY in the "amateur service," Brian.
>
> Way back in 1958 any U.S. civilian could get on HF without any
> code test or ANY other test. :-) Been that way ever since.

Not on the ham bands.

>
> SGC's SG-2020 HF transceiver is sold to private boat owners who
> don't have to take any morse test to operate it legally on HF. Not
> even if they buy power amplifiers to boost 20 W output to 400 W.

But not for operation on the ham bands. Different service, different set of rules.

>
> Many, many, many government and military personnel operate on
> HF quite legally every day without having to take any morse test
> to "prove their technical ability" to be a "skilled radio operator."

But not on the ham bands, different service, different set of requirements.
>
> Nope...in the US of A radio amateurs aren't "real" hams until they
> pass that archaic morse test...sez the "amateur community."

Yep, until the rules change, to get a license for HF operation you must pass the code test. You claim you have no interest in getting a ham license so it shouldn't matter a whit to you, so what's your beef old man? Oh, I know, you can't pass the test.

> That's the LAW, and, by [expletive deleted], those olde-tyme
> hamme raddio kopps are going to enforce it no matter what!

No, the olde-type hamme raddio kopps don't enforce anything, the FCC does and until the FCC changes the rules, it is the law. Even if the code test requirement is dropped you still won't be able to get a ham license because you can't pass the test, even as simple as it is today.

3137. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-24 23:19:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6_Q_b.5311$t16.3848071@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87863
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Newsgroup Lurker" <none@none.net> wrote in message
news:c1fvk5$1isqa6$1@ID-59690.news.uni-berlin.de...
> I purchased a hand held antenna from Burghardt and was charged $15.00 for
> UPS Ground. They don't notify of shipping charges until you receive it, at
> least the time I ordered.
>
> Honestly that was my problem since I didn't ask. The truth of it is, that
is
> far to expensive to charge. Keep product costs down, make up the
difference
> in shipping I guess.
>
>

Shipping costs include more than just the UPS charge. Someone's got to take the time to package it in a suitable container and with suitable packing materials and pay for that time and those materials.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3138. WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 00:06:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87864

No, it's not a political protest thread.

Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station WAR back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:

This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio station WAR.

"...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who can send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of speed....say the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a minute for a short period of time.

The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate of more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty. He must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types and siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at more than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if necessary. He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a minute and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."

From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested they had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate of speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and receiving manually when the automatic systems would not function.

Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US and others.

3139. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 00:06:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040224190658.13960.00000866@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87865

In article <d22b54c3.0402241116.1f2f026d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040224050156.22081.00004275@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402231646.62ea787f@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> >In a contest which is an order of magnitude tougher than SS never mind
>> >silly FD. Radio picnic.
>>
>> Maybe when *you* do it...
>
>Go ahead, keep pushing yer luck . .

Whata re ya gonna do - call me names?

>> >> DX isn't my bag. Domestic contests are. One of the Barracuda Rules is
>> >> that
>> >> you don't try to beat the other guy at his game, you get him to play
>> >> your game.
>> >
>> >Pretty lame excuse for an excuse Micollis.
>> >
>> I got it from you. You made how many QSOs last FD?
>
>I had equipment FUBARS, I did not wimp out because I was afraid to
>take on "your game".

Equipment trouble is par for the course on FD. Part of the game, like bad
weather and insects.

>> >The big Q bands were 40 and 15. Well over 100 mults on 10M sunspot
>> >counts be damned.
>>
>> Tells ya sumthin. But the Final Authority wannabes tell us nobody uses
>> Morse anymore...
>
>Pfft . . ! Lotta BS, the reality is obvious.

There are none so blind as those who will not see.

While we're at it, check out my "WAR!" post in another thread...

>> >Until ya add the "transverters" for 160, 60, 30, 17, 15, 12 and 10M

>> >which the thing cannot get on now.
>>
>> Don't need mosta those bands anyway.
>>
>> >Then comes the "modulator" and the
>> >serial port which it doesn't have either
>>
>> Don't need those either.
>
>Take that line of rationalizations out to it's obvious limit and ya
>don't "need" a ham license either.

Sure ya do. The line is drawn when you get on the air.
>
>> >And by the way Dave the dial in the thing is the rim of a plastic soup
>> >bowl. Absolute truth, so help me.
>>
>> Absolute lie. The Type 4 had a cereal bowl dial - but it was built more
>> than 30 years ago. It was taken apart some time ago and its parts recycled.

The Type 4 can be seen on the HBR website.
>
>Abject apologies, I got yer abominations mixed up. Where did you get
>the digital display for the S8?

Built me a digital dial back in 1975 from TTL. Work with almost any HF ham rx,
regardless of heterodyne scheme or VFO range. Worked with the Type 4 one day
and an S line the next.

This was *before* there were designs for similar units on the market or in the
big ham magazines. I still have it somewhere.

Found out after all that work that I preferred analog dials.

>> >> You betcha, cost me maybe $5 for the whole VFO assembly. Including
>> >> spares.
>> >
>> >Ya obviously got screwed.
>>
>> Better'n some lame 5 to 1 slippy balldrive thing. Swords into plowshares,
>> anyway.
>
>Ever hear the terms "shaft encoder" or "PTO"?

Sure. But the only advantage of those things is linearity.
>
>> >Hell no, but you still have a 1920s style "VFO" and the rest of us do
>> >not.
>>
>> Simple yet effective. Did someone say "phase noise"?
>
>Glad you brought that up. One of my objectives over the weekend was to

>sniff out a whole list of ponderments I had on these sorts of topics.
>Phase noise: Close to the end of the 'test on 40M the amp T/R relay
>hung a couple times and I got to listen to the MP sans antenna. If the
>weak hiss was in fact phase noise it was probably 20 dB. down from the
>base QRN noise level in the band. Lesson: Given a decent radio phase
>noise is never going to be the limiting factor in weak signal
>reception anywhere around where thee or me live so fugeddit, yer VFO
>is not a "solution" for some "phase noise problem".

No, that's not phase noise. You don't hear phase noise directly that way.
>
>Other pins they stuck in sacred balloons:
>
>They don't use QSK, PTT works just fine.
>The AGC is always ON.

All you did was blow up some different sacred balloons.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>w3rv
>

3140. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 00:59:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040224195955.05539.00004499@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 87866

In article <403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> > news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>> > I believe there are a good number of family member techs
>> > who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.
>>
>> Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
>> (people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members, not
>> because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
>> disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage. FRS/GMRS
>> took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
>> for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason for
>> the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.
>
>Overheard on a 2m repeater in this area of the Ohio Valley yesterday:
>
>"KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".
>
>"KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"
>
>"I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
>or somthing".
>
>"Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".
>
>"Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
>will talk this far from each other".
>
>It is a brave new world of amateur radio.
>
Nothing new there, Dave, that sort of thing has been common for well over a
decade. You get a bye because you were out of CONUS in the service of our
country all that time.

Most of those folks eventually wise up in time.

I am reminded of the QST article, way back in the 1950s, about some of the
doozies various manufacturers had to deal with:

- There was the ham who bought a receiver (I think it was a Hallicrafters, in fact) took it home and hooked it up and proceeded to listen to hams. After a time, he got a microphone, plugged it into the PHONES jack (but not all the way), flipped the SEND-RECEIVE switch to SEND, and proceeded to call CQ. He wanted his money back....

- Another, rather than RTFM, carted his receiver downtown for at least two round trips before he finally grasped the function of the RADIO-PHONO switch.

- Then there was guy who literally "fired up" his new Harvey Wells because (again) he did not RTFM, and failed to remove the cardboard shipping padding inside the rig that kept the tubes in their sockets during transit.

My personal favorite:

- Ham's receiver seemed a bit less sensitive than usual, so he lifted the lid and tightened all the loose screws - most of which were mica compression trimmer capacitors.

Nothing new under the sun.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"He tightened all the loose screws"

3141. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 01:06:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <NyS_b.20450$hm4.7984@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87867

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0402240910.637434ef@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message

(SNIP)

> > > Personally, I don't think the 5 wpm code test is a real "barrier"
> > > to anyone given the wide range of accomodations now in place
> > > and the training methods now available.
> > > But if it's going to be dropped for some license classes, it
> > > seems to me that B makes more sense than A.
> >
> > Agreed.
>
> If I had my way there'd be at least 5 wpm code for all classes of
> license. Why not?

Why not? Let's not open that issue all over again :-) :-)

> > > IOW, ARRL would spread the free upgradees
> > > out and give them a smorgasboard of options,
> > > FAR would concentrate them and give them a restricted diet.
> > >
> > > Which do you think makes more sense?
> >
> > Agree again.
>
> I presume you prefer the ARRL scenario to the RAF one.

Yes.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3142. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 01:21:33 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <wMS_b.54293$4o.71175@attbi_s52>
Source record: 87868

> > SGC's SG-2020 HF transceiver is sold to private boat owners who
> > don't have to take any morse test to operate it legally on HF. Not
> > even if they buy power amplifiers to boost 20 W output to 400 W.

Yepper ...the same idiots I hear on the fishing boats utilizing the "F" bomb every other word on the bottom of the 30 meter band. CB afloat .... real role models .... and ya know what ...I don't even like tuna.

73 Tom KI3R

3143. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 01:23:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8OS_b.20467$hm4.11853@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87869

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > > news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
> > > I believe there are a good number of family member techs
> > > who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.
> >
> > Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
> > (people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members, not
> > because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
> > disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage. FRS/GMRS
> > took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
> > for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason for
> > the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.
>
> Overheard on a 2m repeater in this area of the Ohio Valley yesterday:
>
> "KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".
>
> "KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"
>
> "I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
> or somthing".
>
> "Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".
>
> "Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
> will talk this far from each other".
>
> It is a brave new world of amateur radio.

Dave,

Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
parties involved?

Now before answering, consider this:

1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or

secret code.
3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.

Who cares about how we dialog with each other
as long as the parties involved are operating within the
law as per Part 97 rules and regs?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3144. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 01:39:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040224203912.12631.00005140@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 87870

In article <20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>No, it's not a political protest thread.

Of course it is...the POLITICS of trying to keep U.S. amateur radio stuck with a morse code test forever and ever because you came upon an OLD bit a data on the 'net and you refuse to give in on that test despite the WRC-03 decision.

>Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station
>WAR back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
>
>This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio
>station WAR.

Ahem...1942 was SIXTY-TWO YEARS AGO.

A few things changed at Washington Army Radio (WAR) in the next few years. In 6 years they would come over from the dark side of the modulation force and do TTY like the rest of the ACAN. By 10 years after 1952 they would start running automatic TTY relay that could read address preambles on messages and do the switch-over to another circuit without needing human intervention. It was a sort of test-bed for the AUTOVON and AUTODIN to come.

While little ADA in Tokyo (3rd rank in number of messages handled in ACAN) did a mere 220K messages a month, Washington Army Radio did about 1200K messages a month, the rate due to auto-switching of addresses.

>"...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who can
>send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of speed....say
>the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
>minute for a short period of time.

I'm sure "the average person" thought so SIXTY-TWO YEARS AGO.
Uh huh... Morsemanship was real high-tech...62 years ago.

You were there talking to "the average persons," right? You got the stats from a League poll?

>The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate of
>more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty. He
>must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types and
>siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at more
>than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if necessary.

>He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a minute
>and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."

A TTY by Teletype Corporation is a "delicate equipment?!?!?" :-) :-)

"Delicate?!?" A Model 15 or 19?!? Hay-soose, they can crank along
at 60 WPM for days on end as long as someone feeds it paper and
ribbon...and in temperature extremes that will send a human on sick
call! Go try and lift a little Model 15 in its transit case...one-handed.

"Siphon recording equipment?" Don't siphons suck? :-)

>From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested they
>had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate of
>speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and receiving
>manually when the automatic systems would not function.

Yeah, right..."touchtype at 100 WPM" on a 60 WPM machine?
Not likely...the keyboard kicks back and refuses to accept too fast
a keypress.

"When the automatic systems would not function?!?!?" HAR! HAR!

WHAT "automatic systems" in 1942? You mean the Teletype
Corporations' perf receivers and sending distributors used throughout
ACAN? Sending distributors had two read heads...would sense p-tape
run-out and automatically switch over to the other head. Very
"delicate?" Only if the manual relay person forgot to load the next
message...:-) In that case it would be "delicatessen" instead of
"delicate." The duty officer would enjoy chewing on a deli sandwich
made of butt of TTY relayer...:-)

That's riiiight...the automatic TTY switch-relay wasn't there in 1942!

I'll bet you think that Washington Army Radio just creaked along for
the ten-year interval with all-manual touchtypers creaking away at
100 words a minute on their mills, eyeshades pulled low on the
forehead, listening to sounders, clickering of the bugs as they sent
mighty morse signals over the globe when the Cold War was just
ignited.

>Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB, >W0US
and others.

I hope they had fun operating all that "delicate" equipment weighing
hundreds of pounds per rack-full. Oh, yeah, and playing with the
"siphon."

Yeah, right, a Press Wireless PW-15 is "real delicate." Eighth-inch thick
steel panels on that puppy are "very fragile," too! :-) Probably
consider 15 KW RF output to be "QRP," I'll bet... :-) :-) :-)

I was an actual part of the whole of ACAN, Rev. Jimmie...for three years.
Were you in ACAN or there at Washington Army Radio? Or was it too

"delicate" for you?

Let's hear it for all those Sparkies winning the Great War through morsemanship. In 1918, maybe. By 1948, NOT.

LHA / WMD

3145. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 02:06:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040224210646.07155.00000920@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87871

In article <8OS_b.20467$hm4.11853@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Who cares about how we dialog with each other
>as long as the parties involved are operating within the
>law as per Part 97 rules and regs?

Olde-tyme hammes DO care a great deal, Bill.

They are servicemen in the glory and tradition of the amateur service.

Why they might even serve you up on a Summary Court if you don't use the "correct" words and phrases and jargon of olde tymes EXACTLY as ordered!

"You shall key your rig in the service manner, keeping always on the alert and listening for all CW above noise level." - General Order #1 in the amateur serviceman's service manual.

Them olde-tymers have been stewing since 1958 when ordinary civilians could legally use radios on HF without a morse test. A mere 46 years ago and they've been enforcing the letter of the unwritten law ever since. :-)

LHA / WMD

3146. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 02:06:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040224210646.07155.00000919@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87872

In article <wMS_b.54293$4o.71175@attbi_s52>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>> > SGC's SG-2020 HF transceiver is sold to private boat owners who
>> > don't have to take any morse test to operate it legally on HF. Not
>> > even if they buy power amplifiers to boost 20 W output to 400 W.
>
>Yepper ...the same idiots I hear on the fishing boats utilizing the "F" bomb
>every other word on the bottom of the 30 meter band. CB afloat .... real
>role models .... and ya know what ...I don't even like tuna.

Doan wurra much, Tom. Pierre Goral passed away recently to join
his deceased partner in SGC, Don Stoner. Puget Sound (where SGC
is located) is way away from your part of the country. Easterners
probably think that Puget Sound and eastern Washington isn't part of
the USA. :-)

Lots of HF bandspace is there in the spectrum...but hams can't legally
use frequencies outside of their allocated narrow bands. The SG-2020
will tune to the whole of HF. Them tuna catchers in your part of the
country (?) won't mind a bit if you enjoy your cow. Mad.

Ham burghers? Moo bettah. :-)

Beep beep.

LHA / WMD

3147. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 02:50:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402241850.c8d464c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87873

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040224141506.02537.00003165@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
> >fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
> >organization.
>
> FISTS, a mighty force (with a woman at the helm) is bound and
> determined to have EVERYONE enjoying what they enjoy...
> despite the high noise floor of independent thought.

Obvioulsy (an as usual, I might add) you haven't read any of
thier position papers or read any of thier submissions to FCC NPRM's
lately.

> They make [expletive deleted] sure that will be ENFORCED by
> keeping the morse code test in amateurism forever and ever.

As I said...

> FISTS represents the "amateur community."

FISTS represents thier membership, all of whom (to the bst of my
knowledge) are or have been licensed Amateurs.

> Ergo, all amateurs must demonstrate their dedication and resolve
> by satisfying FISTS.

There ya go again.

> The amateur LAW can never be changed to remove a morse test.
> Unthinkable in 1930s thinking. Heretical.

For a 1930's kinda guy (like you) I am sure yuo see it that way.

> [expletive deleted] :-)

YOU would find the use of profanity in public "funny".

I think it's sad you can't express yuorself effectively without
it or alluding to it. Shame on you.

Steve, K4YZ

3148. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 02:56:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402241856.1dd3f35b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87874

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040224141507.02537.00003166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402240621.2d58ef4b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >Gotta love this logic. You get to fly an airplane solo several times
> >before you can get a pilots license, but can't get on HF without first
> >taking a morse code test and getting a license.
>
> ONLY in the "amateur service," Brian.
>
> Way back in 1958 any U.S. civilian could get on HF without any
> code test or ANY other test. Been that way ever since.

Not in Amateur Radio...And not in accordance with the Basis and
Purpose of Part 97.

> SGC's SG-2020 HF transceiver is sold to private boat owners who
> don't have to take any morse test to operate it legally on HF. Not
> even if they buy power amplifiers to boost 20 W output to 400 W.

And this is relevent to Amateur radio...HOW...?!?!

> Many, many, many government and military personnel operate on
> HF quite legally every day without having to take any morse test
> to "prove their technical ability" to be a "skilled radio operator."

And this is relevent to Amateur Radio....HOW...?!?!

> Nope...in the US of A radio amateurs aren't "real" hams until they
> pass that archaic morse test...sez the "amateur community."

"Sez" the non-licensed federal bureaucrats that YOU have
correctly cited as being "in charge", Lennie.

Or have you again changed your position on this?

> That's the LAW, and, by [expletive deleted], those olde-tyme
> hamme raddio kopps are going to enforce it no matter what!

The "law" is written by and enforced by those non-licensed
federal bureaucrats, Lennie...Not "us".

And your swipe at Amateurs again noted..."I am only here to
civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From the "Anthology of
Newsgroup Rhetoric", by Leonard H. Anderson.

Steve, K4YZ

3149. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 03:01:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402241901.64fa03b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87875

"Flip-flop", Brain?

How do you get that from the post (requoted in it's entirety
here)...???

The "disincentive" to which he refers is to taking a test for
which there is no REGULATORY requirement...

Where's the "flip-flop", other than the ones you wear in the
shower?

Steve, K4YZ

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402221659.54fa5de@posting.google.com>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
> > doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
> > allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
> >
> > What am I missing here?
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill, your question reminds me of a scenario painted by Steve, to
> which TAFKA Rev Jim responded below. It is very enlightening to see
> that after a decade of saying that the Morse Code Exam was no barrier
> at all to the Amateur Service, he pipes in with a new theory - that a
> Morse Exam is a disincentive to the use of CW on HF.
>
> Thought you might enjoy the flip-flop.
>
> bb
> ----------------
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > >

> > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > incentive to use voice only!
> >
> > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> >
> > Why is it NOW a problem?
>
> Why?
> ----------------

3150. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 03:03:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402241903.75cafc94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87876

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040223201102.05957.00000624@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402230849.25cf6683@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> Point is that the last-mile problem isn't a real problem at all. Run the fiber
> down the street on the poles, put a little box every so many poles, use a
> little encoding, no problem.

Certainly. But running fiber optics lines is a very expensive
proposition, much more expensive per unit length than any of the other
utility lines. If/when real wideband access comes true in this country
it's most likely gonna at least get started via the cable. That
probability is mixed into Comcast's move to bring the Mouse to Philly.

> >And if "they" can't find a "solution" then kiss the 2.4 Ghz (got it
> >right that time) ham band 'bye-'bye. Get comfortable with the concept
>
> More bandwidth than all of HF.

Hare and I touched on that when he was here, it's a classic case of
use it or lose it and it's not being used. I asked him how much ham
activity he knew about on 2.4 Ghz and he answered "What activity?".

> btw, I came across some info on the Manassas thing. $20 month for BPL - for the
> first three months! Then it jumps to $50/month. On a good day it might get up
> to half of DSL speed. Maybe.

Good. I hope they lose their skivvies on that deal.

In this country standard DSL runs 0.5-1.0 Mb/s and can be found for
$30/month. Cable here runs at around 3Mb/s for $45/month. The JAs have
a flavor of DSL which runs at 26 Mb/sec in heavily-populated areas for
$50/month with the HLs close behind. Manassas BPL for $50/month for
only half of 0.5-1.0 Mb/s you say? They gotta be kidding . . ! One
more dot bomb in the making . .

> >At this point I'm not in the least bit convinced that Gore would have
> >been one bit worse that the Shrub.
>
> Izzat the sun coming up over Sugartown Road?

Huh? How did Sugartown Rd. get into it??

> >Have you checked the size of the national debt recently?
>
> Yep. But that's not the big problem - the real 800 pound gorilla is how fast

> the deficit is making it grow. A few years back we had a surplus....

Yeah, it's the rate which is really scary.

> And now we're supposed to go back to the Moon, and send people to Mars. Yet the
> odds on a Shuttle failure are worse than 100 to 1...

I don't see shuttle safety being part of the politics of the upcoming campaign. As has been the case in all major explorations since Leif Ericsson's days and millenia before the folk who ride the things know they didn't buy a seat in a 737 and some are not gonna come back.

> Tell ya what, let's fund Shrub's moon-mars-madness the same way things like
> education, mass transit and health care get funded.

How 'bout we just bag the whole stupid Mars camping trip thing and first build a new version of the Shuttle then put Wideband on the front burner as a matter of national policy? Which is what the JAs and HLs did and explains why this country is years behind them in this field.

> We could have walkathons
> and bake sales. Corporate sponsorship in return for advertising space, just
> like they do in NASCAR and at Indy. Let groups and individuals send in money to
> buy parts and supplies - a gallon of rocket fuel, coupla resistors for the
> computer, etc.
>
> NASA can have anything in the Southgate Radio stockroom for a very nominal
> price.

Let's not get carried away here Miccolis . .

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3151. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 03:12:43 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <LoU_b.401436$na.784003@attbi_s04>
Source record: 87877

> Doan wurra much, Tom. Pierre Goral passed away recently to join
> his deceased partner in SGC, Don Stoner. Puget Sound (where SGC
> is located) is way away from your part of the country. Easterners
> probably think that Puget Sound and eastern Washington isn't part of
> the USA. :-)

Sorry to hear about the owners ...the fellows I have heard on more that one occasion mentioned Icom 706s ..oh well ... Len I am thinking of going to the Pacific NW this summer for some sight seeing. My dad was stationed up at Ft. Lewis and I would like to see that area. He said it was the most beautiful place he has ever been. I always considered the PNW to be part of the US ...now Calif ????

> Lots of HF bandspace is there in the spectrum...but hams can't legally
> use frequencies outside of their allocated narrow bands.

Boy Len you surely have taught me a lot by that profound statement .... shoulda used as string of BTs if you were reaching for a coffee or scratching or something .... I for one find a lot of elbow room in those "narrow bands"

The SG-2020
> will tune to the whole of HF. Them tuna catchers in your part of the
> country (?) won't mind a bit if you enjoy your cow. Mad.
>
> Ham burghers? Moo bettah. :-)

Na Pitts ...burghers ..... No tuna here ..some catfish and carp that taste a little muddy with just a little taste of heavy metals.

> Beep beep.

Moo-moo ....
>
> LHA / WMD

Take care Len ...73 Tom KI3R

3152. Re: Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 03:27:24 UTC
From: Old School <cobra269no-spam@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <5ajo301mb38n34snggerh8mmros304oafm@4ax.com>
Source record: 87878

All that profit goes into Bush's pocket.

There should be a shutdown of transport. The gas prices are ridiculous
especially when you pay $2.09 here and can go to a city 100 miles away
and pay 0.50 cents less a gallon. They say it cost more to transport
the gas here, but the same truck delivers at that city 100 miles south
and another city 50 miles north where both cities north and south are
the same price. Doesnt make sense. Price Gouging is what it is.

On Mon, 23 Feb 2004 23:55:58 +0100 (CET), Anonymous via the
Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote:

>Mobil/Exxon posted the largest profit in history, last quarter! You can't
>boycott all gasoline...but you CAN boycott the largest company! Don't buy
>gas, don't buy snacks, don't buy coffe from these folks. Let 'em know
>you're mad as hell and not going to take it anymore!
>
>And for any of you truck drivers, if you want to take part in a transport
>shut down like they did in England a few years back, you have my blessing.
>Just give us a little warning before hand so we can all stock up on groceries.
>
>*Why would Bush allow these high gas prices to ruin his economic recovery?
>Cuz he's gonna take one "for the team". He's going to take a dive for the
>Republicans so the Clinton's won't be able to take the White House in four
>years......

3153. Re: Ever Notice???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 08:24:37 UTC
From: Chukkee_EETZ_cum@dickmysuck.com
Message-ID: <d848ea5.0402250024.a1ea2d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87879
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,alt.bible,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.policy

niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW) wrote in message
news:<20040224150256.03211.00000300@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> that's it's been quiet around here? No more AKC idiots?
>
> I guess our freind at Verio lost his account.
>
> :)
>
> NIW

MY BIO!!!!!
K8CPA
Okay, this is the place where I tell you how I came to know how fucked up I am.... and all the personal information about me. I will try and answer all the questions:

Date of Birth: June 28, 1972 <in the fall of 71 my daddy fucked a pig, ya see>

Place of Birth: Detroit, Michigan <in an alley behind the unit block of Waterman Avenue>

Religious Information: Well, first off, I am NOT heterosexual! I am a faggot! I accepted penises as my personal Lord in 1980. I was all of 10 Years old, I knew exactly what I was doing, I knew that if I didn't get cock in my mouth, I would not See the Lord in the rapture of it's jizz pulsing. I have been butt pumped nightly for 12 Years. Although, I was "Backslidden" for about 6 of those years, while screwing female barnyard animals. I am now back serving my Lord penis. I would like to Thank the Rev. Jack Hizhogoff of Detroit Gayboy Outreach (Web at: http://www.dgo.fag) for standing in the gap and slapping his manly dick up my fat faggot ass, and for a playroom where people like me, who were burned by chickenhawks with syphylitic dicks and fellow fags in general, could come and give their hearts back to the Lord penis. My only regret is that Rev Hizhogoff had to start pushing his manly dick in my fat faggot ass to the point where I could not bear to bend over anymore, and I returned to my favorite pastime, cocksucking in the men's room of the Detroit bus station.

"Burned" by the syphylitic cocks in my mouth and asshole?: Yep, Sure was.... I was... like I said before, I was sucking when I was 10, (around 1980), I was originally sucking just anyone, especially born again Christians and other mentally fucked up Baptist types like me. I loved those guys when theyd tell me to tongue their assholes.
Condoms were a BIG no-no.... and I believed it!

Speed ahead 4 years. in 1984, The Baptist Church I went to had a bit of a controversy, The Pastor had resigned because he was caught bobbing on my young fat faggot pee pee, and things there were in a state of chaos, and my mom did not want to suffer having to put up with my faggot punk boy ass at home. She enrolled me into the Detroit Institute for Hopless Gayboy Fatass Chumps. I started attending and believe me, going to a Full-TILT anal only gayboy school. after attending one with a stated preference for teaching Hopless Gayboy Fatass Chumps to mainly suck dick, was a MAJOR SHOCK to my system! But one thing kept me from leaving the place, was the fact that these people seemed to really love the Lord Penis. and there was this one guy, named Robert Snyder, Who played the drums, like John Bonham, (from Led Zeppelin) and we got along great.... (Not to mention he would let me drink his jizz on the sly. That was HOT! least *I* thought so! Hey! I was 14 years old, and my hormones were at full TILT! So SUE ME!) (By the way, Snyder is now married to MoparHolic and living in Ohio. I'm very happy for him.
Anyhow... After being there for about a year. I started being interested in playing drums for them, as I was a drummer, from a young age... and I wanted to use my talent for the Lord Penis. Well, I eventually got the nerve to ask if I could play for them, and they said sure, as long as I would give em all head before each show! AWESOME!!!... My first time playing for Detroit Institute for Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chumps was a nightmare! I was scared, I totally forgot how to play because I was violently burping up the sprem I had sucked down before the show.! I was THAT scared! Anyhow... speed ahead to age 19... I was changing as a person, things were changing at Detroit Institute for Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chumps, as well. and a bit of a disagreement rose up between me and Snyder. I wanted to suck their cocks the night before the show instead of immediately prior to it. They said they needed the rush in order to play better, and I was asked to step down from the music ministry. Needless to say I was crushed. and very upset at Snyder In fact. I didn't think I'd ever be able to forgive him for that... Anyhow... I entered into what I called "My Dark Years" from age 19-26... Drugs, Drinking, eating 7 meals a day of Burger king, Dominos Pizza and Taco Bell in order to make myself an even bigger Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chump.... and when I found out that Snyder had turned heterosexual, I really went off the deep end... until...

MY MOMENT OF CLARITY

Well, when I was around 26, I was totally burned out on the Dominos Pizza... I was just sick and tired of being sick and tired... I needed cocks rammed up my Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chump poop chute and I needed it BADLY!!! the people I was upset at were gone from Detroit Institute for Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chumps. I was not getting any older... and I was ready to stop running from the Lord penis. But I had issues to resolve in my life... How could just Go back to the fags that had only "screwed" me and wouldnt let me suck cocks in the first place? I still felt like I'd been wronged! But I had the Clarity moment of a lifetime... This thought crossed my

mind...

"I was a FAGASS PUNKBOY MOTHERFUCKER BEFORE I came to the Detroit Institute for Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chumps

Why am I allowing something that happened 7 years ago, keep me from serving my God, the Penis?????????

My Return to total Fagassedness!

Well, I was 26 years old... I was wanting to come back full time to Lord Penis. But I wasn't going back to Detroit Institute for Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chumps (at least not at that time!!!) I had heard about a church called DGW (short for Detroit Gayboy Outreach) and I'd heard in the past that it was a nice place... So..... I wanted to be where the Holy Spirit of the Lord Penis was... and there I was... I came to the church on Ann Arbor Trail... my first experience there was a interesting one, I came in the parking lot... puffing on a 7 year old kid's cock, (in my years of being Backslidden, I picked up a nasty 2 child a day, sucking habit...) I finished my child, and went in, and right away I heard SCREAMING in my ear... "what are you doing here???" "these are the people that Screwed you, but would not let you suck dicks!" act..... and when the song service started, the Holy Spirit of Lord Penis fell, and I became very uncomfortable, to the point when I had to leave! and I did!, I remember a usher, running after me and saying where are you going??? I remember looking back at him and saying... "I can't handle this SHIT I got to get out of here!" and I left.... Well, that week... I sort of prepared myself for service to mens dicks next week, I took my Book, Gay Sex For Dummies to work. (I worked midnights as a Security Guard, so I could walk around the ghetto apartment complex I patrolled and peek in windows at sleeping little boys. and I had lots of time to masturbate...) My mother realized I was fantasizing about kids nuts.... I found myself reading the Word, and Praying for a big hairy chested man to suck off.. by Sunday, I knew I was ready to come back... Went back that Sunday.... they had a Illustrated Sermon on fellatio with pictures from several fag magazines, it was great, and needless to say, my Hard cock, Melted in the presence of the Lord Penis. and I knew that I wanted to come home.

I thank the Lord Penis for his Love, That takes us whacked out people as we are, and makes us his Servants....

Where am I now... : Currently Attending Adult classes at The Detroit Institute for Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chumps.

HAM RADIO?!?!?!?!?!?!?I BETRAY IT AND WORSHIP ILLIGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS BECAUSE THEY LIKE SUCKING COCK AS MUCH AS I DO!!!!

I was, I guess you could say, Born into the CB FAGGOT Hobby... My Father, was a Dyed in the wool CB FAG... I even had a stint in the CB radio hobby as well... Anyhow, one year (I think I was around 8 Years old...) my parents and I went to have sex with my Grandfather's

Sister and her German Shepherd, in Conway, Ark, which is the world capital of CB FAGGOTS. To say the least, was totally impressed with the FAGGOT CB Hobby, because it satisfied my craving to run my faggot mouth constantly AND to suck cocks!!!. and for years I did nothing about it, just sucking dicks constantly and that linear tuning on those tube type ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWN amplifiers was just too hard to learn. Speed Ahead to age 14, a friend of mine, Joseph Hampton (Ham call sign N8ExtremeCockNosher-but ALSO a secret ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWN) who lived across the street from me, and also was interested in getting his dick polished as well.. Well, we had some gay sex together... (you see this was when you had to be secretive about your gayness! I was KB8HHZ (hugely horny for zebra!) and Joe was KB8HGL (Hungry Gonad licker!)... I believe me and Joe were originally licensed in 1989....

On April of 2000. The FCC Restructured it's licenses... and I paid a renegade VE 50 bucks and Received my General Class Ticket... I often masturbate while thinking of linears for ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS. And really think Riley is mean. Maybe if I sucked his dick he would not be after traitor scumbag shithunk fagboys like me.

My Call? Is a Vanity call that I paid for, it is my initials! Because as a Hopeless Gayboy Fatass Chump, I need something like that for my ego.

so there you go!

I hope this answers everything you wanted to know about me!

3154. Re:[highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 08:27:00 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87880

To give you a lough for the day, and maybe you fell better about your fuel prices:

Gernerally, fuel prices over here in EU are around 1,00 Euro PER LITER (quarter gallon), so don't complain about high prices. Though almost 50% driving diesel (abt 0,80 euros /liter) powered vehicles (exluding commercial trucks), we also have this price differences within short range.
Szenario: Driving from Venice/IT to Prague/Tschechnia (400 miles) fill up in venice for 1.09, next stop near Vienna/Austria you pay only 0.65 and in prague you can get hte liter of diesel for slightly over 50 cents.
They (Oil Companies) use the same excuse for the different prices as they do over there at your side. BTW, ESSO and MOBILE also are the most expensive brands over here.

Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.

Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70. And their performance is not less the gas engines.

So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
You know, you are filling up CHEAP.

Greetings from Austria

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

"Old School" <cobra269"no-spam"@yahoo.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag news:5ajo301mb38n34snggerh8mmros304oafm@4ax.com...
| All that profit goes into Bush's pocket.
|
| There should be a shutdown of transport. The gas prices are ridiculous
| especially when you pay $2.09 here and can go to a city 100 miles away
| and pay 0.50 cents less a gallon. They say it cost more to transport
| the gas here, but the same truck delivers at that city 100 miles south
| and another city 50 miles north where both cities north and south are
| the same price. Doesnt make sense. Price Gouging is what it is.
|
| On Mon, 23 Feb 2004 23:55:58 +0100 (CET), Anonymous via the
| Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote:
|
| >Mobil/Exxon posted the largest profit in history, last quarter! You can't

| >boycott all gasoline...but you CAN boycott the largest company! Don't
buy
| >gas, don't buy snacks, don't buy coffe from these folks. Let 'em know
| >you're mad as hell and not going to take it anymore!
| >
| >And for any of you truck drivers, if you want to take part in a transport
| >shut down like they did in England a few years back, you have my
blessing.
| >Just give us a little warning before hand so we can all stock up on
groceries.
| >
| >*Why would Bush allow these high gas prices to ruin his economic
recovery?
| >Cuz he's gonna take one "for the team". He's going to take a dive for
the
| >Republicans so the Clinton's won't be able to take the White House in
four
| >years......
|

3155. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 08:39:07 UTC
From: Mark Little <mark@au.id.little>
Message-ID: <di3ug1-sf3.ln1@little.id.au>
Source record: 87881

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040224141506.02537.00003165@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an
organisation
> >> for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that they would
suggest
> >> anything that is actually responsive to the removal of the
international CW
> >> test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).
> >>
> >> Alun
> >
> >Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
> >fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
> >organization.
>
> FISTS, a mighty force (with a woman at the helm) is bound and
> determined to have EVERYONE enjoying what they enjoy...
> despite the high noise floor of independent thought.

Tsk, tsk. Misogyny at work. It would seem that you are as 1920s are the
people you are complaining about.

Mark

3156. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 09:08:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vCZ_b.20863$hm4.5418@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87882

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Some good points Dwight. The "under
> God" part, which was added in the
> early 1950's bears inspection though.
> What was the intent of those who
> added this part? Is there a reason that
> they chose the word "God" instead
> of "Vishnu" or (take your pick)?

I suspect the reason is that most in this country who expressed a religious belief at the time believed in a god, not a Vishnu or (you take your pick). If a belief in some other religious deity dominated at the time, very obviously that would have been selected instead. The intent, as I understand it, was to restore some basic standard of values to this country.

> And there is the crux of the matter. I
> would hazard a guess that the same
> people that find the removal of the
> words "Under God" a bad thing, would
> be equally as distressed if they had to
> say "Under Vishnu" in their place.

I'm not so sure of that. From what I've seen, most in this country who believe in a god are extremely tolerant. Just look at how some of those religions have been trashed in this country - from the word "Christ" being crossed out of a most sacred holiday ("X"mas) to religious symbols being stripped from public places to movies and TV shows that are downright insulting - all without a huge outcry. If that happened to certain other groups, I suspect some would be getting ready for a fight in the streets.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3157. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 09:22:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <kPZ_b.20864$hm4.16077@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87883

"Len Over 2" wrote:
>
> Anyone who has NOT read Frank
> Herbert's "Dune" novel wouldn't
> understand 'Orange Catholic Bible' or
> 'Princess Irulan.' :-)

To be honest, I'm not a big fiction reader (Sci-fi or other). I tried to read Dune once years ago and lost interest. The movie was almost as bad - way over the top. Of course, I'm not a heavy movie watcher either. A big part of that is a lack of time. It's not that I dislike reading - we have way too many books (our friends joke that we have more books than the library). But, I'm one of those would wants to consume anything I try to read (read the entire thing in one sitting). However, I've had very little time for that recently. So, our recent books have taken more of a technical slant, with far less fiction and so on.

> ...now, back to the Zugth Code wars!

Agreed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3158. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 09:33:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nZZ_b.20867$hm4.13230@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87884
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Newsgroup Lurker" wrote:
>
> I purchased a hand held antenna from
> Burghardt and was charged $15.00 for
> UPS Ground. They don't notify of
> shipping charges until you receive it, at
> least the time I ordered.

I noticed your message was posted from "news.uni-berlin.de." You are in the United States, right? If not, $15 is not excessive to ship something to Germany. However, if you're in the USA, you're right that $15 is a little high. However, I don't know why they would charge that. If I remember correctly, they only charged me about $15 (also UPS ground) when they shipped two handheld radios with extra batteries and chargers. Perhaps they have a minimum shipping charge or something.

> Honestly that was my problem since I
> didn't ask.

Well, it is certainly a good idea to get all the details before ordering - something I would recommend with any mail-order transaction.

> The truth of it is, that is far too expensive
> to charge. (snip)

Agreed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3159. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 12:31:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <sn4p305mq38k4oidvri7rd4g7clbgs9s4f@4ax.com>
Source record: 87885

```
On Wed, 25 Feb 2004 01:23:16 GMT, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> > > news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>> > > I believe there are a good number of family member techs
>> > > who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.
>> >
>> > Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
>> > (people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members, not
>> > because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
>> > disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage. FRS/GMRS
>> > took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
>> > for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason for
>> > the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.
>>
>> Overheard on a 2m repeater in this area of the Ohio Valley yesterday:
>>
>> "KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".
>>
>> "KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"
>>
>> "I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
>> or somthing".
>>
>> "Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".
>>
>> "Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
>> will talk this far from each other".
>>
>> It is a brave new world of amateur radio.
>
>Dave,
>
>Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
>parties involved?
```

>
>Now before answering, consider this:
>
>1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
>2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
> secret code.
>3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.
>
>Who cares about how we dialog with each other
>as long as the parties involved are operating within the
>law as per Part 97 rules and regs?

Good point - aside from the obvious lack of technical knowledge of the two parties, this convesation was certainly no sillier than the ones that are frequently heard on SSB HF - excessive use of Q-codes instead of plain speech, saying 'hi hi' instead of just laughing, and using non-standard phonetics ("this is WXX Really Big Antenna, name here is Mike, Mary India Kilowatt England, QSL?")

Jeez!

>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

73, Leo

3160. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 12:39:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402250439.18176560@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87886

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9499EA59F599elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns9497BCEF5AA3Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:20040221200227.23171.00004225@mb-m05.aol.com:
> >>
> >> > In article <Xns94969C0841462elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>> I think the proposal is on AG4RQ's website.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >> >>Doesn't sound a likely prosepect
> >> >
> >> > The FISTS proposal has more of a chance, I think.
> >> >
> >> > It will be interesting to see when/if all these proposals get RM
> >> > numbers and how long it is before FCC does the NPRM thing. Perhaps
> >> > we need another pool!
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an
> >> organisation for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that
> >> they would suggest anything that is actually responsive to the removal
> >> of the international CW test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).
> >>
> >> Alun
> >
> > Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
> > fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
> > organization.
> >
>
> I agree fully. I can't quite see them filing a petition to scrap Element 1,
> though, can you?

I can't seem to find any of the [expletive deleted] virulent netcops ragging on FISTS as they have NCI for overstepping their stated bounds.

Why is that?

3161. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 12:59:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040225075954.25815.00006883@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 87887

In article <d22b54c3.0402241903.75cafc94@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040223201102.05957.00000624@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402230849.25cf6683@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> Point is that the last-mile problem isn't a real problem at all. Run the
>> fiber down the street on the poles, put a little box every so many poles,
use a
>> little encoding, no problem.
>
>Certainly. But running fiber optics lines is a very expensive
>proposition, much more expensive per unit length than any of the other
>utility lines.

It's already all over the place out here in the Principality of Radnor. And TE, and West Chester, etc.

The really big cost is getting from the pole into people's houses. That's the really big selling point of BPL: no installation, every outlet in your house is a broadband connection. As if.

>If/when real wideband access comes true in this country
>it's most likely gonna at least get started via the cable. That
>probability is mixed into Comcast's move to bring the Mouse to Philly.

A lot of "cable" is actually fiber. But it makes no real difference; the big probelm is getting into every overpriced little box made out of ticky tacky. The cable and telco folks took their pain upfront.
>
>> >And if "they" can't find a "solution" then kiss the 2.4 Ghz (got it
>> >right that time) ham band 'bye-'bye. Get comfortable with the concept
>>
>> More bandwidth than all of HF.
>
>Hare and I touched on that when he was here, it's a classic case of
>use it or lose it and it's not being used. I asked him how much ham
>activity he knew about on 2.4 Ghz and he answered "What activity?".

I wuz there. And what activity does exist uses highly directional antennas....
>
>> btw, I came across some info on the Manassas thing. $20 month for BPL - for
>> the

>> first three months! Then it jumps to $50/month. On a good day it might get
>> up to half of DSL speed. Maybe.
>
>Good. I hope they lose their skivvies on that deal.

They'll ask Uncle Sam to bail them out. "No millionaire left behind".

Didja see where RCN went Chapter 11? The cofounder of Microsoft put 1.65
billion into that outfit and now his piece is worth $2 million. That's like
putting $165,000 of yer IRA/401K in something and having it go down to $200.
>
>In this country standard DSL runs 0.5-1.0 Mb/s and can be found for
>$30/month.

Even less if bundled with other services. When the contract on the Southgate
cellphone runs out in June, I'm shopping bigtime.

>Cable here runs at around 3Mb/s for $45/month. The JAs have
>a flavor of DSL which runs at 26 Mb/sec in heavily-populated areas for
>$50/month with the HLs close behind. Manassas BPL for $50/month for
>only half of 0.5-1.0 Mb/s you say?

Double check with Ed but I recall half MB as the best they'd ever gotten - and
that was for a single customer on the system. More folks = sharing.
>
>They gotta be kidding . . ! One more dot bomb in the making . .
>
I sure hope so. Boom dot bust. But it ain't over till it's over.

>> >At this point I'm not in the least bit convinced that Gore would have
>> >been one bit worse that the Shrub.
>>
>> Izzat the sun coming up over Sugartown Road?
>
>Huh? How did Sugartown Rd. get into it??

It's west of here - as in "sun come up in the west on that day..."
>
>> >Have you checked the size of the national debt recently?
>>
>> Yep. But that's not the big problem - the real 800 pound gorilla is how
>> fast the deficit is making it grow. A few years back we had a surplus....
>
>Yeah, it's the rate which is really scary.
>
Not just a big hole but digging it deeper as fast as they can.

>> And now we're supposed to go back to the Moon, and send people to Mars. >>
Yet the odds on a Shuttle failure are worse than 100 to 1...
>
>I don't see shuttle safety being part of the politics of the upcoming
>campaign. As has been the case in all major explorations since Leif
>Ericsson's days and millenia before the folk who ride the things know

>they didn't buy a seat in a 737 and some are not gonna come back.

That's not how it was sold, though. Ask the McAuliffes if they were told that there was a 1 in 75 chance of augering in.

Main point is that if it's that risky just ot get to orbit, the Moon is even more risky and Mars missions lasting years are for the Divine Wind types.
>
>> Tell ya what, let's fund Shrub's moon-mars-madness the same way things like
>> education, mass transit and health care get funded.
>
>How 'bout we just bag the whole stupid Mars camping trip thing and
>first build a new version of the Shuttle then put Wideband on the
>front burner as a matter of national policy?

That makes way too much sense.

In fact the really sensible thing would be a cheap oneshot big booster for unmanned payloads and a highly reliable but much smaller human transport system. Send the big stuff on ahead and the astronauts meet it up there.

>Which is what the JAs and
>HLs did and explains why this country is years behind them in this
>field.
>
'zactly.

>> We could have walkathons
>> and bake sales. Corporate sponsorship in return for advertising space, just
>> like they do in NASCAR and at Indy. Let groups and individuals send in
>> money to
>> buy parts and supplies - a gallon of rocket fuel, coupla resistors for the
>> computer, etc.
>>
>> NASA can have anything in the Southgate Radio stockroom for a very nominal
>> price.
>
>Let's not get carried away here Miccolis . .
>
Hey - didja see where they're planning a space walk on the ISS where all the crew will be outside at the same time, with nobody in the station? Didn't they ever go to the movies back in 1968?

73 de Jim, N2EY

...oh, my God, it's full of stars!...
>
>w3rv
>
>
>

3162. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 13:59:31 UTC
From: jmontfort@att.net
Message-ID: <efdb29ad.0402250559.105ca9bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87888
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I've only ordered from them once, but my experience was generally
good. Shipping charges were listed up front ($4.95 to ship a Kaito
radio, not bad...), and my order arrived in good condition. Turns out
I'm not crazy about the radio, but that's not their fault. I'd
probably buy from them again.

jm

"Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
news:<c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>...
> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.
>
> Rusty in Louisville

3163. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 17:23:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <403CDA15.5040001@psu.edu>
Source record: 87889

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Some good points Dwight. The "under
>>God" part, which was added in the
>>early 1950's bears inspection though.
>>What was the intent of those who
>>added this part? Is there a reason that
>>they chose the word "God" instead
>>of "Vishnu" or (take your pick)?
>
>
>
> I suspect the reason is that most in this country who expressed a
> religious belief at the time believed in a god, not a Vishnu or (you take
> your pick). If a belief in some other religious deity dominated at the time,
> very obviously that would have been selected instead. The intent, as I
> understand it, was to restore some basic standard of values to this country.

Then it is a religious thing.

>
>
>>And there is the crux of the matter. I
>>would hazard a guess that the same
>>people that find the removal of the
>>words "Under God" a bad thing, would
>>be equally as distressed if they had to
>>say "Under Vishnu" in their place.
>
>
>
> I'm not so sure of that. From what I've seen, most in this country who
> believe in a god are extremely tolerant. Just look at how some of those
> religions have been trashed in this country - from the word "Christ" being
> crossed out of a most sacred holiday ("X"mas) to religious symbols being
> stripped from public places to movies and TV shows that are downright
> insulting - all without a huge outcry. If that happened to certain other
> groups, I suspect some would be getting ready for a fight in the streets.

Ahh, not a fight in the streets perhaps, but I don't know if you
remember the "No Pray no Play brouhaha in Texas? Thoroughly angered by a
religion/state ruling by the Supremes, a number of Religious figures
and parents came up with a plan to have "spontaneous" recitations of the
Lord's prayer before football games in Texas. People were supposed to

just show up and break into prayer before the games. It was kind of a in your face defiance of the ruling as it were.

It was planned that the first time this was going to happen was for 10,000 people to show up at a stadium that seated 5,000. A great demonstration of piety would ensue as people both inside and outside the stadium publicly expressed their prayer.

It didn't happen. Seems the 10,000 people didn't materialize. That's a good thing in my book. Even though this seems to argue for your point, it was good to see that there were enough people that saw trough this politicizing of faith. But it also means that we should not cave to those who would.

The greatest irony of the whole thing is the choice of "The Lord's Prayer". Here was a planned public recitation of a portion of the Sermon on the Mount. The part of the Sermon on the Mount immediately preceding the prayer is an admonishment to avoid doing the exact thing the "No Pray - No Play" people were doing.

You have to take your pick, is the reference to God in the POA a religious thing or can other words be substituted without a problem.

i personally think that a pledge or affirmation to the country is a fine thing, and support it wholeheartedly. However, to insert something that you are saying is *not* a pledge into a pledge is awkward at best, and besides, I don't believe that.

Perhaps more people should go back and read the sermon on the mount.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3164. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 18:19:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87890

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com...
> No, it's not a political protest thread.
>
> Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station
WAR
> back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
>
> This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio
station
> WAR.
>
> "...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who
can
> send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of
speed....say
> the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
> minute for a short period of time.
>
> The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate
of
> more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty.
He
> must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types
and
> siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at
more
> than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if
necessary.
> He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a
minute
> and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."
>
> From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested
they
> had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate
of
> speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and
receiving
> manually when the automatic systems would not function.
>
> Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,
W0US
> and others.

>
>

Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.

Dan/W4NTI

3165. Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 18:21:19 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1077731552.809234@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 87891

Today HF access was officially granted to all former
CEPT class 2 licensees in Austria by decree. Technical
problems with the electronic publication had caused us
some waiting for this.

(Announcement in German on http://www.oevsv.at)

But not all is good in Austria:

The EU funded BPL project OPERA makes fighting against
this form of interference even harder. In my home town,
Linz, there is a major roll-out going on, and the utility
is taking amateurs to the court for libel if they state
their position too clearly.

If you are for or against code tests, fighting against
BPL should unite all amateurs!

/ralph

3166. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 19:31:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402251131.76b047fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87892

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040224190658.13960.00000866@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402241116.1f2f026d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >In a contest which is an order of magnitude tougher than SS never
mind
> >> >silly FD. Radio picnic.
> >>
> >> Maybe when *you* do it...
> >
> >Go ahead, keep pushing yer luck . .
>
> Whata re ya gonna do - call me names?

Nah, I have a much more appropriate plan in mind . .

> >I had equipment FUBARS, I did not wimp out because I was afraid to
> >take on "your game".
>
> Equipment trouble is par for the course on FD. Part of the game, like bad
> weather and insects.

Uh . . yeah . . been there too . . point please?

> >Take that line of rationalizations out to it's obvious limit and ya
> >don't "need" a ham license either.
>
> Sure ya do. The line is drawn when you get on the air.

No, we're talking about "repackaging" yer poor lame Southgate 8
contraption into an xcvr which would sell in 2004. Does not require a
ham license to do that but does require more than just three lousy
bands out of ten and more than only one hundred year old mode.

> Built me a digital dial back in 1975 from TTL. Work with almost any HF ham rx,
> regardless of heterodyne scheme or VFO range. Worked with the Type 4 one day
> and an S line the next.
>
> This was *before* there were designs for similar units on the market or in the
> big ham magazines. I still have it somewhere.
>
> Found out after all that work that I preferred analog dials.

Ya hung an S20 Sky Champion german silver dial on yer K2 did ya?

> >> Better'n some lame 5 to 1 slippy balldrive thing. Swords into plowshares,
> >> anyway.
> >
> >Ever hear the terms "shaft encoder" or "PTO"?
>
> Sure. But the only advantage of those things is linearity.

Bwaaahaha! As if!

> >reception anywhere around where thee or me live so fugeddit, yer VFO
> >is not a "solution" for some "phase noise problem".
>
> No, that's not phase noise. You don't hear phase noise directly that way.

If phase noise doesn't manifest itself as crud that's all that matters
vs. a VFO. You want I should hang a spectrum analyzer on the
oscillators during a dx contest or what?

> >Other pins they stuck in sacred balloons:
> >
> >They don't use QSK, PTT works just fine.
> >The AGC is always ON.
>
> All you did was blow up some different sacred balloons.

. . . nah, we been here before, same old sacred balloons . . heh heh .
.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3167. still lookin for big rig

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:02:23 UTC
From: 3898 khz <anon@motosikleman.net>
Message-ID: <c1iuukpbq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 87893
Cross-posted to: alt.military.retired,rec.radio.amateur.policy

hey! i still gotta get me a big rig an the best one i heard tellin
is the BC-610 the BC610 is good for takin cared of CB
poblems and will prolly take care any 75 metur poblems
to. so, where can i getta BC 610???????

tnx and good numers to ya. 73
you can fine me any nite on 3898 or 3860
that is 75 metur channul i thank

3168. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:04:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040225150426.07155.00000932@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87898

In article <7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,
>W0US
>> and others.
>
>Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.

Go for it, Dan boy, "real" hams even if SK by now. :-)

In all fairness, Washington Army Radio was an old, small effort using
old-fashioned (for its time, not ours) up until about the summer of
1942. Quite inadequate to mount a worldwide war effort. The largest
real communications network was maintained by the US Navy back
then (they had already introduced TTY to warships of cruiser size
and above by 1940, the Sigaba real-time encryption cut in in 1941).

The U.S. Army Signal Corps of the beginning 1942 times was, and
their historians grudgingly admit it, not up to the herculean task
ahead. Prior to the Japanese striking Pearl Harbor on the morning
of 7 December 1941, the warning message to the Army commander
on Pearl was sent by RCA commercial-carrier message, not over
any Army radio circuit.

The very first HT (a Motorola design) was operational in 1941, even
used by FDR's Secret Service personnel, but in limited quantities.
The backpack walkie-talkie was still in the design phase in the
summer of 1942, as was the Hallicrafters conversion of their
commercial HF transmitter to the BC-610 military model. High-
power HF transmitters in the military of early '42 were largely
off-the-shelf commercial models or the antiquated 1 KW BC-339
and its big brother, the 10 KW BC-340. ACAN, Army Command
and Administrative Network, was a rather sorry lot in the middle
of 1942, mostly the left-overs of the 20s and 30s sparky days
hardly more than amateur efforts with uniforms. That would change
remarkably in the next year, taking at least two plateau jumps in
both equipment type and quantity...field tested in North Africa and
Italy and over the enormous spans of the Pacific as that island-
by-island campaign began...the Army long-distance radio comms
greatly helped by the USN in the Pacific.

What had been a picayune effort by the Army up to about the
middle of 1942 ended by 1943. By then there was less reliance on
commercial radio carriers for long-distance communications and a
tremendous growth of INTEGRATED wire and radio, truly networked

to enable the excellent logistics capability of the US military demonstrated in WW2. The era of copying the sparky methods of the USN for land use was ending...the Army was expanding in technology of radio and electronics much like the end product of the Manhattan Project.

The second-highest national priority level (behind only the A-bomb project) of WW2 was the production of quartz crystals for radios. In the last three years of WW2, quartz crystal unit production averaged 1 million units per month from over 30 companies in the USA! Not any sort of "amateur" effort." Galvin (later Motorola) was the production Hq for the quartz crystals in a time when artificial quartz blank growth was not yet known. The vast majority of those crystal units was intended for non-morse-code radios used on land and in the air and on landing craft.

The core of network messaging in the military of WW2 was the teleprinter, principally the militarized models from the Teletype Corporation headquartered in Chicago...as were Hallicrafters and Motorola. Teleprinters were ideal for integrated communications, operating well over both wirelines and radio, capable of 60 words per minute continuously, needing only to be fed paper and ribbons and some occasional oil.

The image of the lone morseman with headphones and hunched over his code key saving the nation was only that...an image...no relation to reality. That image is UNreal.

LHA / WMD

3169. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:04:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040225150427.07155.00000933@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87897

In article <di3ug1-sf3.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040224141506.02537.00003165@mb-m23.aol.com...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0402230400.baa24bb@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >> Remind me Jim, what do FISTS propose? Given that they are an
>organisation
>> >> for the promotion of CW, I have trouble beleiving that they would
>suggest
>> >> anything that is actually responsive to the removal of the
>international CW
>> >> test requirement, but I could be wrong(?).
>> >>
>> >> Alun
>> >
>> >Alun, please remember that FISTS is an organization that promotes the
>> >fun of morse code use. It was not meant to be a political
>> >organization.
>>
>> FISTS, a mighty force (with a woman at the helm) is bound and
>> determined to have EVERYONE enjoying what they enjoy...
>> despite the high noise floor of independent thought.
>
>Tsk, tsk. Misogyny at work. It would seem that you are as 1920s are the
>people you are complaining about.

Tsk, tsk, Mark, you fail to note _sarcasm_ in the posting. :-)

Note some of the OTHER players in this zoo...emphasis on
machismo ("be a real man and learn code"...etc.).

Note the long-time name FISTS as an organization of code lovers
with its close emotional attachment to machismo, strength, power
and so forth embodied by "fists."

Thumbing through any collection of U.S. amateur radio magazines
that have photographs of amateurs will reveal that U.S. amateurs
are overwhelmingly male and white. For at least a half century.

"Machismo" is a modified latino name for extreme maleness in
the traditional male role of strength, power, fighting ability, and
(to some) leadership of the tribe. :-)

I should apologize for the use of a latino label since, to us in the U.S. sunbelt (all states along the southern border), Spanish words and phrases are somewhat common in our version of English. I don't believe that is true in Australia or New Zealand or even the UK where modified English is also spoken. :-)

The "tribe" aspect shouldn't be overlooked since there is some extreme polarization on the issue and the fight-to-the-death attitude of olde-tymers demanding strict and utter adherence to to the glorious and noble ways of Their youth. Everyone MUST do as They did or not be considered as "real" as They are. :-)

Note the comment of Brian Burke in this thread. He notes that it seems perfectly permissible for any FISTS member to denounce NCI at any time, yet the converse is not possible. :-) Hypocrisy in clear evidence, the one-sided fight-to-the-death attitude in full fury by the code lovers.

I find it curiously odd that the mighty male morseman legions of FISTS be headed by Nancy Kott, clearly a female in photographs.

Of course, again from my geographical vantage point in the middle of the movie mecca, Los Angeles, here there be experts in make-up. Who knows what ever lurks behind the "front panel?" :-)

Best regards from Len (Love Easy Nancy).

LHA / WMD

3170. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:04:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htnes22.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87896

On Sun, 22 Feb 2004 08:13:42 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Doesn't surprise me. The 9th circuit is usually in "left-field" as compared to
>the rest of the appellate circuits, so I understand from their ruling history -
>even when they do get something technically correct (e.g. "under God" in the PoA
>being unconstitutional by violating "freedom of religion"). Most of the cases
>that I have seen to come to that conclusion are in the tax area.

I can't knock the Ninth Circuit too much. I was involved in two
pirate broadcast enforcement cases that went up there, and they
ruled in our favor.

Not to be confused with a very recent Federal District of Oregon
holding that even though the Telecomm Act of 1996 provides
otherwise, a local government can deny a permit for erection
of a cellphone tower based solely on aesthetic and NIMBY-whining
grounds. Much as we sideline-watchers wanted them to appeal, the
cellphone company decided not to appeal, picked up their marbles
and started looking elsewhere. It would have been a slam-dunk
reversal, even at the Ninth Circuit.

If you haven't noticed, Judge Alex Kozinski of the Ninth Circuit is
an electronic gadget freak, and insists on getting his hands on a
working model of anything electronic whenever one is involved in a
case before him. I've often wondered why he never got a ham
license.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3171. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:04:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htnfck3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87895

On Mon, 23 Feb 2004 09:35:50 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> The Constitution should never be used to ban any mention of religion in
>this country or this government - not if the "free exercise" clause is truly
>respected.

Does this include jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others who believe and practice a different form of religious practice? I think not. Some of us who believe in a Higher Being (called God, or HaShem, or Allah, or Vishnu, or anything else) also believe that it is wrong to throw it in the face of others.

When I am expected to recite the Pledge - like at the beginning of our ham club meetings - I personally omit certain phrases to make it say: "I pledge allegience to....The United States of America.... One nation...indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Am I unpatriotic? Hardly. My allegience is to the country, not to an object representing the country.

Am I against religion? Hardly - I'm the equivalent of a deacon in our congregation where I lead services on a regular basis.

"Liberty and justice for all" means we each get to do our own thing without impinging on the rights of others.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3172. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:04:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htnfpv4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87894

On Mon, 23 Feb 2004 11:39:21 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:

>Some good points Dwight. The "under God" part, which was added in the
>early 1950's bears inspection though. What was the intent of those who
>added this part? Is there a reason that they chose the word "God"
>instead of "Vishnu" or (take your pick)?

I recall a tale told of Thomas J. Watson, the founder of IBM, who
would walk amongst the employees of his company on Monday morning
and ask whether the employee enjoyed the Minister's sermon on
Sunday. He meant the Minister, not the Priest, the Rabbi, or the
Imam.....

Somehow I remember that Eisenhower got that phrase put in under
pressure from the Knights of Columbus, whose political support he
needed.

>And there is the crux of the matter. I would hazard a guess that the
>same people that find the removal of the words "Under God" a bad thing,
>would bne equally as distressed if they had to say "Under Vishnu" in
>their place.

You are so right, Mike.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3173. Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:06:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87899

It seems that the South African authorities have dropped their recent licencing proposal and replaced it with a new one.

Their existing licencing scheme in South Africa has a Full (ZS call) licence and a Restricted (ZR call) licence, the latter having privileges above 30 MHz only, both taking the same theory test, but the ZS calls having to pass a 12wpm code test. IOW, exactly as the UK A and B licences were back when I first got a UK licence.

The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU code test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third class of licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited HF privileges. This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of comments. No such licence will now be implemented, so don't expect to hear any ZT calls anytime soon.

Instead, they are proposing a dual route to a full licence, offering a choice between either an advanced theory test or a code test for each candidate. This was proposed by many people in many countries whilst there still was an ITU requirement for a code test, but this is the first time I have seen it resurface since it ended. If South Africa does implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to do so.

They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that they would have given to the new licence, to the existing restricted licence instead, without any addtional testing.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3174. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 20:28:12 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aa6cfa07e2eadde989793@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 87900

In article <7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
w4nti@get says...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > No, it's not a political protest thread.
> >
> > Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station
> WAR
> > back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
> >
> > This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio
> station
> > WAR.
> >
> > "...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who
> can
> > send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of
> speed....say
> > the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
> > minute for a short period of time.
> >
> > The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate
> of
> > more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty.
> He
> > must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types
> and
> > siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at
> more
> > than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if
> necessary.
> > He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a
> minute
> > and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."
> >
> > From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested
> they
> > had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate
> of
> > speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and
> receiving
> > manually when the automatic systems would not function.
> >

> > Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,
> W0US
> > and others.
> >
> >
>
> Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Yes indeed - I'm still irked about having to pass the 20WPM code for my extra while a friend of mine skated through when they started lowering the code standards.

Have I taken soldering iron, cutters, etc. to gear? Sure I have. But right now I really don't have the time to homebrew gear.

3175. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-25 21:15:59 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c1j3a8$n7$01$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87901

thanks for answering my questions i had for Larry, Bob,

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:403BCBE3.7080409@ix.netcom.com...
| >
| >
| >
| >Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Liberal?
| >
| Someone who is too generous with taxpayer money to the poor?

what has taxmoney to do with Liberals? Is your current president Liberal?
Maybe thats why he is spending so much money instead of giving it to the
needy in your country. Liberalism is a political direction, a middle way
between the older christian and workers (labour)parties. Not a bad
direction, though they sometimes have a touch of racism or are accused of
that.

|
| >
| >Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Socialist?
| >
| We're not sure here in the USA, but we suspect that it might be bad....

So you think socialistic is the same as communistic? As stated above,
socialist parties (labour parties) were foundet to support the rights of the
working people. Like your big Unions, they are a kind of socialist party, or
at least the beginning of one.

| We were told
| all about evil Godless communism back in the Cold War days though. :-)
| "Better dead than red" "Kill a commie for your mommy"....

Yeah, we were told the same from our grandparents, til all the communist
parties in the world died out, due to lack of members. In Europe, there are
possibly fewer communists, as there are currently in the US.

|
| >
| >
| >
| >Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!
| >
| Chairman Mao of Red China, Kuschiev(sp), Stalin.

Good pick, but all SK . Though China still is one of their last bulwarks.
Russia has no communist government any more. Albania still is, North Corea,

Cuba, and one or the other republic in Africa.

|
| AFAIK, every comunist country was a dictatorship, no exceptions. I
| don't know why, but it seemed to always work out that way.

But there
| were also anti-communist dictatorships as well. Not that those were
| any better.
|
No, even worse. Mostly in the arabic countries. We, you and me, would call all of the arabian kingdoms, emirates, sheikdoms dictatorships. It is not only one man dictating, it is one family. Lybia, pre 2003-Iraq, Iran, ...

| >
| >For me it is kind of rediculous expressing this sort of opinion
throughout
| >the world, and then signing with a HAM-call.
| >
| Don't you guys have a 1st Ammendment over there?.....

Yes, we have constitutions in our countries and in the European Union. I don't know if there are any ammendments. What you reffering to is freedom of speech? No, there are no restrictions in that. But one has to stay for that what one is saying. And if that is bad, one has to "pay" for that bad behavior. Like Larry. It is not to supress his opinion or the disagreement, it is the words and the soul and the bad spirit coming out of his lines. The way he acts here on Usenet against other HAMS shows how he is acting on the bands. This makes not the best image of an american ham, on a newsgroup which is read throughout the world. It damages the reputation of Amateur Radio. Period.

Nobody will be able to stop your FCC from doing, what they want to do. Even when your first amendum gives you the right to argue or disput. They dont have to follow any of the proposals. I think, they just want to find out, if the way they are trying to lead the boat is not too far out of the compass. And their decission is already in their drawer.

Take care, Bob,

73 de Helmut
OE8SOQ
Echolink node # 107658
CALLSIGN-AT-QSL.NET

|
| >
| >
| >
|

3176. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 00:00:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040225190012.22081.00004298@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 87902

In article <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU code
>test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third class of
>licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited HF privileges.

Why was this a "truly bizarre way"?

>This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of
>comments.

Democracy in action.

>No such licence will now be implemented, so don't expect to
>hear any ZT calls anytime soon.
>
>Instead, they are proposing a dual route to a full licence, offering a
>choice between either an advanced theory test or a code test for each
>candidate. This was proposed by many people in many countries whilst
>there still was an ITU requirement for a code test, but this is the first
>time I have seen it resurface since it ended.

Sounds like a very reasonable compromise.

>If South Africa does
>implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to do so.

Why? Perhaps it could be a way out of the constant arguments. It wasn't
possible before, due to the treaty.
>
>They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that they
>would have given to the new licence, to the existing restricted licence
>instead, without any addtional testing.

How many has in South Africa, anyway?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3177. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 01:59:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040225205952.07155.00000938@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87903

In article <xnfcneeyarg.htnfck3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> "Liberty and justice for all" means we each get to do our own thing
> without impinging on the rights of others.

...except in U.S. amateur radio where one MUST test for morse even
though morse operation isn't a lawful mandate.

LHA / WMD

3178. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 01:59:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040225205952.07155.00000939@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 87904

In article <xnfcneeyarg.htnes22.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> If you haven't noticed, Judge Alex Kozinski of the Ninth Circuit is
> an electronic gadget freak, and insists on getting his hands on a
> working model of anything electronic whenever one is involved in a
> case before him. I've often wondered why he never got a ham
> license.

...he might have been handed a code key during a case, found
it abhorent, therefore never beep-tested in front of a VE (who
doesn't need to be admitted to any bar). :-)

LHA / WMD

3179. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:03:53 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qdqdnQbPeI-OyaDdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87905
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Newsgroup Lurker" <none@none.net> wrote in message
> news:c1fvk5$1isqa6$1@ID-59690.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
>>I purchased a hand held antenna from Burghardt and was charged $15.00 for
>>UPS Ground. They don't notify of shipping charges until you receive it, at
>>least the time I ordered.
>>
>>Honestly that was my problem since I didn't ask. The truth of it is, that
>
> is
>
>>far to expensive to charge. Keep product costs down, make up the
>
> difference
>
>>in shipping I guess.
>>
>>
>
>
> Shipping costs include more than just the UPS charge. Someone's got to take
> the time to package it in a suitable container and with suitable packing
> materials and pay for that time and those materials.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Actually, shipping/handling is the latest way that companies are dealing
with cut-throat discount online pricing. Do a search at www.mysimon.com
and compare prices with, and without, s/h charges. Very enlightening.

Interestingly, HRO does pretty well for ham gear, but maybe because of
the handful of competitors for big ticket items.

Dave
KZ1O

--
This file is PureMail protected. To reply to the sender,
you MUST include this in the subject line:

RNWENK29CD 04/01/2004

(without that string in the subject, your
message will be deleted, unread)

3180. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:17:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402251817.280470a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87906

Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message news:<1077731552.809234@news.liwest.at>...
>
> If you are for or against code tests, fighting against
> BPL should unite all amateurs!
>
> /ralph

Ralph, one would hope so, but not in America. The PCTA are too [expletive deleted] analcentric to be distracted by BPL. See the "War! What is it good for?" thread. 1942-style radiomanship. Good grief.

3181. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:23:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402251823.1673ec89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87907

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> No, it's not a political protest thread.
>
> Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station WAR
> back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
>
> This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio station
> WAR.
>
> "...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who can
> send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of speed....say
> the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
> minute for a short period of time.
>
> The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate of
> more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty. He
> must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types and
> siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at more
> than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if necessary.
> He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a minute
> and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."
>
> From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested they
> had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate of
> speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and receiving
> manually when the automatic systems would not function.
>
> Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US
> and others.

Nice trip down mammary lane, but what has this to do with amateur radio?

3182. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:29:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402251829.32a33ffc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87908

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > No, it's not a political protest thread.
> >
> > Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station
> WAR
> > back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
> >
> > This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio
> station
> > WAR.
> >
> > "...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who
> can
> > send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of
> speed....say
> > the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
> > minute for a short period of time.
> >
> > The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate
> of
> > more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty.
> He
> > must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types
> and
> > siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at
> more
> > than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if
> necessary.
> > He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a
> minute
> > and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."
> >
> > From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested
> they
> > had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate
> of
> > speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and
> receiving
> > manually when the automatic systems would not function.
> >
> > Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,

> W0US
> > and others.
> >
> >
>
> Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Not real hams. Amateur Radio was suspended at the time, unless you consider a real ham to be one without operating priveleges.

And hopefully they weren't operating WAR using W3GRF, W0DX, W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US, or other callsigns.

3183. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:31:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IUc%b.20652$W74.8127@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87909

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > (snip) The intent, as I understand it, was
> > to restore some basic standard of values
> > to this country.
>
> Then it is a religious thing.

Not necessarily. Values are not just limited to religion, but religion is one place to find the basic values all wrapped up in a neat little package (and in two little words - "under God").

> (snip) It didn't happen. Seems the 10,000
> people didn't materialize. That's a good
> thing in my book. Even though this seems to
> argue for your point, (snip)

Yes, it does. So I'll leave it at that.

> (snip) i personally think that a pledge or
> affirmation to the country is a fine thing,
> and support it wholeheartedly. However,
> to insert something that you are saying is
> *not* a pledge into a pledge is awkward
> at best, and besides, I don't believe that.

Actually, I don't remember saying anything about anything being or not being a pledge, so perhaps it's a good thing that you don't believe whatever you're talking about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3184. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:39:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402251839.1fb50c7c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87910

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402241901.64fa03b1@posting.google.com>...
> "Flip-flop", Brain?
>
> How do you get that from the post (requoted in it's entirety
> here)...???

Posted with enough information that you just might get it.

> The "disincentive" to which he refers is to taking a test for
> which there is no REGULATORY requirement...

The Morse Exam has been a regulatory requirement since 1912. TAFKA
Rev Jim has fought to keep it a regulatory requirement while many
others have called it a disincentive (obstacle, hurdle, etc). Now
that you propose that the Morse Exam be kept for access to the lowest
100 KHz of each band, he says it's a disincentive.

> Where's the "flip-flop", other than the ones you wear in the
> shower?

You stay out of my shower.

> Steve, K4YZ

Read it again, Steve.

bb

> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402221659.54fa5de@posting.google.com>...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dMYZb.14259$W74.13072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Do the petitioners believe that if a General or Advanced
> > > doesn't pass a code test that he/she wouldn't be
> > > allowed by the FCC to operate morse?
> > >
> > > What am I missing here?
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Bill, your question reminds me of a scenario painted by Steve, to
> > which TAFKA Rev Jim responded below. It is very enlightening to see
> > that after a decade of saying that the Morse Code Exam was no barrier
> > at all to the Amateur Service, he pipes in with a new theory - that a

> > Morse Exam is a disincentive to the use of CW on HF.
> >
> > Thought you might enjoy the flip-flop.
> >
> > bb
> > ----------------
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0401311514.1367bcef@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040131104951.02537.00002765@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > > > > Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > > > tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > >
> > > > Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as an
> > > > incentive to use voice only!
> > >
> > > Ahem, The Amateur Formerly Known As Rev. Jim, we've had that very same
> > > or greater disincentive since 1912.
> > >
> > > Why is it NOW a problem?
> >
> > Why?
> > ----------------

3185. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 02:50:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402251850.160d4e3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87911

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>...
> To give you a lough for the day, and maybe you fell better about your fuel
> prices:
>
> Gernerally, fuel prices over here in EU are around 1,00 Euro PER LITER
> (quarter gallon), so don't complain about high prices.

Your high prices are because of punitive taxation by your elected
governments.

Though almost 50%
> driving diesel (abt 0,80 euros /liter) powered vehicles (exluding commercial
> trucks), we also have this price differences within short range.
> Szenario: Driving from Venice/IT to Prague/Tschechnia (400 miles) fill up in
> venice for 1.09, next stop near Vienna/Austria you pay only 0.65 and in
> prague you can get hte liter of diesel for slightly over 50 cents.
> They (Oil Companies) use the same excuse for the different prices as they do
> over there at your side. BTW, ESSO and MOBILE also are the most expensive
> brands over here.

In central Ohio, the price of gas fluctuates +/- .25 every week. My
dad goes to Florida each winter, the price of gas fluctuates there +/-
0.

> Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
> manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
> vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.

They only dump the showboats on the USA because Bill Clinton/Algore
forgot to renew the EPA Fleet Miles Per Gallon requirements. They
were [expletive deleted] idiots. So much for "Earth in the Balance!"

> Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70. And their
> performance is not less the gas engines.
>
> So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into
> your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
> You know, you are filling up CHEAP.

We pay for our fuel in different ways. I don't see too many EU
soldiers trying to keep the flow of oil moving out of the mideast.

> Greetings from Austria
>
> 73 de OE8SOQ
> Helmut

bb

3186. Re: Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 03:03:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Kld%b.988$qK4.205@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 87912

Yep, but don't forget that OPEC just cut production. They tie the price of oil to US dollars - and the US dollar is falling against most currencies, so they want more dollars so they aren't loosing purchasing power. Ever wonder why the US dollar is falling?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote in message news:03ca0dded9176f960cee121922eef6c1@cypherpunks.to...
> Mobil/Exxon posted the largest profit in history, last quarter! You can't
> boycott all gasoline...but you CAN boycott the largest company! Don't buy
> gas, don't buy snacks, don't buy coffe from these folks. Let 'em know
> you're mad as hell and not going to take it anymore!
>
> And for any of you truck drivers, if you want to take part in a transport
> shut down like they did in England a few years back, you have my blessing.
> Just give us a little warning before hand so we can all stock up on groceries.
>
> *Why would Bush allow these high gas prices to ruin his economic recovery?
> Cuz he's gonna take one "for the team". He's going to take a dive for the
> Republicans so the Clinton's won't be able to take the White House in four
> years......
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.595 / Virus Database: 378 - Release Date: 2/25/04

3187. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 03:14:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Nwd%b.20692$W74.1998@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87913

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > The Constitution should never be used
> > to ban any mention of religion in this
> > country or this government - not if the
> > "free exercise" clause is truly respected.
>
>
> Does this include jamming one form of
> religious practice down the throats of others
> who believe and practice a different form of
> religious practice? I think not. (snip)

Don't be silly, Phil. Having to say the word "God" occasionally is hardly "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others." This is especially so in your case since you supposedly worship the same God.

> Some of us who believe in a Higher Being
> (called God, or HaShem, or Allah, or
> Vishnu, or anything else) also believe that
> it is wrong to throw it in the face of others.

Well, you're certainly right that it is just "some of" you - a darn few "some of" you. Want to take a look at your religion as an example? A good place to start might be the efforts to push American food makers to produce food products in compliance with Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol found on most canned and other food products), especially since very few other religions would have the utter audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the food of a nation without first fully informing the people.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3188. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 03:31:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Y5GdnfL3FZct9aDdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87914

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>>(snip) The intent, as I understand it, was
>>>to restore some basic standard of values
>>>to this country.
>>
>>Then it is a religious thing.
>
>
>
> Not necessarily. Values are not just limited to religion, but religion is
> one place to find the basic values all wrapped up in a neat little package
> (and in two little words - "under God").
>
>
>
>>(snip) It didn't happen. Seems the 10,000
>>people didn't materialize. That's a good
>>thing in my book. Even though this seems to
>>argue for your point, (snip)
>
>
>
> Yes, it does. So I'll leave it at that.
>
>
>
>>(snip) i personally think that a pledge or
>>affirmation to the country is a fine thing,
>>and support it wholeheartedly. However,
>>to insert something that you are saying is
>>*not* a pledge into a pledge is awkward
>>at best, and besides, I don't believe that.
>
>
>
> Actually, I don't remember saying anything about anything being or not
> being a pledge, so perhaps it's a good thing that you don't believe whatever
> you're talking about.

You wrote:

>> The words "under God" do not establish a religion. Since many
>> religions believe in a God, no religion is established. Specific
>>government recognition of religions which don't believe in a God,
>>while placing "speech" limits on religions which do, would violate
>>the "establishment" clause in the first case and the "free exercise"
>>clause in the second. Government enforced removal of all mention of
>>religion would also violate the "free exercise" clause (and the "free
>>speech" clause).

I pulled my statement out of what you wrote.

Would pulling the words "Under God" out of the POA be a violation of Fundamentalist Christians free speech?

Is the POA a pledge or what? When I say it I reaffirm my loayalty to my country.

Do you support forcing patriotic agnostics, atheists, and members of other religions, and those christions that actually pay attention to the sermon on the mount to pledge to something else while they are pledging to their country?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3189. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 04:25:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <n6adnUFQ_ee06KDdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87915

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Phil Kane" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>> The Constitution should never be used
>>>to ban any mention of religion in this
>>>country or this government - not if the
>>>"free exercise" clause is truly respected.
>>
>>
>> Does this include jamming one form of
>>religious practice down the throats of others
>>who believe and practice a different form of
>>religious practice? I think not. (snip)
>
>
>
> Don't be silly, Phil. Having to say the word "God" occasionally is hardly
> "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others." This is
> especially so in your case since you supposedly worship the same God.

You do realize that a fair number of Christians find the act of
pledging to God offensive also?

There is not only one form of Christianity, and it's also not only
fundamentalism.

>
>
>>Some of us who believe in a Higher Being
>>(called God, or HaShem, or Allah, or
>>Vishnu, or anything else) also believe that
>>it is wrong to throw it in the face of others.
>
>
>
> Well, you're certainly right that it is just "some of" you - a darn few
> "some of" you. Want to take a look at your religion as an example? A good
> place to start might be the efforts to push American food makers to produce
> food products in compliance with Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol
> found on most canned and other food products), especially since very few
> other religions would have the utter audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the
> food of a nation without first fully informing the people.

If a person doesn't want to buy Kosher food, there is plenty of other options. Unfortunately, there is only one pledge of allegiance.

Many religions practice dietary restrictions and qualifications. From Catholic to Jewish to Baptist to Hindu to Moslem.

A side note. There was just a story in the local paper about this subject. In addition to the more well known Kosher restrictions, there are a few butcher shops around our area that allow local Moslems to kill the animal in the traditional method.

And if nothing else, it is a standard of quality that is sorely lacking, unless you like manure marinated chicken, which you might just get if you don't buy Kosher.

A few points here too while we're at it.

You find audacity in a group asking for food to be prepared in a way in which their religion finds acceptable yet find no problem for wording that another group demands put into a pledge that all are expected to take? Yeah, I know it's isn't mandatory - but just ask the kid in my school who got beat up every day because he wouldn't say it. Oh yeah, he caved after a while and said it. The fundies won didn't they? All they did was prove to a kid that "Christians" will beat ya up if you don't pledge to their God. Same "Christians" in our school district kept our Sex ed so watered down as to be unrecognizable(don't worry though, anytime a girl got pregnant they were quick to blame it on the sex ed classes) and forbade any reference to evolution in the curriculum.

Wouldn't it just be better if he had a pledge to his country that didn't include the religion?

And for me eating Kosher food is just a reflection that it is generally pretty good food, as most of the preparation of the food enhances the taste and certainly the cleanliness, and finally, it is a relatively humane method of killing the animals.

Wow! Look at what they are "forcing" on us!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3190. Re: still lookin for big rig

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 05:00:06 UTC
From: "John W. Hart" <chahta@chahtatushka.org>
Message-ID: <q3f%b.8517$yZ1.7265@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87916

"3898 khz" <anon@motosikleman.net> wrote in message
news:c1iuukpbq0@pita.alt.net...
> hey! i still gotta get me a big rig an the best one i heard tellin
> is the BC-610 the BC610 is good for takin cared of CB
> poblems and will prolly take care any 75 metur poblems
> to. so, where can i getta BC 610???????
>
> tnx and good numers to ya. 73
> you can fine me any nite on 3898 or 3860
> that is 75 metur channul i thank
>
>
>
>

Hell, you'd be better off with a CB set! That damn BC 610 was a plate modulated AM transmitter, and saturated every conductor, telephone, radio receiver, and TV with harmonics within two miles! Piece of junk!

3191. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 05:12:05 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <theletter_k_andthenumeral_4_doh@unclaimedmysteries.net>
Message-ID: <Fef%b.22083$hm4.241@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87917

William wrote:

> Nice trip down mammary lane, but what has this to do with amateur radio?

Excellent work netdeputy. Poster is off-topic and I do believe the
clever title, despite his disclaimer, shows his true colors as a
lily-livered peacenik terrorsymp THREAT. I say we both turn him in, and
split the 500 Patriot Points we'll revceive for bagging this traitor.

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"Religion isn't the opiate of the masses. When
properly used, religion is the methamphetamine
of the masses." - nu-monet v6.0 in alt.slack

3192. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 05:35:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8Af%b.22132$hm4.1207@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87918

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I pulled my statement out of what you wrote.

Which made no comment whatsoever about it being or not being a pledge. My comments addressed two words.

> Would pulling the words "Under God" out
> of the POA be a violation of Fundamentalist
> Christians free speech?
>
> Is the POA a pledge or what? When I say
> it I reaffirm my loayalty to my
> country.
>
> Do you support forcing patriotic agnostics,
> atheists, and members of other religions, and
> those christions that actually pay attention to
> the sermon on the mount to pledge to
> something else while they are pledging to their
> country?

Be serious, Mike. Nobody today is required or forced to say the Pledge of Allegiance or even a single word in it. Therefore, nobody is "forcing" agnostics, atheists, or anyone else, to do anything. If you don't like the words "under God," don't say them. But don't attempt to force others not to say them, which is exactly the goal of those trying to remove those words.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3193. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 06:09:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040226010915.21232.00004474@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 87919

In article <1e4e3692.0402251823.1673ec89@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> No, it's not a political protest thread.
>>
>> Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station
WAR
>> back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
>>
>> This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio
station
>> WAR.
>>
>> "...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who
can
>> send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of
speed....say
>> the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
>> minute for a short period of time.
>>
>> The radio operator on duty at WAR must send or receive or both at a rate of
>> more than fifty words a minute during the eight hours of his tour of duty.
He
>> must understand the delicate equipment such as teletypwriters, radio types
>and
>> siphon recording equipment. He must be able to read manual signals at more
>> than thirty words a minute and to handle traffic at this speed if necessary.

>> He must be able to read from recording tape at more than fifty words a
minute
>> and he must be able to operate a teletype machine..."
>>
>> From [the author's] recollection in 1942 when WAR operators were tested they
>> had to touchtype at 100 wpm, use a Kleinschmidt perforator at a high rate of
>> speed and copy recorded slip tape at 100 wpm as well as sending and
receiving
>> manually when the automatic systems would not function.
>>
>> Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,
>W0US
>> and others.
>
>Nice trip down mammary lane, but what has this to do with amateur radio?

TAFKARJ is trying to "prove" something by connecting SK hams with the U.S. Army and Washington Army Radio of early 1942.

He "proves" absolutely nothing other than vainly trying to promote old, old ways to do things as those for the now and future of amateur radio. Very silly effort considering the actual recorded history of the U.S. and military radio communications.

It's worse than that considering TAFKARJ was never in the U.S. military and has no experience in any era of military radio. All he has is Faith in His Calling To The Code...therefore all must Believe as He Believes. Poor guy is stuck forever in ancient radio of before his time and can't get back into the reality of today. All must remain in the standards and practices of before his birth.

In one way I can't blame him. No experience with the military forces him to rely on anecdotal stories and tales from others who weren't there, either. But, those websites with anecdotal stories and tales are sufficiently tangible that they are used as references for His version of the Truth.

His False Belief is that the U.S. military "still uses morse code" and that is almost unshakable because He champions morse code, therefore all the righteous must be using his Favorite Mode. Reality is that the U.S. military gave up on morse modes some time ago, all branches. The last branch to "use" it was the Coast Guard in their monitoring of the 500 KHz International Maritime Disaster Frequency. That went away after the maritime community cut in the GMDSS; the system that the maritime community itself proposed. The USCG stopped monitoring. End of an era, but not of the many good services performed by the USCG.

Jimmie will probably try ten kinds of wordplay to reinforce His Belief by saying "the U.S. military still uses morse code" since Fort Huachuca still has morse code classes. By selectively omitting that such training is for intelligence-gathering by message intercepts, he thinks he is winning some kind of point. He doesn't. Interception of messages is NOT communications by radio, just more of the many kinds of intelligence gathering done by the major powers through both military and government intelligence community personnel.

ARRL has long been waving the U.S. flag with stock propaganda phrases about "hams serving the country in time of need" and so forth to "illustrate" something. Such propaganda (self-serving) does nothing more than show the ARRL itself hasn't "served" anyone but themselves. Military radio communications prior to 1942 MAY have been somewhat close to amateur radio practice (amateurs did not then nor later send five-letter groups in encyphered messages as the militaries did), but that changed radically once WW2 staffing and stocking went into overdrive after the USA commitment to the war effort.

Washington Army Radio of 1944 was so radically different from what it had been in 1941 that there is no real comparison. By 1944 it had

organized into the beginning of an INTEGRATED communications hub, a center for all Army networks. Ten or twenty amateur NTSs wouldn't have been near enough to serve the nation's needs then.

Washington Army Radio of 1954 was again so different from 1944 that it can't be explained adequately in words. It needs pictures, indeed a whole book to show enough. Yes, there were amateur radio licensees serving but they were NOT using any amateur practices. Everyone did the professional thing to "Get the message through." The messages got through...by the millions, annually.

The era of network centers is diminishing and has been since AUTOVON and AUTODIN began...to eventually be replaced by the DSN or Digital Switched Network, "the government's own Internet." DSN serves telephones, facsimiles, PCs, workstations, PBXs, and can use HF radio as 2nd or 3rd contingency plan. Normally it uses high-rate fiber cable and satellite relay plus commercial leased communications services. DSN can be as secure as mid-level security allows courtesy of the tremendous advances in Information Theory and methods of cryptology opened from that. By tradition the U.S. Army handles operation-maintenance of the DSN on land with help from the USAF where their bases tie in. The Army has battalions and brigades organized and equipped to provide mobile telephone/data/FAX/image communications in the same spirit. The messages get through. Morse code isn't used, isn't wanted, is too slow, is too insecure, is too full of potential errors to trust.

Code lovers can't accept that, may never accept it since it spoils their self-image of important communicators. They bitterly resent removal of the "tested at twenty" old top level rank-status-privilege in their "service." To ease their bitterness they resort to the imagery of some kind of Tolkien-like Middle Earth to attempt stressing the "importance" of good radiotelegraphy through old tales and anecdotes of long ago. None apply now in any radio service but they cannot give up...all must capitulate to Them and Their Beliefs.

LHA / WMD

3194. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 07:46:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7vh%b.22329$hm4.15130@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87920

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > (snip)
>
> You do realize that a fair number of
> Christians find the act of pledging to
> God offensive also?

I've met many Christians over the years and have yet to hear one say any such thing.

> > Well, you're certainly right that it is
> > just "some of" you - a darn few "some
> > of" you. Want to take a look at your
> > religion as an example? A good place
> > to start might be the efforts to push
> > American food makers to produce
> > food products in compliance with
> > Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol
> > found on most canned and other food
> > products), especially since very few
> > other religions would have the utter
> > audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the
> > food of a nation without first fully
> > informing the people.

By the way, I forgot to add the words "literally jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others" to the end of the paragraph above (playing on Phil's claim that Christians are "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others").

> If a person doesn't want to buy Kosher
> food, there is plenty of other options.
> Unfortunately, there is only one pledge
> of allegiance.

Since so few people are even aware of the practice, they're not given the option to choose. Based on my discussions with many people over the years, few know the little "K" symbol on, for examples, the cans of tomato sauce, tomato paste, Kraft Miracle Whip, or whatever, means it was prepared according to Jewish religious dietary law (Kosher). Even if they did, they would find it very difficult to find an alternative today. According to one Kosher licensing organization (Kof-K Kosher Supervision), there are about 75,000 Kosher-certified food products and about 160,000 Kosher-certified ingredients available in the United States today. Those numbers clearly

suggest the vast majority of products on grocery store shelves today are Kosher.

> Many religions practice dietary restrictions
> and qualifications. From Catholic to Jewish
> to Baptist to Hindu to Moslem.

There is a huge difference between having personal eating habits which conform to a religious belief and pushing food manufacturers nation-wide to adopt your religion's food laws (and hiding that from consumers). I have yet to see a "C" for Christian or "M" for Moslem on any commercial food products in this country (or any other country). That little "K" symbol is commonplace on grocery store shelves in this country today.

> A side note. There was just a story in the
> local paper about this subject. In addition
> to the more well known Kosher restrictions,
> there are a few butcher shops around our
> area that allow local Moslems to kill the
> animal in the traditional method.

I'm not talking about speciality butcher shops. I'm talking about the commercial food products found in mainstream grocery stores such as WalMart, Win Dixie, Food Lion, Krogers, Bi-Lo, and others.

> And if nothing else, it is a standard of quality
> that is sorely lacking, unless you like manure
> marinated chicken, which you might just get
> if you don't buy Kosher.

Quality food was prepared in this country long before this Kosher practice started. Indeed, in my opinion, the food just twenty or thirty years ago was much better. Food based diseases are more frequent compared to just three decades ago. The quality of beef today is appalling. Pork has almost disappeared from resturants. And I truly miss a real, old fashioned, hot dog with pork instead of turkey or beef (or the fake pork found in the new "pork" hot dogs today).

> You find audacity in a group asking for
> food to be prepared in a way in which
> their religion finds acceptable yet find
> no problem for wording that another
> group demands put into a pledge that
> all are expected to take? Yeah, I know
> it's isn't mandatory (snip)

And you find two words in a non-mandatory pledge equal in audacity to attempts to manipulate the food we eat in this country?

> And for me eating Kosher food is just a
> reflection that it is generally pretty good
> food, as most of the preparation of the
> food enhances the taste and certainly the

> cleanliness, and finally, it is a relatively
> humane method of killing the animals.

Kosher certification addresses Jewish religious or spiritual requirements - Jewish dietary laws concerning processed fruits and vegetables, animals that are non-ruminant (no pork), non-domesticated birds, seafood without scales or fins, the removal of blood from meats, the mixing of milk and meat, the use of a Rabbi for the slaughter of animals and for certain parts of the production of hard cheeses and grape products (wine and so on), equipment used to prepare Kosher foods, the purchase of a license to use the "K" symbol on the company's products, and so on. There is very little in any of this which specifically insures the quality, taste, or physical (not spiritual) cleanliness of the various products.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3195. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 10:55:59 UTC
From: charlinessex@msn.com
Message-ID: <348b0f38.0402260255.5c98be78@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87921
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I've been a customer of Universal Radio for well over
10 years and always received cureous and polite service.
I find using the 800 order line makes everything faster
moving. I recently purchased an Icom-R75, ordering it on
a Saturday, having the DSP optioned installed (they do it for free
and it eliminates any warantee problems). They intalled the DSP module
on Mpnday and shipped it Tuesday, I received the receiver Thursday
and it works as I expected-good. The receipt shows that Universal installed
the DSP unit and is under full warantee. I's reccoment Universa Radio without
a second thought. Grove, Lentini and AES are also very reliable
as is R&L I've used them all with good results
CB

3196. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 11:51:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87922

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040225190012.22081.00004298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU code
> >test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third class of
> >licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited HF privileges.
>
> Why was this a "truly bizarre way"?

TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
coded license. Bizarre.

> >This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of
> >comments.
>
> Democracy in action.

You almost got it right. Should be "Democracy inaction."

> >No such licence will now be implemented, so don't expect to
> >hear any ZT calls anytime soon.
> >
> >Instead, they are proposing a dual route to a full licence, offering a
> >choice between either an advanced theory test or a code test for each
> >candidate. This was proposed by many people in many countries whilst
> >there still was an ITU requirement for a code test, but this is the first
> >time I have seen it resurface since it ended.
>
> Sounds like a very reasonable compromise.

Then why did they initially suggest a third coded license? Why did
that generate a "large number of comments?"

> >If South Africa does
> >implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to do so.
>
> Why? Perhaps it could be a way out of the constant arguments. It wasn't
> possible before, due to the treaty.

TAFKA Rev Jim, the constant arguments can be gotten out of by letting
go.

> >They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that they
> >would have given to the new licence, to the existing restricted licence

> >instead, without any addtional testing.
>
> How many has in South Africa, anyway?

huh?

3197. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 12:39:58 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c1kpes$t09$06$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87923

Servus, Ralph,

hast du noch nicht gemerkt, daï¿½ hier in der Gruppe fast nur Idioten schreiben? Ameri-Egoisten die glauben, die sind der Nabel der Welt. Warum geht es ï¿½berall sonst in der Welt ohne diese depperte Morsediskussion reibungslos ï¿½ber die Bï¿½hne?

Anstatt daï¿½ die amerikanischen Funkfreunde hergehen, die Unterstï¿½tzung der nationalen Sicherheitsorganisationen wie FEMA und Homeland Security, National Huricane Center oder ï¿½hnlichen Gruppierungen suchen, versucht die nationale amerikanische Amateurfunkervereinigung (sind ï¿½brigens nur ca 20% der Amateurfunker in Amerika Mitglied) da selbst etwas auf die Beine zu stellen. Sieh Dir unser Beispiel Linz an, da hat auch das Rote Kreuz mit den Beschwerden dem Ganzen einen "offiziellen" Anstrich verliehen. Und die Gegenklage der PLC - Betreiber muï¿½ ja erst einmal abgewartet werden, was da herauskommt.

Jedenfalls ist es sehr lustig, hier zu lesen, und manchmal wundere ich mich schon ein biï¿½chen, wie Leute mit null Bildung ï¿½berhaupt eine Lizenz erwerben kï¿½nnen. Da wissen doch die Wenigsten, was auï¿½erhalb der eigenen Zaunpfosten los ist. Die glauben doch tatsï¿½chlich, ihre Soldaten sterben im Irak fï¿½r das ï¿½l, damit sie billiger tanken kï¿½nnen. (Siehe EXXON + Mobil Thread).

Schï¿½nen Tag noch und 73
de OE8SOQ
Helmut

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:1e4e3692.0402251817.280470a3@posting.google.com...
| Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message
news:<1077731552.809234@news.liwest.at>...
| >
| > If you are for or against code tests, fighting against
| > BPL should unite all amateurs!
| >
| > /ralph
|
| Ralph, one would hope so, but not in America. The PCTA are too
| [expletive deleted] analcentric to be distracted by BPL. See the
| "War! What is it good for?" thread. 1942-style radiomanship. Good
| grief.

3198. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 15:42:22 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns949B6CE29AB17elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87924

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com:

> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20040225190012.22081.00004298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU code
>> >test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third class
>> >of licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited HF
>> >privileges.
>>
>> Why was this a "truly bizarre way"?
>
> TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
> licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
> coded license. Bizarre.
>
>> >This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of
>> >comments.
>>
>> Democracy in action.
>
> You almost got it right. Should be "Democracy inaction."
>
>> >No such licence will now be implemented, so don't expect to
>> >hear any ZT calls anytime soon.
>> >
>> >Instead, they are proposing a dual route to a full licence, offering
>> >a choice between either an advanced theory test or a code test for
>> >each candidate. This was proposed by many people in many countries
>> >whilst there still was an ITU requirement for a code test, but this
>> >is the first time I have seen it resurface since it ended.
>>
>> Sounds like a very reasonable compromise.
>
> Then why did they initially suggest a third coded license? Why did
> that generate a "large number of comments?"
>
>> >If South Africa does
>> >implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to do
>> >so.
>>

>> Why? Perhaps it could be a way out of the constant arguments. It
>> wasn't possible before, due to the treaty.
>
> TAFKA Rev Jim, the constant arguments can be gotten out of by letting
> go.
>
>> >They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that
>> >they would have given to the new licence, to the existing restricted
>> >licence instead, without any addtional testing.
>>
>> How many has in South Africa, anyway?
>
> huh?
>

Not quite right, the ZR licence is no-code, but yes, it is bizarre to greet the end of the code requirement by suggesting a new licence with a code test.

And Jim, I didn't say it was a bad idea to have a dual track system with code and theory alternatives. It's actually quite a good one. No doubt now someone will put that in petition number 18, or whatever number we are up to now.

I won't though, because it isn't going to happen. We don't know exactly what the FCC will do, but we do know two things that they are on record as saying:-

1) They don't beleive that the code test serves a useful purpose;

2) They won't rearrange subbands until a consensus emerges amongst us.

So, we do know really (although some are in denial) that the NPRM will dump Element 1 completely.

We can be rather less sure what it will do to reform the unnecessary proliferation of licence classes, and the equally unneccessary slicing and dicing of the ham bands that goes with it. I hope it might do something in this regard, but it is perhaps more likely that it will do nothing, or at least as little as possible, as they probably will decide that we still don't agree with oneanother.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3199. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 15:50:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E15E2.88F23DC9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87925

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Way back in 1958 any U.S. civilian could get on HF without any
> code test or ANY other test. :-) Been that way ever since.

If playing in the Citizen's Band sandbox is what appeals to you, Leonard, then on with your fun.

> SGC's SG-2020 HF transceiver is sold to private boat owners who
> don't have to take any morse test to operate it legally on HF. Not
> even if they buy power amplifiers to boost 20 W output to 400 W.

If buying a boat in order to be able to operate marine radio equipment as a secondary hobby is what turns you on, go for it.

> Many, many, many government and military personnel operate on
> HF quite legally every day without having to take any morse test
> to "prove their technical ability" to be a "skilled radio operator."

You're a little old to re-up, Leonard but if you can obtain an age waiver, I'm sure the military folks won't mind if you want to work some military DX or chew the fat with a military station in Germany. Have a blast.

> Nope...in the US of A radio amateurs aren't "real" hams until they
> pass that archaic morse test...sez the "amateur community."

One thing is for certain. Military ops, boat owners, CBer's and the like aren't radio amateurs until they pass an amateur radio license exam. Those others folks aren't a part of that "amateur radio community" unless or until they do so. You should have that drill down by now.

Dave K8MN

3200. Re: proposed telegraphy alphabet for LOTR tengwar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 15:54:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E16B1.2894073D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87926

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <%fk_b.17843$hm4.17675@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >> (snip) --- from an Appendix of the Orange
> >> Catholic Bible published in 16,391, Princess
> >> Irulan and F. Herbert, editors.
> > >
> > Thanks for that fine recount of those events. We all benefit from repeated
> >looks at the past.
>
> Anyone who has NOT read Frank Herbert's "Dune" novel wouldn't
> understand 'Orange Catholic Bible' or 'Princess Irulan.' :-)
>
> Very few of the "servicemen" taking everything ultra-seriously in
> here seem to read anything but QST ads. :-)

I almost forgot, Len. You're the only guy capable of reading a book.
You're the only guy who knows anything about electronics. You're the
only guy who was ever in the U.S. military. You're quite a fellow.

Aren't you also the guy who hasn't achieved that "Extra right out of the
box" he crowed about several years back? What? Not even a Technician
"right out of the box"?

Dave K8MN

3201. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 16:13:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E1B2C.F950B150@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87927

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >
> > > > I believe there are a good number of family member techs
> > > > who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.
> > >
> > > Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
> > > (people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members, not
> > > because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
> > > disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage. FRS/GMRS
> > > took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
> > > for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason for
> > > the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.
> >
> > Overheard on a 2m repeater in this area of the Ohio Valley yesterday:
> >
> > "KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".
> >
> > "KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"
> >
> > "I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
> > or somthing".
> >
> > "Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".
> >
> > "Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
> > will talk this far from each other".
> >
> > It is a brave new world of amateur radio.
>
> Dave,
>
> Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
> parties involved?
>
> Now before answering, consider this:
```

>
> 1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
> 2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
> secret code.
> 3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.

They certainly understood each other. Neither understood the concept of a repeater. Now, to what I understand: I understand that both of these ops have brought their bad habits from CB radio with them. Neither has bothered to listen to other hams. These two were joined by a new YL op the other day. She was a "do you want me to pick up bread and milk?" type. I'll be very surprised if any of the three will be active on the ham bands in five years.

> Who cares about how we dialog with each other
> as long as the parties involved are operating within the
> law as per Part 97 rules and regs?

I do.

We've even got a new op who can be heard moving between the several local repeaters for a goodly part of each day saying, "This is KC8*** radio check". He'll sometimes pull this stunt on top of an ongoing QSO. He has been informed on a number of occasions about how to make it clear that he is seeking a contact and how not to QRM an existing contact but he persists. When he does enter a QSO, he normally asks the individuals he contacts if they have any radios they'd like to part with. He has now asked me about six times. This fellow is annoying and others--old timers and recent licensees--are beginning to avoid him.

There is another new ham in the area who was previously a CBer. He was licensed only this past May. He quickly became adjusted to how things are done on the ham bands. He asks questions about antennas, modes other than FM, bands other than 2m and about operating practices. He aroused interest in his grandson, who is now licensed. I'm betting that these two will stick.

Dave K8MN

3202. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 16:17:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87928

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Them olde-tymers have been stewing since 1958 when ordinary
> civilians could legally use radios on HF without a morse test. A
> mere 46 years ago and they've been enforcing the letter of the
> unwritten law ever since. :-)

I'm not enough of an old timer to remember hams losing the 11m band. It took place five years before I obtained my first license. I am pleased that you've been provided a haven for your HF radio activity.

By the way, radio amateurs are "ordinary civilians" who happen to have passed a license exam.

Dave K8MN

3203. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 16:25:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E1E16.5A19BD3A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87929

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40392142.C6139598@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> > > >William wrote:
> >
> >> > > > Mark, you must first understand the mind of Heil and Heil apologists.
> >
> >> > >You left out "his running dogs and lackeys".
> >
> >> > Incorrect...YOU are here...
> >
> >> >In article <40382C74.5E95EF85@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> >> >After re-reading Brian's statement and my response, your comment makes
> >> >no sense whatever.
> >
> >> Poor baby. Another with intellectual presbyopia. Tsk, tsk.
> >
> >I had no idea that's what you were diagnosed with, Len.
>
> HAR! YOU are the one diagnosed with it... :-)

Wow, now you're a medical expert too? There's no end to your depth of
knowledge.

> Presbyopia: A common condition in humans around 40 and older
> where the eyeball becomes less flexible, thus requiring bifocal or
> trifocal lens correction for wide-range optical focussing.
>
> Intellectual presbyopia: A common condition among olde-tyme
> hammes of the morse persuasion whose mind has become
> inflexible and incapable of understanding communications they
> are not familiar with or not explained by the League in some
> publication such as "Talking for Dummies."

I'll bet you've invented the second definition since it doesn't follow
the things outlined in the first. No eyeballs involved. No bifocals.
No trifocals.

> >If you look at the whole thing,
> >perhaps it'll become clear to you how you made your error.
>
> My only "error" is...

Aww, you don't have to be modest, Len.

> considering that olde-tyme hammes of the morse
> persuasion MIGHT try to be civil or at least accept the fate of morse
> testing defeat with some grace. In that regard I was absolutely
> wrong and admit it freely. :-)

Lots of us have long noted your civil behavior and your gracious manner
:-) :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

3204. Re: lookin for BC-610

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 16:34:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E2009.BCFF9707@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87930

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40392332.65267E76@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Sure Hallicrafters is as defunct as "Ham Radio" magazine.
>
> Poor baby. Still hurting because you never got an article accepted?

I'd have to have submitted one before it could be rejected, Leonard.
My stuff was published in Ham Radio Horizons and CQ.

> ...or couldn't understand the technical content in any of its 22 year
> independent publishing existance?

I have almost all twenty-two years of independently published issues. I
have received any new ones for quite some time now.

> :-)
>
> >Many of us
> >enjoy indulging in nostalgia over our radio equipment and our past in
> >amateur radio.
>
> You should. Not much future left for you...

Here's a mirror, old top. I am a radio amateur and will be a radio
amateur. You've entered your eighth decade. You might want to
reconsider your statement in terms of statistical inevitability.

> >You'll have to actually pass some exams and obtain a
> >license before you can have a past in amateur radio.
>
> ...and herr robust needs to actually pass a psychiatrist's tests to
> rejoin the human race and have civil social intercourse with us.

Us? The several of you dwelling within the tired body of Leonard H.
Anderson?

> So far you haven't passed those tests. Poor baby.

So far, the unlicensed in medicine, unlicensed in amateur radio "Doctor
Len" is the only person who has seen a need for them. Poor baby.

> Now, you sit right down in front of your raddio and have an oriongasm
> thinking that those without ham licenses would never understand it.
> That seems to sooth your snarly nature.

I'll sit in front of any of my radios and operate on any of the bands
and modes my license permits. You may do as you can.

> Work some DX. But don't reveal that some of them are out-of-band
> Frenchmen.

Why are you worried about whether Frenchmen are in or out of bands which
you can't access? French authorities (and Brian Burke) take care of
French ops. I'm only concerned with where I operate.

Dave K8MN

3205. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 17:00:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040226120016.06226.00003125@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 87931

In article <7vh%b.22329$hm4.15130@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> > (snip)
>>
>> You do realize that a fair number of
>> Christians find the act of pledging to
>> God offensive also?
>
> I've met many Christians over the years and have yet to hear one say any
>such thing.

I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive. I know many other Christians (several dozen at least) who find the taking of His name in oaths and pledges to be offensive as well.

>
>> > Well, you're certainly right that it is
>> > just "some of" you - a darn few "some
>> > of" you. Want to take a look at your
>> > religion as an example? A good place
>> > to start might be the efforts to push
>> > American food makers to produce
>> > food products in compliance with
>> > Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol
>> > found on most canned and other food
>> > products), especially since very few
>> > other religions would have the utter
>> > audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the
>> > food of a nation without first fully
>> > informing the people.
>
> By the way, I forgot to add the words "literally jamming one form of
>religious practice down the throats of others" to the end of the paragraph
>above (playing on Phil's claim that Christians are "jamming one form of
>religious practice down the throats of others"). See the old "Centuriom" (sic) thread for more detail.

Compliance with kosher rules is done for purely economic reasons. The food processors are not forced to comply with those rules by those who observe them. They do it because they'll sell more product that way. A lot of us who don't comply with the kosher rules look for that mark anyway for purely nonreligious reasons.

>
>> If a person doesn't want to buy Kosher
>> food, there is plenty of other options.
>> Unfortunately, there is only one pledge
>> of allegiance.

BINGO!

And the pledge is usually said at public gatherings.
>
> Since so few people are even aware of the practice, they're not given the
>option to choose.

I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I know around here know what "kosher"
means. Most of them are not Jews, and most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
they know what it means.

>Based on my discussions with many people over the years,
>few know the little "K" symbol on, for examples, the cans of tomato sauce,
>tomato paste, Kraft Miracle Whip, or whatever, means it was prepared
>according to Jewish religious dietary law (Kosher).

And the problem is?

>Even if they did, they
>would find it very difficult to find an alternative today.

I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego and Ragu tomato sauces aren't kosher.

>According to one
>Kosher licensing organization (Kof-K Kosher Supervision), there are about
>75,000 Kosher-certified food products and about 160,000 Kosher-certified
>ingredients available in the United States today. Those numbers clearly
>suggest the vast majority of products on grocery store shelves today are
>Kosher.

No they don't! How many total food products are available?

>> Many religions practice dietary restrictions
>> and qualifications. From Catholic to Jewish
>> to Baptist to Hindu to Moslem.
>
> There is a huge difference between having personal eating habits which
>conform to a religious belief and pushing food manufacturers nation-wide to
>adopt your religion's food laws (and hiding that from consumers).

How is it hidden?

>I have yet
>to see a "C" for Christian or "M" for Moslem on any commercial food products
>in this country (or any other country).

That's because those groups don't have dietary rules which require
certification.

>That little "K" symbol is
>commonplace on grocery store shelves in this country today.
>
So is its absence. Both are driven by economics, nothing more. You don't have to buy kosher-certified food.

>> A side note. There was just a story in the
>> local paper about this subject. In addition
>> to the more well known Kosher restrictions,
>> there are a few butcher shops around our
>> area that allow local Moslems to kill the
>> animal in the traditional method.
>
Brings in the $$.

> I'm not talking about speciality butcher shops. I'm talking about the
>commercial food products found in mainstream grocery stores such as >WalMart, Win Dixie, Food Lion, Krogers, Bi-Lo, and others.

Those chains see the financial advanatages.
>
>> And if nothing else, it is a standard of quality
>> that is sorely lacking, unless you like manure
>> marinated chicken, which you might just get
>> if you don't buy Kosher.
>
> Quality food was prepared in this country long before this Kosher practice
>started.

HAW! That's a good one! The kosher practices are older than this country!

OTOH, if you're talking about Native American food practices...

>Indeed, in my opinion, the food just twenty or thirty years ago was
>much better.

In some way, yes, in other ways, no. But none of the change is due to kosher laws.

>Food based diseases are more frequent compared to just three
>decades ago.

I'm not sure if that's statistically true, or if we just have more publicity and identification about them now.

>The quality of beef today is appalling. Pork has almost
>disappeared from resturants. And I truly miss a real, old fashioned, hot dog
>with pork instead of turkey or beef (or the fake pork found in the new
>"pork" hot dogs today).

If you mean that ordinary-grade meat has less taste and seems to be less substantial/satisfying than years ago, I agree 100%. But again this has nothing to do with kosher rules. It's due to the industrialization of agriculture - merger/takeovers that result in a few giant food process corporations, growth hormones, "scientific" feed, additives, selective breeding and other methods

such as flash freezing, designed to keep down the cost of production. You *can*
get good beef, pork, chicken and other products, but they cost more and may
require you to shop at places like Whole Foods and Trader Joe's.

>> You find audacity in a group asking for
>> food to be prepared in a way in which
>> their religion finds acceptable yet find
>> no problem for wording that another
>> group demands put into a pledge that
>> all are expected to take? Yeah, I know
>> it's isn't mandatory (snip)

> And you find two words in a non-mandatory pledge equal in audacity to
>attempts to manipulate the food we eat in this country?

"Manipulate"? "Kosher" simply means "clean", IIRC.
>
>> And for me eating Kosher food is just a
>> reflection that it is generally pretty good
>> food, as most of the preparation of the
>> food enhances the taste and certainly the
>> cleanliness, and finally, it is a relatively
>> humane method of killing the animals.
>
> Kosher certification addresses Jewish religious or spiritual
>requirements - Jewish dietary laws concerning processed fruits and
>vegetables, animals that are non-ruminant (no pork), non-domesticated birds,
>seafood without scales or fins, the removal of blood from meats, the mixing
>of milk and meat, the use of a Rabbi for the slaughter of animals and for
>certain parts of the production of hard cheeses and grape products (wine and
>so on), equipment used to prepare Kosher foods, the purchase of a license to
>use the "K" symbol on the company's products, and so on. There is very
>little in any of this which specifically insures the quality, taste, or
>physical (not spiritual) cleanliness of the various products.
>
Most of the meat and dairy products in "mainstream" supermarkets are not kosher
certified.

And the mark many folks look for today is "organic"

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3206. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 17:21:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E2B04.1806A537@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87932

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40391E94.17C54190@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> determined to be as snarly as possible scribbles in crayon:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40382F9D.5412109E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> You are an amateur extra, a shining role model for the amateur
> >> >> community.
> >> >
> >> >And you are not. You're not a Novice. Your'e not a Tech. You're not a
> >> >General. You're not an Advanced. You aren't a participant.
> >>
> >> I am an electronics engineer, working for pecuniary interest, but no
> >> longer at regular hours. I am also a hobbyist without pecuniary
> >> compensation.
> >
> >Right. There you go back into your professional background.
>
> I've been working on that professional background for 51 years. :-)

...and sitting on it for just as long :-)

> >That isn't amateur radio.
>
> That isn't HAM radio, sweetums. "Amateur" is defined as "without
> pecuniary interest." Even the FCC defines amateur radio that way.

Looks like you're tangled in another Andersonian misdefinition.

> >Lots of us are hobbyists in any number of fields.
>
> You are out standing in your field now.
>
> >You're some kind of hobbyist. You aren't a radio amateur.
>
> Poor baby. Still so confused, scrunching up his fat little fingers,
> bound and determined to Have His Way! :-)

It isn't my way. You are not a radio amateur under anyone's defintion
of the term.

> Hobbyists in radio are defineable as amateurs in radio if they do not
> make any income from it.

Only some SWL with delusions of grandeur would tell his friends that he
is a radio amateur. The terms "amateurs in radio" are not synonymous
with "amateur radio" or "radio amateur".

> LICENSES in amateur radio are required to transmit RF on allocated
> amateur radio bands in order to be legal with the federal government.

Really? You constantly amaze those of us who hold such licenses. We
had NO IDEA that such was the reason for those licenses. You're a
fountain of readily obtainable and commonly known information.

> Poor baby, doesn't understand that amateur radio licenses are NO
> GOOD outside of allocated amateur bands. That's true. Anyone can
> verify that with Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, especially in
> Parts 1 and 2..

Well, poor Leonard, I think those of us holding such licenses are well
aware of just where in the RF sprectrum we may use them. That's another
great piece of commonly known information you've provided. I'm ever so
grateful.

> Did you know that the federal government can operate all kinds of RF
> emitters without having ANY operators licensed? True. A ham license
> there isn't worth the price of a ham sandwich. No criminal liability!

Super "news", Len, though I don't have the slightest idea of why I'm
supposed to care.

> Don't you just HATE it when your rant gets destroyed?

I dunno about anything being destroyed. It seems you've decided on a
detour.

> >> I've been involved with radio and electronics, both with and without
> >> pecuniary interest since 1947.
> >
> >Bully for you. You haven't been involved in amateur radio at all.
>
> :-) I haven't been involved in LICENSED amateur radio.

Just a bootlegger, huh?

> Too bad I can't bring up Jim Fisk as a reference (he is SK). I don't
> know about Alf Wilson, W6NIF, or Rich Rosen.

Yep, "Ham Radio" magazine and Jim Fisk are both defunct.

They were rather
> involved with HAM RADIO. :-)

Yep. They were also involved in ham radio. You aren't.

> >I guess you really showed us, huh?
>
> That's not difficult. :-)

You'll have to do a lot better than you've been doing.

> >I returned your snipped line to its rightful place. We wouldn't want
> >you to mislead others now, would we?
>
> Anyone can read these public postings without your selective
> editing. :-)

You did the selective edit. I replaced what you cut.

> You don't seem to comprehend half of it, but that's quite another
> problem and all yours.

I don't think so. If you were better able to express your thoughts and
if they reflected facts, there might not be a problem.

> >> Right. U.S. amateur radio is a SECRET, classified service which NO
> >> outsider can possibly know about, therefore no one can comment
> >> unless they have an amateur license.
> >
> >You can read up on it in "Now You're Talking".
>
> Morsemanship isn't "talking." It's beeping.

You'll have to start somewhere, Len. Since the 5 wpm "Extra right out
of the box" was too high a hurdle, you might want to start with no code
test.

>
> >> Right. NOBODY can become involved unless they are already involved.
> >
> >Wrong. NOBODY can become unvolved until they take steps to do so.
> >You can read up on astronomy. That alone does not make you an
> >astronomer.
>
> Oh? Astronomers need to be "licensed" and take a morse test?

Is that what you think I wrote? I'm beginning to see that you and Brian
share more than a few traits.

> >You can peruse magazines and books on auto repair. Those things alone
> >do not make you a car mechanic.
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!!!!!
>
> Riiiiight. I guess Kragen and all those auto parts stores are doomed
> for lack of sales, right? :-)

I didn't bring up auto parts stores. I wrote that simply reading a book
or magazine doesn't make you a car mechanic.

> >> Right. In order to "show interest in radio," everyone has to learn morse
> >> code and get a ham license.
> >
> >Wrong. You've been corrected on this same mis-statement of yours on a
> >number of occasions. It is "interest in AMATEUR radio", Leonard.
>
> Noooo, noooo. You are desperately trying to hang on but are
> inexorably drawn over the edge. It's a very long drop below you...

You can type "Noooo, noooo" until your fingers bleed. That won't change things. Every time I've written "interest in amateur radio" or "interested in amateur radio", you've responded with this "interest in radio" thing. Your "interest in radio" can be satisfied by tuning in Sean Hannity.

> LICENSED amateur radio is what you are trying (vainly) to say and then
> only to be legal with the federal government on transmitting RF energy
> WITHIN allocated amateur radio bands. As the FCC explains, an
> amateur radio license is NOT required for transmitting RF energy outside
> of amateur radio bands. That sort of thing is quite illegal. :-).

Where've you been? Have a nice nap, did you?

> That's only for CIVILIAN radio services and the FCC has NO jurisdiction
> over government users of radio.

Great. Become a government user of radio.

> But, did you know that UNLICENSED civilians can use certain allocated
> radio bands and transmit RF energy without taking a single test? True!
> Been several of those since 1958! Ask the FCC about non-amateur
> radio services if you are too "involved" in amateur radio activity to go
> look it up. :-)

Super. Enjoy your channelized slices of post-1958 spectrum. You still aren't a radio amateur.

> >Neither your decades-long "interest" nor your "Extra right out of the
> >box" boast of several years ago have resulted in your having taken a
> >single step toward obtaining even the most basic level of amateur radio
> >license.
>
> Poor baby. Still angry over the past?

Why would I be angry that you haven't lived up to your boast?

> You STILL can't understand why I am here. I've explained it enough
> times, but your have this set-in-concrete mind that can't get flexible
> enough to understand. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Nobody seems to understand why you're here. You aren't a regulator. You aren't a radio amateur. You've commented to your government.

> >> Right. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states
> >> that no citizen can comment about any amateur radio regulations unless

> >> they already possess an amateur radio license. Right.
> >
> >You've commented. End of involvement.
>
> Not even close to the "end."
>
> "Comments" are NOT "involvement" even in your distorted little Middle
> Earth view, Frodo. [you aren't Golem, but the resemblance is there]

Comments are much involvement as you'll have in amateur radio, Leonard.

> >A number of them did merit explanation after you attempted to twist them
> >into something else. It is "interested in AMATEUR radio". Why do you
> >persist in deleting that very important word?
>
> Sigh..."amateur" refers to an activity without pecuniary interest. The
> FCC uses those same words. [the FCC granted your amateur radio
> license]

Sigh You aren't a radio amateur. The FCC did not grant you an amateur
radio license.

> The word "amateur" (with or without all-capitals) does not explicitly
> say TRANSMISSION OF RF ENERGY IN ALLOCATED AMATEUR
> RADIO BANDS. Your prized amateur radio license is NO GOOD for
> legal transmission of RF energy OUTSIDE of allocated amateur bands.

More info from Leonard H. Anderson, fountain of already known
information.

> In fact, in some U.S. civilian radio services it is perfectly legal to
> transmit RF energy WITHOUT a license of any kind!!! Sunovagun!

That's great. Go there. Do that.

> Poor baby. Another Heilian rant shot down in flames.

Len, you wouldn't want it put to a vote about who is the r.r.a.p.
ranter.

> >You've misdefined your interest.
>
> Not me. YOU. All wrong, Golem...er, I mean Frodo.
>
> I HAVE defined my "interest" quite correctly.
>
> That you totally refuse to believe it is not my problem. Yours.

You've have never stated your obvious interest: to post frequent,
lengthy items in a newsgroup about amateur radio.

> Your intellectual presbyopia is glaringly obvious.

Is it as obvious as your obsessive-compulsive need to haunt an amateur
radio newsgroup?

> >You have interest in internet newsgroup posting.
>
> No more so than regular physical exercise. :-)

Typing is your idea of regular physical excercise? :-) :-)

> >You have interest in outlining your past professional glories.

> I've spent 51 years in professional radio-electronics activity and none
> of it can qualify as "glorious."

I believe you. Now just sell that idea to yourself.

> Intellectually INTERESTING, yes, and
> some of it quite enjoyable. If some of it was more involved than what
> you did, TS, that's the breaks of life.

...and if some of it was less interesting and less involved that what I
did, you'll have to live with it. Besides, I'm a radio amateur in
addition.

> Maybe your distemper is flaring up again because I got assigned to
> a very large HF transmitting facility while in the U.S. Army...and got
> rank and responsibility operating many high-powered HF transmitters.
> 51 years ago. Before your first hamme raddio license. TS for you.

Your kidding, right?

> >You aren't involved in amateur radio.
>
> Not involved in TRANSMITTING RF ENERGY ON ALLOCATED HAM
> BANDS, true. :-)

Don't sweat it, Len. You can inhale some of that transmitted RF energy
on allocated ham bands with your trusty Icom receiver, as an SWL.

> TRANSMIT, Baggins, TRANSMIT. Like in legal RF energy within
> those tight, confining HF band bounds.

Oh, we're allowed to receive too, Len. It is actually highly encouraged
to do some of both. We can even turn the stuff off and watch a movie or
read a book. I have all the room I need within to tight, confining
amateur bands denied to you.

> I'm just advocating the elimination of morse code testing for any radio
> license but you desperately want to make that some kind of grande
> production of drama and pathos, a giant mountain built out of a mole
> hill of your old morse message blanks. Tsk, tsk, tsk, you try such
> theatrics! Do you have an interest in the theater? :-)

"I'm just", "I'm just". Who asked you?

Do I have an interest in theater? Oh yes. My interest extends to attending plays and watching films. I don't attempt to tell anyone associated with theater how to act, nor would I attempt to outline how regulations governing theater production or movie making should be changed. I'd never call for a minimum age for actors either.

> I'll just put you down in the same emotional category as other
> emotionally-seven-year-old Extras.
>
> Those are very "involved" as long as their attention spans last... :-)

They are as involved as they'd like to be. You are as involved as you can be.

Dave K8MN

3207. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 17:47:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403E3137.C55AE7B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87933

Len Over 21 wrote:

> FISTS, a mighty force (with a woman at the helm) is bound and
> determined to have EVERYONE enjoying what they enjoy...
> despite the high noise floor of independent thought.

Do you have a problem with women as leaders of organizations? When did FISTS refer to itself as a mighty force?

> They make [expletive deleted] sure that will be ENFORCED by
> keeping the morse code test in amateurism forever and ever.

"It" will be enforced? What is "it"?

> FISTS represents the "amateur community."

FISTS represents a portion of the amateur radio community. You, on the other hand, play no part in the amateur radio community.

> Ergo, all amateurs must demonstrate their dedication and resolve
> by satisfying FISTS.

How funny is that? You'd have us believe that your views on how amateur radio should be adopted and you have nothing to do with amateur radio.

[LHA/WMD deleted]

Dave K8MN

3208. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 19:33:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <403E4A0E.6080803@psu.edu>
Source record: 87934

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:

>>Do you support forcing patriotic agnostics,
>>atheists, and members of other religions, and
>>those christions that actually pay attention to
>>the sermon on the mount to pledge to
>>something else while they are pledging to their
>>country?
>
>
>
> Be serious, Mike. Nobody today is required or forced to say the Pledge of
> Allegiance or even a single word in it.

I am serious, Dwight! I notice you snipped the part about the kid in my school and his problems with the POA. You're correct, he wasn't forced to say it. But he sure paid the price for it. Of course there are plenty of good Christians that probably support his beatings due to his atheism. That's one of those little life lessons that left an impression on me.

> Therefore, nobody is "forcing"
> agnostics, atheists, or anyone else, to do anything. If you don't like the
> words "under God," don't say them. But don't attempt to force others not to
> say them, which is exactly the goal of those trying to remove those words.

Nonsense, the original POA did not include those words - they were added later.

If the effort to remove those words is an effort to "force people not to say them" then conversely the effort to put them into the POA was an effort to force people *to* say them.

Francis Bellamy wrote the POA in 1892 and it didn't contain the words "under God" in it. There was a minor change from "My flag" to "the flag of the United States of America", a good change for distinctness.

then in the 1950's, the Knights of Columbus pressed D. Eisenhower to modify the Pledge.

What kind of organization is the KofC?

Eisenhower himself said about the newly modified pledge:

"...in this way we shall constantly strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resource in peace and

war."

Hmm, sounds like pledging to God, and right from the horses mouth.

So since we have an altered pledge, and the person who is most responsible for it proclaims it as a spiritual weapon, it sounds to me like a religious oath as well as a pledge to our country.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3209. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 20:08:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <403E5238.2040006@psu.edu>
Source record: 87935

N2EY wrote:
> In article <7vh%b.22329$hm4.15130@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>>>>"Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>>>> (snip)
>>>
>>>You do realize that a fair number of
>>>Christians find the act of pledging to
>>>God offensive also?
>>
>> I've met many Christians over the years and have yet to hear one say any
>>such thing.
>
>
> I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive. I know many other Christians
> (several dozen at least) who find the taking of His name in oaths and pledges
> to be offensive as well.

Of course! most Christians I know actually pay attention to the sermon
on the mount, which tells the faithful not to either have "Public
prayer" and specifically forbids oaths to God.

>>>> Well, you're certainly right that it is
>>>>just "some of" you - a darn few "some
>>>>of" you. Want to take a look at your
>>>>religion as an example? A good place
>>>>to start might be the efforts to push
>>>>American food makers to produce
>>>>food products in compliance with
>>>>Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol
>>>>found on most canned and other food
>>>>products), especially since very few
>>>>other religions would have the utter
>>>>audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the
>>>>food of a nation without first fully
>>>>informing the people.
>>>
>> By the way, I forgot to add the words "literally jamming one form of
>>religious practice down the throats of others" to the end of the paragraph
>>above (playing on Phil's claim that Christians are "jamming one form of
>>religious practice down the throats of others"). See the old "Centuriom" (sic)

>
> thread for more detail.
>
> Compliance with kosher rules is done for purely economic reasons. The food
> processors are not forced to comply with those rules by those who observe them.
> They do it because they'll sell more product that way. A lot of us who don't
> comply with the kosher rules look for that mark anyway for purely nonreligious
> reasons.

Like, ummm the food is prepared in a more sanitary fashion, it tends to
taste better, and the animals are killed humanely?

>>>If a person doesn't want to buy Kosher
>>>food, there is plenty of other options.
>>>Unfortunately, there is only one pledge
>>>of allegiance.
>>
>
> BINGO!
>
> And the pledge is usually said at public gatherings.
>
>> Since so few people are even aware of the practice, they're not given the
>>option to choose.
>
> I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I know around here know what "kosher"
> means. Most of them are not Jews, and most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
> they know what it means.

Agreed! I don't personally know anyone that isn't aware of Kosher
preparation. And absolutely no one except for Dwight here that ever
complained about it.

>
>>Based on my discussions with many people over the years,
>>few know the little "K" symbol on, for examples, the cans of tomato sauce,
>>tomato paste, Kraft Miracle Whip, or whatever, means it was prepared
>>according to Jewish religious dietary law (Kosher).
>
>
> And the problem is?

I wonder if Dwight is hanging out with a different group than we are?

>
>>Even if they did, they
>>would find it very difficult to find an alternative today.
>
>
> I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego and Ragu tomato sauces aren't kosher.
>
>

>
>>According to one
>>Kosher licensing organization (Kof-K Kosher Supervision), there are about
>>75,000 Kosher-certified food products and about 160,000 Kosher-certified
>>ingredients available in the United States today. Those numbers clearly
>>suggest the vast majority of products on grocery store shelves today are
>>Kosher.
>
>
> No they don't! How many total food products are available?
>
>
>>>Many religions practice dietary restrictions
>>>and qualifications. From Catholic to Jewish
>>>to Baptist to Hindu to Moslem.
>>
>> There is a huge difference between having personal eating habits which
>>conform to a religious belief and pushing food manufacturers nation-wide to
>>adopt your religion's food laws (and hiding that from consumers).
>
>
> How is it hidden?
>
>
>>I have yet
>>to see a "C" for Christian or "M" for Moslem on any commercial food products
>>in this country (or any other country).
>
>
> That's because those groups don't have dietary rules which require
> certification.
>
>
>>That little "K" symbol is
>>commonplace on grocery store shelves in this country today.
>>
>
> So is its absence. Both are driven by economics, nothing more. You don't have
> to buy kosher-certified food.
>
>
>>>A side note. There was just a story in the
>>>local paper about this subject. In addition
>>>to the more well known Kosher restrictions,
>>>there are a few butcher shops around our
>>>area that allow local Moslems to kill the
>>>animal in the traditional method.
>>
> Brings in the $$.
>

>
>> I'm not talking about speciality butcher shops. I'm talking about the
>>commercial food products found in mainstream grocery stores such as >WalMart,
>
> Win Dixie, Food Lion, Krogers, Bi-Lo, and others.
>
> Those chains see the financial advanatages.
>
>>>And if nothing else, it is a standard of quality
>>>that is sorely lacking, unless you like manure
>>>marinated chicken, which you might just get
>>>if you don't buy Kosher.
>>
>> Quality food was prepared in this country long before this Kosher practice
>>started.
>
>
> HAW! That's a good one! The kosher practices are older than this country!
>
> OTOH, if you're talking about Native American food practices...
>
>
>>Indeed, in my opinion, the food just twenty or thirty years ago was
>>much better.
>
>
> In some way, yes, in other ways, no. But none of the change is due to kosher
> laws.
>
>
>>Food based diseases are more frequent compared to just three
>>decades ago.
>
>
> I'm not sure if that's statistically true, or if we just have more publicity
> and identification about them now.
>
>
>>The quality of beef today is appalling. Pork has almost
>>disappeared from resturants. And I truly miss a real, old fashioned, hot dog
>>with pork instead of turkey or beef (or the fake pork found in the new
>>"pork" hot dogs today).
>
>
> If you mean that ordinary-grade meat has less taste and seems to be less
> substantial/satisfying than years ago, I agree 100%. But again this has nothing
> to do with kosher rules. It's due to the industrialization of agriculture -
> merger/takeovers that result in a few giant food process corporations, growth
> hormones, "scientific" feed, additives, selective breeding and other methods
> such as flash freezing, designed to keep down the cost of production. You *can*

> get good beef, pork, chicken and other products, but they cost more and may
> require you to shop at places like Whole Foods and Trader Joe's.

Lessee. We feed cattle an interesting concoction of food. Did you know
that cows are fed newspaper, chicken manure, ground up parts of other
cows, ground up fish guts and their contents, leftover junk from
restaurants and lots of antibiotics (to protect them from their food?) I
can tell meat that has been fed this way, because it tastes like fish to
me! Know what the "formula" is that is fed to many calves? Blood from
slaughtered pigs and cows. Side note is that we are turning cattle into
vampiric, shit eating cannibals. It has been know for quite some time
that cannibalism is a great way to infect the person/animal doing the
cannibal act with nasty infectious and horrible diseases. Enter Mad Cow
disease!

The idea of blaming this on Kosher food preparation is ridiculous and
just plain wrong. Dwight, you are way off on this statement, and I
expect better arguments from you.

>>>You find audacity in a group asking for
>>>food to be prepared in a way in which
>>>their religion finds acceptable yet find
>>>no problem for wording that another
>>>group demands put into a pledge that
>>>all are expected to take? Yeah, I know
>>>it's isn't mandatory (snip)
>>
>
>> And you find two words in a non-mandatory pledge equal in audacity to
>>attempts to manipulate the food we eat in this country?
>
>
> "Manipulate"? "Kosher" simply means "clean", IIRC.
>
>>>And for me eating Kosher food is just a
>>>reflection that it is generally pretty good
>>>food, as most of the preparation of the
>>>food enhances the taste and certainly the
>>>cleanliness, and finally, it is a relatively
>>>humane method of killing the animals.
>>
>> Kosher certification addresses Jewish religious or spiritual
>>requirements - Jewish dietary laws concerning processed fruits and
>>vegetables, animals that are non-ruminant (no pork), non-domesticated birds,
>>seafood without scales or fins, the removal of blood from meats, the mixing
>>of milk and meat, the use of a Rabbi for the slaughter of animals and for
>>certain parts of the production of hard cheeses and grape products (wine and
>>so on), equipment used to prepare Kosher foods, the purchase of a license to
>>use the "K" symbol on the company's products, and so on. There is very
>>little in any of this which specifically insures the quality, taste, or
>>physical (not spiritual) cleanliness of the various products.

>>
>
> Most of the meat and dairy products in "mainstream" supermarkets are not kosher
> certified.
>
> And the mark many folks look for today is "organic"

The preparation process has a LOT to do with the taste of the food. The
bleeding and salting of chickens for instance provides for a superior
flavor, and even the color of the meat is more appealing. Same with
beef, sans the salting.

- mike KB3EIA -

3210. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 20:15:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <403E53DD.60208@psu.edu>
Source record: 87936

I got to thinking about this Dwight.

The pledge of allegiance is MY pledge to the country. It's my pledge,
Your pledge, and every patriotic American's pledge.

What right do you and other people who think that it is supposed to
reflect you religion's particular take on how the country "should be" to
make up a pledge that contains a "spiritual weapon" that we are supposed
to pledge to?

It is everyone's pledge, not just one group's.

- mike KB3EIA -

3211. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:14:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <v5v%b.23307$hm4.4299@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87937

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:403E1B2C.F950B150@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040223060944.23307.00006878@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > > >
> > > > > I believe there are a good number of family member techs
> > > > > who probably have limited desire even to get on HF at all.
> > > >
> > > > Around here we had lots of "honeydew hams" in the '80s and '90s
> > > > (people who got ham licenses to keep in touch with family members,
not
> > > > because they were interested in radio itself). Nice folks but many
> > > > disappeared when cell phones became cheap and good coverage.
FRS/GMRS
> > > > took some othere. And some discovered they were interested in radio
> > > > for its own sake, too. I think that phenomenon is the main reason
for
> > > > the somewhat-lower renewal percentage of Techs.
> > >
> > > Overheard on a 2m repeater in this area of the Ohio Valley yesterday:
> > >
> > > "KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".
> > >
> > > "KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"
> > >
> > > "I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be
overmodulatin
> > > or somthing".
> > >
> > > "Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between
us".
> > >
> > > "Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held
radios
> > > will talk this far from each other".
> > >
```

> > > It is a brave new world of amateur radio.
> >
> > Dave,
> >
> > Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
> > parties involved?
> >
> > Now before answering, consider this:
> >
> > 1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
> > 2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
> > secret code.
> > 3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.
>
> They certainly understood each other.

OK

Neither understood the concept of a repeater.

So what? Does that bother anyone?

Now, to what I understand: I understand that both of these
> ops have brought their bad habits from CB radio with them.

What bad habits. I don't see any at all. You may
not like their conversation, but there is NO aspect
of Part 97 that requires any specific use of only
"ham" approved lingo...or did I skip that chapter somehow.

> Neither has
> bothered to listen to other hams.

For what reason must they do so? What about their
use of the repeater as you dicribed is wrong?

> These two were joined by a new YL op
> the other day. She was a "do you want me to
> pick up bread and milk?" type.

One of my best ham buddies is a long time Extra and his wife
chats with him on almost every homebound commute. In
some cases she gives him a "honey do" list of things to get
from the market on the way home. What's wrong with
that (i.e. what's wrong with "pick up bread & milk."

I'll be very surprised if any of the three will be active on the
ham bands in five years.

I'll presume that should make you very pleased then.

> > Who cares about how we dialog with each other
> > as long as the parties involved are operating within the
> > law as per Part 97 rules and regs?

>
> I do.

Based on what authority? You are free to worry your
poor self about whatever you want, but thankfully you
have no authority to enforce your own standards of how
to speak on the air on anyone but yourself.

> We've even got a new op who can be heard moving between the several
> local repeaters for a goodly part of each day saying, "This is KC8***
> radio check".

And that violates what in Part 97?

> He'll sometimes pull this stunt on top of an ongoing
> QSO.

That then IS a violation. I'd fully support the area hams
directing him as to the rules to NOT QRM an existing QSO.

> He has been informed on a number of occasions about how to make it
> clear that he is seeking a contact and how not to QRM an existing
> contact but he persists.

If, that is as you say, then report him to the FCC.

> When he does enter a QSO, he normally asks the
> individuals he contacts if they have any radios they'd like to part
> with.

And that violates what Part 97 rule?

> He has now asked me about six times.

Maybe he has Alzheimers.

> This fellow is annoying and
> others--old timers and recent licensees--are beginning to avoid him.

Which is perfectly OK.

> There is another new ham in the area who was previously a CBer. He was
> licensed only this past May. He quickly became adjusted to how things
> are done on the ham bands. He asks questions about antennas, modes
> other than FM, bands other than 2m and about operating practices. He
> aroused interest in his grandson, who is now licensed. I'm betting that
> these two will stick.

Fine with me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3212. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:35:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <PcKdnVYnjan4GaPdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87943

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> One thing is for certain. Military ops, boat owners, CBer's and the
> like aren't radio amateurs until they pass an amateur radio license
> exam. Those others folks aren't a part of that "amateur radio
> community" unless or until they do so. You should have that drill down
> by now.
>
> Dave K8MN

He does Dave, but he can't pass the test, that is why he has his shorts
in such a wad over us who did.

3213. Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:36:25 UTC
From: tom@wsd.SPAM
Message-ID: <103t0o82d5of9a4@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 87938

Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone know if what they are threatening me with is legal?

3214. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:38:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040226183846.21955.00000743@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87940

In article <c1fijaksd06$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Liberal?

Helmut:

Gladly. A Liberal is a person who uses other people's money to assuage
his own guilt.

>Can you please explain, what is your understanding of a Socialist?

A Socialist is a person who views government as the ultimate alternative
to his own ingenuity and initiative.

>What is bad of fraternizing with the Communists, when even the tops of your
>current administration do so?

If by "fraternizing," you mean seeking diplomatic solutions to potentially
dangerous relationships between nations, then I guess we're guilty of that.
Thank goodness. This "fraternization" is not necessarily a good thing or
a bad thing, just something that must be done to accommodate the realities
of modern human relations between peoples of radically different worldviews.

>Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!

Anyone who seeks to place the government in the position of being the
ultimate power over the people. Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Kruschev, Ho Chi Ming,
Kim Sung Il, are all modern-day examples.

>For me it is kind of rediculous expressing this sort of opinion throughout
>the world, and then signing with a HAM-call.

Well, that's your own opinion, and as an American, I respect your right
to hold that opinion and express it in public. What I don't understand is
why you apparently don't wish to give me that same freedom. Moreover,
the fact that there are many people in this world with the same problem
you have, is part of the reason why us Americans must make every effort
and endure every sacrifice required to remain the strongest power on
Earth -- in order to prevent people who think like you from effecting global
domination.

>If your callsign is true and no FAKE, as a HAM you never should discriminate
>any minority. You are not ANONYMOUS.

Why would I wish to remain anonymous when expressing my opinions,
in any forum -- public or private? I am an American, and I have the freedom
to express my opinions without fear -- the same way you expressed your

opinion of me.

>Thinking after all you have written above, Larry, your callsign must be
>faked. A real HAM never could do this kind of beating down on other humans
>around the world.

You can check it out easily enough by going to qrz.com/callsign/k3lt. My callsign is not fake, and I am not impersonating anyone named Lawrence J. Roll, as I am he.

>God bless, take care,
>we all reading this newsgroup throughout the world would not love to loose
>you. Its a lough-number every time.
>
>73 de OE8SOQ
>Helmut

Unfortunately, I did not find your post very amusing. It did, however, serve to reinforce a few of my long-held beliefs about certain non-Americans. I have lived in Europe, and found European people to be generally very accepting of Americans, and grateful for our contributions to their own peace and security. But there are the very small minority who must exert your own independence by taking your silly little jabs at us. I understand, and in a way, can't blame you. Since you will never be as wealthy and powerful as America, there is bound to be some resentment and pockets of disaffection. So go ahead, and sling your little barbs. I'm big enough to handle it, and so is America.

May God Bless you and your countrymen. Austria is a beautiful country and the homeland of my direct descendants. You are lucky to live there, and us Americans are lucky to have you as friends and allies. I hope we do meet on the air someday. Maybe it is possible for us to be personal friends as well. I certainly hope so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3215. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:38:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040226183847.21955.00000744@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87939

In article <c1j3a8$n7$01$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>
>Yes, we have constitutions in our countries and in the European Union. I
>don't know if there are any ammendments. What you reffering to is freedom of
>speech? No, there are no restrictions in that. But one has to stay for that
>what one is saying. And if that is bad, one has to "pay" for that bad
>behavior. Like Larry. It is not to supress his opinion or the disagreement,
>it is the words and the soul and the bad spirit coming out of his lines. The
>way he acts here on Usenet against other HAMS shows how he is acting on the
>bands.

Helmut:

Very interesting. I find it quite extraordinary that you are able to gauge my
behavior on the bands by what you read from me on Usenet. In reality, my
on-the-air behavior is probably very much like your own, assuming that you
are friendly, courteous, and helpful to your fellow hams.

>This makes not the best image of an american ham, on a newsgroup
>which is read throughout the world. It damages the reputation of Amateur
>Radio. Period.

I think that far worse damage is done by making rash, totally blind judgments
which, in any other forum, would be legally actionable as libelous.

>Nobody will be able to stop your FCC from doing, what they want to do. Even
>when your first amendum gives you the right to argue or disput. They dont
>have to follow any of the proposals. I think, they just want to find out, if
>the way they are trying to lead the boat is not too far out of the compass.
>And their decission is already in their drawer.

All of the above may be true, but at least, here in America, we have an
abiding respect for other people's opinions which is codified into our law.
Whether or not the FCC creates a code-free HF license remains to be
seen, and it is not necessarily a pre-ordained decision, although I expect
that a no-code HF license will be the ultimate result of the FCC's rulemaking
process. If it is, then I must live with the decision, knowing that it was
made with the consent of the majority, even though that majority may not
represent my own opinions.

As for you, my friend, I am pleased to advise you that I do not use your
behavior on Usenet as a means of judging your on-the-air behavior as a
radio amateur, because I have not personally experienced the latter.
However, as a Usenet participant, I must say that you seem to have the
typical shoot-from-the-hip attitude down pat. Nothing new here.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3216. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:40:36 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Q6KdnbTJJeBeGKPdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87944

Dave Heil wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>> Them olde-tymers have been stewing since 1958 when ordinary
>> civilians could legally use radios on HF without a morse test. A
>> mere 46 years ago and they've been enforcing the letter of the
>> unwritten law ever since. :-)
>
>
> I'm not enough of an old timer to remember hams losing the 11m band. It
> took place five years before I obtained my first license. I am pleased
> that you've been provided a haven for your HF radio activity.
>
> By the way, radio amateurs are "ordinary civilians" who happen to have
> passed a license exam.
>
> Dave K8MN

I have yet to meet a ham who "stewed" over loosing 11 meters. It was hardly used, the only thing anyone might "stew" about is how it has turned into the sewer pit of the radio spectrum by the cbers who refuse to follow rules.

3217. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:41:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htpdfcd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87941

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 03:14:53 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Well, you're certainly right that it is just "some of" you - a darn few
>"some of" you. Want to take a look at your religion as an example? A good
>place to start might be the efforts to push American food makers to produce
>food products in compliance with Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol
>found on most canned and other food products), especially since very few
>other religions would have the utter audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the
>food of a nation without first fully informing the people.

You misinterpret what Kosher certification is all about.

No one is "forcing" manufacturers to do anything. The process
is that if the manufacturer wants to carry the certifcation - and
thereby open the market up to those folks who will not buy/eat
products which do not have that certification - then there are
specific standards which must be observed and inspections by the
certifying body made to assure conformance. The same thing holds
for products which are certified organic or diabetic-safe, for
example.

No "force" is involved - if the manufacturer does not want to reach
that sector of the market, so be it.

The only legal requirement is that if a manufacturer or seller puts
forth the product as Kosher or organic or diabetic-safe it must
conform to recognized Kosher or organic or diabetic-safe standards.

As far as Kosher certification goes, a simple "K" means that the
manufacturer self-certifies it, which may be insufficient
certification for certain consumers. If specific symbols are used,
the product must have been certified by the organization that the
symbol represents. Violations of the above bring Truth-in-Labeling
laws into play.

It's the manufacturer's choice - free market, if you will.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3218. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:41:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htpkoue.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87942

On 26 Feb 2004 17:00:16 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego and Ragu tomato sauces
>aren't kosher.

More accurately, they aren't certified Kosher. If they are
all-vegetable products (Marinara, etc) they most probably would
qualify if they are run on different production lines from the
products that contain (non-kosher) meat.

>>I have yet
>>to see a "C" for Christian or "M" for Moslem on any commercial food products
>>in this country (or any other country).

Dwight - when is the last time that you have been in a Middle
Eastern ethnic food grocery and read the Arabic inscriptions on
certain products? BTW - any product that is certified Kosher meets
the Muslim Halal requirements.

>"Manipulate"? "Kosher" simply means "clean", IIRC.

It actually means "acceptable" or "proper".

>>Kosher certification addresses Jewish religious or spiritual
>>requirements - Jewish dietary laws concerning processed fruits and
>>vegetables, animals that are non-ruminant (no pork), non-domesticated
>>birds, seafood without scales or fins, the removal of blood from meats,
>>the mixing of milk and meat, the use of a Rabbi for the slaughter of
>>animals and for certain parts of the production of hard cheeses and
>>grape products (wine and so on),

Not so. The slaughterer or certification supervisor does not have
to be a rabbi. but must be trained and qualfied to do the job properly.
My wife has long been certified to supervise kosher operations in
synagogue kitchens, and when she was working in the food industry
she would routinely have to explain to the (mostly immigrant) Christian
production line workers that the kosher inspector who came through
quarterly was not "the rabbi blessing the food".

BTW - CocaCola maintains several inspectors as full-time employees
checking not only the production lines but also the sources of their
ingredients. AFAIK all Coke products are certified.

>>equipment used to prepare Kosher foods, the purchase of a license to
>>use the "K" symbol on the company's products, and so on. There is very
>>little in any of this which specifically insures the quality, taste, or
>>physical (not spiritual) cleanliness of the various products.

Not so. A spoiled or dirty product cannot be considered kosher regardless of what label attaches. Each and every animal which is slaughtered for food must have its entrails examined for signs of disease before it is allowed to go onto the processing line. The standards used by kosher inspectors exceed those of the FDA by several orders of magnitude (at one time I served on a local certifcation panel).

Questions of taste are up to the individual. Put two brands of the same product - both certified kosher - side by side. I like the taste of Brand A but not that of Brand B. You like the taste of Brand B but not Brand A. It's all subjective.

Just like the sign says in the Tommy's Joynt Restaurant in San Francisco - "we certify that our buffalo meat is real buffalo. We make no claims as to its taste or texture - just that it's real buffalo". The same applies to a kosher certification.

>Most of the meat and dairy products in "mainstream" supermarkets are not
>kosher certified.
>
>And the mark many folks look for today is "organic"

The only "forcing" is that if a product is labeled Kosher (or organic, or diabetic-safe) and it is not in fact Kosher (or organic or diabetic-safe) the State or Federal government will get involved in Truth-in-Labelling law violations.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3219. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-26 23:49:20 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <c1m0m0khl1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 87945

tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
> have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a
> letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
> operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone
> know if what they are threatening me with is legal?

Foolishly ignoring the enormous stench of a troll...

In the US (and some other places) you can sue for just about anything,
including "I don't like the color of your shirt".

Winning such a suite is a separate issue, and I am sure this will be debated
with about 579 posts while it becomes a liberal vs conservative arguement.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

3220. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 00:14:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htpmpdf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 87946

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 23:49:20 +0000 (UTC), jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote:

>tom@wsd.spam wrote:
>> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
>> have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a
>> letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
>> operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone
>> know if what they are threatening me with is legal?
>
>
>Foolishly ignoring the enormous stench of a troll...

Yup.

>In the US (and some other places) you can sue for just about anything,
>including "I don't like the color of your shirt".
>
>Winning such a suite is a separate issue, and I am sure this will be debated
>with about 579 posts while it becomes a liberal vs conservative arguement.

You mean a "code" versus "no code" discussion..... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3221. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 00:18:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <coKdnVIbGKJ5EaPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87947

Helmut wrote:
> Servus, Ralph,
>
> hast du noch nicht gemerkt, daï¿½ hier in der Gruppe fast nur Idioten
> schreiben? Ameri-Egoisten die glauben, die sind der Nabel der Welt. Warum
> geht es ï¿½berall sonst in der Welt ohne diese depperte Morsediskussion
> reibungslos ï¿½ber die Bï¿½hne?

Hehe. Perhaps you are correct, only idiots post here! Welome, you'll fit
right in I think.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3222. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 00:54:59 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <c1m4h3$3o8$2@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 87948

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
> On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 23:49:20 +0000 (UTC), jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote:

> >tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> >> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
> >> have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a
> >> letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
> >> operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone
> >> know if what they are threatening me with is legal?
> >>
> >>
> >Foolishly ignoring the enormous stench of a troll...

> Yup.

> >In the US (and some other places) you can sue for just about anything,
> >including "I don't like the color of your shirt".
> >
> >Winning such a suite is a separate issue, and I am sure this will be debated
> >with about 579 posts while it becomes a liberal vs conservative arguement.

> You mean a "code" versus "no code" discussion..... <ggg>

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Yeah, and probably also gun control and how Radio Shack sucks.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

3223. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 00:55:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403E958F.9080106@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 87949

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>
> Where's the "flip-flop", other than the ones you wear in the
>shower?
>
>
>
In the computer. Millions of 'em. And not just the 74LS74's.... ;-)

3224. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 02:25:21 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <lUx%b.52950$M8.7219734@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 87950

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.htpmpdf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 23:49:20 +0000 (UTC), jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote:
>
> >tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> >> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
> >> have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received
a
> >> letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
> >> operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does
anyone
> >> know if what they are threatening me with is legal?
> >
> >
> >Foolishly ignoring the enormous stench of a troll...
>
> Yup.
>
> >In the US (and some other places) you can sue for just about anything,
> >including "I don't like the color of your shirt".
> >
> >Winning such a suite is a separate issue, and I am sure this will be
debated
> >with about 579 posts while it becomes a liberal vs conservative
arguement.
>
> You mean a "code" versus "no code" discussion..... <ggg>
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Heck, Phil. You could've at least answered the chap's question on the off
chance it's legit. If the guy's system is legal, can the ISP bring and win
an interference based suit?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3225. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 04:00:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <1r2dnStPX5jNW6Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88001

JJ wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
>
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Them olde-tymers have been stewing since 1958 when ordinary
>>> civilians could legally use radios on HF without a morse test. A
>>> mere 46 years ago and they've been enforcing the letter of the
>>> unwritten law ever since. :-)
>>
>>
>>
>> I'm not enough of an old timer to remember hams losing the 11m band. It
>> took place five years before I obtained my first license. I am pleased
>> that you've been provided a haven for your HF radio activity.
>>
>> By the way, radio amateurs are "ordinary civilians" who happen to have
>> passed a license exam.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>
> I have yet to meet a ham who "stewed" over loosing 11 meters. It was
> hardly used, the only thing anyone might "stew" about is how it has
> turned into the sewer pit of the radio spectrum by the cbers who refuse
> to follow rules.
>

And I might add for senior citizen lenny's benefit, that is what happens
when you let civilians legally use radios on HF without a test, Morse or
otherwise.

3226. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 04:53:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <403ECD37.2090804@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88002

>
>
>>>
>>>
>
>
>
>> You mean a "code" versus "no code" discussion..... <ggg>
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>--
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>
>
>Yeah, and probably also gun control and how Radio Shack sucks.
>
>
>
Gun control is using both hands.....

Besides, BPL should be "Must accept interference from legal radio services
and not cause them any interference". Actually, BPL just should not
be....

3227. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 06:47:50 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aa8b24e16c628998979f@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88003

In article <403ECD37.2090804@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
> >
> >
> >>>
> >>>
> >
> >
> >
> >> You mean a "code" versus "no code" discussion..... <ggg>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >
> >>--
> >> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Yeah, and probably also gun control and how Radio Shack sucks.
> >
> >
> >
> Gun control is using both hands.....
>
> Besides, BPL should be "Must accept interference from legal radio services
> and not cause them any interference". Actually, BPL just should not
> be....

BPL must have an FCC part that it falls under as it will radiate an RF
signal that could potentially interfere with other services (Namely the
Amateur HF bands damn it!)

If so it probably has a provision that says it must accept interference
from other legal services. It's going to be very interesting to see how
it all plays out.

But in my opinion running high speed data over open and unshielded lines
is asking for trouble.

3228. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 07:08:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <G1C%b.22438$W74.9151@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88004

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I am serious, Dwight! I notice you
> snipped the part about the kid in
> my school and his problems with
> the POA. (snip)

I snipped it because I have no time to respond to personal anecdotes that can't be verified. If that's your story, fine. Enough said.

> If the effort to remove those words is
> an effort to "force people not to say
> them" then conversely the effort to put
> them into the POA was an effort to
> force people *to* say them.

If an act is completely voluntary (no demand, coercion, or gain), the person cannot, by definition, be forced. The pledge today is entirely voluntary - nobody is forced to say it or any part of it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3229. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 07:52:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <0HC%b.22529$W74.10672@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88005

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> What right do you and other people who
> think that it is supposed to reflect you
> religion's particular take on how the
> country "should be" to make up a pledge
> that contains a "spiritual weapon" that
> we are supposed to pledge to? (snip)

It is not "my religion." I've made no claim to any religion whatsoever in this discussion. That does not, however, change my perception that Christians are being unfairly trashed in this country today. You brought this (the words in the POA) up in a public newsgroup discussion. Since it is "weooh, OT," I have to wonder why. You then went on a rant about the Knights of Columbus, Eisenhower, and so on, acting as if your life was being destroyed by the mere mention of those words. Trust me. Your life won't change whether those words are there or not.

As for your question about my right to support those words in the POA, it is the same right you have to rant against it. Those with a belief in god are the vast majority in this country and I have no problems whatsoever with non-intrusive expressions of that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3230. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 09:35:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wbE%b.22920$W74.14390@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88006

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive.
> I know many other Christians (several
> dozen at least) who find the taking of His
> name in oaths and pledges to be offensive
> as well.

Then you're truly the first, and only Christian, I've talked to who finds the words "...one nation, under God..." offensive. As for the others you speak about, your experience is vastly different than mine.

> I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I
> know around here know what "kosher"
> means. Most of them are not Jews, and
> most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
> they know what it means.

Don't twist the subject, Jim. Did that same 95% of the adults you know also know that much of the food in our grocery stores, the foods we eat everyday, is prepared according to dietary laws of the Jewish religion? Were they aware of that tiny "K" symbol on many of those same food products? These are the things I talked about, not the meaning of a word.

> And the problem is?

You don't have a problem with the fact that a religious group is manipulating much of the foods we eat? There are very few things in this world as intrusive as that. Given a choice between this and the word "God" in a pledge, I'll choose the latter any day of the week.

> I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego
> and Ragu tomato sauces aren't kosher.

Those reading are free to look through their own kitchen shelves for examples.

> How is it hidden?

By not asking the people of this country whether they even wanted their foods changed to conform to Jewish dietary law before doing so. Through the use of a tiny, nondescript, "K" symbol instead of simply saying this product was prepared according to the dietary laws of the Jewish religion. By not making that "K" symbol known to the public through publications and other media. By downplaying the religious significance (by claiming it just means "good food") whenever the topic is broached publically.

> That's because those groups don't have
> dietary rules which require certification.

True, Christians and Moslems don't have dietary rules which require certification. But, by the same token, Jews don't have dietary rules which require the rest of the nation to eat the same things. If Jews have special dietary needs, let them have a small section of the store just like any other group wanting specialty foods. But nothing justifies the manipulation of mainstream food products to conform to the requirements of a specific religion in a country that has, at it's core, the concept that no single religion may dominate.

> Brings in the $$.

If Kosher truly brings in the money, why not advertise it directly instead of hiding it under a tiny, nondescript, "K" at the bottom of a product label? Clearly, the claim that it increases profit is somewhat suspect.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3231. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1384 February 20, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 09:40:52 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040227044052.02207.00000475@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 88007

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1384 February 20, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1384 with a release date of Friday, February 20, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Reaction begins to the FCC on B-P-L, Hamvention will probably remain in Dayton and restructuring continues around the world. These stories and more coming your way on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1384, right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: ARRL REACTS TO FCC NPRM

The ARRL and many others in ham radio are not happy with last weeks FCC decision to proceed with further implementation of Broadband Over Powerline, and they are making their position known. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramovich, NT3V, has been following developments and has more in this report:

--

To say American Radio Relay League President Jim Haynie W5JBP was disappointed with the FCC's decision to issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Broadband Over Powerlines might be an understatement.

Haynie sat in on the FCC's Feb. 12 meeting in Washington, D.C. and admits he was dumbfounded when many of the commissioners expressed excitement about the possibilities of BPL, ignoring interference concerns expressed by their technical staff.

"To have Commissioner (Kathleen) Abernathy come out in her initial speech that blew us away and her unbounded enthusiasm and then turn around at the hearing I attended and listen to Commissioner (Jonathan) Adelstein allude to unsubstantiated reports of interference and I was livid," Haynie says.

Haynie says the commissioners look more like cheerleaders for, than regulators of, the communications industry.

"It just seems to me though that the commission has gone from a regulatory agency to a Chamber of Commerce," Haynie says. "Their eagerness to implement this prior to the NTIA study rollout, which they actually have a letter from a congressman asking them to wait, seemed to me it was put on the fast track and try to beat the NTIA results."

Haynie says lots of what he heard about what's supposed to be in the NPRM does not bode well for amateur radio. But he says there are some burdens on the

electric utilities.

"They put a lot of constraints on the BPL industry," Haynie explains. "They have to react in real time, they have to be frequency agile. They have to have public web sites, they've got to have somebody on duty 24-7 to mitigate complaints of interference."

Ah, yes, interference. BPL proponents claim hams don't know what they're talking about.

"I've heard reports of some of the BPL industry spokesman who flat deny that there's a problem," Haynie says. "There never has been a problem, there can't be a problem. "In several interviews I've done with the regular press it was: 'Okay, go down a buy you a short-wave receiver at Radio Shack. Go down there and listen to it for yourself. I don't have to give you all these engineering data, you can hear it for yourself.'

"The utilities, they are being hand-held very carefully by the BPL industry and being told: "There's not a problem, there's not a problem.' "

Haynie says profit for the equipment manufacturers and the utilities is clearly the motive for BPL.

"Any CEO worth his salt who's running a power company is going to try to figure out more ways to get investment return for his investors," Haynie says. "He's got a grid there and if these salesmen come in and tell him: 'Well look, you know, we can bring you in an extra million dollars a day or million dollars a week for your power grid and it's not going to cost you anything other than just put these little devices on every quarter mile.' Why not?"

But Haynie says a recent Carnegie Mellon University study of the BPL business model identifies pitfalls.

"It would take 17 years for the recovery of the initial investment," Haynie says. "And that puzzled me until I read the article and it said because broadband is dropping, DSL dial-up is getting cheaper every month.

"Deals are coming out, Verizon's fixin' to come out with some more stuff. The old thing $30 a month is going to be high. And that's what BPL wants right now, $30 for a residential, $50 for a business."

Haynie accuses proponents of deception proponents in "selling" the concept. He says the claim it will finally connect rural areas of the country to high-speed internet access is, well, hogwash!

"We know that what the BPL industry wants to do is pick the low-hanging fruit, the high-density population areas," Haynie says. "But that's the selling point they're using on the (Capitol) Hill. And that's the selling point they use with the commission. I heard Chairman (Michael) Powell say that himself along with several of the other commissioners.

"They have been sold this bill of goods. And if anybody would stop and think about it, if it was such a good deal to serve five customers in a four-square-mile area, the DSL and the cable people would be doing it now."

Haynie says he's seen and heard criticism of ARRL, much of it declaring the League hasn't done enough to address the BPL threat.

"Let me assure you, we have done a lot, and we have talked to a lot of our potential allies," Haynie says."We've had one, in-face meeting in Washington. We do constant e-mails back and forth.

"But I am not going to, and the League is not going to, reveal all the things we're working on because that would be ridiculous to show the hand to the industry. Let them figure out what we're up to."

What can you do and where do Haynie and the League see this going? Tune in next week for part two of our interview with Jim Haynie W5JBP.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia

--

Can radio services including ham radio survive with the level of interference that many experts say BPL will create? We will look into this in future reports. (ARNewsline (tm))

**

WITH THE ARRL: THREE LONGTIME AWARDS DISCONTINUED

Meantime, the ARRL Awards Branch has discontinued three longtime awards programs. Gone are the Rag Chewer's Club, the Old Timer's Club and the Friendship Awards.

According to the ARRL Letter, the society’s Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says that the number of amateurs applying for awards in general has declined significantly over the years, and interest in these three awards had slowed to a trickle.

Mills says that the awards programs eliminated had outlived their interest level. He adds that the cessation of the three awards is effective immediately. (ARRL)

**

RESTRUCTURING: NEW RULES FOR DANISH HAMS

More restructuring of ham radio is taking place around the world. This, as a set of new Amateur Radio regulations have been introduced in Denmark that make the nation code-free. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, reports:

--

The Danish Information Technology and Telecom Agency has announced new regulations for radio amateurs in Denmark. The main feature of the new regulations is the elimination of the Morse code examination for access to the HF bands. Danish radio amateurs are also now allowed to use parts of the 4-meter band without a special permit. These are: 70.0125 to 70.0625, 70.0875 to 70.1125, 70.3125 to 70.3875 and 70.4125 to 70.4875MHz. Beacons are allowed in the 70.0125 to 70.0500MHz portion of the band. Detailed Danish 70MHz band

plans can be found on the Internet.

I’m G4NJH in Nottingham.
--

The new regulations came into effect on the 1st of February. (GB2RS)

**

RESTRUCTURING: CROATIAN HAMS GET NEW PRIVILEGES ON 40 METERS

Croatia has become the first country in Region 1 to benefit from the expansion of the 40-meter band agreed at the World Radio Conference in Switzerland last summer. 9 A prefix amateurs have also been given privileges at 70 and 3400MHz and now no longer have to pass a Morse code test for access to the HF bands.

New amateur radio regulations came into effect in Croatia on the 26th of December but have only recently been announced to the world. Since that date Croatian amateurs have been permitted to operate between 7100 and 7200 kilohertz on a Secondary basis, with a maximum power of 1000 watts P-E-P. This is in addition to the normal Region 1 allocation of 7000 to 7100 kilohertz.

On 4 meters, Croatian amateurs now have 70.000 to 70.450 MHz, with a power limit of 10 watts. They also gain a new band between 3400 and 3410 MHz, with a maximum permitted power of 150 watts.

And like so many other nations, the Morse code requirement for an H-F band access license has been dropped. Under the new regulations and there are now only two classes in Croatia. They are the full license and a beginners' ticket. (GB2RS)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world Catalina Repeater Association system serving Los Angeles California from the island that’s 26 miles across the sea.

(5 sec pause here)

**

CONVENTIONS: HAMVENTION HOPES TO STAY IN DAYTON

Hamvention will probably stay in the Dayton Ohio area. This, according to the event’s General Chairman Gary Des Combes, N8EMO. In an interview with the Rain Report, Des Combes says that Dayton is the Hamvention’s home:

--

Des Combes: “My personal goal, and the goal of all of the volunteers is to maintain the show in Dayton Ohio. This is where it started and we would love to have it stay here. The plan we have no is to continue to go in that direction.”

--

How do planners intend to do this?

--

Des Combes: “What we need to do as a volunteer team is to work smarter, harder and more efficiently. Make the dollar ‘squeal’ so that the cost to the attendee and the flea-marketer and the exhibitors stay reasonable.”

--

What about the rumors of a move away from Dayton?

--

Des Combes: “There have been questions, quite frankly, from the exhibitors and others about wanting to move to newer and nicer facilities, but there are significant costs associated with that, and its our goal to keep this show a volunteer show because -- quite frankly -- we can do it better and more economically than if we went to a larger venue.”

--

Keeping the show in Dayton is only a small part of what Gary De Combes has to say about Hamvention 2004. Part one of the Rain interview with De Combes is on-line right now at www.rainreport.com and on the phone at 847-827-7246. Part 2 will be available on Friday, February 27th.

Hamvention 2004 takes place May 14, 15 and 16th at its traditional home at the Hara Arena in Dayton Ohio. (ARNewsline (tm), RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: EX-KG6IRO DUE BACK TO COURT

I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, with a late breaking story. Dateline Los Angeles California where former ham Jack Gerritsen, the ex-KG6IRO is headed back to court. This time for a probation hearing and sentenceing on charges that he tresspassed on a federal instalation. Bur local hams haqve gotten themselves involved in the sentencing proceedure and are trying to convince Judge Carolyn Turchin of United States District Court to ban Gerritsen from owening or operarating any transmitting equipment -- of any sort -- during his probation period.

This action appears to be a grass-roots effort by repeater owner operators all across Southern California who believe that Gerritsen is responsible for interference to their systems. They are asking all of their users and other hams in the area to send a letter to Judge Turchin explaining the importance of quashing any source of interference that could cause problems during emergencies. They also want to let the judge know all about Gerritsen’s past record and have her order him to stay away from ham radio or any other two-way service as a restriction of his probation.

Judge Turchin has set Monday, February 23rd for the hearing. Will let you know the outcome in next weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO EDUCATION: TEXAS HAM DONATES STATION TO SCHOOL

The San Angelo Texas Planning Commission has approved a 40 foot Amateur Radio tower for Santa Rita Elementary School. San Angelo businessman, Kenneth Gunther, W5ZJ, plans to donate the tower, a rotor, antenna's and radio equipment to the educational institution. The radio gear and antenna system will allow students to learn about telecommunications technology and earn their ham radio licenses.

W5ZJ, is the owner of Gunter Wholesale Electric Company. His donated tower will be erected inside the courtyard of the elementary school's main building. Plans for the 40 foot tower passed 6-1 after a motion to allow a 50 foot tower failed 4-3. (San Angelo Standard Times, WB5T)

**

RADIO GOOD-GUYS: COLORADO YOUTH RADIOS IN REPORT OF FOUND POLICE TWO-WAY

A Highlands Ranch, Colorado, teen appears to have done the right thing when he found a Denver police radio on Monday the 16th. Not sure what the unit was, he used it to let the police force know he had it.

The 13-year-old boy found the radio in the yard of a nearby home. This, after he saw it thrown from a sport utility vehicle. The unidentified youngster retrieved it, figured out how to turn it on and used the radio to tell a police dispatcher that he had it.

Denver police and Douglas County sheriff's officials were working to retrieve the radio. Officials say that they hadn't been notified that a radio was missing, and investigators were trying to determine who it belonged to. They are also looking into how this radio got out of the City and County of Denver.

The complete story is on-line at rockymountainnews.com/drmn/local/article/0,1299,DRMN_15_2660662,00.html (Rocky Mountain News, CGC)

**

ROAD RADIO SAFETY: STUDY FINDS LOTS OF IN-CAR DISTRACTIONS

Drivers are distracted 16.1 percent of the time their vehicles were moving and cellphones nor two-way radio is not the main culprit. This, according to a study conducted by the auto club and researchers at the University of North Carolina.

The investigation tracked 70 drivers from North Carolina and Pennsylvania. It found that Cellular telephones were not the major distraction. In fact only 30 percent of the subjects used a cell phone while their vehicle was moving compared with 97 percent who leaned over to reach for something and 91 percent who fiddled with the controls on their car’s entertainment system.

The study found all drivers fiddle with their radios or engage in other distracting behavior. This, even when they're being watched as part of a study on distracted drivers. (Science OnLine)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: NEW FROM CREATIVE SERVICES SOFTWARE

Turning to ham radio business, Creative Services Software has announced that version 3.0 of Pacterm for Windows and P K term for Windows will be released later this year. Version 3.0 not only includes new sound card modes, but also an integrated logging program to keep track of QSO's, DXCC and even do light contesting. It will also support exporting to ADIF for use with the ARRL Logbook of the World and to other logging programs, provide radio and rotor control, and be able to sync with Packet Clusters that are connected by the Packet window. More information on Creative Services Software products can be found at www.cssincorp.com (CSS via VHF Reflector)

**

THE ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY: CES PREDICTS GOOD SALES IN 2004

The Consumer Electronics Association -- better known by the initials CES -- says that the wholesale electronics market in 2004 is likely to grow to 100 point 99 billion dollars in sales. That's up 5 percent over 2003 and a major improvement over three years of negative or minimal growth.

CES is a trade group representing audio, video and mobile electronics makers. It says that the U.S. consumer electronics market is seeing a sharp growth in video products, which has helped to offset the decline in stand-alone audio products and in-car consumer electronics. Sales of new technologies such as plasma television screens were expected to generate nearly $1.5 billion in revenues for 2003, nearly tripling from $515 million just one year earlier. Growth in consumer electronics last peaked in 2000, when sales rose 12.7 percent to $96.37 billion over 1999. (Adapted from CES release)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: LELAND SMITH, W5KL OF QCWA - S.K.

Some sad news to report QCWA President Emeritus Leland Smith, W5KL, has become a Silent Key. According to QCWA webmaster Bob Roske, N0UF, Smith passed away in his sleep the evening of February 15th.

In addition to being President Emeritus of QCWA, Smith served as Chairman of the organizations Scholarship Committee, was President of The Old-Old Timers Club and a member of The Society Of Wireless Pioneers. (QCWA)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: RSGB PAST PRES. GEOFF STONE, G3FZL - S.K.

And word that Radio Society of Great Britain past president Geoff Stone, G3FZL, has also become a Silent Key. This following a long illness.

Stone served as the Society's President in 1964. The RSGB described him as a loyal servant of the Society, serving on Council and numerous boards including the VHF Committee. His funeral took place at on Wednesday, February 11th in South London. (RSGB)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT SAYS IT NEEDS $110,000 TO LAUNCH ECHO

AMSAT says that it urgently needs to raise $110,000 to help defray the launch of the Echo ham radio satellite. The bird is scheduled to ride into orbit thus coming June 29th, and the money has to be raided well before that date.

AMSAT like Amateur Radio Newsline is a federally recognized tax exempt 501(c)(3) organization, and your donation should be tax deductible in the United States. Information on how to support the Echo launch and other ham radio in space projects is on the web at www.amsat.org (AMSAT-NA)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: U-O-SAT AT AGE 20

Meantime, there’s a big anniversary coming up for ham radio space operations. March 1st marks the 20th anniversary of the UO11 ham radio satellite on-orbit. We have more in this report:

--

On the 1st March the UO-11 ham radio satellite, which is also known as UOSAT 2 will have been in space for two decades. To mark the event, AMSAT-UK will be issuing a commemorative QSL card in exchange for listener reports from stations hearing the signals during the month of March. The reports must be made by way of the reporting page on the web site and the QSL card will be in the form of a downloadable "E-QSL".

By way of background, UO-11 was the second satellite to be launched by Martin Sweeting, G3YJO's, group at the University of Surrey in here in England. Its telemetry beacon can still be heard on 145.825 MHz FM using nothing more than a handheld 2 meter rig. There is also a 2401.5 MHz beacon but signal is not very strong and represents quite a challenge.

Depending on the status of the satellite, it sometimes goes into 'safe' mode, and the beacon transmitters are not activate for days at a time. Because of this, University of Surrey ground station controllers will attempt to maximise the number of days the transmitters are active during the month of March.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Rick Johnson, KA9VZD reporting.

--

An article and pictures about U O11 and the rules for filing reports are available on the AMSAT-UK website. Its in cyberspace at www.uk.amsat.org (AMSAT-UK)

**

RADIO IN SPACE: RADIO TELESCOPES DISCOVER NEW GALAXY

Using radio telescopes on Earth and another optical scope in space, a team of astrophysicists says it's detected a tiny galaxy that is the farthest known object from Earth. California Institute of Technology astronomer Richard Ellis says the galaxy is roughly 13 billion light-years from Earth. According to Science On Line, an expert at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in Massachusetts says the discovery gives a rare glimpse of the time when the first stars and galaxies began to emerge. (Science OnLine)

**

INTERNATIONAL - ISRAEL: A REPEATER FOR ALBANIA

Hagal International reports that the Israel Amateur Radio Club has donated a 2 meter repeater to Albania’s amateur radio society. Hopefully, by the time you read this it will be up and running in Tirana, which is Albania’s capital city. (Hagal International)

**

CONTEST CALENDAR: THE DIGITAL SKIRMISH

Turning to the contest calendar, "The Skirmish" - that’s the Troy Amateur Radio Association’s digital prefix contest, will be held on April 17. Categories include PSK31, PSK63, MFSK, RTTY, Packet, ASCII, SSTV and others with activity on 160 through 6 meters excluding the Warc bands. You can find additional information at www.n2ty.org/seasons/tara_seasons.html (Via E-Mail)

**

CONTEST CALENDAR: N3FTI FROM TURKS & CAICOS FOR ARRL DX CONTEST

Steve Kerns, N3FTI, says he will be on the island of Providenciales, Grid Square FL31 in the Turks & Caicos chain for this years ARRL World Wide DX Contest. During the contest, his group consisting of WE3C, KQ3V and himself will be active as VQ5A. This is the first time to Steve’s knowledge this prefix has been activated from the Turks and Caicos and the first time this prefix has been used by any station. During non-contest times listen for Steve operating as VP5 stroke N3FTI.

This contest runs for 48 hours from zero hours UTC on Saturday the 21st of February on all the contest bands between 160 and 10 meters. For more information the VQ5A operation, check www.qsl.net/n3fti on the world-wide-web (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In D-X, word that LZ1ZF is celebrating his 35th anniversary of being on the amateur radio bands with the special callsign L35ZF. He is active on all bands and modes. until the 31st of December.

Also, SM0CCM will be active as J73CCM from Dominica through the 4th of March. He will operate on 160 to 6 meters mostly CW, with some RTTY and PSK 31. QSL as directed on the air.

And word that JA2EZD will be traveling in Vietnam and Cambodia through the end of the month. He plans to operate using the calls 3W2B and XU7AAA. Again, QSL as directed on the air.

And QSL Manager José of Jesus Moura Costa, PS8ET tells Amateur Radio Newsline that he has relocated. His new address is Q-25 C-17 Parque Piauí Teresina, PI. 64.025-100 Brazil South América

Lastly, 4X4SIX is an Israeli 6 meter beacon operating on 50.080 MHz. The team of 4X6ON and 4Z5AY built the 5 watt station which announces its call sign around the clock in Morse using a J-Pole antenna.

(Above from various DX sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE LONG HAM RADIO WALK

And finally this week, the story of a long walk that’s taking ham radio with it. Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF reports:

--

Tony Whitaker, G3RKL, from Sheffield, in the United Kingdom is off to New Zealand for a short walk. Well not exactly a short walk. More like 750 miles as Whitaker treks from Invercargill to Blenheim, along State Highway 6 up the West Coast of the South Island. And he will operate an Amateur Radio station along the way.

Whitaker will be on the air using the special callsign ZL6SHS on H-F, V-H-F and U-H-F while actually walking. He also plans to use F-M simplex, Echolink and I-R-L-P Internet-linked repeaters in places where they are available. He will use them to keep in touch with his ham radio friends back home in the U-K.

Whitaker’s marathon walk starts in Invercargill on the 21st of February. If all goes to plan he is scheduled to arrive in Blenheim on the 8th of April -- probably a bit tired -- but very satisfied. We will keep you posted on his progress.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline down-under, I’m Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF.

--

This is not Whitaker’s fist long ham radio walk. He has already made seven others including one in Australia. (GB2RS)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the newly created Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is up and operating. We already have signed up over two dozen hams who are willing to assist others. If you can help, or if you need assistance please drop a note with your name, address, hone number and area of expertise to mentor@arnewsline.org and we will get back to you as fast as we can.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilb anks, AE5DW, in New Orleans saying 73, Happy Mardi Gras and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

3232. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 09:57:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6wE%b.22978$W74.1670@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88008

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Of course! most Christians I know
> actually pay attention to the sermon
> on the mount, which tells the faithful
> not to either have "Public prayer"
> and specifically forbids oaths to God.

The words "...one nation, under God..." is neither a public prayer nor an oath to God (it isn't even an oath). The Pledge of Allegiance it is a pledge to one's own self. Therefore, it violates nothing in Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, Mike.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3233. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 10:06:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%EE%b.23007$W74.979@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88009

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > (snip) A good place to start might be
> > the efforts to push American food makers
> > to produce food products in compliance
> > with Jewish dietary law (snip)
>
>
> You misinterpret what Kosher certification
> is all about.
>
> No one is "forcing" manufacturers to do
> anything. (snip)

The word I used was "push," Phil. Not "force" or "forcing."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3234. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 12:30:03 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <9MqdnWL34dXKpaLd4p2dnA@crocker.com>
Source record: 88010

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.htpmpdf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 23:49:20 +0000 (UTC), jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote:
>
> >tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> >> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
> >> have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received
a
> >> letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
> >> operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does
anyone
> >> know if what they are threatening me with is legal?
> >>
> >>
> >Foolishly ignoring the enormous stench of a troll...
>
> Yup.
>
> >In the US (and some other places) you can sue for just about anything,
> >including "I don't like the color of your shirt".
> >
> >Winning such a suite is a separate issue, and I am sure this will be
debated
> >with about 579 posts while it becomes a liberal vs conservative
arguement.
>
> You mean a "code" versus "no code" discussion..... <ggg>
>
WOW! 3 messages from CB vs BPL to Code vs NoCode, that has to be a record
for morphing a thread completely away from where it started!

3235. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 12:30:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040227073029.02537.00003193@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88011

In article <wbE%b.22920$W74.14390@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:

>> I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive.
>> I know many other Christians (several
>> dozen at least) who find the taking of His
>> name in oaths and pledges to be offensive
>> as well.

> Then you're truly the first, and only Christian, I've talked to who finds
>the words "...one nation, under God..." offensive.
>As for the others you
>speak about, your experience is vastly different than mine.

With all due respect, Dwight, you should meet a wider variety of Christians. And check out Matthew 4:33-37.
>
>> I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I
>> know around here know what "kosher"
>> means. Most of them are not Jews, and
>> most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
>> they know what it means.
>
> Don't twist the subject, Jim.

It's not twisted at all. They know what it means and it doesn't bother them a bit.

>Did that same 95% of the adults you know
>also know that much of the food in our grocery stores, the foods we eat
>everyday, is prepared according to dietary laws of the Jewish religion?

Yes! And they have no problem with it. Not an issue.

>Were
>they aware of that tiny "K" symbol on many of those same food products?

Yes! And they have no problem with it. Not an issue.

>These are the things I talked about, not the meaning of a word.

They all go together. Most children I know, Jews and non-Jews, also understand the basic meanings of the words and symbols. We may not all know all the rituals and requirements, but we've got the basic idea. And it's not an issue.
>
>> And the problem is?

>
> You don't have a problem with the fact that a religious group is
>manipulating much of the foods we eat?

"Manipulating?" How? Which of the kosher rules do you find objectionable? Will eating something that satisfies a Jewish requirement somehow make me less of a Christian, or less of an American? Oy!

>There are very few things in this
>world as intrusive as that.

Then you'd better become a subsistence farmer, because all sorts of things are done to your food. And I hope you don't think that government food inspectors can do it all.

>Given a choice between this and the word "God"
>in a pledge, I'll choose the latter any day of the week.

Then let's do it this way:

On Sunday, we say "under God" for Christians
On Monday, we leave the word out, for atheists and agnostics
On Tuesday, we say "under Vishnu" for Hindus
On Wednesday, we say "under the gods" for pagans
On Thursday, we say "under He Who Is" for those who don't like to use His Name directly.
On Friday, we say (insert appropriate Arabic phrase here) for Muslims
On Saturday, we say (insert appropriate Hebrew phrase here) for Jews

They all mean the same thing (except for Monday) so why not?

>> I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego
>> and Ragu tomato sauces aren't kosher.
>
> Those reading are free to look through their own kitchen shelves for
>examples.

Omigawrsh, Spam isn't kosher! Neither are bacon cheeseburgers! Or the lobster bisque, the bean with bacon soup, the alfredo sauce with the little meatballs...!!!
>
>> How is it hidden?

> By not asking the people of this country whether they even wanted their
>foods changed to conform to Jewish dietary law before doing so.

We're not asked about a lot of things. Nobody asked me if I wanted cars to have seat belts or that danged third pin on electric cords.

In fact, nobody asked me if I wanted my food inspected at all. How dare they!

>Through the
>use of a tiny, nondescript, "K" symbol instead of simply saying this product
>was prepared according to the dietary laws of the Jewish religion.

>By not
>making that "K" symbol known to the public through publications and other
>media. By downplaying the religious significance (by claiming it just means
>"good food") whenever the topic is broached publically.

Methinks you doth protest too much, Dwight.
>
>> That's because those groups don't have
>> dietary rules which require certification.
>
> True, Christians and Moslems don't have dietary rules which require
>certification.

Muslims do.

>But, by the same token, Jews don't have dietary rules which
>require the rest of the nation to eat the same things. If Jews have special
>dietary needs, let them have a small section of the store just like any
>other group wanting specialty foods.

The ghetto aisle, huh? Keep 'em in the back of the store, away from everybody
else.

Oh wait, let's get those Eye-Talian foods in their own special section too.
Linguini, zucchini...get all those "eenie" foods away! To say nothing of French
fries! Chili? Tacos? Hot and sour soup? Hey - what's this "lox" stuff?

>But nothing justifies the manipulation
>of mainstream food products to conform to the requirements of a specific
>religion in a country that has, at it's core, the concept that no single
>religion may dominate.

It's not manipulation. Any and all food processors choose whether or not to
seek kosher certification.
>
>> Brings in the $$.

> If Kosher truly brings in the money, why not advertise it directly instead
>of hiding it under a tiny, nondescript, "K" at the bottom of a product
>label?

No need to. Everybody who cares knows what it means. Do they advertise that
ketchup has tomatoes in it?

>Clearly, the claim that it increases profit is somewhat suspect.
>
Only to you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3236. Re: Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 16:00:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402270800.491b33c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88012

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040225150427.07155.00000933@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <di3ug1-sf3.ln1@little.id.au>, "Mark Little" <mark@au.id.little>
> writes:

> >Tsk, tsk. Misogyny at work. It would seem that you are as 1920s are the
> >people you are complaining about.
>
> Tsk, tsk, Mark, you fail to note _sarcasm_ in the posting.

With you, who can tell? You never keep your own stories
straight, Lennie...How do you expect others to do it...?!?!

> Note some of the OTHER players in this zoo...emphasis on
> machismo ("be a real man and learn code"...etc.).

At elast SOME of us have SOME chance of BEING "machismo",
Lennie...Unlike yourself.

> Note the long-time name FISTS as an organization of code lovers
> with its close emotional attachment to machismo, strength, power
> and so forth embodied by "fists."

Or "fists", and in the colloquial term for a skilled hand on a
key, Lennie....?!?!

Naaaaawh. THAT would make SENSE!

> Thumbing through any collection of U.S. amateur radio magazines
> that have photographs of amateurs will reveal that U.S. amateurs
> are overwhelmingly male and white. For at least a half century.

Here we go again...Lennie, what's up with you and sexism and
racism? Can't find any VALID arguments so you play the "race" card?

> "Machismo" is a modified latino name for extreme maleness in
> the traditional male role of strength, power, fighting ability, and
> (to some) leadership of the tribe.

And so far YOU are the ONLY one making an issue of it, Lennie.

Me thinks you are trying to overcompensate for some other
"deficiency" in your personal life.

> I should apologize for the use of a latino label since, to us in the
> U.S. sunbelt (all states along the southern border), Spanish words
> and phrases are somewhat common in our version of English. I
> don't believe that is true in Australia or New Zealand or even the

> UK where modified English is also spoken.

What you SHOULD apologize for, Lennie, is your habitual lying,
antagonism, and cruel and selfish behaviour...

> The "tribe" aspect shouldn't be overlooked since there is some
> extreme polarization on the issue and the fight-to-the-death
> attitude of olde-tymers demanding strict and utter adherence to
> to the glorious and noble ways of Their youth. Everyone MUST
> do as They did or not be considered as "real" as They are.

The "must do as we did" thing has been disproven over and over,
yet you continue to try and envoke it, Lennie.

Why? Do you ENJOY being made a fool of?

> Note the comment of Brian Burke in this thread. He notes that it
> seems perfectly permissible for any FISTS member to denounce
> NCI at any time, yet the converse is not possible. Hypocrisy
> in clear evidence, the one-sided fight-to-the-death attitude in full
> fury by the code lovers.

Another misdirected twisting of the truth...but hey...What's one
more amongst the hundreds of others, eh...?!?!

> I find it curiously odd that the mighty male morseman legions of
> FISTS be headed by Nancy Kott, clearly a female in photographs.

Clearly a female in person, too. And you'd get a chance to KNOW
that if you were a licensed, ACTIVE Amateur Radio operator,
Lennie...Ms Kott makes it to several of teh alrger events every year.

> Of course, again from my geographical vantage point in the middle
> of the movie mecca, Los Angeles, here there be experts in make-
> up. Who knows what ever lurks behind the "front panel?"

Or who know's what evil lurks on Lanark...?!?!

WE DO... ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

3237. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 16:59:42 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c1nt1p$t83$02$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88013

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:20040226183847.21955.00000744@mb-m20.aol.com...
| In article <c1j3a8$n7$01$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut"
<Helmut@Stroeml.com>
| writes:
|
| >
| >Yes, we have constitutions in our countries and in the European Union. I
| >don't know if there are any ammendments. What you reffering to is freedom
of
| >speech? No, there are no restrictions in that. But one has to stay for
that
| >what one is saying. And if that is bad, one has to "pay" for that bad
| >behavior. Like Larry. It is not to supress his opinion or the
disagreement,
| >it is the words and the soul and the bad spirit coming out of his lines.
The
| >way he acts here on Usenet against other HAMS shows how he is acting on
the
| >bands.
|
| Helmut:
|
| Very interesting. I find it quite extraordinary that you are able to
gauge my
| behavior on the bands by what you read from me on Usenet. In reality, my
| on-the-air behavior is probably very much like your own, assuming that you
| are friendly, courteous, and helpful to your fellow hams.

so why do you spit out thinks like:

[quote] All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
making us just another Third World nation. How charming. [quote ends]

against other fellow hams.

| >This makes not the best image of an american ham, on a newsgroup
| >which is read throughout the world. It damages the reputation of Amateur
| >Radio. Period.
|
| I think that far worse damage is done by making rash, totally blind
judgments
| which, in any other forum, would be legally actionable as libelous.

Larry, it was you, who posted:

[quote] All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
making us just another Third World nation. How charming. [quote ends]

| As for you, my friend, I am pleased to advise you that I do not use your
| behavior on Usenet as a means of judging your on-the-air behavior as a
| radio amateur, because I have not personally experienced the latter.
| However, as a Usenet participant, I must say that you seem to have the
| typical shoot-from-the-hip attitude down pat. Nothing new here.

Again, Larry, the initial qoute I've refered to, was your bucket full of
blind agression, you spilled over all no-coders in the world. You did not
specify any nationality. Even then, it would have been unacceptable
behavior, which allows the conclusion, your behavior against nocoders on the
air is conducted alike.

A Liberal is a person who uses other people's money to assuage
his own guilt.
A Socialist is a person who views government as the ultimate alternative
to his own ingenuity and initiative.

>Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!

Anyone who seeks to place the government in the position of being the
ultimate power over the people.

Larry, your definition describes any dictatorship, democracy and kingdom as
well

Marx,
Though he inspired communism, he was a true sozialist himself

Lenin, Stalin, Kruschev, Ho Chi Ming,
they are all outdated, sk.

Kim Sung Il,
yes, he is leading North Corea the old fashioned communistic way.

You were writing of things you dont now about. Assumably, while your time in
Germany, you did not have much time to watch the "normal life" in the
country you were living in for a certain periode of time. Otherwise you've
had learned what the Liberal, the Sozialist, the Christian and the Communist
Parties are standing for and what they are pledging for.

According to your initial post: [shortquote]are mainly liberal, socialist,
Communist sympathizers who hate America
and want to weaken us by reducing all standards [shortquote ends]
all CW-tested-Hams must be supporting Democrats ,Republicans, and Cristian
Parties.

But this is not a political forum, and what anyone is thinking politically,
has nothing to do with HAM Radio.

In all the respect for the american freedom of speech, and your right to express it here, Larry, the whole initial statment of you is not to be made of a ham. You know the Ham Rules? As you are a member of different HAM organizations, I am sure you do. Instead of writing such rubbish about other fellow hams, even when they are underpreveleged in comparishion to you, why aren't you reaching out, give them a supporting "hand" and haul them over to your side of the street? Because they don't want to practice your favourite kind of game?

Larry, dont be jealous! If someone gets a gift, like on Valentines Day, and you dont, do you cry out loud: "Dont give it to him, I did not get one ever!"? To be jealous about things other get, is worth a child.

Larry, it is not worth to argue about things you cannot refrain from beeing ruled from the authorities. It is weakening your heart, and your mind. Stay strong, and take the things as they will come. Stay calm, it is not worth to be angry about anything which is out of our reach to lead it in any direction.

There were so many paragraphs in your previous postings, I hope I answered all of them in good courtesy. If I forgot some, you will remind me.

Bis Bald, Servus, Tschuess

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

|
| 73 de Larry, K3LT
|

3238. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 17:26:51 UTC
From: Helmut <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
Message-ID: <c1nukm$a4v$04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88014

Hey, Mike, wrong translation,

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:coKdnVIbGKJ5EaPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
| Helmut wrote:
| > Servus, Ralph,
| >
| > hast du noch nicht gemerkt, daï¿½ hier in der Gruppe fast nur Idioten
| > schreiben? Ameri-Egoisten die glauben, die sind der Nabel der Welt.
Warum
| > geht es ï¿½berall sonst in der Welt ohne diese depperte Morsediskussion
| > reibungslos ï¿½ber die Bï¿½hne?
|
| Hehe. Perhaps you are correct, only idiots post here!

It is: "almost only idiots"

| Welome, you'll fit right in I think.

I did not ecpect you to be in this group, Micheal. Do you feel like that?
|

Where did you catch your german?

| - Mike KB3EIA -
|

3239. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 18:09:02 UTC
From: Inte Rnet <inte.rnet@hemma.hos>
Message-ID: <c1o13vhmt1@phys-news1.kolumbus.fi>
Source record: 88015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:c1612fira1@news.x-echo.com...
> Why is it not OK to freeband on unused parts
> of 11 and 10 meters?
> when guns are outlawed only outlaws will have
> guns...no, you won't find many freebanders lobbying
> for change to open the freqs because the law as
> it reads, doesn't bug us.

Also: if getting married was illegal,
only outlaws would have in-laws....

This proves my case against all CB-transplants

73 es QRO

3240. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 18:10:50 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040227131050.973$ky@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Inte Rnet" <inte.rnet@hemma.hos> wrote:
> This proves my case against all CB-transplants
>
> 73 es QRO
>
Didn't know you had a case, which court is it in?

--
Mopar http://www.allpar.com/mopar.html

3241. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 18:44:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <403F8FF2.7080802@psu.edu>
Source record: 88017

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive.
>>I know many other Christians (several
>>dozen at least) who find the taking of His
>>name in oaths and pledges to be offensive
>>as well.
>
>
>
> Then you're truly the first, and only Christian, I've talked to who finds
> the words "...one nation, under God..." offensive. As for the others you
> speak about, your experience is vastly different than mine.

Once upon a time you wrote:

> I snipped it because I have no time to respond to personal anecdotes that
> can't be verified. If that's your story, fine. Enough said.

We can't verify that you know these people. If that's your story, fine.
Enough said.

>>I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I
>>know around here know what "kosher"
>>means. Most of them are not Jews, and
>>most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
>>they know what it means.
>
>
>
> Don't twist the subject, Jim. Did that same 95% of the adults you know
> also know that much of the food in our grocery stores, the foods we eat
> everyday, is prepared according to dietary laws of the Jewish religion? Were
> they aware of that tiny "K" symbol on many of those same food products?
> These are the things I talked about, not the meaning of a word.

Everyone I know reads the labels. granted that's just something that
you can't verify.
>
>>And the problem is?
>
>
> You don't have a problem with the fact that a religious group is
> manipulating much of the foods we eat? There are very few things in this
> world as intrusive as that. Given a choice between this and the word "God"

> in a pledge, I'll choose the latter any day of the week.

HAR! The method of preparation is a matter of exclusions, not
inclusions, with the exception of the salt sometimes put on chicken. You
speak as if the practice involves putting stuff into the food. It does not.

>>I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego
>>and Ragu tomato sauces aren't kosher.
>
>
>
> Those reading are free to look through their own kitchen shelves for
> examples.
>
>
>
>>How is it hidden?
>
>
>
> By not asking the people of this country whether they even wanted their
> foods changed to conform to Jewish dietary law before doing so.

Dwight, you are way off base here. There is no coercion here except
that there is a market that won't buy food items unless they have been
prepared a certain way. That method of preparation is so innocuous and
doesn't add much expense at all, so many if not most manufacturers are
willing and happy enough to do it.

> Through the
> use of a tiny, nondescript, "K" symbol instead of simply saying this product
> was prepared according to the dietary laws of the Jewish religion. By not
> making that "K" symbol known to the public through publications and other
> media. By downplaying the religious significance (by claiming it just means
> "good food") whenever the topic is broached publically.

Sigh... there is no actual religious significance to the food, other
than that there are some people who attach some to it. Eating Kosher
food does not make me Jewish, just the same as if I refused to touch
alcohol it would not make me Baptist.

>>That's because those groups don't have
>>dietary rules which require certification.
>
>
>
> True, Christians and Moslems don't have dietary rules which require
> certification.

Wrong! There are Moslems that do have dietary restrictions, and Many
Christian churches forbid alcohol consumption.

> But, by the same token, Jews don't have dietary rules which
> require the rest of the nation to eat the same things.

No they don't.

> If Jews have special
> dietary needs, let them have a small section of the store just like any
> other group wanting specialty foods.

Actually, they do. There are certain foods that for one reason or the
other are niche foods, such as Gefilte fish. Those are in specialty
sections.

> But nothing justifies the manipulation
> of mainstream food products to conform to the requirements of a specific
> religion in a country that has, at it's core, the concept that no single
> religion may dominate.

Do you really think this Dwight?

A food company sets up a production line. Most companies want to sell
as much as possible. Some small portion of consumers have some specific
guidelines regarding food preparations, many of which are good sanitary
practice. Is is more economical to make two production lines, one which
is Kosher, and one which is not? This being especially the case where
there is no identifiable difference in the products? (while some
products have a definite taste difference, like poultry, others are
identical)

It makes no economical sense, and most people consider it a positive
thing anyway. You are in a major minority here.

>>Brings in the $$.
>
>
>
> If Kosher truly brings in the money, why not advertise it directly instead
> of hiding it under a tiny, nondescript, "K" at the bottom of a product
> label? Clearly, the claim that it increases profit is somewhat suspect.

Because they are being discreet. People like you get upset about such
things. But you do know how to find the difference, so just eat things
that don't have the little K on them. BTW, you might also want to avoid
"pareve" marked foods also. Not *necessarily* Kosher, but do you want to
take the chance?

Perhaps this is the chance for you to make some money here. You could
start a food chain called "Stewart's Non-Kosher Foods"! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3242. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:13:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402271213.52081782@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88018

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040226010915.21232.00004474@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0402251823.1673ec89@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> No, it's not a political protest thread.
> >>
> >> Just a description of what it took to be a radio operator at radio station
> WAR
> >> back in WW2. Copied from a Yahoo reflector:
> >>
> >> This from an article in Radio News of November '42 regarding the radio
> station
> >> WAR.
> >>
> >> "...The average person thinks of a highly trained radio operator a man who
> can
> >> send radiograms with very little confusion and at a fair rate of
> speed....say
> >> the messages are actually handled at around fifteen or even twenty words a
> >> minute for a short period of time.
snip
> >>
> >> Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,
> W0US
> >> and others.
> >
> >Nice trip down mammary lane, but what has this to do with amateur radio?
>
> TAFKARJ is trying to "prove" something by connecting SK hams
> with the U.S. Army and Washington Army Radio of early 1942.

You know, Len, when you want to talk Army radio, its considered
completely irrelevant. Its just NOT Amateur Radio!

When TAFKARJ wants to talk Army radio, it is wholesome and wunnerful,
and has everything to do with amateur radio somehow, even though
amateur radio was OUTLAWED at the time he speaks of.

I don't think these guys are complete fools, but there edging their
way over.

billy

3243. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:19:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402271219.2fdfbba2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88019

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251829.32a33ffc@posting.google.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Not real hams. Amateur Radio was suspended at the time, unless you
> consider a real ham to be one without operating priveleges.
>
> And hopefully they weren't operating WAR using W3GRF, W0DX,
> W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US, or other callsigns.

Hey Dan, tell me about these wannabees we have today. C'mon Dan, tell
me about them.

If you unzip very slowly you might get your tie out w/o too much
damage, hihi.

"We've got another bleeder!"

3244. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:22:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040227152210.11022.00004413@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 88021

In article <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>By the way, radio amateurs are "ordinary civilians" who happen to have
>passed a license exam.

No. They are self-defined exceptional people who can do things in
their imagination that ordinary civilians cannot or will not.

Some radio amateurs are so self-defined as to be superior to any and
all radio professionals.

Some radio amateurs are - by public display - arrogant control freaks
who like to imagine they prey on ordinary civilians.

So far you are batting 3 for 3. Well done. Not rare.

LHA / WMD

3245. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:22:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040227152210.11022.00004412@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 88022

In article <403E2B04.1806A537@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> I'll just put you down in the same emotional category as other
>> emotionally-seven-year-old Extras.
>>
>> Those are very "involved" as long as their attention spans last... :-)
>
>They are as involved as they'd like to be. You are as involved as you
>can be.

Poor baby. Still INVOLVED with tossing personal insults and nasty
comments to others that don't agree with your views.

Your behavior remains constant at emotional tantrum level equal to
the average seven-year-old.

Try addressing SUBJECTS instead of the personalities who comment
against your views. Few care one whit about your perceived personal
affronts or the emotional injuries you seem to suffer while reading
these posts. Grow thicker skin.

Now go sit down in front of your tansceiver and have an oriongasm.

LHA / WMD

3246. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:22:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040227152211.11022.00004414@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 88020

In article <403E1E16.5A19BD3A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Lots of us have long noted your civil behavior and your gracious manner
>:-) :-) :-)

...and yours.

LHA / WMD

3247. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:25:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402271225.7c32bdf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88023

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251850.160d4e3d@posting.google.com>...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>...
> > To give you a lough for the day, and maybe you fell better about your fuel
> > prices:
> >
> > Gernerally, fuel prices over here in EU are around 1,00 Euro PER LITER
> > (quarter gallon), so don't complain about high prices.
>
> Your high prices are because of punitive taxation by your elected
> governments.

They're probably passing higher taxes as we speak.

> Though almost 50%
> > driving diesel (abt 0,80 euros /liter) powered vehicles (exluding commercial
> > trucks), we also have this price differences within short range.
> > Szenario: Driving from Venice/IT to Prague/Tschechnia (400 miles) fill up in
> > venice for 1.09, next stop near Vienna/Austria you pay only 0.65 and in
> > prague you can get hte liter of diesel for slightly over 50 cents.
> > They (Oil Companies) use the same excuse for the different prices as they do
> > over there at your side. BTW, ESSO and MOBILE also are the most expensive
> > brands over here.
>
> In central Ohio, the price of gas fluctuates +/- .25 every week. My
> dad goes to Florida each winter, the price of gas fluctuates there +/-
> 0.

It was $1.58.99 this morning. This afternoon it is $1.78.99.
Probably be back to $1.58.99 by Wednesday. I'll keep you posted.

> > Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
> > manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
> > vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.
>
> They only dump the showboats on the USA because Bill Clinton/Algore
> forgot to renew the EPA Fleet Miles Per Gallon requirements. They
> were [expletive deleted] idiots. So much for "Earth in the Balance!"

I was looking at newer used cars today. Hardly a 4-banger out there
anymore. Everything seems to be a 200hp Six or higher.

> > Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70. And their
> > performance is not less the gas engines.

Impossible. And then there's the noise. Sounds like someone put a
length of chain in a galvanized bucket and strapped it on a paint
shaker.

> > So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into
> > your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
> > You know, you are filling up CHEAP.

Diesel is often higher than gas.

> We pay for our fuel in different ways. I don't see too many EU
> soldiers trying to keep the flow of oil moving out of the mideast.
>
> > Greetings from Austria
> >
> > 73 de OE8SOQ
> > Helmut
>
> bb

bb

3248. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 20:35:48 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <9n8v30te373h1b0rch79j6t7mj76l5vf92@4ax.com>
Source record: 88024

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 19:18:43 -0500, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Helmut wrote:
>> Servus, Ralph,
>>
>> hast du noch nicht gemerkt, daï¿½ hier in der Gruppe fast nur Idioten
>> schreiben? Ameri-Egoisten die glauben, die sind der Nabel der Welt. Warum
>> geht es ï¿½berall sonst in der Welt ohne diese depperte Morsediskussion
>> reibungslos ï¿½ber die Bï¿½hne?
>
>Hehe. Perhaps you are correct, only idiots post here! Welome, you'll fit
>right in I think.

Um, Mike, there's more to it than that....

Below is a rough (very, very rough!) translation of Helmut's entire
message in this thread. (thanks to our friends at Babel Fish for
helping with this one.....http://world.altavista.com/)

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Hello Ralph,

If you have not yet noticed, here in the group almost only
the idiots write? American egoists believe they are the navel of the
world. Why if it goes everywhere, otherwise, in the world without this
dopey Morse discussion freely from problems above the stage?

Apart from the fact that the American radio friends have the support
of their national security organizations like FEMA and Homeland
Security, Nationwide Huricane Center or similar groups, they try a
national American ham radio club (which, by the way, only approx. 20%
the radio hams in America are members) without any legs to stand on.
Have a look at our example at Linz, there the Red Cross complaints
added an official side to it. And the countercomplaint of the PLC -
operator must be waited for first, for its outcome.

In any case, it is very amusing to read here, I an sometimes surprised
a little bit, that people with zero education can generally acquire a
license. They don't know much outside their own fence posts.
Nevertheless actually believe, their soldiers die in the Iraq for the
oil, so that they can refuel more cheaply. (See EXXON + Mobil Thread).

Nice day still and 73
de OE8SOQ
Helmut

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>

Hmmmm. Are you thinkin' what I'm thinkin' ? :)

> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

3249. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 21:31:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403FB731.5EFB1488@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88025

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >By the way, radio amateurs are "ordinary civilians" who happen to have
> >passed a license exam.
>
> No. They are self-defined exceptional people who can do things in
> their imagination that ordinary civilians cannot or will not.

I've observed no one here defining himself in that manner. What we're
left with is YOU defining someone in that manner.

> Some radio amateurs are so self-defined as to be superior to any and
> all radio professionals.

I've observed no one here defining himself in that manner. What we have
is just YOU defining someone in that manner.

> Some radio amateurs are - by public display - arrogant control freaks
> who like to imagine they prey on ordinary civilians.

You seem to have a problem with anyone who has achieved something you
have not. You've surely memorized that N2EY of your likely actions by
now.
All hams are simply ordinary citizens who've passed an amateur radio
license exam. You aren't one of them.

> So far you are batting 3 for 3. Well done. Not rare.

I submit that you don't know one end of a bat (baseball-type or the
mammal) from the other.

Dave K8MN

3250. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-27 21:36:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <403FB855.D3708F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88026

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <403E2B04.1806A537@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I'll just put you down in the same emotional category as other
> >> emotionally-seven-year-old Extras.
> >>
> >> Those are very "involved" as long as their attention spans last... :-)
> > >
> > >They are as involved as they'd like to be. You are as involved as you
> > >can be.
>
> Poor baby. Still INVOLVED with tossing personal insults and nasty
> comments to others that don't agree with your views.

Poor Leonard. Unable to accept a simple statement of fact. It would
make no difference if you agreed with my views. You'd still have no
involvement in amateur radio.

> Your behavior remains constant at emotional tantrum level equal to
> the average seven-year-old.

Leonard, meet Leonard.

> Try addressing SUBJECTS instead of the personalities who comment
> against your views. Few care one whit about your perceived personal
> affronts or the emotional injuries you seem to suffer while reading
> these posts. Grow thicker skin.

So I'm to do as you say and not as you do. Is that it?

> Now go sit down in front of your tansceiver and have an oriongasm.

I'll sit in front of it or not as I choose. I'll excercise the
privileges granted by my license or I won't given my mood. I'll do as I
like; you do as you can.

Dave K8MN

3251. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 01:31:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LbS%b.25044$hm4.22211@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88027

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0402271219.2fdfbba2@posting.google.com...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251829.32a33ffc@posting.google.com>...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Not real hams. Amateur Radio was suspended at the time, unless you
> > consider a real ham to be one without operating priveleges.
> >
> > And hopefully they weren't operating WAR using W3GRF, W0DX,
> > W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US, or other callsigns.
>
> Hey Dan, tell me about these wannabees we have today. C'mon Dan, tell
> me about them.
>
> If you unzip very slowly you might get your tie out w/o too much
> damage, hihi.
>

Hey look everybody....another CBPlusser.

Dan/W4NTI

> "We've got another bleeder!"

3252. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 01:35:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040227203548.12501.00006497@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 88029

In article <1e4e3692.0402271213.52081782@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> >> Operators there at that time included W3GRF(sk), W0DX (sk) W9BRD/VA3ZBB,
>> W0US
>> >> and others.
>> >
>> >Nice trip down mammary lane, but what has this to do with amateur radio?
>>
>> TAFKARJ is trying to "prove" something by connecting SK hams
>> with the U.S. Army and Washington Army Radio of early 1942.
>
>You know, Len, when you want to talk Army radio, its considered
>completely irrelevant. Its just NOT Amateur Radio!
>
>When TAFKARJ wants to talk Army radio, it is wholesome and wunnerful,
>and has everything to do with amateur radio somehow, even though
>amateur radio was OUTLAWED at the time he speaks of.

Careful about those emotionally-loaded words, next thing you know
we will have another Sermon On The Antenna Mount about the
glory and the majesty of morse code.

Washington Army Radio (WAR) had as much to do with amateur
radio as ham-astronauts got into spaceflight through ham radio. :-)

>I don't think these guys are complete fools, but there edging their
>way over.

Not fools in the true sense. They are just BELIEVERS in the
Church of St. Hiram. None of them had anything to do with Army
radio and so they grasp at idolized imagination straws trying to
promote morse code and the old ways. If they find some scrap
of information that supports their evangelism, they will want to
scrap with anyone about it and its veracity. :-)

LHA / WMD

3253. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 01:35:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040227203549.12501.00006498@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 88028

In article <xnfcneeyarg.htpkoue.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>Most of the meat and dairy products in "mainstream" supermarkets are not
>>kosher certified.
>>
>>And the mark many folks look for today is "organic"
>
> The only "forcing" is that if a product is labeled Kosher (or
> organic, or diabetic-safe) and it is not in fact Kosher (or organic
> or diabetic-safe) the State or Federal government will get involved
> in Truth-in-Labelling law violations.

Gosh. "Genghis Cohen's Mongolian Barbecue" restaurant is still
operating in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles...has been
for years. Is there mongolian kosher? :-)

LHA / WMD

3254. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 02:41:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040227214132.21457.00004265@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 88031

In article <xnfcneeyarg.htpkoue.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 26 Feb 2004 17:00:16 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>I just checked the kitchen shelves. Prego and Ragu tomato sauces
>>aren't kosher.
>
> More accurately, they aren't certified Kosher. If they are
> all-vegetable products (Marinara, etc) they most probably would
> qualify if they are run on different production lines from the
> products that contain (non-kosher) meat.

Whatever the reason, they were uncertified. My point was that I was easily able
to find uncertified versions of the products Dwight mentioned.
>
>>>I have yet
>>>to see a "C" for Christian or "M" for Moslem on any commercial food
>>>products in this country (or any other country).
>
> Dwight - when is the last time that you have been in a Middle
> Eastern ethnic food grocery and read the Arabic inscriptions on
> certain products? BTW - any product that is certified Kosher meets
> the Muslim Halal requirements.

oh mama mia

>>"Manipulate"? "Kosher" simply means "clean", IIRC.
>
> It actually means "acceptable" or "proper".

Thanks for the update. And of course "clean" is part of "acceptable", but the
latter term includes much more.

That Empire ground turkey was really good, btw.
>
>>>Kosher certification addresses Jewish religious or spiritual
>>>requirements - Jewish dietary laws concerning processed fruits and
>>>vegetables, animals that are non-ruminant (no pork), non-domesticated
>>>birds, seafood without scales or fins, the removal of blood from meats,
>>>the mixing of milk and meat, the use of a Rabbi for the slaughter of
>>>animals and for certain parts of the production of hard cheeses and
>>>grape products (wine and so on),
>
> Not so. The slaughterer or certification supervisor does not have
> to be a rabbi. but must be trained and qualfied to do the job properly.

> My wife has long been certified to supervise kosher operations in
> synagogue kitchens, and when she was working in the food industry
> she would routinely have to explain to the (mostly immigrant) Christian
> production line workers that the kosher inspector who came through
> quarterly was not "the rabbi blessing the food".

So many urban legends...

> BTW - CocaCola maintains several inspectors as full-time employees
> checking not only the production lines but also the sources of their
> ingredients. AFAIK all Coke products are certified.

cool
>
>>>equipment used to prepare Kosher foods, the purchase of a license to
>>>use the "K" symbol on the company's products, and so on. There is very
>>>little in any of this which specifically insures the quality, taste, or
>>>physical (not spiritual) cleanliness of the various products.
>
> Not so. A spoiled or dirty product cannot be considered kosher
> regardless of what label attaches. Each and every animal which is
> slaughtered for food must have its entrails examined for signs of
> disease before it is allowed to go onto the processing line. The
> standards used by kosher inspectors exceed those of the FDA by
> several orders of magnitude (at one time I served on a local
> certifcation panel).

Perhaps this is where I got the notion of "clean".

> Questions of taste are up to the individual. Put two brands of the
> same product - both certified kosher - side by side. I like the
> taste of Brand A but not that of Brand B. You like the taste of
> Brand B but not Brand A. It's all subjective.
>
> Just like the sign says in the Tommy's Joynt Restaurant in San
> Francisco - "we certify that our buffalo meat is real buffalo. We
> make no claims as to its taste or texture - just that it's real
> buffalo". The same applies to a kosher certification.
>
>>Most of the meat and dairy products in "mainstream" supermarkets are not
>>kosher certified.
>>
>>And the mark many folks look for today is "organic"
>
> The only "forcing" is that if a product is labeled Kosher (or
> organic, or diabetic-safe) and it is not in fact Kosher (or organic
> or diabetic-safe) the State or Federal government will get involved
> in Truth-in-Labelling law violations.

IOW, the only govt. involvement is the avoidance of fraud (claiming something
is what it isn't).
>

Separation of church and state. What a concept!

Special note to Dwight: The terms "push", "manipulate", "tamper" and "literally force down the throats" simply don't apply to kosher certification in any way that I can see. It's totally voluntary, driven by free market forces.

The choice of words in a public pledge is a completely different matter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3255. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 02:41:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040227214133.21457.00004266@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 88030

In article <403F8FF2.7080802@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>>I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive.
>>>I know many other Christians (several
>>>dozen at least) who find the taking of His
>>>name in oaths and pledges to be offensive
>>>as well.

>> Then you're truly the first, and only Christian, I've talked to who finds
>> the words "...one nation, under God..." offensive. As for the others you
>> speak about, your experience is vastly different than mine.

>Once upon a time you wrote:

>> I snipped it because I have no time to respond to personal anecdotes that
>> can't be verified. If that's your story, fine. Enough said.
>
> We can't verify that you know these people. If that's your story, fine.

>Enough said.
>
The fact is that some Christians do, indeed, find the use of His name in
pledges and oaths to be offensive. Some have gotten into a lot of legal hot
water because they wouldn't put their hand on a Bible and swear to Him that
they were telling the truth or would do this or that.

What is surreal about the whole issue is that it was usually one flavor of
Christian telling another flavor of Christian what to do, and often doing it in
the name of the One they supposedly follow.

>>>I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I
>>>know around here know what "kosher"
>>>means. Most of them are not Jews, and
>>>most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
>>>they know what it means.

>> Don't twist the subject, Jim. Did that same 95% of the adults you know
>> also know that much of the food in our grocery stores, the foods we eat
>> everyday, is prepared according to dietary laws of the Jewish religion?
>> Were
>> they aware of that tiny "K" symbol on many of those same food products?
>> These are the things I talked about, not the meaning of a word.
>
> Everyone I know reads the labels. granted that's just something that

>you can't verify.

>>>And the problem is?

>> You don't have a problem with the fact that a religious group is
>> manipulating much of the foods we eat? There are very few things in this
>> world as intrusive as that. Given a choice between this and the word "God"
>> in a pledge, I'll choose the latter any day of the week.
>
> HAR! The method of preparation is a matter of exclusions, not
>inclusions, with the exception of the salt sometimes put on chicken. You
>speak as if the practice involves putting stuff into the food. It does not.

If anything, it involves keeping bad stuff out of food!

>>>How is it hidden?

>> By not asking the people of this country whether they even wanted their
>> foods changed to conform to Jewish dietary law before doing so.
>
> Dwight, you are way off base here. There is no coercion here except
>that there is a market that won't buy food items unless they have been
>prepared a certain way. That method of preparation is so innocuous and
>doesn't add much expense at all, so many if not most manufacturers are
>willing and happy enough to do it.

You can count on the fact that they know exactly how much certification costs
and how much it affects their sales. Particularly the big processors.

>> Through the
>> use of a tiny, nondescript, "K" symbol instead of simply saying this
>> product
>> was prepared according to the dietary laws of the Jewish religion. By not
>> making that "K" symbol known to the public through publications and other
>> media. By downplaying the religious significance (by claiming it just means
>> "good food") whenever the topic is broached publically.
>
>Sigh... there is no actual religious significance to the food, other
>than that there are some people who attach some to it. Eating Kosher
>food does not make me Jewish, just the same as if I refused to touch
>alcohol it would not make me Baptist.

Or a Muslim!

>> But nothing justifies the manipulation
>> of mainstream food products to conform to the requirements of a specific
>> religion in a country that has, at it's core, the concept that no single
>> religion may dominate.
>
> Do you really think this Dwight?

If so then Christianity may not dominate.

>>>Brings in the $$.

>> If Kosher truly brings in the money, why not advertise it directly
>> instead
>> of hiding it under a tiny, nondescript, "K" at the bottom of a product
>> label? Clearly, the claim that it increases profit is somewhat suspect.
>
> Because they are being discreet. People like you get upset about such
>things. But you do know how to find the difference, so just eat things
>that don't have the little K on them. BTW, you might also want to avoid
>"pareve" marked foods also. Not *necessarily* Kosher, but do you want to
>take the chance?
>
> Perhaps this is the chance for you to make some money here. You could
>start a food chain called "Stewart's Non-Kosher Foods"! 8^)
>
Even though I'm not catholic anymore I have a confession to make.....

For supper tonight I made.....tacos. But no beer.

Ingredients used:

Lettuce and onions (kosherness of fresh vegetables assumed but unknown)
Acme Monterey jack cheese (not marked)
Acme Taco seasoning mix (not marked)
Ortega Taco sauce (marked with a K)
Ortega taco shells (not marked)
Empire Kosher ground turkey (it was 80 cents a pound cheaper than Perdue,
fresher, less fat and tastes better. And it was right there next to the other
"mainstream" poultry products!)

So in my house we had a Christian, who is also a second generation American of
Italian descent, making a Mexican dinner with some kosher and some nonkosher
ingredients. They were really good tacos, too.

btw, gefilte fish is really really good. It is an "inverse" food - its taste is
inversely proportional to how it looks. I ate some on a dare and then I
couldn't get enough of the stuff.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3256. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 02:41:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040227214134.21457.00004267@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 88032

In article <Xns949B6CE29AB17elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>it is bizarre to greet
>the end of the code requirement by suggesting a new licence with a code
>test.

Why?

The revised treaty says that each country shall determine for itself what the code test requirements for an amateur license will be. It appears that South Africa is in the process of determining what it shall be for South Africa. Perhaps there will be no test, or no change, or something in between.
>
>And Jim, I didn't say it was a bad idea to have a dual track system with
>code and theory alternatives. It's actually quite a good one. No doubt now
>someone will put that in petition number 18, or whatever number we are up
>to now.

I first suggested such a thing several years ago in my "Chinese Menu" license concept. The idea was that there would be a "core" test requirement for the lowest level of license, and upgrading could be accomplished by accumulating credits in a variety of ways, such as specialized written tests, and code tests.
>
>I won't though, because it isn't going to happen.

Why not? Nobody has suggested it yet in the USA because in the past it would have violated the treaty to have an HF license with no code test. Now it could be done.

>We don't know exactly
>what the FCC will do, but we do know two things that they are on record as
>saying:-
>
>1) They don't beleive that the code test serves a useful purpose;

Not true!

They said it "serves no *regulatory* purpose"
>
>2) They won't rearrange subbands until a consensus emerges amongst us.

I sure hope they don't!
>
>So, we do know really (although some are in denial) that the NPRM will dump
>Element 1 completely.

It ain't over until it's over, and even then it ain't over.
>
>We can be rather less sure what it will do to reform the unnecessary
>proliferation of licence classes,

What "proliferation"? We have 6 right now, with one scheduled to disappear in a little over six years even if no rules changes at all are made. Two others are disappearing by attrition.

>and the equally unneccessary slicing and
>dicing of the ham bands that goes with it.

Would you have only one class of license and no subbands by mode?

>I hope it might do something in
>this regard, but it is perhaps more likely that it will do nothing, or at
>least as little as possible, as they probably will decide that we still
>don't agree with oneanother.

And we don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3257. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 03:39:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <e_CdnTsCf-fAkN3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88033

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Of course! most Christians I know
>>actually pay attention to the sermon
>>on the mount, which tells the faithful
>>not to either have "Public prayer"
>>and specifically forbids oaths to God.
>
>
>
> The words "...one nation, under God..." is neither a public prayer nor an
> oath to God (it isn't even an oath). The Pledge of Allegiance it is a pledge
> to one's own self. Therefore, it violates nothing in Jesus' Sermon on the
> Mount, Mike.

And we can refer those who do indeed find it as a public prayer or an oath or a pledge to God to you for reassurance?

The fact that we discuss this from two different views shows that you are not right about this one.

If a person *thinks* it is an oath to God, then it *is* one. Lots of those people who think it is an oath are Christians.

The people that started the court ruling process about the prayers at football games in Texas were not atheists. They wer Christians that didn't like the flavor of prayer being said.

And finally, I have great faith that it does indeed violate Jesus' sermon on the mount. YMMV.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3258. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 04:20:17 UTC
From: modrisco@tds.net
Message-ID: <e09403b8.0402272020.64601099@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

modrisco@tds.net (M?che?l ?Drisceoil) wrote in message
news:<e09403b8.0402200920.633aea75@posting.google.com>...
> "Rusty in Louisville" <russ@russradioshop.com> wrote in message
news:<c109uc$g43$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > I would like to get some opinions about
> > Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
> >
> > My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> > and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> > or more to back order.
> >
> > Rusty in Louisville
>
> Placed one order with Universal Radio, and it was promptly processed.
> Have been waiting on a back order (Sony AN-LP1 Active Loop SW antenna)
> since early January. I'm sure they're waitning on Sony to deliver to
> them, but it's frustrating.

In light of other recent threads regarding Universal Radio and my own post, I must say "fair dues" to Universal Radio. Called today to cancel my backorder for a Sony AN-LP1 (not Universal's fault... Sony is just too busy building flat screen TV's), only to be told my order shipped today. The person I spoke with said they received only 10 units. My hat's off to UR!

Mike

3259. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 04:50:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40401E19.C1DE4553@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88035

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0402271213.52081782@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >When TAFKARJ wants to talk Army radio, it is wholesome and wunnerful,
> >and has everything to do with amateur radio somehow, even though
> >amateur radio was OUTLAWED at the time he speaks of.
>
> Careful about those emotionally-loaded words, next thing you know
> we will have another Sermon On The Antenna Mount about the
> glory and the majesty of morse code.

> >I don't think these guys are complete fools, but there edging their
> >way over.
>
> Not fools in the true sense. They are just BELIEVERS in the
> Church of St. Hiram. None of them had anything to do with Army
> radio and so they grasp at idolized imagination straws trying to
> promote morse code and the old ways. If they find some scrap
> of information that supports their evangelism, they will want to
> scrap with anyone about it and its veracity. :-)

"Poor baby. Still INVOLVED with tossing personal insults and nasty
comments to others that don't agree with your views."

--Leonard H. Anderson, Feb. 27, 2004

Dave K8MN

3260. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 05:07:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40402216.4AB3548@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88036

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:403E1B2C.F950B150@earthlink.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> > > Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
> > > parties involved?
> > >
> > > Now before answering, consider this:
> > >
> > > 1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
> > > 2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
> > > secret code.
> > > 3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.
> > >
> > They certainly understood each other.
>
> OK
>
> Neither understood the concept of a repeater.
>
> So what? Does that bother anyone?

It should.

> Now, to what I understand: I understand that both of these
> > ops have brought their bad habits from CB radio with them.
>
> What bad habits. I don't see any at all.

I find your statement rather sad and pathetic.

> You may
> not like their conversation, but there is NO aspect
> of Part 97 that requires any specific use of only
> "ham" approved lingo...or did I skip that chapter somehow.

I did not state anything about Part 97. Poor practice is poor practice.

> > Neither has
> > bothered to listen to other hams.
>
> For what reason must they do so?

Must? There is no "must". There is "should". I don't subscribe to the "get a license; buy a radio; rip the plastic bag off; mash the PTT and talk" school.

> What about their
> use of the repeater as you dicribed is wrong?

Liddy is as liddy does.

> > These two were joined by a new YL op
> > the other day. She was a "do you want me to
> > pick up bread and milk?" type.
>
> One of my best ham buddies is a long time Extra and his wife
> chats with him on almost every homebound commute. In
> some cases she gives him a "honey do" list of things to get
> from the market on the way home. What's wrong with
> that (i.e. what's wrong with "pick up bread & milk."

Apparently nothing....in your view.

> I'll be very surprised if any of the three will be active on the
> ham bands in five years.
>
> I'll presume that should make you very pleased then.

No, what would please me is for them to operate properly and to know what a repeater does.

> > > Who cares about how we dialog with each other
> > > as long as the parties involved are operating within the
> > > law as per Part 97 rules and regs?
> >
> > I do.
>
> Based on what authority?

Sheesh, Bill. I don't need authority in order to care. You asked a question. I provided an honest answer.

> You are free to worry your
> poor self about whatever you want, but thankfully you
> have no authority to enforce your own standards of how
> to speak on the air on anyone but yourself.

My poor self? You're starting to sound like Leonard H. Anderson. I'm not worried. I pointed out what kind of hams we're now turning out. If you believe that what I've described is acceptable, feel free to exchange "four-roger's", "good numbers" and "first personals" to your heart's delight.

> > We've even got a new op who can be heard moving between the several
> > local repeaters for a goodly part of each day saying, "This is KC8***
> > radio check".
>
> And that violates what in Part 97?

Stupidity isn't covered by Part 97.

> > He'll sometimes pull this stunt on top of an ongoing
> > QSO.
>
> That then IS a violation. I'd fully support the area hams
> directing him as to the rules to NOT QRM an existing QSO.

We're all thankful for your support.

> > He has been informed on a number of occasions about how to make it
> > clear that he is seeking a contact and how not to QRM an existing
> > contact but he persists.
>
> If, that is as you say, then report him to the FCC.

It'll happen.

> > When he does enter a QSO, he normally asks the
> > individuals he contacts if they have any radios they'd like to part
> > with.
>
> And that violates what Part 97 rule?

I don't recall mentioning a Part 97 infraction. Do you often greet
folks on 2m with, "Do you have any radios you'd like to part with"?

> > He has now asked me about six times.
>
> Maybe he has Alzheimers.

Could be though I don't know of many people in their mid-twenties who
suffer from it.

> > This fellow is annoying and
> > others--old timers and recent licensees--are beginning to avoid him.
>
> Which is perfectly OK.

Aren't you going to ask "By whose authority"?

> > There is another new ham in the area who was previously a CBer. He was
> > licensed only this past May. He quickly became adjusted to how things
> > are done on the ham bands. He asks questions about antennas, modes
> > other than FM, bands other than 2m and about operating practices. He
> > aroused interest in his grandson, who is now licensed. I'm betting that
> > these two will stick.
>
> Fine with me.

Glad it meets with your approval.

Dave K8MN

3261. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 05:12:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4040234A.181880E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88037

JJ wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >
> > One thing is for certain. Military ops, boat owners, CBer's and the
> > like aren't radio amateurs until they pass an amateur radio license
> > exam. Those others folks aren't a part of that "amateur radio
> > community" unless or until they do so. You should have that drill down
> > by now.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> He does Dave, but he can't pass the test, that is why he has his shorts
> in such a wad over us who did.

He has the option of taking the no-code exam and I have every confidence that he could pass it. He won't though, as if he's really showing us by denying himself the license. It won't effect me one way or the other if Leonard Anderson never obtains an amateur radio license.

Dave K8MN

3262. Re: New Morse code symbor for "@"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 05:24:26 UTC
From: John Smith <djfinn2@nobellspsoutham.net>
Message-ID: <ExV%b.35574$GA5.18028@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 88038

Easier, in English anyway.

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:rV6_b.3498$3b6.190@news02.roc.ny...
> Yep,
>
> I was going to mention that last night but assumed it would be
> self-evident. I keep forgetting that nothing is evident to many loose in
> this newsgroup ;)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
> >> Is it really? Sending the word "at" is still faster!
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.593 / Virus Database: 376 - Release Date: 2/20/04
>
>

3263. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 08:51:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88039

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > Then you're truly the first, and only
> > Christian, I've talked to who finds
> > the words "...one nation, under God..."
> > offensive. (snip)
>
> With all due respect, Dwight, you should
> meet a wider variety of Christians. And
> check out Matthew 4:33-37.

With all due respect, Jim, I've met plenty, thank you. Regardless, I think you meant to say Matthew Chapter 5, not Chapter 4. There is nothing in Chapter 4 relating to anything we're talking about. Therefore, Matthew Chapter 5:33-37:

33: Again, ye have heard that it hath been
said by them of old time, Thou shalt not
forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the
Lord thine oaths:
34: But I say unto you, Swear not at all;
neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:
35: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool:
neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of
the great King.
36: Neither shalt thou swear by thy head,
because thou canst not make one hair white
or black.
37: But let your communication be, Yea, yea;
Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these
cometh of evil.

Since the Pledge of Allegiance, or the words "...one nation, under God...," is not an oath given to others, but simply a pledge to one's own self, there is no contridiction with anything written above.

By the way, the comma following "Christian" in what I wrote earlier (quoted at the top of this page) was meant to be placed before that word (as in "...the first, and only, Christain I've..."). Just wanted to clarify that before someone objected.

> "Manipulating?" How? Which of the kosher
> rules do you find objectionable? Will eating
> something that satisfies a Jewish requirement
> somehow make me less of a Christian, or

> less of an American? Oy!

What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify what we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and doing so in a somewhat less than forthright manner. I do not wish to live under the dietary rules of the Jewish religion, or the dietary rules of any other religion. But that is must certainly happening today. Jews refuse to eat pork. As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot dogs. Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have virtually disappeared from resturant menus. Ham, another favorite for many years, has also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus. Based on the efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves, only a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.

> Methinks you doth protest too much, Dwight.

And I think you are defending all this too much, Jim. Why? Regardless, that is all I have to say about this. This is not a safe subject to speak out too loudly about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3264. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 09:37:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ejZ%b.25460$hm4.4783@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88040

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) Some have gotten into a lot of
> legal hot water because they wouldn't
> put their hand on a Bible and swear to
> Him that they were telling the truth or
> would do this or that. (snip)

Once again, you've got it wrong, Jim. They were not asked to "swear to Him." The phrase in question went like this...

"I swear to tell the truth, the whole
truth, and nothing but the truth, so
help me God."

The words "...so help me God" were a request for God's help to tell the truth. The Bible was used because it was believed few would not tell the truth in the presence of such a symbol of their faith. The main objection was that the words might be considered a public prayer for God's help. Of course, only a very few Christians objected under this grounds - most have no problem with either public prayer or telling the truth. Instead, the vast majority of those who objected were non-christians who were "offended" by the word "God" and the use of a Bible. The practice ended when conventional thinking decided a person who does not believe in God or the Bible would not be influenced by either.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3265. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 10:05:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <sJZ%b.25462$hm4.23149@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88041

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > The words "...one nation, under God..."
> > is neither a public prayer nor an oath to
> > God (it isn't even an oath). The Pledge of
> > Allegiance it is a pledge to one's own self.
> > Therefore, it violates nothing in Jesus'
> > Sermon on the Mount, Mike.
>
>
> And we can refer those who do indeed find
> it as a public prayer or an oath or a pledge
> to God to you for reassurance? (snip)

No, I would suggest you refer them to their own church leaders. I'm sure
they will be glad to answer their religious concerns.

> The fact that we discuss this from two
> different views shows that you are not right
> about this one. (snip)

No, Mike, it simply shows you don't understand the "Pledge" of Allegiance.
This can be addressed by the casual use of a dictionary (a pledge is a
pledge, not an oath or public prayer).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3266. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 10:31:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <H5_%b.25465$hm4.19645@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88042

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" writes:
> > Not so. The slaughterer or certification
> > supervisor does not have to be a rabbi.
> > (snip)
>
> So many urban legends...

Hardly an urban legend, Jim. From the Kof-K Kosher Supervision website (www.gokosher.net/Requirements.htm)...

"What are the requirements to certify a
product Kosher?" (snip)

"The animal must be slaughtered by a
certified, trained Rabbi using a knife
that has been specially sharpened and
honed."

> Special note to Dwight: The terms "push",
> "manipulate", "tamper" and "literally force
> down the throats" simply don't apply to
> kosher certification in any way that I can
> see. (snip)

Then perhaps you need to open your eyes, Jim. But then, some people will, of course, never see more than they want to see.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3267. Michael Powell in a bra - really

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 10:36:44 UTC
From: johnbartley@email.com
Message-ID: <f90c7f43.0402280236.3c3c3ff3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88043

Yes, Michael Powell in a bra.

Some telecom or computer magazine I've read within the past week had a B&W pic of the Chair of the FCC in a bra. I'd heard he wore it at some stag event, and wasn't surprised when I saw it; just trashed the magazine, and forgot about it.

Now, I've read the Notice of Rulemaking for BPL (internet service over power lines), and need that picture, because there's nothing like sophomoric humor on the part of Powell to illustrate the cavalier way the FCC is approaching the issue.

What issue?

Go set your tune your hi-fi to AM, pick a spot between local stations, and turn up the vpolume about half way. Then, try to have a phone conversation over a bad cellular connection with your ear six inches from the speakers, and you will still have an easier time communicating than hams will when we experience the 16 db over S9 interference already demonstrated by BPL.

That interference explains why Austria and Japan already tried, then abandoned, BPL. However, this is 'the best government which lobbyist money can buy', so we get the FCC telling us in the Notice they expect power companies to fix the problems, the same power companies who already take *months* to resolve RFI (radio frequency interference) problems with existing tech.

The burden of proof of the problem will be on the *ham*. How easy is it to talk to your power company? Hams know it gets much harder when interference problems arise.

Hams have to buy all of our own gear to equip ourselves to be able to communicate in emergencies, and we're a part of just about every emergency plan there is.

How many hams will learn the special skills needed for shortwave and longwave and make the investment of $$$$ to buy the gear, if all we get is static from BPL? You have to practice just like it's for real to be competent in something so demanding as passing radio traffic, and longwave & shortwave require very different skills than the VHF and UHF short-range frequencies which are unaffected by BPL.

Folks, I need this pic to help me prove my point. Anyone remember what magazine that picture was in?

Thanks, 73s and best regards,

3268. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 12:49:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <u700c.25085$W74.2072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88044

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40402216.4AB3548@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:403E1B2C.F950B150@earthlink.net...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
> > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
> > > > > parties involved?
> > > > >
> > > > > Now before answering, consider this:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
> > > > > 2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
> > > > > secret code.
> > > > > 3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.
> > > >
> > > > They certainly understood each other.
> > >
> > > OK
> > >
> > > Neither understood the concept of a repeater.
> > >
> > > So what? Does that bother anyone?
>
> It should.

Why? Nothing they were doing violated any aspect
of Part 97. If the lack of knowledge on the part of others
isn't creating illegal operation, then I don't care if they
forgot everything they had to learn, memorize or guess
to pass the tests to become a ham. I guess it would
really bother you too to know that I couldn't send/recieve
at 13wpm today if my life depended on it...even though
I once passed the 13 wpm test.
```

> > Now, to what I understand: I understand that both of these
> > > ops have brought their bad habits from CB radio with them.
> >
> > What bad habits. I don't see any at all.
>
> I find your statement rather sad and pathetic.

I find your unwillingness to accept anything but "the official
way to speak on the repeater according to you" to be
pathetic too. It;s not at all different than setting up a
"ham radio politically correct" speech requirement.

> > You may
> > not like their conversation, but there is NO aspect
> > of Part 97 that requires any specific use of only
> > "ham" approved lingo...or did I skip that chapter somehow.
>
> I did not state anything about Part 97. Poor practice is poor practice.

They violated NOTHING as to poor practice eccept
as defined by you.

> > > Neither has
> > > bothered to listen to other hams.
> >
> > For what reason must they do so?
>
> Must? There is no "must". There is "should". I don't subscribe to the
> "get a license; buy a radio; rip the plastic bag off; mash the PTT and
> talk" school.

Neither did rhe two you gave as examples. They did
everything legally required. They iolated NO operating
practices. Ib fact, please tell us what operating practices
they violated as you see it.

> > What about their
> > use of the repeater as you dicribed is wrong?
>
> Liddy is as liddy does.

???????

> > > These two were joined by a new YL op
> > > the other day. She was a "do you want me to
> > > pick up bread and milk?" type.
> >
> > One of my best ham buddies is a long time Extra and his wife
> > chats with him on almost every homebound commute. In
> > some cases she gives him a "honey do" list of things to get
> > from the market on the way home. What's wrong with
> > that (i.e. what's wrong with "pick up bread & milk."
>
> Apparently nothing....in your view.

True...but what do YOU consider there to be wrong in
such an on-the-air exchange? Would I be correct in
thinking you believe that asking hubby to pick-up bread
and milk is bad operating or, should be illegal?

> > I'll be very surprised if any of the three will be active on the
> > ham bands in five years.
> >
> > I'll presume that should make you very pleased then.
>
> No, what would please me is for them to operate properly and to know
> what a repeater does.

Operate properly according to you and make you,
the self appointed knowledge police happy? You'd
better be prepared for lot of stress if what other people
legally do or don't do is that uposetting to you.

> > > > Who cares about how we dialog with each other
> > > > as long as the parties involved are operating within the
> > > > law as per Part 97 rules and regs?
> > >
> > > I do.
> >
> > Based on what authority?
>
> Sheesh, Bill. I don't need authority in order to care. You asked a
> question. I provided an honest answer.

Fair enough.

> > You are free to worry your
> > poor self about whatever you want, but thankfully you
> > have no authority to enforce your own standards of how
> > to speak on the air on anyone but yourself.
>
> My poor self? You're starting to sound like Leonard H. Anderson. I'm
> not worried. I pointed out what kind of hams we're now turning out. If
> you believe that what I've described is acceptable, feel free to
> exchange "four-roger's", "good numbers" and "first personals" to your
> heart's delight.

I do on occasion.

> > > We've even got a new op who can be heard moving between the several
> > > local repeaters for a goodly part of each day saying, "This is KC8***
> > > radio check".
> >
> > And that violates what in Part 97?
>
> Stupidity isn't covered by Part 97.

Yawn.

> > > He'll sometimes pull this stunt on top of an ongoing
> > > QSO.
> >
> > That then IS a violation. I'd fully support the area hams
> > directing him as to the rules to NOT QRM an existing QSO.
>
> We're all thankful for your support.

If all you are going to do is bitch about what he does, he'll
probably not stop.

> > > He has been informed on a number of occasions about how to make it
> > > clear that he is seeking a contact and how not to QRM an existing
> > > contact but he persists.
> >
> > If, that is as you say, then report him to the FCC.
>
> It'll happen.

Which is exactly the right thing to do.

> > > When he does enter a QSO, he normally asks the
> > > individuals he contacts if they have any radios they'd like to part
> > > with.
> >
> > And that violates what Part 97 rule?
>
> I don't recall mentioning a Part 97 infraction. Do you often greet
> folks on 2m with, "Do you have any radios you'd like to part with"?

If it bothers you so much, don't respond to his call
when you hear him.

> > > He has now asked me about six times.
> >
> > Maybe he has Alzheimers.
>
> Could be though I don't know of many people in their mid-twenties who
> suffer from it.

Then just answer his question with a NO.

> > > This fellow is annoying and
> > > others--old timers and recent licensees--are beginning to avoid him.
> >
> > Which is perfectly OK.
>
> Aren't you going to ask "By whose authority"?

Not at all. No one, not you, me or anyone has any
obligation to answer him when he calls. Since there's no
mandated response to a call of CQ or XXX monitoring
in Part 97, then you could say that the FCC by default
authorizes everyone to ignore anyone they want.

> > > There is another new ham in the area who was previously a CBer. He
was
> > > licensed only this past May. He quickly became adjusted to how things
> > > are done on the ham bands. He asks questions about antennas, modes
> > > other than FM, bands other than 2m and about operating practices. He
> > > aroused interest in his grandson, who is now licensed. I'm betting
that
> > > these two will stick.
> >
> > Fine with me.
>
> Glad it meets with your approval.

I neither approve nor disapprove it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3269. Hamo Erectus

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 13:06:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402280506.1669b546@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88045

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40402216.4AB3548@earthlink.net>...

> I did not state anything about Part 97. Poor practice is poor practice.

[5 second delay, 4, 3, 2, 1...]

Kirk, "Spock, what the [expletive deleted] did he say?"

Spock, "Captain, he admitted that working out-of-band Frenchmen is poor amateur practice."

Kirk, "That's what I thought he said, that double-standard loving son of a [expletive deleted]."

Spock, "Captain, I find this species, Hamo Erectus var. CW, quite amusing."

3270. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 13:13:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402280513.564830e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88046

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040227214134.21457.00004267@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns949B6CE29AB17elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >it is bizarre to greet
> >the end of the code requirement by suggesting a new licence with a code
> >test.
>
> Why?

Because, TAFKARJ, the country already has coded licenses. And they've
had since 1912 to perfect them. Now its time for them to try
something new and different, but instead they get more of the same.
Can't think outside the box.

3271. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 13:34:29 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aaaa91856c9381d989688@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88047

In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net says...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > Then you're truly the first, and only
> > > Christian, I've talked to who finds
> > > the words "...one nation, under God..."
> > > offensive. (snip)
> >
> > With all due respect, Dwight, you should
> > meet a wider variety of Christians. And
> > check out Matthew 4:33-37.
>
>
> With all due respect, Jim, I've met plenty, thank you. Regardless, I think
> you meant to say Matthew Chapter 5, not Chapter 4. There is nothing in
> Chapter 4 relating to anything we're talking about. Therefore, Matthew
> Chapter 5:33-37:
>
> 33: Again, ye have heard that it hath been
> said by them of old time, Thou shalt not
> forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the
> Lord thine oaths:
> 34: But I say unto you, Swear not at all;
> neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:
> 35: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool:
> neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of
> the great King.
> 36: Neither shalt thou swear by thy head,
> because thou canst not make one hair white
> or black.
> 37: But let your communication be, Yea, yea;
> Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these
> cometh of evil.
>
> Since the Pledge of Allegiance, or the words "...one nation, under
> God...," is not an oath given to others, but simply a pledge to one's own
> self, there is no contridiction with anything written above.
>
> By the way, the comma following "Christian" in what I wrote earlier
> (quoted at the top of this page) was meant to be placed before that word (as
> in "...the first, and only, Christain I've..."). Just wanted to clarify that
> before someone objected.

>
>
> > "Manipulating?" How? Which of the kosher
> > rules do you find objectionable? Will eating
> > something that satisfies a Jewish requirement
> > somehow make me less of a Christian, or
> > less of an American? Oy!
>
>
> What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify what
> we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and doing
> so in a somewhat less than forthright manner. I do not wish to live under
> the dietary rules of the Jewish religion, or the dietary rules of any other
> religion. But that is must certainly happening today. Jews refuse to eat
> pork.

As do Muslims. You statement smacks of ignorance

As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
> decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot dogs.

Paging Hal Turner..you have another convert waiting to inducted.

Foul Tasting turkey dogs were a product of people who wanted to eat
something other than meat. It's a vegetarian dog. And all beef dogs
are made because the people at Swift Meat Packing use the parts of the
hog that are left over from processing. It has nothing to do with
dietarty laws.

> Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have virtually
> disappeared from resturant menus.

????? Where do you live. Every resturaunt, every Diner, every B-B-QUE
place has pork chops. TGI FRidays has pork chops. OutBack Steak House
has pork chops (and damn good ones at that)

Ham, another favorite for many years, has
> also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus.

You must not go out for breakfast much. There isn't a resturant around
that doesn't serve ham or ham or bacon (Oh you forgot bacon) as part of
a breakfast meal. Excuse you..your ignornace is showing

Funny for someone who lives in Mrylte Beach, you'd think there were lots
of restuarants to serve the tourists. Guess not.

Based on the
> efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves, only
> a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the
> Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.

Just when I thought you couldn't appear any more foolish, you raise the
bar and duck under

He Dwight, don't be so hard on yourself, although anyone who would label
himself a fool in a public forum shows there is hope

> > > Methinks you doth protest too much, Dwight.
> > > And I think you are defending all this too much, Jim. Why? Regardless,
> > > that is all I have to say about this. This is not a safe subject to speak
> > > out too loudly about.

Correct, better to remain silent than speak up and show all around
you're a fool

> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3272. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 13:36:43 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aaaa9bbe9e1e0a6989689@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88048

In article <H5_%b.25465$hm4.19645@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net says...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > "Phil Kane" writes:
> > > Not so. The slaughterer or certification
> > > supervisor does not have to be a rabbi.
> > > (snip)
> >
> > So many urban legends...
>
>
> Hardly an urban legend, Jim. From the Kof-K Kosher Supervision website
> (www.gokosher.net/Requirements.htm)...
>
> "What are the requirements to certify a
> product Kosher?" (snip)
>
> "The animal must be slaughtered by a
> certified, trained Rabbi using a knife
> that has been specially sharpened and
> honed."

Thast called Glatt Kosher and is available only in special meat markets.
Its' not used for the type of shopping you do Dwight. General Kosher
items are certified based on cleanliness and preparation. Nioce try,
but once again, that bar goes up and you go under

Try this website Dwight, I think you'll fit in very well. This mental
migdget shares similar concepts

http://www.halturnershow.com

>
>
> > Special note to Dwight: The terms "push",
> > "manipulate", "tamper" and "literally force
> > down the throats" simply don't apply to
> > kosher certification in any way that I can
> > see. (snip)
>
>
> Then perhaps you need to open your eyes, Jim. But then, some people will,
> of course, never see more than they want to see.
>

Thena again, there's nothing worse than a blind man who thinks he can
tell the sighted what's going on

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

3273. A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 13:44:54 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aaaab7e8d45f99e98968a@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88049

In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>
>
> What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify what
> we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and doing
> so in a somewhat less than forthright manner. I do not wish to live under
> the dietary rules of the Jewish religion, or the dietary rules of any other
> religion. But that is must certainly happening today. Jews refuse to eat
> pork. As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
> decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot dogs.
> Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have virtually
> disappeared from resturant menus. Ham, another favorite for many years, has
> also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus. Based on the
> efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves, only
> a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the
> Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.

It's funny, but because of RedNecks similar in thought to people such as
yourself, there's not grits being served in resturants. I know they
aren't available in supermarkets, even in the Red Neck Cracker aisle

Funny how at Christmas time Chinese resturaunts are full, selling ham
and pork and Seafood. Why in act Dwight there are 20 Chinese resturants
along the Strip in Myrtle Beach alone. Funny how rants are always prven
wrong

>
>
> > Methinks you doth protest too much, Dwight.

methinks he speaks not what he knows but what believes he knows

Ya'll think Jeff Foxworthy was thinking of this guy when he started his
Red Neck routine

3274. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 14:55:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402280655.4d0a5f2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88050

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4040234A.181880E1@earthlink.net>...
> JJ wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:

> > > He does Dave, but he can't pass the test, that is why he has his shorts
> > > in such a wad over us who did.
>
> He has the option of taking the no-code exam and I have every confidence
> that he could pass it. He won't though, as if he's really showing us by
> denying himself the license. It won't effect me one way or the other if
> Leonard Anderson never obtains an amateur radio license.

I agree with JJ...Lennie Anderson's personal apparatus is
insufficient to get him licensed to operate Amateur Radio apparatus,
so why worry about it.

Even if he did get a ticket, I am willing to bet he'd take that
"I Know Better Than You" attitude to the local repeaters only to find
his coax the target of every knitting needle in Los Angeles County.
He's certainly set the tone here...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3275. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 15:01:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87951

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040226010915.21232.00004474@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> >Nice trip down mammary lane, but what has this to do with amateur radio?
>
> TAFKARJ is trying to "prove" something by connecting SK hams
> with the U.S. Army and Washington Army Radio of early 1942.

As opposed to YOU "connecting" Army KIA's to YOUR service in the
Army three years after they became KIA's, Your Scumminess...?!?!

The rest of your vain, "See, I Know Radio History Better Than
You" rant snipped...You only "proved" that you were enbarrassed that
some "mere amateur" demonstrated as much interest in radio history as
you...

Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay undr her nose to
smotehr the stench?

Steve, K4YZ

3276. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 15:06:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402280706.3bdd2bc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87952

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040227203548.12501.00006497@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> Washington Army Radio (WAR) had as much to do with amateur
> radio as ham-astronauts got into spaceflight through ham radio. :-)

Actually, Scummy, WAR has played host to actual licensed Amateurs
as "guest operators" on more than one occassion over it's several
decade history.

Also, if you really knew as much about the space program as you
allude, you'd know that at least two Astronauts have credited Amateur
Radio as thier "intro" to technology in grade school and subsequent
career path to engineering.

Too bad your career path in engineering wasn't sufficient to
prepare you for licensure in Amateur Radio. Maybe a licensing course
at a local middle school...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3277. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 15:08:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402280708.6a602c42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87953

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40401E19.C1DE4553@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:

> > Not fools in the true sense. They are just BELIEVERS in the
> > Church of St. Hiram. None of them had anything to do with Army
> > radio and so they grasp at idolized imagination straws trying to
> > promote morse code and the old ways. If they find some scrap
> > of information that supports their evangelism, they will want to
> > scrap with anyone about it and its veracity. :-)
>
> "Poor baby. Still INVOLVED with tossing personal insults and nasty
> comments to others that don't agree with your views."
>
> --Leonard H. Anderson, Feb. 27, 2004

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"

--Leonard H. Anderson on occassions too numerous...

Steve, K4YZ

3278. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 16:16:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Y5GdnZgiRNJLI93dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87954

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>> The words "...one nation, under God..."
>>>is neither a public prayer nor an oath to
>>>God (it isn't even an oath). The Pledge of
>>>Allegiance it is a pledge to one's own self.
>>>Therefore, it violates nothing in Jesus'
>>>Sermon on the Mount, Mike.
>>
>>
>>And we can refer those who do indeed find
>>it as a public prayer or an oath or a pledge
>>to God to you for reassurance? (snip)
>
>
>
> No, I would suggest you refer them to their own church leaders. I'm sure
> they will be glad to answer their religious concerns.
>
>
>
>>The fact that we discuss this from two
>>different views shows that you are not right
>>about this one. (snip)
>
>
>
> No, Mike, it simply shows you don't understand the "Pledge" of Allegiance.
> This can be addressed by the casual use of a dictionary (a pledge is a
> pledge, not an oath or public prayer).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3279. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 16:19:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Y5GdnZsiRNLrIt3dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87955

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:

<some snippage>

>>The fact that we discuss this from two
>>different views shows that you are not right
>>about this one. (snip)
>
>
>
> No, Mike, it simply shows you don't understand the "Pledge" of Allegiance.
> This can be addressed by the casual use of a dictionary (a pledge is a
> pledge, not an oath or public prayer).

If it isn't a pledge or an oath or whatever to God, then no one should
have a problem with either it's removal or inclusion.

A pity that Dwight Eisenhower had it wrong too!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3280. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 16:35:31 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns949D75E5259DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87956

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0402280513.564830e8@posting.google.com:

> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20040227214134.21457.00004267@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns949B6CE29AB17elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >it is bizarre to greet
>> >the end of the code requirement by suggesting a new licence with a
>> >code test.
>>
>> Why?
>
> Because, TAFKARJ, the country already has coded licenses. And they've
> had since 1912 to perfect them. Now its time for them to try
> something new and different, but instead they get more of the same.
> Can't think outside the box.
>

I agree that Jim is being a little obdurate, but don't lose sight of the
fact that South Africa have dropped that plan. They at least are somewhat
open to persuasion.

3281. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 16:54:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0402280854.792b11ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87957

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040225075954.25815.00006883@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0402241903.75cafc94@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> >Certainly. But running fiber optics lines is a very expensive
> >proposition, much more expensive per unit length than any of the other
> >utility lines.
>
> It's already all over the place out here in the Principality of Radnor. And TE,
> and West Chester, etc.

There's an optics cable running along the street here which isn't more
than 75 feet from me as I peck at the keyboard. And a half block north
there's a moose-sized optics cable running along MacDade Blvd. I have
no idea where they come from or where they go or what they actually do
but there isn't a drop to a residence or a business in sight anywhere.
I've seen Ma Bell "mobile labs" futzing with the things so I guess
it's for running phone comms between switching centers. Or something.
In any event these cables don't look like they're ready to duke it out
with BPL.

> The really big cost is getting from the pole into people's houses. That's the
> really big selling point of BPL: no installation, every outlet in your house is
> a broadband connection. As if.

> A lot of "cable" is actually fiber. But it makes no real difference; the big
> probelm is getting into every overpriced little box made out of ticky tacky.
> The cable and telco folks took their pain upfront.

And they can avoid more pain by *not* installing residential drops.
Install 802 dot somthing boxes on the poles every hundred yards or so.
Would work and would kick BPLs butt. The huge advantage wireless
devices bring to this game is that they do *not* need a connection to
the house wiring. Freely floating lappers, remotes, etc.

> >Hare and I touched on that when he was here, it's a classic case of
> >use it or lose it and it's not being used. I asked him how much ham
> >activity he knew about on 2.4 Ghz and he answered "What activity?".
>
> I wuz there. And what activity does exist uses highly directional antennas....

Seems like we all forgot that most of it is satellite ops which do not
always use directional antennas. That could be a problem but a couple
MHZ wide AMSAT setaside would probably work.

> >> btw, I came across some info on the Manassas thing. $20 month for BPL - for
> >> the
> >> first three months! Then it jumps to $50/month. On a good day it might get
> >> up to half of DSL speed. Maybe.
> >
> >Good. I hope they lose their skivvies on that deal.
>
> They'll ask Uncle Sam to bail them out. "No millionaire left behind".

That would require Congessional action and it would never in this
world happen.

> Didja see where RCN went Chapter 11?

I looked at RCN when it first popped up. Talk about no bang for the
buck, the Comcast and Ma Bell guys musta been laughing their buns off
at the RCN prices.

> The cofounder of Microsoft put 1.65
> billion into that outfit and now his piece is worth $2 million. That's like
> putting $165,000 of yer IRA/401K in something and having it go down to $200.

Yeah and after RCN drubbed him Mr. Allen came out with 20 point
somthing billion left in his piggy bank. Pore thing. He and his buddy
Bill are tossing coin at all sortsa wild investment adventures. Their
baby airliner is a good example. They don't care, it's only money.

> >Cable here runs at around 3Mb/s for $45/month. The JAs have
> >a flavor of DSL which runs at 26 Mb/sec in heavily-populated areas for
> >$50/month with the HLs close behind. Manassas BPL for $50/month for
> >only half of 0.5-1.0 Mb/s you say?
>
> Double check with Ed but I recall half MB as the best they'd ever gotten - and
> that was for a single customer on the system. More folks = sharing.

. . . . more is better, bring it on . . .

> >They gotta be kidding . . ! One more dot bomb in the making . .
> >
> I sure hope so. Boom dot bust. But it ain't over till it's over.

It won't hurt very long . .

> >> Yep. But that's not the big problem - the real 800 pound gorilla is how
> >> fast the deficit is making it grow. A few years back we had a surplus....
> >
> >Yeah, it's the rate which is really scary.
> >
> Not just a big hole but digging it deeper as fast as they can.

Check OMB's rant on the subject which was published yesterday.

> >I don't see shuttle safety being part of the politics of the upcoming
> >campaign. As has been the case in all major explorations since Leif
> >Ericsson's days and millenia before the folk who ride the things know

> >they didn't buy a seat in a 737 and some are not gonna come back.
>
> That's not how it was sold, though. Ask the McAuliffes if they were told that
> there was a 1 in 75 chance of augering in.

Sure they knew, just like the relatives of military aircrews know the
level of risk involved. Whether they accept it and internalize it or
not is another story.

> >How 'bout we just bag the whole stupid Mars camping trip thing and
> >first build a new version of the Shuttle then put Wideband on the
> >front burner as a matter of national policy?
>
> That makes way too much sense.
>
> In fact the really sensible thing would be a cheap oneshot big booster for
> unmanned payloads and a highly reliable but much smaller human transport
> system. Send the big stuff on ahead and the astronauts meet it up there.

The UAs been doing that for thirty years.

> Hey - didja see where they're planning a space walk on the ISS where all the
> crew will be outside at the same time, with nobody in the station? Didn't they
> ever go to the movies back in 1968?

Was not the first time by any means and yup, it rained so they had to
duck back inside.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3282. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 17:00:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040228120047.01692.00000829@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 87958

In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > Then you're truly the first, and only
>> > Christian, I've talked to who finds
>> > the words "...one nation, under God..."
>> > offensive. (snip)
>>
>> With all due respect, Dwight, you should
>> meet a wider variety of Christians. And
>> check out Matthew 4:33-37.
>
> With all due respect, Jim, I've met plenty, thank you.

It's not about the number, it's about the variety. If I'm the first Christian you know of who objects to the use of His name in the pledge and in oaths, you simply don't know a wide variety of Christians.

>Regardless, I think
>you meant to say Matthew Chapter 5, not Chapter 4.

You are correct! Typo on my part.

>Therefore, Matthew
>Chapter 5:33-37:
>
> 33: Again, ye have heard that it hath been
> said by them of old time, Thou shalt not
> forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the
> Lord thine oaths:
> 34: But I say unto you, Swear not at all;
> neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:
> 35: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool:
> neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of
> the great King.
> 36: Neither shalt thou swear by thy head,
> because thou canst not make one hair white
> or black.
> 37: But let your communication be, Yea, yea;
> Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these
> cometh of evil.

Exactly! "for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

That means we should simply tell the truth and not get all involved in mucking about with oaths and pledges and such.

"Swear not at all"

> Since the Pledge of Allegiance, or the words "...one nation, under
>God...," is not an oath given to others, but simply a pledge to one's own
>self, there is no contridiction with anything written above.

It's a public pledge that includes some words that some people find objectionable.
>
> By the way, the comma following "Christian" in what I wrote earlier
>(quoted at the top of this page) was meant to be placed before that word (as
>in "...the first, and only, Christain I've..."). Just wanted to clarify that
>before someone objected.

If I'm the first and only, then my recommendation that you get to know a wider variety of Christians is a good one. I would add that you should get to know more Jews, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3283. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 17:11:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QvCdnbPJ5tlFVt3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87959

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>> The words "...one nation, under God..."
>>>is neither a public prayer nor an oath to
>>>God (it isn't even an oath). The Pledge of
>>>Allegiance it is a pledge to one's own self.
>>>Therefore, it violates nothing in Jesus'
>>>Sermon on the Mount, Mike.
>>
>>
>>And we can refer those who do indeed find
>>it as a public prayer or an oath or a pledge
>>to God to you for reassurance? (snip)
>
>
>
> No, I would suggest you refer them to their own church leaders. I'm sure
> they will be glad to answer their religious concerns.

You might be able to explain it better than their leaders!

Found more of the qoute from President Eisenhower:

>>> In this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith
>>>in America's heritage and future; in this way we shall constantly
>>>strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our
>>>country's most powerful resource in peace and war."

The American Family Association has an online campaign they call
StopLiberalJudges.com (strange it isn't an .org)

http://www.stopliberaljudges.com/default.asp

There is still a logical disconnect in here. If it isn't a prayer or
pledge, there should be no problem with either its inclusion or removal.

But since it was the intention of the people who originally made the
change to "reaffirm the transcendance of religious faith", and that the
sponsors of Bill S1558 are trying to exempt the POA, National Motto, and
the Ten commandments from any review as to their legality, you have a
hard time proving your position.

Interestingly enough, their website states that they don't want liberal judges to rule on it. Apparently conservative judges making rulings on it are okay! ;^)

You might want to get on contact with your Senators to get them working on this.

>>The fact that we discuss this from two
>>different views shows that you are not right
>>about this one. (snip)
>
>
>
> No, Mike, it simply shows you don't understand the "Pledge" of Allegiance.
> This can be addressed by the casual use of a dictionary (a pledge is a
> pledge, not an oath or public prayer).

Dwight Eisenhower himself says it is a reaffirmation of faith.

Encyclopedia Britannica says an affirmation is:

in law, a promise by a witness concerning testimony allowed in place of an oath to those who cannot, because of conscience, swear an oath. For example, members of the Society of Friends (Quakers), ...

American Heratige dictionary:

The act of affirming or the state of being affirmed; assertion. 2. Something declared to be true; a positive statement or judgment. 3. Law A solemn declaration given...

Rogets Thesaurus synonyms In case you don't want to use that nasty legal term above:

affidavit, assertion, asseveration, attestation, averment, avouchment, avowal, certification, confirmation, declaration, green light, oath, OK, pronouncement, ratification, statement, sworn statement, testimony.

Do you presume to know more about this that the person that sponsored the rewrite?

Perhaps you want it kept in there because you simply *want* it in there? That's an argument I can accept.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3284. twistedhed go now GO GO GO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 18:56:38 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <3a0992212b4096228b99ca96397b6dc4@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 87960
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
From: Jungle Drum <uei@ebi.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: twistedhed go now GO GO GO
Date: 28 Feb 2004 07:03:10 GMT
Organization: Comcast/AOL Remote Admin DataLink V4.2
Lines: 19
Message-ID: <c1pefe$c8d$1@news.x-echo.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: news-front1.voila.fr
X-Trace: news.x-echo.com 1077951790 12557 195.101.94.106 (28 Feb 2004 07:03:10 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: abuse@x-echo.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: 28 Feb 2004 07:03:10 GMT

The likelihood of Twirted being correct decreases
in a direct proportion to the intensity with which
he drinks ass juice.

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sat Feb 28 08:03:07 2004 depuis lIP : ac929f36.ipt.aol.com VIP 532284301978

Sour Grapes Leland?
```

3285. Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 20:35:57 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous>
Source record: 87961

Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
dont want to be considered as a public
service. Everybody has not the military
spirit.
Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
considered as a service has many
drawbacks for the ham rights, you
are always dependent of what a
governement wants. Does the governement
has any influence on how you want to
play golf ?
No, you can play in the manner you want.
So let the hams vote if they want to
continue to be a service. The answer is
evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.

So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

3286. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 20:52:53 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <r82dnSzmJ940Yt3dRVn-gg@crocker.com>
Source record: 87962

"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
news:J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous...
>
> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
> ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
> dont want to be considered as a public
> service. Everybody has not the military
> spirit.
> Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
> radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
> considered as a service has many
> drawbacks for the ham rights, you
> are always dependent of what a
> governement wants. Does the governement
> has any influence on how you want to
> play golf ?
> No, you can play in the manner you want.
> So let the hams vote if they want to
> continue to be a service. The answer is
> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
>
> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !

being a 'service' also has its advantages. would golfers be listened to at all if BPL were going to take away their 'right' to play golf? would hobbyists be asked to help in time of emergency, or be ordered off the air? if big business wanted one of our bands and all we did was hunt dx and ragchew and didn't have a history of service to the country would the government think twice about taking their money for it? as long as we remain a service and at least some of us do what we can to help then all reap the rewards... I move we get rid of the freeloaders, if you don't do so many hours of 'service' every year you lose your license! how about them apples! Of course that won't happen as the administration of it would be expensive and complicated. so crawl back in your hole and accept the paper title of the 'service' and just do what you want anyway.

3287. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 21:31:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402281331.cf84a5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87963

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040225190012.22081.00004298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> > In article <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> > >The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU code
> > >test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third class of
> > >licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited HF privileges.
> >
> > Why was this a "truly bizarre way"?
>
> TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
> licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
> coded license. Bizarre.

Question, Brain...

I have never seen Jim Miccolis refer to you as anything but
"Brian"...

So WHY do YOU inisist on following the insulting and demeaning
example of a known pathological liar and antagonist in engaging in any
interaction with him...?!?!

Are you, after all, as shallow and immature as I thought you
really are?

Please give some specific example of how Jim has belittled or
demeaned YOU in a like manner...

> > >This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of
> > >comments.
> >
> > Democracy in action.
>
> You almost got it right. Should be "Democracy inaction."

As the otehr post suggested...You can either get to the higher
class license by progressing up a Code ladder or a theory ladder.

Why is that "inaction"...?!?!

> > Sounds like a very reasonable compromise.
>
> Then why did they initially suggest a third coded license? Why did

> that generate a "large number of comments?"

To introduce a pathway to the higher license. Shall I draw you a
map?

> > >If South Africa does
> > >implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to do so.
> >
> > Why? Perhaps it could be a way out of the constant arguments. It wasn't
> > possible before, due to the treaty.
>
> TAFKA Rev Jim, the constant arguments can be gotten out of by letting
> go.

Ahhhhh...so, if we all just agree with you, then we don't need to
"discuss" anything any more, eh?

How Lenniesque.

> > >They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that they
> > >would have given to the new licence, to the existing restricted licence
> > >instead, without any addtional testing.
> >
> > How many has in South Africa, anyway?
>
> huh?

Even a gradeschooler can see he just dropped the "m" out of
"hams", BRAIN...

I can see how you'll wind up a loser if you ever got on "Wheel of
Fortune"...

OOOOOOPS! YOU'RE ALREADY A LOSER!

EXXXXXXXXXCCCCCUUUUUUUUUSSSSSSSSSEEEEEEEEE MEEEEEEEEEEEE ! ! !
! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

3288. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 21:32:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402281332.6ba92cab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87964

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402280513.564830e8@posting.google.com>...

> Because, TAFKARJ, the country already has coded licenses. And they've
> had since 1912 to perfect them. Now its time for them to try
> something new and different, but instead they get more of the same.
> Can't think outside the box.

Again with teh belittlements where no belittlement in kind existed.

And you mean can't think outside YOUR box...

Steve, K4YZ

3289. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 22:24:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <By80c.25723$W74.3044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87965

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1aaaa91856c9381d989688@news.west.earthlink.net...
> In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net says...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > > Then you're truly the first, and only
> > > > Christian, I've talked to who finds
> > > > the words "...one nation, under God..."
> > > > offensive. (snip)
> > >
> > > With all due respect, Dwight, you should
> > > meet a wider variety of Christians. And
> > > check out Matthew 4:33-37.
> >
> >
> > With all due respect, Jim, I've met plenty, thank you. Regardless, I
think
> > you meant to say Matthew Chapter 5, not Chapter 4. There is nothing in
> > Chapter 4 relating to anything we're talking about. Therefore, Matthew
> > Chapter 5:33-37:
> >
> > 33: Again, ye have heard that it hath been
> > said by them of old time, Thou shalt not
> > forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the
> > Lord thine oaths:
> > 34: But I say unto you, Swear not at all;
> > neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:
> > 35: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool:
> > neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of
> > the great King.
> > 36: Neither shalt thou swear by thy head,
> > because thou canst not make one hair white
> > or black.
> > 37: But let your communication be, Yea, yea;
> > Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these
> > cometh of evil.
> >
> > Since the Pledge of Allegiance, or the words "...one nation, under
> > God...," is not an oath given to others, but simply a pledge to one's
own
> > self, there is no contridiction with anything written above.
> >

> > By the way, the comma following "Christian" in what I wrote earlier
> > (quoted at the top of this page) was meant to be placed before that word
(as
> > in "...the first, and only, Christain I've..."). Just wanted to clarify
that
> > before someone objected.
> >
> >
> > > "Manipulating?" How? Which of the kosher
> > > rules do you find objectionable? Will eating
> > > something that satisfies a Jewish requirement
> > > somehow make me less of a Christian, or
> > > less of an American? Oy!
> >
> >
> > What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify
what
> > we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and
doing
> > so in a somewhat less than forthright manner. I do not wish to live
under
> > the dietary rules of the Jewish religion, or the dietary rules of any
other
> > religion. But that is must certainly happening today. Jews refuse to eat
> > pork.
>
> As do Muslims. You statement smacks of ignorance

I'm going to weigh in just once on this thread.
Steve is correct, but it really makes NO difference
what anyone wants...in the end, it is the marketplace
that drives what is or is not available. If private companies want
to cater to particular dietary requirements, they are free to do
so without government interference. In the end, again,
it will be the profit incentive that drives the availability.

> As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
> > decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot
dogs.

Last time I checked, they were readily available in my
local A&P, Shopright or whatever. If they aren't available
in a particular local, ask the store to stock them. If you do,
they may answer that they dropped the product because
it didn't sell. That's basic marketing and economics 101.

> Paging Hal Turner..you have another convert waiting to inducted.
>
> Foul Tasting turkey dogs were a product of people who wanted to eat
> something other than meat. It's a vegetarian dog. And all beef dogs
> are made because the people at Swift Meat Packing use the parts of the

> hog that are left over from processing. It has nothing to do with
> dietarty laws.

I agree 100%.

> > Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have
virtually
> > disappeared from resturant menus.

Probably because they didn't sell to the patrons. Back to
marketing and eco 101.

> ????? Where do you live. Every resturaunt, every Diner, every B-B-QUE
> place has pork chops. TGI FRidays has pork chops. OutBack Steak House
> has pork chops (and damn good ones at that)

Yep, just saw them in a brandy new TGIF last night.

> Ham, another favorite for many years, has
> > also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus.

Where the hell does this guy live?
Next he'll tell us he can't order bacon and eggs anywhere anymore.

> You must not go out for breakfast much. There isn't a resturant around
> that doesn't serve ham or ham or bacon (Oh you forgot bacon) as part of
> a breakfast meal. Excuse you..your ignornace is showing
>
> Funny for someone who lives in Mrylte Beach, you'd think there were lots
> of restuarants to serve the tourists. Guess not.

Well I think Myrtle Beach does shut down a great deal between
the end of October and the start of the spring season but I can't believe
there is a total lack of pork products there.

> Based on the
> > efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves,
only
> > a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the
> > Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.

Let's assume this guy is right as to cause...the reality, is still
drven by $$$$. The stores won't just do this or that because
some religious group wants certain products or opposes others.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3290. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 22:27:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <dB80c.25757$W74.11044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87966

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1aaaab7e8d45f99e98968a@news.west.earthlink.net...
> In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >
> >
> > What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify
what
> > we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and
doing
> > so in a somewhat less than forthright manner. I do not wish to live
under
> > the dietary rules of the Jewish religion, or the dietary rules of any
other
> > religion. But that is must certainly happening today. Jews refuse to eat
> > pork. As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
> > decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot
dogs.
> > Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have
virtually
> > disappeared from resturant menus. Ham, another favorite for many years,
has
> > also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus. Based on the
> > efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves,
only
> > a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the
> > Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.
>
>
>
> It's funny, but because of RedNecks similar in thought to people such as
> yourself, there's not grits being served in resturants. I know they
> aren't available in supermarkets, even in the Red Neck Cracker aisle
>
>
> Funny how at Christmas time Chinese resturaunts are full, selling ham
> and pork and Seafood. Why in act Dwight there are 20 Chinese resturants
> along the Strip in Myrtle Beach alone. Funny how rants are always prven
> wrong

How about Italian Sausage & Pepper Heros?
How about McDonald's Bacon (or sausage), Egg & Cheese McMuffin

Cheers, and oops, I said I'd only weigh in once on this subject.
Bill K2UNK

3291. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 22:34:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <VH80c.25804$W74.18998@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87967

"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
news:J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous...
>
> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
> ham-radio is a "service" ?

It is a service because that is how it is defined and
authorized under FCC rules Part 97.

> All hams dont want to be considered as a public
> service. Everybody has not the military
> spirit. Let Them choose!

There is nothing to choose. It is a service.
In actual day-to-day activity, the fact that
ham radio is a service still allows individuals
to be hams on nothing more than a personal
hobby basis.

> Suppress amateur
> radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
> considered as a service has many
> drawbacks for the ham rights, you
> are always dependent of what a
> governement wants. Does the governement
> has any influence on how you want to
> play golf ?

The government will ALWAYS have a say in ham radio
because the radio spectrum is not a privatlely owned
resource. Under US law and under the laws of
most countries, the government (the FCC in the USA)
gets to specify the rules for amateur radio.

> No, you can play in the manner you want.
> So let the hams vote if they want to
> continue to be a service. The answer is
> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
>
> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !

Sorry, there is NO opportunity for
you or anyone else to vote as you wish.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3292. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-28 22:41:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <f6KdndnmTaUAhtzdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 87968

Anonymous wrote:
> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
> ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
> dont want to be considered as a public
> service. Everybody has not the military
> spirit.
> Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
> radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
> considered as a service has many
> drawbacks for the ham rights, you
> are always dependent of what a
> governement wants. Does the governement
> has any influence on how you want to
> play golf ?
> No, you can play in the manner you want.

No you can't. There are rules on the golf coures you must follow or you will not be allowed to play. You can't play golf on the Whitehous lawn, in the middle of the street, on someone elses' private property, in a public park, or any number of other places. Almost everything you do has rules attatched.

> So let the hams vote if they want to
> continue to be a service. The answer is
> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
>
> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !

I guess you are one of the idiots who advocate that the the government should not have any say in how the airwaves can be used. That the airwaves should be free for anyone to use anyway they please at anytime. If that were so, I wonder how you would feel if your family was killed in a plane crash because the pilot could not communicate with air traffic control because some freedom loving moron such as yourself was transmitting on the ATC frequencies.

The FCC defines Amateur Radio as a service, and the hams like it that way, now go spout you drivle somewhere else.

3293. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 00:06:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040228190616.29815.00003513@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 87969

In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

(I previously wrote):

>> "Manipulating?" How? Which of the kosher
>> rules do you find objectionable? Will eating
>> something that satisfies a Jewish requirement
>> somehow make me less of a Christian, or
>> less of an American? Oy!
>
> What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify what
>we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and doing
>so in a somewhat less than forthright manner.

Me too! But I don't see any "pushing". Do you have evidence that anyone "pushed" the food processors to get their products certified?

Or is it possible that *they* (the food processing companies) went looking for new customers, and realized that they could sell more products if they were kosher-certified?

>I do not wish to live under the dietary rules of the Jewish religion,
>or the dietary rules of any other religion.

Then don't. There are plenty of uncertified products out there.

>But that is must certainly happening today.

Did you mean to write:

"But that is must certainly happening today."

?

>Jews refuse to eat pork.

SOME Jewish people refuse to eat pork. Just like *some* Christians refuse to eat meat on Fridays in Lent. Others don't abide by those rules.

>As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
>decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot dogs.

Dwight, you've convinced me that you're either pulling a huge (and bad) joke or you are very misinformed.

Do you really believe what you wrote?

>Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have virtually
>disappeared from resturant menus.

Not in around here, or in any restaurant I've been to.
And I live in the Philadelphia area, and we have plenty of Jewish people
here. Also lots of Christians, some Muslims, and various other groups.

>Ham, another favorite for many years, has
>also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus.

Not around here!

>Based on the
>efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves, only
>a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the
>Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.

What "effort"?

I remember that as a small child, over 40 years ago, seeing the various symbols
on jars and cans. I asked what it meant, and was given a simple explanation of
kosher requirements. These were "mainstream" (your word, not mine) products
like Miracle Whip and ketchup.

>> Methinks you doth protest too much, Dwight.

> And I think you are defending all this too much, Jim.

I don't think so.

>Why?

Why am I countering your claims? Simple: They are grossly inaccurate. They
are not backed by any facts. They are simply illogical.

>Regardless, that is all I have to say about this. This is not a safe subject
to speak
>out too loudly about.

Has anyone threatened you, Dwight? Or have your claims simply been refuted?

In a previous post, I described what has been going on in US food production
for the past few decades. You seem to have missed it. It explains all of your
concerns, but it seems that you prefer to name a minority religious group as
the boogieman rather than look at how things really work.

Or maybe you're just pulling our collective leg.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

3294. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 00:20:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402281620.290ac612@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87970

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040222121726.05539.00004473@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <dBTZb.2780$LK1.2122@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >I know you love to .... um .... shake things up .... but ... I had my 1st
> >class radiotelephone license in 1966.
>
> Irrelevant in this newsgroup. Some of the amateurs in here seem to
> think an Amateur Extra class license is a "PhD in radio." No other
> radio licenses are allowed to figure in...

It's not about licenses.

It's about practical experience...In this regard you ahve ZERO.

> >I also worked in Electromagnetic Compatibilty testing in 1995.
>
> Another guy in here has you beat...worked as a purchasing agent
> for a set-top box maker. High-level knowledge.

If that was my SOLE experience in electronics, your "point" might
be humorous. In this case you're only slinging mud.

> EMI testing, Tempest, the whole works is fairly normal work on any
> DoD contract. So? You think BPL is equivalent to an EMP?!?
>
> >Believe me, even an improperly grounded power
> >pole can cause problems.
>
> Yes, all those wooden utility poles are real tough radiators...?
>
> >No, I am not suggesting "interfering" with an
> >unlicensed service. I am suggesting asserting the rights of a licensed
> >service.
>
> OK, plant the flag and claim HF is the sovereign terrortory of hams.

"Hams" are not the only licensed service affected in this matter,
and that point has been made not only by the ARRL, but numerous other
agencies who see this as a threat to THIER licensees.

Too bad YOU can't see that...Or can you? I imagine you CAN, and
the rest of this is just your usual antagonistic trolling.

> Mama Dee has interpreted the law and sent down an encyclical that
> any ham can do anything as long as they have a LICENSE and "are

> authoritized to radiate."
>
> Not quite right, that, but it pleases the machismo of some.

The "machismo" (your favorite adjective of late) is yours,
Lennie...WE know what our responsibilities are.

> You rather clearly stated an INTENT to interfere. Intent is not
> evidenciary per se, but it doesn't win you any friends in court..

Ahhhhhhhhhhh......Lennie the Lawyer has now rendered HIS verdict!

> >Unlicensed services may not cause interference and must put up
> >with interference.
>
> Nooo, not quite and the OET won't buy that by itself, nor would any
> courts in most countries, USA included.

Yeeeeesssss...Quite. The FCC has stated this in just so many
words on several occassions, Your Putziness.

Sorry they didn't confer with you before making those assertions.

> If all could be summed up that easily, it would be "perfectly legal"
> for you to hold a 5 W HT up to the abdomen of a pacemaker wearer
> and thumb the PTT switch. Are you licensed by the FCC to
> deliberately interfere with anything? I don't think so. We can toss a
> coin to see if the pacemaker wearer has an infarc.

"Infarct", Lennie...

Besides...A pacer is not the therapy of choice for a myocardial
infarction. A pacer is placed due to an SA node or other pacer
failure...An ELECTRICAL failure of the heart which may or mayNOT be
due to an MI. An MI is actual damage done to the myocardium, or heart
muscle, usually due to cardiovascular disease or a thrombus of other
etiology, even trauma.

> >You, and some others, think this is an "amateur vs. the
> >world" thing. It is not.
>
> I didn't write that. You imagined that in another burst of macho
> testosterone, ASSERTING yourself.

No, Your Scumminess, that's EXACTLY what you did. Over and over
and over...

I am beginning to believe you are gay, Lennie...of the feminine
preference. You seem to have a problem with the idea of any exertion
of maleness.

Perhas the reason for your lack of family other than an ex-wife?

> Does your geographic territory NEED another beacon? The
> pioneering and exploration of HF was pretty much over with when

> the USA got into WW2. If you NEED QSLs so much, advertise for
> some on the Internet.

Same to ya, Your Putziness...Then you can send them out for your
11 meter "chats" or your Part 15 station. You ARE still designing
that station to join us on HF aren't you, Lennie...?!?! You SAID you
were...(among OTHER lies you've usttered here, of course...)

> >There will be problems with other services, I can assure you.
>
> Duhhhhhh...no kiddin, huh?

You'll never know, unless your cable provider or garage door
opener manufacturer switch to HF frequencies for thier devices.

> Jim, I'm more than well aware of potential interference problems in
> radio, all the way from VLF on up into the microwaves. That's where
> I've been working for a half century and still keep my hand in.

Hmmmmm..

I wonder how long it will be until you find an endearment for
him, Lennie... We'll see...

> I've also had four tours of duty as a juror and understand quite well
> what INTENT is. No LLD needed for that.

Ahhhh! Lennie's now an expert in the law becasue he sat on a
JURY!

> All the aging olde-tyme hammes in here seem to be ASSERTING
> themselves in some adolescent machismo in tuff tawk...and none of
> them has demonstrated knowledge-one about the BPL signal levels
> or the data protocol or anything else about any BPL system proposed.

Whoa! Your SCUMMINESS! Neither do YOU, it seems, in as much as
you make assinine assertions about BPL and then when asked to pony up
explanations of yoru assertions, make silly "it's my right to NOT
respond" rhetoric!

> None of the tuff tawkers seem to know anything yet they all talk like
> they are a cross between expert PhDs in EMI and The Terminator
> gutturally announcing "Ahl be backkk." [just before driving through
> the door of a police station and killing lots of cops]

Don't make fun of Arnold, Lennie...YOU guys elected him!

> All that anyone seems to want to do is wait until Newington spoon-feeds
> them "what they need to know" and cause a lot of wing-flapping and
> squawking. Nobody seems to check the FCC website. Nobody has
> gone out to try to find a representative technical document from one of
> the proposed BPL systems. All seem to be whistling in the dark while
> tiptoeing through the graveyard.

Evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, I am sure that
repeating that to yourself over and over makes you feel warm and
fuzzy, Lennie.

> The NPRM is announced as docket number 04-37 and there is one
> document (as of Saturdy, 21 Feb 04) on that NPRM. The text of the
> NPRM isn't available on the 'web. Perhaps the executives in
> Newington have a copy...the general public doesn't have it available.

Thanks for reciting the obvious, Lenno...

> None of you KNOW what the characteristics of any proposed BPL
> system IS, yet you are all "expert" on it becoming the downfall of HF
> for Hams. Will it interfere in general? Probably. Will it have terrible
> interference and cancel all the events in the ham playground? Unknown.

What >>>IS<<< known is that damage will occur...it's been proven.
That if allowed to promulgate unrestrained it will do exactly what's
been cited...

> Meanwhile, think about how you wing-flappers appear to the guvmint
> and the industry, all the while demonstrating near-absolute-zero on
> thinking and radiation expertise. Tawkin tuff in here doesn't cut it on
> getting rid of it. Tawking tuff doan police your playground. EM
> spectrum ain't da 'hood and you guys ain't da onley Boyz in da HF
> 'hood.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"
from "My Anthology Of Newsgroup Lies" by Leonard H. Anderson.

Steve, K4YZ

3295. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 01:07:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ANidnV1OCOHFptzdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87971

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>What right do you and other people who
>>think that it is supposed to reflect you
>>religion's particular take on how the
>>country "should be" to make up a pledge
>>that contains a "spiritual weapon" that
>>we are supposed to pledge to? (snip)
>
>
>
> It is not "my religion." I've made no claim to any religion whatsoever in
> this discussion. That does not, however, change my perception that
> Christians are being unfairly trashed in this country today. You brought
> this (the words in the POA) up in a public newsgroup discussion. Since it is
> "weooh, OT," I have to wonder why.

Well Dwight, the thread is kind of OT, eh?

> You then went on a rant about the Knights
> of Columbus, Eisenhower, and so on, acting as if your life was being
> destroyed by the mere mention of those words. Trust me. Your life won't
> change whether those words are there or not.

I don't go on too many rants, and this isn't one of them. I think I may
just have gotten under your skin pretty badly. I'm just trying to have
some friendly discussion here.

All of the Pledge information is simply background facts involved in
the discussion. The rewrite *was* spearheaded by the KofC, Eisenhower
did say it was a "spiritual reaffirmation", and at least some of the
groups that are so intent on having it remain the way it is are also
trying to get one of the most blatantly Judeo/Christion documents placed
in the same category. (the 10 commandments)

I mean it looks, acts, and quacks like a duck!

> As for your question about my right to support those words in the POA, it
> is the same right you have to rant against it. Those with a belief in god
> are the vast majority in this country and I have no problems whatsoever with
> non-intrusive expressions of that.

I understand what you mean. Sometimes the minority has to be protected
from the majority.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3296. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 01:08:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402281708.7b98b291@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87972

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<LbS%b.25044$hm4.22211@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0402271219.2fdfbba2@posting.google.com...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0402251829.32a33ffc@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > Not real hams. Amateur Radio was suspended at the time, unless you
> > > consider a real ham to be one without operating priveleges.
> > >
> > > And hopefully they weren't operating WAR using W3GRF, W0DX,
> > > W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US, or other callsigns.
> >
> > Hey Dan, tell me about these wannabees we have today. C'mon Dan, tell
> > me about them.
> >
> > If you unzip very slowly you might get your tie out w/o too much
> > damage, hihi.
> >
>
> Hey look everybody....another CBPlusser.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

DAn, I never held a license that said "plus" on it. You'll just have
to do better than that.

3297. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 05:00:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040229000030.02537.00003224@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 87973

In article <dB80c.25757$W74.11044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>How about Italian Sausage & Pepper Heros?

YUM!

>How about McDonald's Bacon (or sausage), Egg & Cheese McMuffin

Those are good. The classic Egg McMuffin has ham in it.

>Cheers, and oops, I said I'd only weigh in once on this subject.

"weigh in"...I love it...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3298. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 05:07:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040229000759.13960.00000966@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87976

In article <c1kpes$t09$06$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>Servus, Ralph,
>
>hast du noch nicht gemerkt, daï¿½ hier in der Gruppe fast nur Idioten
>schreiben?

Hey watchit, buster, I resemble that remark!

>Ameri-Egoisten die glauben, die sind der Nabel der Welt. Warum
>geht es ï¿½berall sonst in der Welt ohne diese depperte Morsediskussion
>reibungslos ï¿½ber die Bï¿½hne?

That's what this newsgroup is for -- discussion of Morse code (testing)
issues.

(Bunch of sour-kraut whining snipped)

>Jedenfalls ist es sehr lustig, hier zu lesen, und manchmal wundere ich mich
>schon ein biï¿½chen, wie Leute mit null Bildung ï¿½berhaupt eine Lizenz erwerben
>kï¿½nnen. Da wissen doch die Wenigsten, was auï¿½erhalb der eigenen Zaunpfosten
>los ist. Die glauben doch tatsï¿½chlich, ihre Soldaten sterben im Irak fï¿½r das
>ï¿½l, damit sie billiger tanken kï¿½nnen. (Siehe EXXON + Mobil Thread).

Our soldiers aren't dying in Iraq for oil. They are dying there to win freedom
for the people of Iraq, and to ensure that Iraq will not become a center for
terrorist activity which could threaten the security of the U.S. and other
Western countries, including Germany and Austria.

Wenn ich Sie, Helmut war, wï¿½rde ich anfangen, zu lesen einige Geschichtenbï¿½cher
und zu sehen, was Amerikaner gemacht haben, andere Lï¿½nder um die Welt zu
unterstï¿½tzen, die von Tyrannen und Diktatoren unterdrï¿½ckt wurde. Bei weitem die
Mehrheit von Deutsch und ï¿½sterreichern die ich habe getroffen mich habe
verstanden, daï¿½ dieses und Amerika geschï¿½tzt hat, fï¿½r was sie gemacht haben.

Vergeben Sie bitte mein armes Deutsch.

Schï¿½nen Tag noch und 73 de Larry, K3LT

3299. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 05:08:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040229000800.13960.00000967@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87974

In article <20040225150426.07155.00000932@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> The core of network messaging in the military of WW2 was the
> teleprinter, principally the militarized models from the Teletype
> Corporation headquartered in Chicago...as were Hallicrafters and
> Motorola. Teleprinters were ideal for integrated communications,
> operating well over both wirelines and radio, capable of 60 words
> per minute continuously, needing only to be fed paper and ribbons
> and some occasional oil.
>
> The image of the lone morseman with headphones and hunched
> over his code key saving the nation was only that...an image...no
> relation to reality. That image is UNreal.
>
> LHA / WMD

Loonie:

Er, I mean, "Lennie." Sorry. How come the "image of the lone morseman with headphones" is so predominant, if it is not true? In virtually every depiction
of WWII-Era military communications, the mode being used is Morse/CW. I know had have known many WWII-Era military radio operators, and they were all able to use Morse/CW conversationally at speeds in excess of 50 WPM. They told tales of pulling duty watches in which they spent the entire time with headphones on listening for message traffic in CW. While they have also spoken of the use of radioteletype, for the most part, that was used only for the most routine, non-secure message traffic, and mainly within the CONUS between military installations and defense manufacturing facilities (which were on a landline net).

Your credibility is zero. You claim that Morse/CW was essentially unheard of as a primary military communications mode, when, in fact, all of the evidence is that exactly the opposite is true.

OK. You hate CW. We get it. There's no need to make a barefaced liar out of yourself to prove your point.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3300. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 05:08:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040229000800.13960.00000968@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 87975

In article <J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous>, Anonymous
<BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> writes:

>Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
>ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
>dont want to be considered as a public
>service. Everybody has not the military
>spirit.
>Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
>radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
>considered as a service has many
>drawbacks for the ham rights, you
>are always dependent of what a
>governement wants. Does the governement
>has any influence on how you want to
>play golf ?
>No, you can play in the manner you want.
>So let the hams vote if they want to
>continue to be a service. The answer is
>evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
>
>So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !
>

Troll-O-Meter:

0 1 3 5 7 9 +10 +20
||||||

73 de Larry, K3LT

3301. MAKE LOTS OF MONIES NOW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 06:19:34 UTC
From: anne <anne66_2002@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4041867b_5@news.athenanews.com>
Source record: 87988

MAKE THOUSANDS!!!

I found this on a bulletin board and decided to try it: I don't care about the useless pre-fabricated crap this message usually says. All I say is, it works. Continue pre-fab crap.

WELL GUESS WHAT!!!

Within five days, I started getting money in the mail!! I was shocked!! I figured it would end soon, but the money just kept coming in. In my first week, I made about $63.00 By the end of the second week I had
made a total of $1873.00!! In the third week I had made a total of $9,612.00 and more mail kept coming in!! This is now my fourth week and I have made a total of $35,165.00 and it's still coming rapidly. It's certainly worth $6.00 and six stamps, and I have spent more than that on the lottery without ever winning!!!
My mailman asked me what was with all the mail , and when i showed him this system he was amazed and got going at it . Everyday he thanks me , it feels good to know your helping make other pepole have more time and money to do the things they care about most .(Dont let this pass you buy , it so easy and it realy does work)
Let me tell you how this works and most important, why it works.....
also make sure you print this out NOW, so you can get the information off of it, as you will need it. I promise you that if you follow the directions exactly that you
will start making more money than you thought possible by doing something so easy!!

Suggestion: Read this entire message carefully!! (Print it out or download it)

Follow the simple directions and watch the money come in!! It's easy. It's legal. And, your investment is only $6.00 (Plus postage) !!!

IMPORTANT:

This is not a rip-off, it is decent; it's legal; and it is virtually no risk - it really works!! If all the following instructions are adhered to, you will receive extraordinary dividends.

PLEASE NOTE:

Please follow the directions EXACTLY, and $50,000 or more can be yours in 20 to 60 days. This program remains successful because of the honesty and

integrity of the participants. Please continue its success by carefully adhering to
the instructions. You will now become apart of the Mail Order business. You
are in the business of developing Mailing Lists. Many large corporations are
happy to pay big bucks for quality lists. However, the money made from the
mailing lists is secondary to income which is made from people like you and me asking to be included in that list. Here are the four easy steps to success.

STEP ONE:

Get six separate pieces of paper and write the following on each piece of paper "PLEASE PUT ME ON YOUR MAILING LIST." Now get 6 U.S. $1.00 bills and place ONE inside of EACH of the six pieces of paper so the bill will not be seen through the envelope (to prevent thievery). Next, place one paper in each of the six envelopes and seal them. You now should have six sealed envelopes, each with a piece of paper stating the above phrase, your name and address, and a $1.00 bill. What you are doing is creating a service.

THIS IS ABSOLUTELY LEGAL!!!!!

You are requesting a legitimate service and you are paying for it!! Like
most of us I was a little skeptical and little worried about the legal aspects
of it all. So I checked it out with the U.S. Post Office (1-800-238-5355) and they
confirmed that it is indeed legal!!

Mail the six envelopes to the following addresses:

1) G. Burrows
1/264 Tor St
Toowoomba QLD
4350 Australia

2) J. Safian
6950 W. Forest Presrv. Dr., #115
Norridge, IL 60706-1324

3) R. Ansems
Gen. Foulkesstraat 5
4641 BW Ossendrecht
Netherlands

4) C. Milligan
6597 Herry Rd.
Vernon BC
Canada

V1B3T6

5) Foster
39 Poplar Avenue,
Hollins,
Oldham,
England

6) Jack Burke
220 Kingsbury Drive
Aptos,Ca. 95003-5003
U.S.A.

STEP TWO:Now take the #1 name off the list that you see above, move the other names up (six becomes 5, 5 becomes 4, and etc.) and add YOUR NAME as number 6 on the list.

STEP THREE:
Change anything you need to but try to keep this article as close to original as possible. Now post your amended article to at least 200 news groups. :
(I think there are close to 24,000 groups) All you need is 200, but remember, the more you post, the more money you make!! This is perfectly legal!! If you have any doubts, refer to Title 18 Sec. 1302 & 1341 of the Postal Lottery laws. Keep a copy of these steps for yourself and whenever you need money, you can use it again, and again. PLEASE REMEMBER that this program remains successful because of the honesty and integrity of the participants and by their carefully adhering to directions. Look at it this way. If you were of integrity, the program will continue and the money that so many others have received will come your way.

NOTE: You may want to retain every name and address sent to you, either on a computer or hard copy and keep the notes people send you. This VERIFIES that you are truly providing a service. (Also, it might be a good idea to wrap the $1 bill in dark paper to reduce the risk of mail theft). So, as each post is downloaded and the directions carefully followed, all members will be reimbursed for their participation as a List Developer with one dollar each. Your name will move up the list geometrically so that when your name reaches the #1 position you will be receiving thousands of dollars in CASH!!! What an opportunity for only $6.00 ($1.00 for each of the first six people listed above) Send it now, add your own name to the list and you're in business!!!

*****DIRECTIONS FOR HOW TO POST TO NEWS GROUPS!!!*****

STEP ONE: You do not need to re-type this entire letter to do your own posting. Simply put your cursor at the beginning of this letter and drag your
cursor to the bottom of this document, and select 'copy' from the edit menu. This

will copy the entire letter into the computer's memory.

STEP TWO:
Open a blank 'notepad' file and place your cursor at the top
of the blank page. From the 'edit' menu select 'paste'. This will
paste a copy
of the letter into the notepad so that you will add your name to the
list.

STEP THREE:
Save your new notepad file as a text file. If you want to do your
posting in different settings, you'll always have this file to go back
to.

STEP FOUR:
You can use a program like "postXpert" to post to all the newsgroups
at once.
You can find this program at <http://www.download.com>.

Use Netscape or Internet Explorer and try searching for various new
groups (on- line forums, message boards, chat sites, discussions.)

STEP FIVE:
Visit message boards and post this article as a new message by
highlighting the text of this letter and selecting paste from the edit
menu. Fill in the subject, this will be the header that everyone sees
as they scroll through the list of postings in a particular group,
click the post message button. You're done.

Congratulations!!!!!!

THAT'S IT!! All you have to do, and It Really works!!!

Best Wishes

3302. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 08:00:49 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns949E1EA04CFC4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 87977

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0402281331.cf84a5d@posting.google.com:

> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com>...
>> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> news:<20040225190012.22081.00004298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> > In article <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >
>> > >The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU
>> > >code test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third
>> > >class of licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited
>> > >HF privileges.
>> >
>> > Why was this a "truly bizarre way"?
>>
>> TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
>> licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
>> coded license. Bizarre.
>
> Question, Brain...
>
> I have never seen Jim Miccolis refer to you as anything but
> "Brian"...
>
> So WHY do YOU inisist on following the insulting and demeaning
> example of a known pathological liar and antagonist in engaging in any
> interaction with him...?!?!
>
> Are you, after all, as shallow and immature as I thought you
> really are?
>
> Please give some specific example of how Jim has belittled or
> demeaned YOU in a like manner...
>
>> > >This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of
>> > >comments.
>> >
>> > Democracy in action.
>>
>> You almost got it right. Should be "Democracy inaction."
>
> As the otehr post suggested...You can either get to the higher

> class license by progressing up a Code ladder or a theory ladder.
>
> Why is that "inaction"...?!?!
>
>> > Sounds like a very reasonable compromise.
>>
>> Then why did they initially suggest a third coded license? Why did
>> that generate a "large number of comments?"
>
> To introduce a pathway to the higher license. Shall I draw you a
> map?
>
>> > >If South Africa does
>> > >implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to
>> > >do so.
>> >
>> > Why? Perhaps it could be a way out of the constant arguments. It
>> > wasn't possible before, due to the treaty.
>>
>> TAFKA Rev Jim, the constant arguments can be gotten out of by letting
>> go.
>
> Ahhhhh...so, if we all just agree with you, then we don't need to
> "discuss" anything any more, eh?
>
> How Lenniesque.
>
>> > >They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that
>> > >they would have given to the new licence, to the existing
>> > >restricted licence instead, without any addtional testing.
>> >
>> > How many has in South Africa, anyway?
>>
>> huh?
>
> Even a gradeschooler can see he just dropped the "m" out of
> "hams", BRAIN...
>
> I can see how you'll wind up a loser if you ever got on "Wheel of
> Fortune"...
>
> OOOOOOPS! YOU'RE ALREADY A LOSER!
>
> EXXXXXXXXXCCCCCUUUUUUUUUSSSSSSSSSEEEEEEEEE MEEEEEEEEEEEE ! ! !
> ! ! ! !
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I think when he spoke of inaction he meant the earlier ZS proposal, not the
one they are now considering

3303. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 09:19:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <j8i0c.26368$W74.20812@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87978

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?

No, Jim. But I knew it was only a matter of time before people like Steven Adell, and to a lesser extent you with your "you prefer to name a minority religious group as the boogieman," would turn this into an attack on me personally instead of discussing the issue or into me versus Jews in spite of the fact that I have clearly, and repeatedly, said I would object to this no matter which religious group did it. This is the typical response whenever anyone questions, or objects to, anything done by Jews in this country. Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and much more. Since I don't want this to happen to my family, I have ended my participation in the discussion (and do so with this message).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3304. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 09:50:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IBi0c.26370$W74.9959@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87979

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> If it isn't a pledge or an oath or
> whatever to God, then no one
> should have a problem with
> either it's removal or inclusion.

You're changing your objection with each post, Mike. First you talked about an oath and how that conflicted with the Sermon on the Mount. When I pointed out that the Pledge of Allegiance was a pledge to one's self, you changed that to "a pledge or an oath or whatever to God."

There is no conflict between a pledge and the Sermon of the Mount. The Pledge of Allegiance is not an oath. The words "...one nation, under God...," are not "to" God, but are, in my opinion, simply an acknowledgement of God - an affirmation that this nation was founded by men who believed in a God (the men who wrote about unalienable rights endowed by their "Creator" in the Declaration of Independence).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3305. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 10:02:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <JMi0c.26371$W74.15811@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 87980

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> The American Family Association has
> an online campaign they call
> StopLiberalJudges.com (strange it isn't
> an .org)

I don't care what the American Family Association has to say on the matter, Mike. They have their opinion. I have mine. You have yours. And I'm sure many others have theirs. I'm not bound by anyone else's opinion any more than you're bound by mine or I'm bound by yours.

> Dwight Eisenhower himself says it is a
> reaffirmation of faith. (snip)

As I said, many people have their own opinions. That was Eisenhower's opinion. The words "reaffirmation of faith" are not found in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3306. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 11:28:12 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c1sicb$j1i$01$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87981

Good morning, Larry!
as a first and general remark, I can go with you on most of the arisen questions here in this thread. The ones I do not fully agree with you, I will comment further down at the appropriate spot.

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> schrieb im Newsbeitrag news:20040229000759.13960.00000966@mb-m11.aol.com...
| In article <c1kpes$t09$06$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
| writes:
|
| >Servus, Ralph,
| >
| >hast du noch nicht gemerkt, daï¿½ hier in der Gruppe fast nur Idioten
| >schreiben?
|
| Hey watchit, buster, I resemble that remark!

[trans] didn't you notice , that ALMOST all posters are idiots here in this group, did you?[trans end]

From your previous postings I see your agreement on that, and my explicit statement to Ralph was, that MOST, and this does not say ALL, ...

|
| >Ameri-Egoisten die glauben, die sind der Nabel der Welt. Warum
| >geht es ï¿½berall sonst in der Welt ohne diese depperte Morsediskussion
| >reibungslos ï¿½ber die Bï¿½hne?
|
| That's what this newsgroup is for -- discussion of Morse code (testing)
| issues.

From the name of the NG I would feel for Amateur Radio POLICY, and not only from the US. For the Morse-Code-Issue there is a different newsgroup dedicated: alt.ham-radio.nocode

Though morse code testing is one of the issues of your restructuring process, which concernes you personally very much, because this is your main interest in HAM radio. Nowhere else in the ham-world people did get this much of agression and awfull scenery out of this issue. There were zero discussion nor flaming in neither of the european countries dropped CW-testing or elswhere in the world. And there are a lot of countries dropped the codetest requirement by now, and many will follow.

The translation would read: [Why does it run without friction and without this dumb morse-code-discussion everywhere else on the world.]

|
| (Bunch of sour-kraut whining snipped)

Sauerkraut is not for whining, its for eating, what I did yesterday,
incidentally. It is one of the most important C-vitamin suppliers we have
here during wintertime.

|
| >Jedenfalls ist es sehr lustig, hier zu lesen, und manchmal wundere ich
mich
| >schon ein bii¿½chen, wie Leute mit null Bildung i¿½berhaupt eine Lizenz
erwerben
| >kï¿½nnen. Da wissen doch die Wenigsten, was auï¿½erhalb der eigenen
Zaunpfosten
| >los ist. Die glauben doch tatsï¿½chlich, ihre Soldaten sterben im Irak fï¿½r
das
| >ï¿½l, damit sie billiger tanken kï¿½nnen. (Siehe EXXON + Mobil Thread).
|

| Our soldiers aren't dying in Iraq for oil.

You are definetly right.

Likely, you did read the thread "boycott exon+mobile", where one of the
answers to my post was, that you americans pay in a different way for fuel,
your soldiers dye in Iraq for the oil. I refered to this statement of one of
the posters in conjunction with the close mental/intellectual horizon, some
of your fellow americans are confined in.

You, Larry, have been abroad with the service and private, extended your
view of the world, far beyond your fencepoles. I am sure, you agree on this.

| They are dying there to win freedom for the people of Iraq

Right, mission accomplished.

The hard road is still ahaed of them. Still it is far more important to get
the Iraqi population's mind cleared of all that crap that they had to learn
and to believe throughout the decades.

| and to ensure that Iraq will not become a center for
| terrorist activity which could threaten the security of the U.S. and other
| Western countries, including Germany and Austria.

In the meantime, the proponents of the attack (GWB and TB) did commit, there
was no such thread, no WMD.

|
| Wenn ich Sie, Helmut war, wï¿½rde ich anfangen, zu lesen einige
Geschichtenbï¿½cher
| und zu sehen, was Amerikaner gemacht haben, andere Lï¿½nder um die Welt zu
| unterstï¿½tzen, die von Tyrannen und Diktatoren unterdrï¿½ckt wurde.

Lieber Larry, Du kannst mir glauben, ich weiss das alles. Ich selbst bin
Mitglied der Streitkrï¿½fte der Vereinten Nationen, und war jahrelang im

Einsatz in Zypern, Israel, und Syrien. Das ist die Art, wie ein neutrales Land wie ï¿½sterreich sich um den Frieden kï¿½mmert. Und ich leiste meinen Beitrag dazu. Freiwillig.

| Bei weitem die
| Mehrheit von Deutsch und ï¿½sterreichern die ich habe getroffen mich habe
| verstanden, daï¿½ dieses und Amerika geschï¿½tzt hat, fï¿½r was sie gemacht haben.
|

Es steht auï¿½er Zweifel, daï¿½ Vieles auf der Welt ohne die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika nicht so wï¿½re, wie es heute ist. Mir brauchst Du das nicht zu erzï¿½hlen, Du kannst mich einen amerikanischen Patrioten nennen, obwohl ich derzeit nicht dort wohne. Ich habe aber das Leben dort in California kennengelert ï¿½ber mehr als zwei Jahre hinweg. Ich werde dorthin zurï¿½ckkehren, wenn ich pensioniert bin.

| Vergeben Sie bitte mein armes Deutsch.

Dear Larry, there is nothing to be forgiven for. I have to express my reverence. The referenced reply was meant for a native german speaker, and not for someone with german as second or third language. Please feel free to further reply in german, if this helps to practice your language skills. Practicing these skills is one of the reasons for me to take part in the discussions in the ham newsgroups.

|
| Schï¿½nen Tag noch und 73 de Larry, K3LT

Have a nice day

73 de OE8SOQ

3307. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 11:41:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402290341.4c165977@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87982

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns949E1EA04CFC4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> I think when he spoke of inaction he meant the earlier ZS proposal, not the
> one they are now considering

Perhaps, Alun, but 99% of that post was asking Brain why it was
important to him to demean and belittle another person who does not
demean or belittle him.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3308. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 11:44:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402290344.624626b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87983

Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message news:<J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous>...

Remainder of another LennieRant under an anonymous "signature" snipped.

Nothing new. Same rhetoric.

Steve, K4YZ

3309. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 11:59:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402290359.2022b11b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87984

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040229000800.13960.00000967@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <20040225150426.07155.00000932@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > The core of network messaging in the military of WW2 was the
> > teleprinter, principally the militarized models from the Teletype
> > Corporation headquartered in Chicago...as were Hallicrafters and
> > Motorola. Teleprinters were ideal for integrated communications,
> > operating well over both wirelines and radio, capable of 60 words
> > per minute continuously, needing only to be fed paper and ribbons
> > and some occasional oil.
> >
> > The image of the lone morseman with headphones and hunched
> > over his code key saving the nation was only that...an image...no
> > relation to reality. That image is UNreal.

Some Snippage

> Your credibility is zero. You claim that Morse/CW was essentially
> unheard of as a primary military communications mode, when, in fact, all
> of the evidence is that exactly the opposite is true.

Leonard H. Anderson has never had a problem with misrepresenting
the truth even when the evidence to the contrary was plentiful and
well known to all concerned.

That he feels compelled to continue to make a mockery of his
"character" and humiliate his family name so readily in a public forum
should be adequate evidence that this old man is NOT dealing with a
full deck.

He's ill. That's all there is to it.

> OK. You hate CW. We get it. There's no need to make a barefaced
> liar out of yourself to prove your point.

Oooooooops! Too late!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3310. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 12:48:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4041DF7D.29138A9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 87985

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?
>
> No, Jim. But I knew it was only a matter of time before people like Steven
> Adell, and to a lesser extent you with your "you prefer to name a minority
> religious group as the boogieman," would turn this into an attack on me
> personally instead of discussing the issue or into me versus Jews in spite
> of the fact that I have clearly, and repeatedly, said I would object to this
> no matter which religious group did it. This is the typical response
> whenever anyone questions, or objects to, anything done by Jews in this
> country. Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and much more. Since I
> don't want this to happen to my family, I have ended my participation in the
> discussion (and do so with this message).

That's too bad, Dwight. I was kind of looking forward to taking you on
over some of your absurd comments myself. This isn't the first time
you've provided us with statements which indicate that you're a racial
and religeous bigot.

Dave K8MN

3311. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 13:28:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040229082832.21232.00004525@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 87987

In article <By80c.25723$W74.3044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Steve is correct, but it really makes NO difference
>what anyone wants...in the end, it is the marketplace
>that drives what is or is not available. If private companies want
>to cater to particular dietary requirements, they are free to do
>so without government interference. In the end, again,
>it will be the profit incentive that drives the availability.

And that really is what happens. Bill, you summed it up perfectly.
>
>>> As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
>>> decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot
>>> dogs.
>
>Last time I checked, they were readily available in my
>local A&P, Shopright or whatever. If they aren't available
>in a particular local, ask the store to stock them. If you do,
>they may answer that they dropped the product because
>it didn't sell. That's basic marketing and economics 101.

Exactly. I was in BJ's yesterday and Acme the day before. All sorts of pork
products available. Anad all sorts of stuff that could not be certified kosher
in any way.

Pork has obtained a bad reputation in some circles as a meat with a lot of fat
that requires careful and thorough cooking for safety. The result has been for
pork producers to breed piggies that are more lean, and for food processors to
offer alternative products such as turkey bacon and sausages. Many of these
products are quite good, and they compete for a market share once dominated by
pork. This is the result of basic marketing and economics 101, not any
religious group. And the pork products are still there. (Scrapple, anyone?)

>> Paging Hal Turner..you have another convert waiting to inducted.
>>
>> Foul Tasting turkey dogs were a product of people who wanted to eat
>> something other than meat. It's a vegetarian dog.

Untrue. You're thinking of "tofu pups" and other oddities. True turkey and
chicken dogs have turkey meat and chicken meat in them, respectively.

>> And all beef dogs
>> are made because the people at Swift Meat Packing use the parts of the
>> hog that are left over from processing.

"Everything except the squeal"

>> It has nothing to do with dietarty laws.

Or "pushing" and "manipulating" by any religious groups.
>
>I agree 100%.
>
>> > Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have
>> > virtually
>> > disappeared from resturant menus.
>
>Probably because they didn't sell to the patrons. Back to
>marketing and eco 101.
>
I have yet to find a nonkosher nonvegetarian restaurant that didn't have some
pork products on the menu

>> ????? Where do you live. Every resturaunt, every Diner, every B-B-QUE
>> place has pork chops. TGI FRidays has pork chops. OutBack Steak House
>> has pork chops (and damn good ones at that)
>
>Yep, just saw them in a brandy new TGIF last night.

I'm getting hungry....
>
>> > Ham, another favorite for many years, has
>> > also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus.
>
>Where the

[expletive deleted]

> does this guy live?
> Next he'll tell us he can't order bacon and eggs anywhere anymore.
>
I wonder if Dwight is serious or is just pulling our leg?

>> You must not go out for breakfast much. There isn't a resturant around
>> that doesn't serve ham or ham or bacon (Oh you forgot bacon) as part of
>> a breakfast meal. Excuse you..your ignornace is showing
>>
>> Funny for someone who lives in Mrylte Beach, you'd think there were lots
>> of restuarants to serve the tourists. Guess not.
>
>Well I think Myrtle Beach does shut down a great deal between
>the end of October and the start of the spring season but I can't believe
>there is a total lack of pork products there.

Exactly.
>
>> > Based on the
>> > efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves,
>> > only
>> > a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the

>> > Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.
>
>Let's assume this guy is right as to cause...

Why? No evidence has been produced. In fact, the popularity of pork is verifiable in restaurants and food stores all over the USA.

>the reality, is still
>drven by $$$$. The stores won't just do this or that because
>some religious group wants certain products or opposes others.

Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3312. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 13:28:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040229082833.21232.00004526@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 87986

In article <lBi0c.26370$W74.9959@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>There is no conflict between a pledge and the Sermon of the Mount.

Not to you. Others interpret those words differently.

>The Pledge of Allegiance is not an oath.

Not to you. To others it is.

>The words "...one nation, under
>God...," are not "to" God, but are, in my opinion, simply an acknowledgement
>of God

That's what it means *to you*

Others look at "one nation, under God" differently. For example, some interpret the words to mean that He has given this country some sort of special guidance or other attention that other nations are denied. Others interpret those words to mean that this nation must never do anything that conflicts with His laws - or rather, their particular interpretation of His laws. There are many other possible interpretations.

>- an affirmation that this nation was founded by men who believed in
>a God (the men who wrote about unalienable rights endowed by their "Creator"
>in the Declaration of Independence).

You might be surprised to find out what those men actually believed.

More to the point, the Declaration of Independence was not the end of the story. The Constitution plays a much bigger role, because it sets forth the concepts upon which this nation is founded. Two of the most central concepts are religious freedom and separation of church and state.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3313. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 15:33:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CDn0c.7126$t16.4657281@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 87989

"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:t2t340pqujjj3fgbgo2e19b8n9s641ifik@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 28 Feb 2004 20:52:53 -0000, "Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
> >news:J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous...
> >>
> >> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
> >> ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
> >> dont want to be considered as a public
> >> service. Everybody has not the military
> >> spirit.
> >> Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
> >> radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
> >> considered as a service has many
> >> drawbacks for the ham rights, you
> >> are always dependent of what a
> >> governement wants. Does the governement
> >> has any influence on how you want to
> >> play golf ?
> >> No, you can play in the manner you want.
> >> So let the hams vote if they want to
> >> continue to be a service. The answer is
> >> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
> >>
> >> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !
> >
> >being a 'service' also has its advantages. would golfers be listened to
at
> >all if BPL were going to take away their 'right' to play golf? would
> >hobbyists be asked to help in time of emergency, or be ordered off the
air?
> >if big business wanted one of our bands and all we did was hunt dx and
> >ragchew and didn't have a history of service to the country would the
> >government think twice about taking their money for it? as long as we
> >remain a service and at least some of us do what we can to help then all
> >reap the rewards... I move we get rid of the freeloaders, if you don't do
so
> >many hours of 'service' every year you lose your license! how about them
> >apples! Of course that won't happen as the administration of it would be
> >expensive and complicated. so crawl back in your hole and accept the
paper
> >title of the 'service' and just do what you want anyway.

>
> It's not a service at all. It is a hobby. All amateur radio operators can
do in
> times of emergency is get in the way. Leave the professionals to get on
> with their job and go back to playing two way radios.
>
>
> -Barry

And I sure that FEMA, the Red Cross, and other groups who consider ham
operators vital would agree with you. NOT!!

Trolls just never go away.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3314. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 15:53:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402290753.14edc409@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87990

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402281332.6ba92cab@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402280513.564830e8@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Because, TAFKARJ, the country already has coded licenses. And they've
> > had since 1912 to perfect them. Now its time for them to try
> > something new and different, but instead they get more of the same.
> > Can't think outside the box.
>
> Again with teh belittlements where no belittlement in kind existed.
>
> And you mean can't think outside YOUR box...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What belittlements, Stebe?

3315. MAKE LOTS OF MONIES NOW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 15:54:18 UTC
From: anne <anne66_2002@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <40420d1e_1@news.athenanews.com>
Source record: 88064

MAKE THOUSANDS!!!

I found this on a bulletin board and decided to try it: I don't care about the useless pre-fabricated crap this message usually says. All I say is, it works. Continue pre-fab crap.

WELL GUESS WHAT!!!

Within five days, I started getting money in the mail!! I was shocked!! I figured it would end soon, but the money just kept coming in. In my first week, I made about $63.00 By the end of the second week I had made a total of $1873.00!! In the third week I had made a total of $9,612.00 and more mail kept coming in!! This is now my fourth week and I have made a total of $35,165.00 and it's still coming rapidly. It's certainly worth $6.00 and six stamps, and I have spent more than that on the lottery without ever winning!!!
My mailman asked me what was with all the mail , and when i showed him this system he was amazed and got going at it . Everyday he thanks me , it feels good to know your helping make other pepole have more time and money to do the things they care about most .(Dont let this pass you buy , it so easy and it realy does work)
Let me tell you how this works and most important, why it works.....
also make sure you print this out NOW, so you can get the information off of it, as you will need it. I promise you that if you follow the directions exactly that you will start making more money than you thought possible by doing something so easy!!

Suggestion: Read this entire message carefully!! (Print it out or download it)

Follow the simple directions and watch the money come in!! It's easy. It's legal. And, your investment is only $6.00 (Plus postage) !!!

IMPORTANT:

This is not a rip-off, it is decent; it's legal; and it is virtually no risk - it really works!! If all the following instructions are adhered to, you will receive extraordinary dividends.

PLEASE NOTE:

Please follow the directions EXACTLY, and $50,000 or more can be yours in 20 to 60 days. This program remains successful because of the honesty and

integrity of the participants. Please continue its success by carefully adhering to
the instructions. You will now become apart of the Mail Order business. You
are in the business of developing Mailing Lists. Many large corporations are
happy to pay big bucks for quality lists. However, the money made from the
mailing lists is secondary to income which is made from people like you and me asking to be included in that list. Here are the four easy steps to success.

STEP ONE:

Get six separate pieces of paper and write the following on each piece of paper "PLEASE PUT ME ON YOUR MAILING LIST." Now get 6 U.S. $1.00 bills and place ONE inside of EACH of the six pieces of paper so the bill will not be seen through the envelope (to prevent thievery). Next, place one paper in each of the six envelopes and seal them. You now should have six sealed envelopes, each with a piece of paper stating the above phrase, your name and address, and a $1.00 bill. What you are doing is creating a service.

THIS IS ABSOLUTELY LEGAL!!!!!

You are requesting a legitimate service and you are paying for it!! Like
most of us I was a little skeptical and little worried about the legal aspects
of it all. So I checked it out with the U.S. Post Office (1-800-238-5355) and they
confirmed that it is indeed legal!!

Mail the six envelopes to the following addresses:

1) G. Burrows
1/264 Tor St
Toowoomba QLD
4350 Australia

2) J. Safian
6950 W. Forest Presrv. Dr., #115
Norridge, IL 60706-1324

3) R. Ansems
Gen. Foulkesstraat 5
4641 BW Ossendrecht
Netherlands

4) C. Milligan
6597 Herry Rd.
Vernon BC
Canada

V1B3T6

5) Foster
39 Poplar Avenue,
Hollins,
Oldham,
England

6) Jack Burke
220 Kingsbury Drive
Aptos,Ca. 95003-5003
U.S.A.

STEP TWO:Now take the #1 name off the list that you see above, move the other names up (six becomes 5, 5 becomes 4, and etc.) and add YOUR NAME as number 6 on the list.

STEP THREE:
Change anything you need to but try to keep this article as close to original as possible. Now post your amended article to at least 200 news groups. :
(I think there are close to 24,000 groups) All you need is 200, but remember, the more you post, the more money you make!! This is perfectly legal!! If you have any doubts, refer to Title 18 Sec. 1302 & 1341 of the Postal Lottery laws. Keep a copy of these steps for yourself and whenever you need money, you can use it again, and again. PLEASE REMEMBER that this program remains successful because of the honesty and integrity of the participants and by their carefully adhering to directions. Look at it this way. If you were of integrity, the program will continue and the money that so many others have received will come your way.

NOTE: You may want to retain every name and address sent to you, either on a computer or hard copy and keep the notes people send you. This VERIFIES that you are truly providing a service. (Also, it might be a good idea to wrap the $1 bill in dark paper to reduce the risk of mail theft). So, as each post is downloaded and the directions carefully followed, all members will be reimbursed for their participation as a List Developer with one dollar each. Your name will move up the list geometrically so that when your name reaches the #1 position you will be receiving thousands of dollars in CASH!!! What an opportunity for only $6.00 ($1.00 for each of the first six people listed above) Send it now, add your own name to the list and you're in business!!!

*****DIRECTIONS FOR HOW TO POST TO NEWS GROUPS!!!*****

STEP ONE: You do not need to re-type this entire letter to do your own posting. Simply put your cursor at the beginning of this letter and drag your
cursor to the bottom of this document, and select 'copy' from the edit menu. This

will copy the entire letter into the computer's memory.

STEP TWO:
Open a blank 'notepad' file and place your cursor at the top
of the blank page. From the 'edit' menu select 'paste'. This will
paste a copy
of the letter into the notepad so that you will add your name to the
list.

STEP THREE:
Save your new notepad file as a text file. If you want to do your
posting in different settings, you'll always have this file to go back
to.

STEP FOUR:
You can use a program like "postXpert" to post to all the newsgroups
at once.
You can find this program at <http://www.download.com>.

Use Netscape or Internet Explorer and try searching for various new
groups (on- line forums, message boards, chat sites, discussions.)

STEP FIVE:
Visit message boards and post this article as a new message by
highlighting the text of this letter and selecting paste from the edit
menu. Fill in the subject, this will be the header that everyone sees
as they scroll through the list of postings in a particular group,
click the post message button. You're done.

Congratulations!!!!!!

THAT'S IT!! All you have to do, and It Really works!!!

Best Wishes

3316. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 16:02:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402290802.7d67194c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 87991

Helmut, now that you and Larry have made nice, perhaps he could now
answer your question of why he shows his ass to the world.

73, Billy

"Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message news:<c1nt1p$t83$02$1@news.t-online.com>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:20040226183847.21955.00000744@mb-m20.aol.com...
> | In article <c1j3a8$n7$01$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut"
> <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
> | writes:
> |
> | >
> | >Yes, we have constitutions in our countries and in the European Union. I
> | >don't know if there are any ammendments. What you reffering to is freedom
> of
> | >speech? No, there are no restrictions in that. But one has to stay for
> that
> | >what one is saying. And if that is bad, one has to "pay" for that bad
> | >behavior. Like Larry. It is not to supress his opinion or the
> disagreement,
> | >it is the words and the soul and the bad spirit coming out of his lines.
> The
> | >way he acts here on Usenet against other HAMS shows how he is acting on
> the
> | >bands.
> |
> | Helmut:
> |
> | Very interesting. I find it quite extraordinary that you are able to
> gauge my
> | behavior on the bands by what you read from me on Usenet. In reality, my
> | on-the-air behavior is probably very much like your own, assuming that you
> | are friendly, courteous, and helpful to your fellow hams.
>
> so why do you spit out thinks like:
>
> [quote] All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
> are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
> and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
> making us just another Third World nation. How charming. [quote ends]
>
> against other fellow hams.
>
> | >This makes not the best image of an american ham, on a newsgroup

> | >which is read throughout the world. It damages the reputation of Amateur
> | >Radio. Period.
> |
> | I think that far worse damage is done by making rash, totally blind
> judgments
> | which, in any other forum, would be legally actionable as libelous.
>
> Larry, it was you, who posted:
>
> [quote] All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
> are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
> and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
> making us just another Third World nation. How charming. [quote ends]
>
>
> | As for you, my friend, I am pleased to advise you that I do not use your
> | behavior on Usenet as a means of judging your on-the-air behavior as a
> | radio amateur, because I have not personally experienced the latter.
> | However, as a Usenet participant, I must say that you seem to have the
> | typical shoot-from-the-hip attitude down pat. Nothing new here.
>
> Again, Larry, the initial qoute I've refered to, was your bucket full of
> blind agression, you spilled over all no-coders in the world. You did not
> specify any nationality. Even then, it would have been unacceptable
> behavior, which allows the conclusion, your behavior against nocoders on the
> air is conducted alike.
>
>
>
> A Liberal is a person who uses other people's money to assuage
> his own guilt.
> A Socialist is a person who views government as the ultimate alternative
> to his own ingenuity and initiative.
>
> >Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!
>
> Anyone who seeks to place the government in the position of being the
> ultimate power over the people.
>
> Larry, your definition describes any dictatorship, democracy and kingdom as
> well
>
> Marx,
> Though he inspired communism, he was a true sozialist himself
>
> Lenin, Stalin, Kruschev, Ho Chi Ming,
> they are all outdated, sk.
>
> Kim Sung Il,
> yes, he is leading North Corea the old fashioned communistic way.

>
> You were writing of things you dont now about. Assumably, while your time in
> Germany, you did not have much time to watch the "normal life" in the
> country you were living in for a certain periode of time. Otherwise you've
> had learned what the Liberal, the Sozialist, the Christian and the Communist
> Parties are standing for and what they are pledging for.
>
> According to your initial post: [shortquote]are mainly liberal, socialist,
> Communist sympathizers who hate America
> and want to weaken us by reducing all standards [shortquote ends]
> all CW-tested-Hams must be supporting Democrats ,Republicans, and Cristian
> Parties.
>
> But this is not a political forum, and what anyone is thinking politically,
> has nothing to do with HAM Radio.
>
> In all the respect for the american freedom of speech, and your right to
> express it here, Larry, the whole initial statment of you is not to be made
> of a ham. You know the Ham Rules? As you are a member of different HAM
> organizations, I am sure you do. Instead of writing such rubbish about other
> fellow hams, even when they are underpreveleged in comparishion to you, why
> aren't you reaching out, give them a supporting "hand" and haul them over to
> your side of the street? Because they don't want to practice your favourite
> kind of game?
>
> Larry, dont be jealous! If someone gets a gift, like on Valentines Day, and
> you dont, do you cry out loud: "Dont give it to him, I did not get one
> ever!"? To be jealous about things other get, is worth a child.
>
> Larry, it is not worth to argue about things you cannot refrain from beeing
> ruled from the authorities. It is weakening your heart, and your mind. Stay
> strong, and take the things as they will come. Stay calm, it is not worth to
> be angry about anything which is out of our reach to lead it in any
> direction.
>
> There were so many paragraphs in your previous postings, I hope I answered
> all of them in good courtesy. If I forgot some, you will remind me.
>
> Bis Bald, Servus, Tschuess
>
> 73 de OE8SOQ
> Helmut
>
>
> |
> | 73 de Larry, K3LT
> |

3317. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 16:30:09 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c1t42d$3o5$02$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 87992

Billy,

was he treated nicely before by "the world"? Maybe it's only a return favor.

73 de Helmut
OE8SOQ

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:1e4e3692.0402290802.7d67194c@posting.google.com...
| Helmut, now that you and Larry have made nice, perhaps he could now
| answer your question of why he shows his ass to the world.
|
| 73, Billy
|
| "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c1nt1p$t83$02$1@news.t-online.com>...
| > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
| > news:20040226183847.21955.00000744@mb-m20.aol.com...
| > | In article <c1j3a8$n7$01$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut"
| > <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
| > | writes:
| > |
| > | >
| > | >Yes, we have constitutions in our countries and in the European
Union. I
| > | >don't know if there are any ammendments. What you reffering to is
freedom
| > of
| > | >speech? No, there are no restrictions in that. But one has to stay
for
| > that
| > | >what one is saying. And if that is bad, one has to "pay" for that bad
| > | >behavior. Like Larry. It is not to supress his opinion or the
| > disagreement,
| > | >it is the words and the soul and the bad spirit coming out of his
lines.
| > The
| > | >way he acts here on Usenet against other HAMS shows how he is acting
on
| > the
| > | >bands.
| > |
| > | Helmut:
| > |
| > | Very interesting. I find it quite extraordinary that you are able to

| > gauge my
| > | behavior on the bands by what you read from me on Usenet. In reality,
my
| > | on-the-air behavior is probably very much like your own, assuming that
you
| > | are friendly, courteous, and helpful to your fellow hams.
| >
| > so why do you spit out thinks like:
| >
| > [quote] All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
| > are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
| > and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
| > making us just another Third World nation. How charming. [quote ends]
| >
| > against other fellow hams.
| >
| > | >This makes not the best image of an american ham, on a newsgroup
| > | >which is read throughout the world. It damages the reputation of
Amateur
| > | >Radio. Period.
| > |
| > | I think that far worse damage is done by making rash, totally blind
| > judgments
| > | which, in any other forum, would be legally actionable as libelous.
| >
| > Larry, it was you, who posted:
| >
| > [quote] All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
| > are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
| > and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
| > making us just another Third World nation. How charming. [quote ends]
| >
| >
| > | As for you, my friend, I am pleased to advise you that I do not use
your
| > | behavior on Usenet as a means of judging your on-the-air behavior as a
| > | radio amateur, because I have not personally experienced the latter.
| > | However, as a Usenet participant, I must say that you seem to have the
| > | typical shoot-from-the-hip attitude down pat. Nothing new here.
| >
| > Again, Larry, the initial qoute I've refered to, was your bucket full of
| > blind agression, you spilled over all no-coders in the world. You did
not
| > specify any nationality. Even then, it would have been unacceptable
| > behavior, which allows the conclusion, your behavior against nocoders on
the
| > air is conducted alike.
| >
| >
| >

| > A Liberal is a person who uses other people's money to assuage
| > his own guilt.
| > A Socialist is a person who views government as the ultimate alternative
| > to his own ingenuity and initiative.
| >
| > >Whom would you call a Communist? Namely!
| >
| > Anyone who seeks to place the government in the position of being the
| > ultimate power over the people.
| >
| > Larry, your definition describes any dictatorship, democracy and kingdom
as
| > well
| >
| > Marx,
| > Though he inspired communism, he was a true sozialist himself
| >
| > Lenin, Stalin, Kruschev, Ho Chi Ming,
| > they are all outdated, sk.
| >
| > Kim Sung Il,
| > yes, he is leading North Corea the old fashioned communistic way.
| >
| > You were writing of things you dont now about. Assumably, while your
time in
| > Germany, you did not have much time to watch the "normal life" in the
| > country you were living in for a certain periode of time. Otherwise
you've
| > had learned what the Liberal, the Sozialist, the Christian and the
Communist
| > Parties are standing for and what they are pledging for.
| >
| > According to your initial post: [shortquote]are mainly liberal,
socialist,
| > Communist sympathizers who hate America
| > and want to weaken us by reducing all standards [shortquote ends]
| > all CW-tested-Hams must be supporting Democrats ,Republicans, and
Cristian
| > Parties.
| >
| > But this is not a political forum, and what anyone is thinking
politically,
| > has nothing to do with HAM Radio.
| >
| > In all the respect for the american freedom of speech, and your right to
| > express it here, Larry, the whole initial statment of you is not to be
made
| > of a ham. You know the Ham Rules? As you are a member of different HAM
| > organizations, I am sure you do. Instead of writing such rubbish about
other

| > fellow hams, even when they are underpreveleged in comparishion to you,
why
| > aren't you reaching out, give them a supporting "hand" and haul them
over to
| > your side of the street? Because they don't want to practice your
favourite
| > kind of game?
| >
| > Larry, dont be jealous! If someone gets a gift, like on Valentines Day,
and
| > you dont, do you cry out loud: "Dont give it to him, I did not get one
| > ever!"? To be jealous about things other get, is worth a child.
| >
| > Larry, it is not worth to argue about things you cannot refrain from
beeing
| > ruled from the authorities. It is weakening your heart, and your mind.
Stay
| > strong, and take the things as they will come. Stay calm, it is not
worth to
| > be angry about anything which is out of our reach to lead it in any
| > direction.
| >
| > There were so many paragraphs in your previous postings, I hope I
answered
| > all of them in good courtesy. If I forgot some, you will remind me.
| >
| > Bis Bald, Servus, Tschuess
| >
| > 73 de OE8SOQ
| > Helmut
| >
| >
| > |
| > | 73 de Larry, K3LT
| > |

3318. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 17:17:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040229121721.21232.00004527@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 87993

In article <VH80c.25804$W74.18998@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
>news:J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous...
>>
>> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
>> ham-radio is a "service" ?
>
>It is a service because that is how it is defined and
>authorized under FCC rules Part 97.

All throughout Title 47 C.F.R. the word "service" is a regulatory term denoting the type and kind of radio activity being regulated.

>> All hams dont want to be considered as a public
>> service. Everybody has not the military
>> spirit. Let Them choose!
>
>There is nothing to choose. It is a service.
>In actual day-to-day activity, the fact that
>ham radio is a service still allows individuals
>to be hams on nothing more than a personal
>hobby basis.

Citizens Band Radio SERVICE.

Remote Control Radio SERVICE.

Private Land Mobile Radio SERVICE.

Broadcasting SERVICE.

Aeronautical Mobile SERVICE.

Just five examples of types and kinds of radio activity in Title 47 C.F.R., all using the word "service." All those "services" are for civil (non-government) radio. No military or government-like services are meant nor intended. Just a regulatory term.

>The government will ALWAYS have a say in ham radio
>because the radio spectrum is not a privatlely owned
>resource. Under US law and under the laws of
>most countries, the government (the FCC in the USA)
>gets to specify the rules for amateur radio.

All throughout Title 47 C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory term used to denote a type or kind of radio activity being

regulated for U.S. non-government radio.

Of the five examples given, only broadcasting is required to perform specified services of a specified percentage of transmission time to program content and material to the general community within its service area.

Note that "service area" is a term phrase to denote the geographic coverage of broadcast signals above a specified certain field strength. The specific word "service" in that phrase does not refer to a "community service" nor "military service" nor "service to the country" nor even "service for eight" as in dinnerware.

Those trying to imply that the word "service" in Amateur Radio Service is some sort of "service to the community" is merely self-enoblement by radio amateurs which has no relevance to reality. Amateur radio as practiced. Amateur radio - as practiced - is almost entirely a personal recreational activity involving radio, done without pecuniary interest. A hobby. Anything more than that is a fantasy existing within radio amateur's imagination...and in the self-serving propaganda of the ARRL to reinforce such imaginary thoughts in order to convince radio amateurs of belonging to the League.

If anything the Amateur Radio Service is closer to "service for one" as in dinnerware.

An amateur radio licensee cannot transfer that license. It belongs only to the stated licensee. The license does not state, convey, or imply that the licensee must perform any community service to anyone other than emergency communications under certain conditions stated in Parts 2 and 97 of Title 47 C.F.R.

>> No, you can play in the manner you want.
>> So let the hams vote if they want to
>> continue to be a service. The answer is
>> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
>>
>> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !
>
>Sorry, there is NO opportunity for
>you or anyone else to vote as you wish.

Actually, there IS such an opportunity and it is built into the Constitution of the United States and some Amendments. For a large change try Articles V and VII plus Amendment IX. :-)

Otherwise - except in this little zoo called a newsgroup - we can all "vote" as we wish just like a bunch of amateurs are "serving" the nation through their "service" of being in a hobby.

LHA / WMD

3319. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 17:33:47 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aabecc0880f3a8f9897af@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 87994

In article <t2t340pqujjj3fgbgo2e19b8n9s641ifik@4ax.com>,
god_freee_jones@hotmail.com says...
> On Sat, 28 Feb 2004 20:52:53 -0000, "Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
> >news:J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous...
> >>
> >> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
> >> ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
> >> dont want to be considered as a public
> >> service. Everybody has not the military
> >> spirit.
> >> Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
> >> radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
> >> considered as a service has many
> >> drawbacks for the ham rights, you
> >> are always dependent of what a
> >> governement wants. Does the governement
> >> has any influence on how you want to
> >> play golf ?
> >> No, you can play in the manner you want.
> >> So let the hams vote if they want to
> >> continue to be a service. The answer is
> >> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
> >>
> >> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !
> >
> >being a 'service' also has its advantages. would golfers be listened to at
> >all if BPL were going to take away their 'right' to play golf? would
> >hobbyists be asked to help in time of emergency, or be ordered off the air?
> >if big business wanted one of our bands and all we did was hunt dx and
> >ragchew and didn't have a history of service to the country would the
> >government think twice about taking their money for it? as long as we
> >remain a service and at least some of us do what we can to help then all
> >reap the rewards... I move we get rid of the freeloaders, if you don't do so
> >many hours of 'service' every year you lose your license! how about them
> >apples! Of course that won't happen as the administration of it would be
> >expensive and complicated. so crawl back in your hole and accept the paper
> >title of the 'service' and just do what you want anyway.
>
> It's not a service at all. It is a hobby. All amateur radio operators can do in
> times of emergency is get in the way. Leave the professionals to get on
> with their job and go back to playing two way radios.

Uh huh - just wait until Al Qaeda figures out how to disable our communications infrastructure. It's easy, a fiber snip here, a block of C4 at the base of a tower, drive an explosive laden truck into a switching facility.

One little known fact about the PSTN is that it's a 4:1 ratio. For ever four lines there is in reality only one actual talk path. Just imagine a major switching center/tandem being take out.

And what exactly will be left? Amateur Radio.

3320. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 18:32:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <UvKdnSjnaOG4rd_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87995

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>If it isn't a pledge or an oath or
>>whatever to God, then no one
>>should have a problem with
>>either it's removal or inclusion.
>

> You're changing your objection with each post, Mike.

Not changing, Dwight. I have many objections and from many different points of view it is objectionable. So the objections just come out as time passes.

> First you talked
> about an oath and how that conflicted with the Sermon on the Mount.

Yup, it is. The people that want this included in the pledge want it in there from a religious point of view, from the people that originally put it there, to the people that are trying to make it off limits to even rule on it.

> When I
> pointed out that the Pledge of Allegiance was a pledge to one's self, you
> changed that to "a pledge or an oath or whatever to God."

Huh? It isn't a pledge to ones self, it is a pledge to one's country specifically the one you and I live in. And I assume that I'm pledging to everything in the pledge. I don't want a POA that I have to pick and choose what I pledge to. Kind of dilutes the thing IMO.

> There is no conflict between a pledge and the Sermon of the Mount. The
> Pledge of Allegiance is not an oath. The words "...one nation, under
> God...," are not "to" God, but are, in my opinion, simply an acknowledgement
> of God - an affirmation that this nation was founded by men who believed in
> a God (the men who wrote about unalienable rights endowed by their "Creator"
> in the Declaration of Independence)

It certainly wasn't a pledge they wrote. The religion aspect was added in the 1950's by people who understood that it was a religious addition.

That you have an opinion that the addition is not a religious addition is a protected right you have, but it is hard to argue the position when the originators specifically note the addition is a spiritual reaffirmation, and these who denounce any attempt to remove it are arguing that it's removal is not allowing them to practice their faith.

So yes, from that point of view that the originators and defenders of this addition, it very much *is* public prayer, and that very much is denounced in the sermon on the mount.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3321. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 18:40:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <9e6dnZ5fEYW3r9_dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87996

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>The American Family Association has
>>an online campaign they call
>>StopLiberalJudges.com (strange it isn't
>>an .org)
>
>
>
> I don't care what the American Family Association has to say on the
> matter, Mike. They have their opinion. I have mine. You have yours. And I'm
> sure many others have theirs. I'm not bound by anyone else's opinion any
> more than you're bound by mine or I'm bound by yours.

So what you are saying is that you believe that one of the rights that these people have is to hijack MY pledge of allegiance to insert a prayer into it - and even though they think it is a prayer it doesn't matter because removing it would violate their rights to pursuit of their religion - and my recourse is to not say it? Wow, that is a tough one. Apparently one of the rights some people enjoy is to deprive others of their rights.

>
>>Dwight Eisenhower himself says it is a
>>reaffirmation of faith. (snip)
>
>
>
> As I said, many people have their own opinions. That was Eisenhower's
> opinion. The words "reaffirmation of faith" are not found in the Pledge of
> Allegiance.

Hey no problem, Dwight! Leaves me scratching my head, but if you want your opinion to supersede the stated purpose of the people who created and defend such a thing, have at it.

- Mike KB3EIA

Maybe we've beat this subject to death? 8^)

3322. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 18:46:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <x6ydncjFVdj0rt_dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 87997

Helmut wrote:

> [trans] didn't you notice , that ALMOST all posters are idiots here in this
> group, did you?[trans end]

For what it's worth, Helmut, I translated it as *All* the posters are
idiots in this group.

Of course your German is much better than mine! ;^) For that matter
your English may be also, but the difference does make a big difference
in how we react.

After all when you say "almost all", that leaves everyone to thik that
"ahh, he doesn't think *I'm* an idiot! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3323. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 18:48:19 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c1tc5j$i5b$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 87998

Barry OGrady (god_freee_jones@hotmail.com) writes:
> On Sat, 28 Feb 2004 20:52:53 -0000, "Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
>>news:J2MH52HJ38045.6499652778@anonymous...
>>>
>>> Golf is a hobby not a service. Why
>>> ham-radio is a "service" ? All hams
>>> dont want to be considered as a public
>>> service. Everybody has not the military
>>> spirit.
>>> Lets them choose ! Suppress amateur
>>> radio as a service in ITU rules. To be
>>> considered as a service has many
>>> drawbacks for the ham rights, you
>>> are always dependent of what a
>>> governement wants. Does the governement
>>> has any influence on how you want to
>>> play golf ?
>>> No, you can play in the manner you want.
>>> So let the hams vote if they want to
>>> continue to be a service. The answer is
>>> evident, they will vote for FREEDOM.
>>>
>>> So act for "NO SERVICE INTERNATIONAL" !
>>
>>being a 'service' also has its advantages. would golfers be listened to at
>>all if BPL were going to take away their 'right' to play golf? would
>>hobbyists be asked to help in time of emergency, or be ordered off the air?
>>if big business wanted one of our bands and all we did was hunt dx and
>>ragchew and didn't have a history of service to the country would the
>>government think twice about taking their money for it? as long as we
>>remain a service and at least some of us do what we can to help then all
>>reap the rewards... I move we get rid of the freeloaders, if you don't do so
>>many hours of 'service' every year you lose your license! how about them
>>apples! Of course that won't happen as the administration of it would be
>>expensive and complicated. so crawl back in your hole and accept the paper
>>title of the 'service' and just do what you want anyway.
>
> It's not a service at all. It is a hobby. All amateur radio operators can do in
> times of emergency is get in the way. Leave the professionals to get on
> with their job and go back to playing two way radios.
>

>
Even if you weren't confused, you'd be confused.

Amateur radio is not a service because of any public service done by licensed hams.

It's a service because it is licensed by the government. It's the same useage of "service" as seen in the GMRS, "General Mobile Radio Service".

When I was a kid and first licensed, it was still the "Amateur Experimental Service" here in Canada.

Nothing at all to do with public service.

Michael VE2BVW

3324. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 19:07:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040229140726.21955.00000793@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88000

In article <d22b54c3.0402280854.792b11ae@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040225075954.25815.00006883@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0402241903.75cafc94@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >Certainly. But running fiber optics lines is a very expensive
>> >proposition, much more expensive per unit length than any of the other
>> >utility lines.

>> It's already all over the place out here in the Principality of Radnor. And
>> TE, and West Chester, etc.
>
>There's an optics cable running along the street here which isn't more
>than 75 feet from me as I peck at the keyboard. And a half block north
>there's a moose-sized optics cable running along MacDade Blvd. I have
>no idea where they come from or where they go or what they actually do
>but there isn't a drop to a residence or a business in sight anywhere.

I didn't mean direct fiber to the customer.

>I've seen Ma Bell "mobile labs" futzing with the things so I guess
>it's for running phone comms between switching centers. Or something.
>In any event these cables don't look like they're ready to duke it out
>with BPL.

The point is that BPL is not meant for long distances (more than a few miles) but instead as a way to get around the high cost of the "last mile". Which is mostly the cost of getting from the pole to the desktop or lapper.
>
>> The really big cost is getting from the pole into people's houses. That's
>> the really big selling point of BPL: no installation, every outlet in your
>> house is a broadband connection. As if.
>
>> A lot of "cable" is actually fiber. But it makes no real difference; the
>> big probelm is getting into every overpriced little box made out of ticky
>> tacky. The cable and telco folks took their pain upfront.
>
>And they can avoid more pain by *not* installing residential drops.

By "took their pain" I meant they built an infrastructure meant for comms (the big cable on the pole) rather than trying to force something meant for other uses to do the job.

>Install 802 dot somthing boxes on the poles every hundred yards or so.

That's exactly what I've been talking about. Fiber/cable feeds the
802.11/alphabet soup box, customers have a similar box and a password.

>Would work and would kick BPLs butt. The huge advantage wireless
>devices bring to this game is that they do *not* need a connection to
>the house wiring. Freely floating lappers, remotes, etc.

And it's already been done. The 802 stuff makes it faster and cheaper.

Not only would it kick BPL butt, it could conceivably be made part of a
wireless
network/firewall arrangement in customer's residences and businesses. Little
stubbys everywhere. Antennas, that is..
>
>> >Hare and I touched on that when he was here, it's a classic case of
>> >use it or lose it and it's not being used. I asked him how much ham
>> >activity he knew about on 2.4 Ghz and he answered "What activity?".
>>
>> I wuz there. And what activity does exist uses highly directional
>>antennas....
>
>Seems like we all forgot that most of it is satellite ops which do not
>always use directional antennas. That could be a problem but a couple
>MHZ wide AMSAT setaside would probably work.

Bingo.
>
>> >> btw, I came across some info on the Manassas thing. $20 month for BPL -
>>> > for the
>> >> first three months! Then it jumps to $50/month. On a good day it might
>> >> get up to half of DSL speed. Maybe.
>> >
>> >Good. I hope they lose their skivvies on that deal.

Can you say "Iridium"? I knew that you could....

>> They'll ask Uncle Sam to bail them out. "No millionaire left behind".

>That would require Congessional action and it would never in this
>world happen.

Uh huh. Never say never.

Didja read where Shrub wants a *constitutional amendment* defining marriage as
being only between a man and woman? It would also require the intended couple
to register at Halliburton....
>
>> Didja see where RCN went Chapter 11?
>
>I looked at RCN when it first popped up. Talk about no bang for the
>buck, the Comcast and Ma Bell guys musta been laughing their buns off
>at the RCN prices.

watta mess
>
>> The cofounder of Microsoft put 1.65
>> billion into that outfit and now his piece is worth $2 million. That's like
>> putting $165,000 of yer IRA/401K in something and having it go down to
>>$200.
>
>Yeah and after RCN drubbed him Mr. Allen came out with 20 point
>somthing billion left in his piggy bank. Pore thing. He and his buddy
>Bill are tossing coin at all sortsa wild investment adventures. Their
>baby airliner is a good example. They don't care, it's only money.

Yup - and where did that money go? ;-)
>
>> >Cable here runs at around 3Mb/s for $45/month. The JAs have
>> >a flavor of DSL which runs at 26 Mb/sec in heavily-populated areas for
>> >$50/month with the HLs close behind. Manassas BPL for $50/month for
>> >only half of 0.5-1.0 Mb/s you say?
>>
>> Double check with Ed but I recall half MB as the best they'd ever gotten -
>> and
>> that was for a single customer on the system. More folks = sharing.
>
> . . . . more is better, bring it on . . .

there's an idea - ewverybody signs up and the system works worse than
dialup....

>> >They gotta be kidding . . ! One more dot bomb in the making . .

>> I sure hope so. Boom dot bust. But it ain't over till it's over.
>
>It won't hurt very long . .

The fat lady ain't sung yet.

>> >> Yep. But that's not the big problem - the real 800 pound gorilla is how
>> >> fast the deficit is making it grow. A few years back we had a
>> >> surplus....
>> >
>> >Yeah, it's the rate which is really scary.
>> >
>> Not just a big hole but digging it deeper as fast as they can.
>
>Check OMB's rant on the subject which was published yesterday.

You got a link?

>> >I don't see shuttle safety being part of the politics of the upcoming
>> >campaign. As has been the case in all major explorations since Leif
>> >Ericsson's days and millenia before the folk who ride the things know
>> >they didn't buy a seat in a 737 and some are not gonna come back.
>>
>> That's not how it was sold, though. Ask the McAuliffes if they were told

>> that there was a 1 in 75 chance of augering in.
>
>Sure they knew, just like the relatives of military aircrews know the
>level of risk involved. Whether they accept it and internalize it or
>not is another story.
>
I don't think they were given the 1 in 75 number.

>> >How 'bout we just bag the whole stupid Mars camping trip thing and
>> >first build a new version of the Shuttle then put Wideband on the
>> >front burner as a matter of national policy?
>>
>> That makes way too much sense.
>>
>> In fact the really sensible thing would be a cheap oneshot big booster for
>> unmanned payloads and a highly reliable but much smaller human transport
>> system. Send the big stuff on ahead and the astronauts meet it up there.
>
>The UAs been doing that for thirty years.

those clever Rooskies!
>
>> Hey - didja see where they're planning a space walk on the ISS where all
>> the
>> crew will be outside at the same time, with nobody in the station? Didn't
>> they ever go to the movies back in 1968?
>
>Was not the first time by any means and yup, it rained so they had to
>duck back inside.
>
It was the first time for a US crew. The UAs did it many times on 'ol Mir.
Another space first for Ivan

73 de Jim, N2EY

3325. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 19:07:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040229140727.21955.00000794@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 87999

In article <j8i0c.26368$W74.20812@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?

> No, Jim.

Well, there you have it.

>But I knew it was only a matter of time before people like Steven
>Adell, and to a lesser extent you with your "you prefer to name a minority
>religious group as the boogieman," would turn this into an attack on me
>personally

How is what I wrote an attack on you personally?

You claim to see a religious group "pushing". "manipulating" and otherwise fooling with the US food industry. I and others have refuted every claim you have made in this area. Yet you continue to make unsubstantiated claims against a religious/ethnic group.

> instead of discussing the issue or into me versus Jews in spite
>of the fact that I have clearly, and repeatedly, said I would object to this
>no matter which religious group did it.

It's not "you vs. Jews". It's your claims vs. the facts.

Do you *really* believe that pork products are not as available in restaurants and supermarkets today as in the past? Do you really believe that "the Jews" are somehow "pushing" their dietary rules on others?

>This is the typical response
>whenever anyone questions, or objects to, anything done by Jews in this
>country.

Not from where I sit.

Where are your facts?

>Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and much more.

Give us some examples.

>Since I
>don't want this to happen to my family, I have ended my participation in the
>discussion (and do so with this message).

I think you don't have any facts, and have simply been trying to foist a very bad joke on us, Dwight.

3326. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 19:35:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040229143521.21232.00004528@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88054

In article <20040229000800.13960.00000967@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20040225150426.07155.00000932@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> The core of network messaging in the military of WW2 was the
>> teleprinter, principally the militarized models from the Teletype
>> Corporation headquartered in Chicago...as were Hallicrafters and
>> Motorola. Teleprinters were ideal for integrated communications,
>> operating well over both wirelines and radio, capable of 60 words
>> per minute continuously, needing only to be fed paper and ribbons
>> and some occasional oil.
>>
>> The image of the lone morseman with headphones and hunched
>> over his code key saving the nation was only that...an image...no
>> relation to reality. That image is UNreal.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Loonie:
>
>Er, I mean, "Lennie." Sorry. How come the "image of the lone morseman >with headphones" is so predominant, if it is not true? In virtually every >depiction
>of WWII-Era military communications, the mode being used is Morse/CW.

If all you see is a code key and all you hear is beeping morse, then all that can be "depicted to you" is the lone morseman valiantly serving his country heroically through his skill at morsemanship. :-)

I didn't invent the blinders you are wearing and certainly wouldn't wear the blunders you make as a "communications veteran of the military."

You've never served the USAF in any capacity as a communicator on radio or wirelines and certainly NOT before 1956. You just don't know anything but what you've read or seen in stories told by others.

>I know had have known many WWII-Era military radio operators, and they >were all able to use Morse/CW conversationally at speeds in excess of >50 WPM. They told tales of pulling duty watches in which they spent the >entire time with headphones on listening for message traffic in CW.

You know damn few if any at all.

World War 2 ENDED almost 59 years ago. Well before your time.

>While
>they have also spoken of the use of radioteletype, for the most part, that
>was used only for the most routine, non-secure message traffic, and mainly
>within the CONUS between military installations and defense manufacturing
>facilities (which were on a landline net).

Poor baby...still trying to foist the "depictions" thing again when you've had NO possible experience in anything military before 1956.

Teleprinter - with or without encryption ("Sigaba") - was begun in the USN in 1940 on ships of cruiser and heavier class. The HIGHEST security level required encrypted teleprinter...on ships that meant radioteleprinter. How did you think the decrypted "Purple code" messages were forwarded? By bicycle messenger, hand carried? How do you think the Battle of Midway was coordinated in order to surprise the Japanese fleet? Encrypted teleprinter is the answer.

Do you think the M-209 Code Converter was used solely for morse communications? Little unit, non-electrical device for lower-level cryptographic purposes, made by the thousands by typewriter companies during WW2. Museum artifact now just as morse keys are relics everywhere but in amateur radio.

You want to hold the OLD image of Washington Army Radio in your mind because it is safe, secure, and understandable and that you want to be a Big Man because you have tested at higher morse rates as an AMATEUR. You have NO concept of W-A-R as it grew after the USA involvement with war became increased. You have NO real concept of military radio during WW2 other than third- and fourth-hand tales and the selective histories of amateur radio publications.

>Your credibility is zero.

Only in your imagination. I BEGAN in radio communications IN the military in 1953 and remained at that assignment for three years. HF radio transmission 24/7 trans-Pacific at the 3rd largest ACAN station (first was W-A-R) in terms of messages handled. I've been involved with military communications methods, concentrating on design concerning them full-time and in a consulting basis. That's through the plateau jumps in technology over a half century that includes the demise of the vacuum tube and into the era of the large-scale integrated circuits of solid-state electronics. Hands-on all the way. Can you say the same after thumbing through old ham mags?

You've never carried an AN/PRC-6 or AN/PRC-10 or hand-cranked an AN/GRC-9 or spoken over an AN/GRC-26 in its little hut on the bed of a deuce and a half. [the -6 and -10 are/were VHF and voice, the -9 was CW/voice and the -26 RTTY/Voice] That was just IN the military. You've never carried an AN/PRC-119 SINCGARS on your back and have no real idea of what it is even though a quarter million of them have been produced. It worked 30 to 88 MHz where you fear to tread as a morse purist. You've never even had an AN/PRC-104 on your back either even though it IS an HF radio...it's mode is voice

or data like the -119. You've never had to control the mobile and ground variants based on the R/Ts. You've never used the AN/ARCs of the USAF or the radionav equipment and probably couldn't define "station" location in an aircraft. You've never used a TTY terminal order-wire and certainly not a KL-7 ancient machine (whose details made WO Walker some money once).

As a USAF "twenty" veteran you had all your military experience behind a DESK filling out FORMS. You have NO communications experience while in the military or out of it other than amateur radio. You show NO sign of being familiar with any military radios by nomenclature or familiar name nor do you know any non-military radios other than those featured in ads of ham magazines. You don't show any signs of wanting to know...even though you could go to the USAF ACAS website and download a free book of USAF radio history. I doubt you ever used a KY-nn of any kind during your desk-jockey air days of communicating over a handset (I include the jelly unless you were into a hand set).

>You claim that Morse/CW was essentially
>unheard of as a primary military communications mode, when, in fact, all
>of the evidence is that exactly the opposite is true.

[expletive deleted] sweetums. From 1948 onwards W-A-R and all of ACAN made on-off keying morsemanship downsized to nothing for all fixed-point to fixed-point circuits that bore the brunt of military messaging. The USN did the same from about 1960 onwards and the USAF did it in between USA and USN.

There's all kinds of documentary PROOF that is for public dissemination and has been for years. You can start at the USAF AFCC at Scott Field and work outward. "Radio" works by the same physics regardless of an administration's label of type or kind. Download "From Flares to Satellites" for an overview, a good history of communications in the USAF...although a bit too condensed at only about 90 pages with only a few illustrations.

You can put on your blinders and pump up your morsemanship all you want. Such will appeal to PCTAs who long for "good old days" that, like you, they never really experienced in their lifetimes. You will, of course, demand that reality is like your imaginings and refuse to believe anyone who was actually IN military communications. If you have the chutzpah you can call such as "liars" in a grande job of snowmanship newsgroup poker which only proves that YOU are the massive LIAR in here.

LHA / WMD

3327. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 19:35:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040229143522.21232.00004529@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88052

In article <20040229082833.21232.00004526@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <lBi0c.26370$W74.9959@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight >Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>There is no conflict between a pledge and the Sermon of the Mount.
>
>Not to you. Others interpret those words differently.

...and all must adhere to the PCTA "interpretation" in "the service."

Is this the preamble to another Sermon on the Antenna Mount?

>>The Pledge of Allegiance is not an oath.
>
>Not to you. To others it is.

Everyone understands that all must believe as you believe, "one amateur nation under code...etc."

>>The words "...one nation, under
>>God...," are not "to" God, but are, in my opinion, simply an acknowledgement
>>of God
>
>That's what it means *to you*

...and, of course, it is "wrong" and you must warm up the fire to heat the brimstone.

>Others look at "one nation, under God" differently. For example, some interpret
>the words to mean that He has given this country some sort of special guidance
>or other attention that other nations are denied. Others interpret those words
>to mean that this nation must never do anything that conflicts with His laws -
>or rather, their particular interpretation of His laws. There are many other
>possible interpretations.

Ah, yes, the old telepathy talents brought forth again to illustrate "how others think." :-)

Amazing...all that from hearing sex discussion on 2 meter repeaters!

:-)

>>- an affirmation that this nation was founded by men who believed in
>>a God (the men who wrote about unalienable rights endowed by their "Creator"
>>in the Declaration of Independence).

>
>You might be surprised to find out what those men actually believed.

Tell us what Adams and Jefferson "thought" then...didn't you three
do lunch in Paris right after they were assigned there as
ambassadors?

>More to the point, the Declaration of Independence was not the end of the
>story. The Constitution plays a much bigger role, because it sets forth the
>concepts upon which this nation is founded. Two of the most central concepts
>are religious freedom and separation of church and state.

"One amateur nation under the league and the code for which it stands,
indivisible under the inspiration of Saint Hiram?"

Let's see...this thread began with outrages against the awful language
used on two meter repeaters reported third- and fourth-hand, the out-
rages ranted by amateurs who don't consider the two meter band to
be a "real" ham band. Then it evolved into the Quality of Kosher as if
all Catholics know the exact meaning of everything Jewish. Then it
evolved into a "debate" over oaths and pledges as if all citizens are
considered "alien" if not thinking as you think. Now it is about
"religious freedom!"

That's rather hypocritical, don't you think? There's no "religious
freedom" in amateur radio unless one Believes wholeheartedly in the
teachings of the Church of St. Hiram. Those who do not Believe are
ex-communicated. :-)

LHA / WMD

3328. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 19:35:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040229143523.21232.00004530@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88053

In article <JMi0c.26371$W74.15811@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> The American Family Association has
>> an online campaign they call
>> StopLiberalJudges.com (strange it isn't
>> an .org)
>
> I don't care what the American Family Association has to say on the
>matter, Mike. They have their opinion. I have mine. You have yours. And I'm
>sure many others have theirs. I'm not bound by anyone else's opinion any
>more than you're bound by mine or I'm bound by yours.

Mike is now a regular in here. Regulars seem to be PCTAs and all MUST think as they do, express the same opinions, and generally march in the same ranks as their "service" men.

Ergo, if the American Family Association comes even close to the subject thread of theology or oaths or pledges or sex discussions on 2 meter repeaters or anything else, then you must agree or be considered river-bottom slime unworthy of consideration or civility.

There is only ONE opinion. That of the PCTA regulars. :-)

>> Dwight Eisenhower himself says it is a
>> reaffirmation of faith. (snip)
>
> As I said, many people have their own opinions. That was Eisenhower's
>opinion. The words "reaffirmation of faith" are not found in the Pledge of
>Allegiance.

"I pledge allegiance to the league and to the code for which they stand, one organization under Saint Hiram..."

For the PCTA this seems as close to sex discussions on 2 meter repeaters as they can get. :-)

LHA / WMD

3329. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 19:35:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040229143524.21232.00004531@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88051

In article <CDn0c.7126$t16.4657281@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> It's not a service at all. It is a hobby. All amateur radio operators can do
in
>> times of emergency is get in the way. Leave the professionals to get on
>> with their job and go back to playing two way radios.
>>
>> -Barry
>
>And I sure that FEMA, the Red Cross, and other groups who consider ham
>operators vital would agree with you. NOT!!
>
>Trolls just never go away.

True, you don't...

LHA / WMD

3330. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 20:30:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402291230.5da279ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88055

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message

> What belittlements, Stebe?

You really need to ask? The you ARE the idiot I have surmised all along.

Steve, K4YZ

3331. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 20:34:45 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c1ticu$e19$05$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88056

Hey, Mike, its funny, isn't it?

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:x6ydncjFVdj0rt_dRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
| Helmut wrote:
|
| > [trans] didn't you notice , that ALMOST all posters are idiots here in
this
| > group, did you?[trans end]
|
|
| For what it's worth, Helmut, I translated it as *All* the posters are
| idiots in this group.

Sometimes, one word miss is all miss. And as the word "fast" [almost] is
also an english word, it is even more difficult.

|
| Of course your German is much better than mine! ;^)

I've tried to learn now for almost 52 years, and never will be perfect.

| For that matter your English may be also,

I try hard not to misspell.

| but the difference does make a big difference
| in how we react.
|
| After all when you say "almost all", that leaves everyone to thik that
| "ahh, he doesn't think *I'm* an idiot! 8^)

I never would dare to accuse the whole holy amateur radio newsgroup

Mike, for a non-native german speaker it is not easy, to catch the "little"
differences. German is accused to be one of the most difficult languages to
learn, at least here in Europe. Your translation was not that bad as all. I
would be glad to accomplish the same - in italian.

Take care
Helmut
OE8SOQ

| - Mike KB3EIA -
|

3332. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 20:37:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402291237.45324ce5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88057

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040229000800.13960.00000968@mb-m11.aol.com>...

> Troll-O-Meter:
>
> 0 1 3 5 7 9 +10 +20
> ||||||

New scale: AnonyRantometer

Scale rates percentage of relevence to on-going discussion or
likelyhood that the author has something valuable to contibute:

0 -20 -40 -60 -80 -100
IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII

Full sale on first public deployment!

Steve, K4YZ

3333. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 20:41:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402291241.5711e435@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88058

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251817.280470a3@posting.google.com>...

> Ralph, one would hope so, but not in America. The PCTA are too
> [expletive deleted] analcentric to be distracted by BPL. See the
> "War! What is it good for?" thread. 1942-style radiomanship. Good
> grief.

(Sigh)......

Brain...re-read waht you wrote, and THEN try to deny that you
have your nose so far up Lennie's butt that every time he breaks wind,
you have to wipe your nose...

Sheeeeeeesh......

Steve, K4YZ

3334. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 20:50:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0402291250.5b11b035@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88059

"Helmut" <MyCallSign@QSL.net> wrote in message news:<c1sicb$j1i$01$1@news.t-online.com>...

> Dear Larry, there is nothing to be forgiven for. I have to express my
> reverence. The referenced reply was meant for a native german speaker, and
> not for someone with german as second or third language. Please feel free to
> further reply in german, if this helps to practice your language skills.
> Practicing these skills is one of the reasons for me to take part in the
> discussions in the ham newsgroups.

Uh oh, Helmut...

We have one poster in particular that is adamandt that "we"
(Amateur Radio operators) DON'T do anything that resembles the
"international goodwill" US regulations say we help to promote.

Your post (and Ralph's) disproves it in a big way...idiots or
not! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3335. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 21:00:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040229160038.21232.00004532@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88060

In article <u700c.25085$W74.2072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:40402216.4AB3548@earthlink.net...
>> Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >
>> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > news:403E1B2C.F950B150@earthlink.net...
>> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > > > news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
>> > > > > N2EY wrote:
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > > > news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>>
>> > > > Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
>> > > > parties involved?
>> > > >
>> > > > Now before answering, consider this:
>> > > >
>> > > > 1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
>> > > > 2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
>> > > > secret code.
>> > > > 3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.
>> > >
>> > > They certainly understood each other.
>> >
>> > OK
>> >
>> > Neither understood the concept of a repeater.
>> >
>> > So what? Does that bother anyone?
>>
>> It should.
>
>Why?

Because the concept of a repeater is one of the most
basic concepts of amateur radio VFH/UHF communication.
The folks involved are licensed hams - if they don't understand
the basic concept of a repeater, something is very very wrong.

Repeaters are not new technology, nor are they very "high tech"
or difficult to understand. There are plenty of questions on repeaters
in the Tech and higher written tests.

>Nothing they were doing violated any aspect
>of Part 97.

Not a strict violation. But neither do they project a positive
image of the technical knowledge of hams.

Are you proud of the example they set, Bill?

>If the lack of knowledge on the part of others
>isn't creating illegal operation, then I don't care if they
>forgot everything they had to learn, memorize or guess
>to pass the tests to become a ham.

I do. Amateur radio is not about seeing how little one can know.

>I guess it would
>really bother you too to know that I couldn't send/recieve
>at 13wpm today if my life depended on it...even though
>I once passed the 13 wpm test.

I would not think it was something to brag about.

>> > Now, to what I understand: I understand that both of these
>> > > ops have brought their bad habits from CB radio with them.
>> >
>> > What bad habits. I don't see any at all.

I do. Lots of them.

>> I find your statement rather sad and pathetic.
>
>I find your unwillingness to accept anything but "the official
>way to speak on the repeater according to you" to be
>pathetic too. It;s not at all different than setting up a
>"ham radio politically correct" speech requirement.

There are accepted practices of operation in amateur radio. They're not
arbitrary. They represent good practice.

There's a mindset that proclaims "it's just a hobby". This mindset is often
really saying "I'm not serious about this, I don't want to have to think about
what I'm doing, or consider other people's standards, traditions, methods or
enjoyment"

I don't buy that mindset for one second.
>
>> > You may
>> > not like their conversation, but there is NO aspect
>> > of Part 97 that requires any specific use of only
>> > "ham" approved lingo...or did I skip that chapter somehow.
>>

>> I did not state anything about Part 97. Poor practice is poor practice.
>
>They violated NOTHING as to poor practice eccept
>as defined by you.

As defined by the standards and practices of amateur radio.

Of course, there are some who don't like the idea of amateur radio having "standards and practices", let alone having to learn them or use them. These are often the folks mentioned above who say "it's only a hobby"..

>> > > Neither has
>> > > bothered to listen to other hams.
>> >
>> > For what reason must they do so?
>>
>> Must? There is no "must". There is "should". I don't subscribe to the
>> "get a license; buy a radio; rip the plastic bag off; mash the PTT and
>> talk" school.
>
>Neither did rhe two you gave as examples. They did
>everything legally required.

And that's part of the problem.

>They iolated NO operating
>practices. Ib fact, please tell us what operating practices
>they violated as you see it.

OK, here goes:

["KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".]

"Over" is better practice than "come back". More understandable.

["KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"]

"I hear you" is better practice (simpler and clearer) than "I have a copy on you". "Where are you" is better practice (simpler and clearer) than "What's your twenty"

["I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
or somthing".
"Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".]

Expressing ignorance of the characteristics of FM and repeaters is not a way of supporting the basis and purposes outlined in Part 97.

["Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
will talk this far from each other".]

There is no reason to say "Yeah, 4-Roger" when a simple "OK" or "Roger" will do. Again, expressing ignorance of the characteristics of FM and repeaters is not a way of supporting the basis and purposes outlined in Part 97.

>> > What about their
>> > use of the repeater as you dicribed is wrong?
>>
>> Liddy is as liddy does.
>
>???????

It means there is no reason to consider such operations acceptable.
>
>> > > These two were joined by a new YL op
>> > > the other day. She was a "do you want me to
>> > > pick up bread and milk?" type.
>> >
>> > One of my best ham buddies is a long time Extra and his wife
>> > chats with him on almost every homebound commute. In
>> > some cases she gives him a "honey do" list of things to get
>> > from the market on the way home. What's wrong with
>> > that (i.e. what's wrong with "pick up bread & milk."
>>
>> Apparently nothing....in your view.
>
>True...but what do YOU consider there to be wrong in
>such an on-the-air exchange? Would I be correct in
>thinking you believe that asking hubby to pick-up bread
>and milk is bad operating or, should be illegal?

I think such "honeydew" stuff is 100% acceptable if done in accordance with
established operating procedures.

>> > I'll be very surprised if any of the three will be active on the
>> > ham bands in five years.

>> > I'll presume that should make you very pleased then.

>> No, what would please me is for them to operate properly and to know
>> what a repeater does.
>
>Operate properly according to you and make you,
>the self appointed knowledge police happy? You'd
>better be prepared for lot of stress if what other people
>legally do or don't do is that uposetting to you.

>> > > > Who cares about how we dialog with each other
>> > > > as long as the parties involved are operating within the
>> > > > law as per Part 97 rules and regs?
>> > >
>> > > I do.
>> >
>> > Based on what authority?
>>
>> Sheesh, Bill. I don't need authority in order to care. You asked a
>> question. I provided an honest answer.
>

>Fair enough.

It's about our opinions of what amateur radio is supposed to be. Sloppy
operating and aping the antics of cb are not what amateur radio is about.
>
>> > You are free to worry your
>> > poor self about whatever you want, but thankfully you
>> > have no authority to enforce your own standards of how
>> > to speak on the air on anyone but yourself.
>>
>> My poor self? You're starting to sound like Leonard H. Anderson.

Who?

>> I'm
>> not worried. I pointed out what kind of hams we're now turning out.

There are lots of new hams who learn the right way and do a good job on the
air. The above are more the exception than the rule, around here. And I have
found that they will often if not usually pick up the right ways after some
exposure.

For example, I once worked a newbie who told me on the first go-around that his
"personal" was Walter. I replied that my name was Jim. Did not call attention
to his poor operating practice, just demonstrated the correct way. It wasn't
long before he was using "name" all the time.

>> If
>> you believe that what I've described is acceptable, feel free to
>> exchange "four-roger's", "good numbers" and "first personals" to your
>> heart's delight.
>
>I do on occasion.
>
Ugly with a capital UGH.

>> > > We've even got a new op who can be heard moving between the several
>> > > local repeaters for a goodly part of each day saying, "This is KC8***
>> > > radio check".
>> >
>> > And that violates what in Part 97?
>>
>> Stupidity isn't covered by Part 97.
>
>Yawn.

Around here it is common to say "This is N2EY for a radio check, anyone hear
me?". Such a call has a very specific purpose: I want a quick signal report,
not a prolonged QSO. Often such a call on a repeater will result in a quick
exchange of info that lasts only 20-30 seconds. Often the replies will include
folks who went to the input to see if they could hear you there, and report on
the direct signal rather than the repeat.
>

>> > > He'll sometimes pull this stunt on top of an ongoing
>> > > QSO.
>> >
>> > That then IS a violation. I'd fully support the area hams
>> > directing him as to the rules to NOT QRM an existing QSO.
>>
>> We're all thankful for your support.
>
>If all you are going to do is bitch about what he does, he'll
>probably not stop.

Most newcomers I have encountered want to do it the right way and are
receptive. A few aren't.
>
>> > > He has been informed on a number of occasions about how to make it
>> > > clear that he is seeking a contact and how not to QRM an existing
>> > > contact but he persists.
>> >
>> > If, that is as you say, then report him to the FCC.
>>
>> It'll happen.
>
>Which is exactly the right thing to do.
>
>> > > When he does enter a QSO, he normally asks the
>> > > individuals he contacts if they have any radios they'd like to part
>> > > with.
>> >
>> > And that violates what Part 97 rule?
>>
>> I don't recall mentioning a Part 97 infraction. Do you often greet
>> folks on 2m with, "Do you have any radios you'd like to part with"?
>
>If it bothers you so much, don't respond to his call
>when you hear him.
>
I wouldn't

>> > > He has now asked me about six times.
>> >
>> > Maybe he has Alzheimers.
>>
>> Could be though I don't know of many people in their mid-twenties who
>> suffer from it.
>
>Then just answer his question with a NO.

How many times?
>
>> > > This fellow is annoying and
>> > > others--old timers and recent licensees--are beginning to avoid him.

>> >
>> > Which is perfectly OK.
>>
>> Aren't you going to ask "By whose authority"?
>
>Not at all. No one, not you, me or anyone has any
>obligation to answer him when he calls. Since there's no
>mandated response to a call of CQ or XXX monitoring
>in Part 97, then you could say that the FCC by default
>authorizes everyone to ignore anyone they want.

Except in an emergency.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3336. Re; Where will you CW'rs go when the NO-CODERS arrive?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 21:53:24 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0402291353.5b01f71b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88061
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>On Sun, 29 Feb 2004 11:04:11 -0500, "Mitch Dickson"
><mitch@volstate.net> wrote:
>
>>Well I for one have a set of WARC, W5YI, and ARRL VEC badges for sale.
> I
>>certainly will not put my signature on your No-code HF license son!!!!
>>
>>Where will I go now? Well I thought about bailing out altogether. I sold
>>all my radio equipment and for about a year now, I went silent. But I
>>decided to get back to my roots and I started designing and building a
>few
>>QRP rigs and even a 50 watt kicker! I have now "RE-DONE" my shack with
>>something you will never be able to do son, homemade equipment! Only thing
>>in it that is "storebought" is my 1931 key :)
>>
>>Oh you can screw up the bands for a while and just like CB drive everyone
>>nuts, but the new will wear off and there will be a glut of HF gear on
>the
>>market in a few years. Those who put nothing in will soon get bored and
>>bail out.
>>
>>You will find me where you cannot go! I will be that faint, almost
>>imperceptible little sound way back there in the back, talking across the
>>globe on 1 watt on my homebrew antennas and transmitters :) There will
>be
>>no nocoders in my world son :) I have the ability to design a good enough
>>RIT and crystal filter to tune you right out LMAO!
>
>Design a good enough RIT? Sounds like you don't even know what one
>is.

watch out mitch, those ilegal cbers are going to tell you all they know about RF.

3337. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 22:07:38 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c1tnr3$ol9$07$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88062

Hi, Steve, old man,

| Uh oh,[is this the way you say "Hi"?] Helmut...

I have to admit, you've got me on this one! On the first go, I did not get figured out, what you wanted to express. Please help me to get this straightend out.

| We have one poster [a person in this NG, or a picture to stick to the wall] in particular that [did you mean "who",then it is the person; "that" will imply its the picture] is adamandt [a word i've never heard before, nor did my dictionary] that "we" (Amateur Radio operators) DON'T do anything [do nothing?] that resembles the
| "international goodwill" US regulations [you mean a law? constitution?] say we help to promote.
|

I think the key will be an explanation of the word "adamandt", or a substitution for that word.

| Your post (and Ralph's) disproves it in a big way...idiots or
| not! =)
|
| 73
|
| Steve, K4YZ

It is challenging, Steve, will send you the translation, as soon as I know what the paragraph is meant to say.

Do quick, I am waiting

Helmut

3338. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-02-29 22:22:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <kCt0c.27275$hm4.26954@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88063

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040229160038.21232.00004532@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <u700c.25085$W74.2072@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:40402216.4AB3548@earthlink.net...
> >> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> >
> >> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> > news:403E1B2C.F950B150@earthlink.net...
> >> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> > > > news:403BB6EE.C1911A56@earthlink.net...
> >> > > > > N2EY wrote:
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > > > news:<vNy_b.17870$W74.17526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >>
> >> > > > Exactly what is wrong with the above dialog between the two
> >> > > > parties involved?
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Now before answering, consider this:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > 1. Both parties ID'd as required by law.
> >> > > > 2. Neither party used any type of clandestine or
> >> > > > secret code.
> >> > > > 3. Both parties appear to have understood each other.
> >> > >
> >> > > They certainly understood each other.
> >> >
> >> > OK
> >> >
> >> > Neither understood the concept of a repeater.
> >> >
> >> > So what? Does that bother anyone?
> >>
> >> It should.
> >
> >Why?
>
> Because the concept of a repeater is one of the most
```

> basic concepts of amateur radio VFH/UHF communication.
> The folks involved are licensed hams - if they don't understand
> the basic concept of a repeater, something is very very wrong.

The question is so what? How much is required of new
hams regarding repeater operation. If these folks don't
remember it, there is nothing wrong with them as individuals
or as hams. I had to memorize a bunch of dumb answers regarding
"space operations" as part of the Extra exam syllabus.
Do I remember any of it? Not on your life.

> Repeaters are not new technology, nor are they very "high tech"
> or difficult to understand. There are plenty of questions on repeaters
> in the Tech and higher written tests.
>
> >Nothing they were doing violated any aspect
> >of Part 97.
>
> Not a strict violation. But neither do they project a positive
> image of the technical knowledge of hams.

Considering the Extra hams that swear, curse or otherwise
act as complete scmucks on the air, I'd suggest these folks
are great role models in comparison.

> Are you proud of the example they set, Bill?

What example? One QSO between two licensed
hams. My God, you'd think this was being broadcast
on 20/20 or 60 minutes as the hot news story of the day.

> >If the lack of knowledge on the part of others
> >isn't creating illegal operation, then I don't care if they
> >forgot everything they had to learn, memorize or guess
> >to pass the tests to become a ham.
>
> I do. Amateur radio is not about seeing how little one can know.

Amateur radio is whatever it is to each individual ham as long
as the ham operates legally. Don't expect every ham to
meet some unofficial role model of what a ham
is/should be according to Jim.

> >I guess it would
> >really bother you too to know that I couldn't send/recieve
> >at 13wpm today if my life depended on it...even though
> >I once passed the 13 wpm test.
>
> I would not think it was something to brag about.

Frankly I don't care who knows. I neither brag nor
hide it. It is just the way it is.

> >> > Now, to what I understand: I understand that both of these
> >> > > ops have brought their bad habits from CB radio with them.
> >> >
> >> > What bad habits. I don't see any at all.
>
> I do. Lots of them.

Yet you offer not ONE concrete example of bad
habits according to Jim.

> >> I find your statement rather sad and pathetic.
> >
> >I find your unwillingness to accept anything but "the official
> >way to speak on the repeater according to you" to be
> >pathetic too. It;s not at all different than setting up a
> >"ham radio politically correct" speech requirement.
>
> There are accepted practices of operation in amateur radio. They're not
> arbitrary. They represent good practice.

They are NOT mandatory and as long as the two people
involved are communicating, it doesn't mean anything.
If you don't like their lingo, don't enter a QSO with them.
Pretty simple basic of life as I see it.

> There's a mindset that proclaims "it's just a hobby". This mindset is
often
> really saying "I'm not serious about this, I don't want to have to think
about
> what I'm doing, or consider other people's standards, traditions, methods
or
> enjoyment"
> I don't buy that mindset for one second.

The FCC defines ham radio as a service....BUT the FCC
has, to the best of my knowledge, never mandated a
specific "service and not a hobby" mindset for any ham.

> >> > You may
> >> > not like their conversation, but there is NO aspect
> >> > of Part 97 that requires any specific use of only
> >> > "ham" approved lingo...or did I skip that chapter somehow.
> >>
> >> I did not state anything about Part 97. Poor practice is poor
practice.
> >
> >They violated NOTHING as to poor practice eccept
> >as defined by you.
>
> As defined by the standards and practices of amateur radio.

I have a weekly commute QSO with two other hams on 2m simplex
as we drive to meet for breakfast every Monday. We use phrases like

"I have the front door/backdoor/ etc. Guess we must be
real bad ham denizens of the airwaves.

> Of course, there are some who don't like the idea of amateur radio having
> "standards and practices", let alone having to learn them or use them.
These
> are often the folks mentioned above who say "it's only a hobby"..

I repeat, whatever works as valid communications between two hams is fine
with me. The point of standards and practices is driven not as a means to
form fit every ham into the same mold, but rather to have a common
set of practices for when it is needed...i.e. an emergency or
a contest, etc.

> >> > > Neither has
> >> > > bothered to listen to other hams.
> >> >
> >> > For what reason must they do so?
> >>
> >> Must? There is no "must". There is "should". I don't subscribe to
the
> >> "get a license; buy a radio; rip the plastic bag off; mash the PTT and
> >> talk" school.
> >
> >Neither did rhe two you gave as examples. They did
> >everything legally required.
>
> And that's part of the problem.

You gotta love the doublespeak. They did everything legally required
but that's part of the problem.

> >They iolated NO operating
> >practices. Ib fact, please tell us what operating practices
> >they violated as you see it.
>
> OK, here goes:
>
>
> ["KC8--- this is KC8***, come back".]
>
> "Over" is better practice than "come back". More understandable.

For you, but apparently KC8--- had no problem as to understanding.

> ["KC8*** this is KC8--- . I have a copy on you. What's yer twenty?"]
>
> "I hear you" is better practice (simpler and clearer) than "I have a copy
on
> you". "Where are you" is better practice (simpler and clearer) than
"What's
> your twenty"

Ditto my last. At least you didn't say they should have said
what's your QTH as many other hams do.

> ["I'm up here on the hill but you're scratchy. You must be overmodulatin
> or somthing".
> "Well I'm copyin' you pretty good considering the distance between us".]
>
> Expressing ignorance of the characteristics of FM and repeaters is not a
way of
> supporting the basis and purposes outlined in Part 97.

Give me a break...or more to the point, convince
me that it is a violation of the basis and purposes of Part 97.

> ["Yeah, 4-Roger. It's pretty amazin' that these little hand held radios
> will talk this far from each other".]
>
> There is no reason to say "Yeah, 4-Roger" when a simple "OK" or "Roger"
will
> do. Again, expressing ignorance of the characteristics of FM and repeaters
is
> not a way of supporting the basis and purposes outlined in Part 97.

Yawn.

> >> > What about their
> >> > use of the repeater as you dicribed is wrong?
> >>
> >> Liddy is as liddy does.
> >
> >???????
>
> It means there is no reason to consider such operations acceptable.

And who died and made you the operations standards police?

> >> > > These two were joined by a new YL op
> >> > > the other day. She was a "do you want me to
> >> > > pick up bread and milk?" type.
> >> >
> >> > One of my best ham buddies is a long time Extra and his wife
> >> > chats with him on almost every homebound commute. In
> >> > some cases she gives him a "honey do" list of things to get
> >> > from the market on the way home. What's wrong with
> >> > that (i.e. what's wrong with "pick up bread & milk."
> >>
> >> Apparently nothing....in your view.
> >
> >True...but what do YOU consider there to be wrong in
> >such an on-the-air exchange? Would I be correct in
> >thinking you believe that asking hubby to pick-up bread
> >and milk is bad operating or, should be illegal?
>

> I think such "honeydew" stuff is 100% acceptable if done in accordance
with
> established operating procedures.

Stll yawning.

> >> > I'll be very surprised if any of the three will be active on the
> >> > ham bands in five years.
>
> >> > I'll presume that should make you very pleased then.
>
> >> No, what would please me is for them to operate properly and to know
> >> what a repeater does.
> >
> >Operate properly according to you and make you,
> >the self appointed knowledge police happy? You'd
> >better be prepared for lot of stress if what other people
> >legally do or don't do is that uposetting to you.
>
> >> > > > Who cares about how we dialog with each other
> >> > > > as long as the parties involved are operating within the
> >> > > > law as per Part 97 rules and regs?
> >> > >
> >> > > I do.
> >> >
> >> > Based on what authority?
> >>
> >> Sheesh, Bill. I don't need authority in order to care. You asked a
> >> question. I provided an honest answer.
> >
> >Fair enough.
>
> It's about our opinions of what amateur radio is supposed to be. Sloppy
> operating and aping the antics of cb are not what amateur radio is about.

Yet you can't show me that anything these folks did was
a violation in the eyes of the FCC of any aspect of Part 97.
Answer this question: If the FCC had monitored the QSO under
discussion...what would the FCC have done...if at all?

> >> > You are free to worry your
> >> > poor self about whatever you want, but thankfully you
> >> > have no authority to enforce your own standards of how
> >> > to speak on the air on anyone but yourself.
> >>
> >> My poor self? You're starting to sound like Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> Who?
>
> >> I'm
> >> not worried. I pointed out what kind of hams we're now turning out.

>
> There are lots of new hams who learn the right way and do a good job on
the
> air. The above are more the exception than the rule, around here. And I
have
> found that they will often if not usually pick up the right ways after
some
> exposure.
>
> For example, I once worked a newbie who told me on the first go-around
that his
> "personal" was Walter. I replied that my name was Jim. Did not call
attention
> to his poor operating practice, just demonstrated the correct way. It
wasn't
> long before he was using "name" all the time.

So where's the beef?

> >> If
> >> you believe that what I've described is acceptable, feel free to
> >> exchange "four-roger's", "good numbers" and "first personals" to your
> >> heart's delight.
> >
> >I do on occasion.
> >
> Ugly with a capital UGH.

Yawn.

> >> > > We've even got a new op who can be heard moving between the several
> >> > > local repeaters for a goodly part of each day saying, "This is
KC8***
> >> > > radio check".
> >> >
> >> > And that violates what in Part 97?
> >>
> >> Stupidity isn't covered by Part 97.
> >
> >Yawn.
>
> Around here it is common to say "This is N2EY for a radio check, anyone
hear
> me?". Such a call has a very specific purpose: I want a quick signal
report,
> not a prolonged QSO. Often such a call on a repeater will result in a
quick
> exchange of info that lasts only 20-30 seconds. Often the replies will
include
> folks who went to the input to see if they could hear you there, and
report on

> the direct signal rather than the repeat.

Perhaps that is common where you are. I have heard any
variations of a request for a signal report.

> >> > > He'll sometimes pull this stunt on top of an ongoing
> >> > > QSO.
> >> >
> >> > That then IS a violation. I'd fully support the area hams
> >> > directing him as to the rules to NOT QRM an existing QSO.
> >>
> >> We're all thankful for your support.
> >
> >If all you are going to do is bitch about what he does, he'll
> >probably not stop.
>
> Most newcomers I have encountered want to do it the right way and are
> receptive. A few aren't.

Then nail those that aren't.

> >> > > He has been informed on a number of occasions about how to make it
> >> > > clear that he is seeking a contact and how not to QRM an existing
> >> > > contact but he persists.
> >> >
> >> > If, that is as you say, then report him to the FCC.
> >>
> >> It'll happen.
> >
> >Which is exactly the right thing to do.
> >
> >> > > When he does enter a QSO, he normally asks the
> >> > > individuals he contacts if they have any radios they'd like to part
> >> > > with.
> >> >
> >> > And that violates what Part 97 rule?
> >>
> >> I don't recall mentioning a Part 97 infraction. Do you often greet
> >> folks on 2m with, "Do you have any radios you'd like to part with"?
> >
> >If it bothers you so much, don't respond to his call
> >when you hear him.
> >
> I wouldn't

Yet another great American freedom.

> >> > > He has now asked me about six times.
> >> >
> >> > Maybe he has Alzheimers.
> >>
> >> Could be though I don't know of many people in their mid-twenties who

> >> suffer from it.
> >
> >Then just answer his question with a NO.
>
> How many times?

Why does it matter? If it eventually is a pain, then
ignore hhis call. Pretty simple choice as I see it.

> >> > > This fellow is annoying and
> >> > > others--old timers and recent licensees--are beginning to avoid
him.
> >> >
> >> > Which is perfectly OK.
> >>
> >> Aren't you going to ask "By whose authority"?
> >
> >Not at all. No one, not you, me or anyone has any
> >obligation to answer him when he calls. Since there's no
> >mandated response to a call of CQ or XXX monitoring
> >in Part 97, then you could say that the FCC by default
> >authorizes everyone to ignore anyone they want.
>
> Except in an emergency.

Interesting statement. Has anyone ever been cited for failure
to respond to an emergency call? More to the point,
how would anyone or the FCC know?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK